

EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY

GREEK PHILOSOPHY 13-26

edited by Eckart Wilkens

1956/1957

THIRTEENTH LECTURE: THE TREMENDOUS ECONOMY AND PATIENCE OF THE SPIRITUAL HISTORY OF MANKIND

I WHERE IS SAMOS?

1

...{ }, Constantine are the big cities in Thrace. Quite right.

So Orpheus would hail from this part of the northern sphere, and it would again be an outlandish part of the Greek mainland.

Now the next, Musäus. Where does he come from? Mr. Mandaville? (*I haven't got it, Sir.*)

Oh, you only know Arabia. I see. Is there anybody from Arabia in this? Have you found anybody from Egypt in this list? (*Oh, of course, Egypt is playing an important part in all these { }.*)

One of these names comes right from Egypt. Who is it? Who found out about that?

2

Gentlemen, you don't do any work. God help you. If you are not interested in the history of Greek philosophy, I won't make you interested. That's your own interest. Why don't you do the work I have assigned to you?

Which of these men comes from Egypt? Dwight? (*Well, the man from Samos { } was, wasn't he?*)

Ach, ach, ach. You think Samos is in Egypt? Very interesting. That's quite an achievement. Really appalling.

Croesus comes from Samos. Pythagoras comes from there. The Greek of the Greeks. It has nothing to do with Egypt. It's one of the fundamental centers of the Greek spirit. Pure Greek.

3

Where is Samos? Where is Samos situated? Well, I gave you an outline last time? I put Italy; I put Sicily; I put Greece, vaguely; and I put Asia Minor here. Here's Egypt, put room here. Here is Crete. Here are all the islands.

Now where is Samos? What is Samos? City? (*An island.*) An island. Where is it situated? (*Outside of Athens.*) That's Salamis, yes. But not Samos. Heavens! Have you never learned any such geography? (*It's near the Turkish shore.*)

Sure. It's one of the main islands in face of Ephesus and Miletus. Here is Samos. And Mr. Pythagoras then went from here to Croton, Italy, and that is the great line of communication.

Why do you laugh so much, my dear man? Sir, in the blue shirt? (*Why am I laughing?*)
Ja. (*I'm laughing at "Mr. Pythagoras."*) What did I say? (*"Mr. Pythagoras."*)

Ja. Well, he was a gentlemen. He had a daughter, Thea. He was. Yes.

4

Now, Mr. Bollus, Page 125, Number 78, he comes from the delta of the Nile. But he's a later man. He shouldn't be in this book, anyway. But he is an Egyptian-Greek, who already lives under the Ptolemys, when Alexander the Great has conquered Egypt and made it into a Greek subject country, and when Alexandria is founded.

So the story of the name of Bollus appearing here as from Egypt bears out the whole story that the story of Greek philosophy is also one of expansion into newly conquered country. Alexander the Great brings Mr. Bollus about. He lives in Menden.

The old Egyptian city of Menden had a religion of its own, a goat-god -- but this man Bollus just belongs to the Pythagorean school.

Now, go back.

II TO RECONCILE THE EXISTENCE OF YOUR HOMELAND WITH THE REST OF THE WORLD

1

Musäus comes from which city? Nobody has done this work, obviously, except myself. What? (*Athens.*)

Athens, yes. And that is remarkable. If we now go through the list quickly, I'll tell you who is from Athens.

There is one among the seven sages, Solon.

I won't say "Mr. Solon," otherwise the gentleman laughs again.

Solon is not listed as specifically as under Number 10, or 73A, the seven sages. There is one man, Solon, coming from Athens.

If you go on, you find how small the contribution of Athens is. Armanias, 27, supposedly comes from Athens. We aren't quite sure. Damon, in 37, is Athenian. Archelaus, Number 60; 65 supposedly is -- Catilus is Athenian. We'll talk about it in a minute. He is a pupil of Heraclitus of Ephesus. So I don't feel very sure about his homeland -- in the source it is now called Athens.

And then there is Antiphon, 87, and Critias, 88, Athens. And the 89, the anonymous writer quoted by Iamblichus, might be Athenian. He writes in the Attic prose, in Attic style, but more -- we don't know his birthplace.

2

I think it is very important for you to put down the fact, gentlemen, that only six of these men are Athenians. Isn't it right? Six. So Athens is a great center on the crossroads of the Greek world, but it isn't, by no means, the birthplace of the great spirit of the Greek culture.

And you mistake the two things too easily. Therefore I think this is a good list to show you how eccentric the contributions really lie arranged, of the Greek mind. If you see there is one Spartan and perhaps Number 90, he may come from a Spartan, Doric environment. And the other man, from Argos, Polyclitus, Number 40, smaller mind. Nothing very great.

You find anybody else from the Peloponnesus? Peloponnesus contains Olympia, and Elis, and Sparta, the great Prussia, the great West Point of Greece.

Who else is from this Peloponnesus? Have you anybody? Ja, Helis, actually, very good. Thank you very much.

3

And so it is to be sure a very small percentage of people who do any thinking of this type, of this independent type, as a reason for this scarcity in Athens and the Peloponnesus, gentlemen, is the well-functioning of the political unit.

Gentlemen, *for philosophy there is only occasion if you have to reconcile the existence of your homeland with the rest of the world.* If your homeland however is very secluded as in Switzerland, the Swiss have not produced philosophers, because they have produced great leaders in their little mountain cantons.

4

And to this day, if you try to philosophize, don't go to Switzerland. They are an anti-philosophical nation, because they are politically sound. And strong.

And you don't understand this, gentlemen. There is a constant correspondence between political integration and philosophical necessity. If you are in a small political community and have to live in a big universe, then the question of the universe is so preponderant that you cannot be satisfied with the ways of daily life in your little state of Podunk.

But if the people in the Middle West think they can be isolationists, and if you are an isolationist, you don't have to philosophize. Philosophy and non-isolation are connected, because then you have to have ideas, which transcend your native political action.

III WE CAN'T GO TO WAR

1

And there is a struggle.

Why is the Republican Party today so boring? Because it is isolationist at bottom. And it doesn't want to have a philosophy about the future of the universe.

2

Now gentlemen, we already live in a universe with one economy. I tried to tell you this. And therefore this so-called modern Republicanism is still simply isolationist. It's nothing else, because it hasn't digested the doctrines of the war. Even the president of the United States says we can go to war.

3

Now gentlemen, we can't go to war. With the atom and the H-bomb, war is out of the question for any reasonable man. The idea that we just can go to war or not is nonsense.

You can have police actions. You can have riots. You can have bush-fire, wars. But this country cannot go to World War III. It cannot. And it won't.

And the sooner the Republican Party learns this, the more it has a chance ever to elect a president again.

4

It's very strange. This is all talk here, co-existence so. The question is, what kind of co-existence? In one world? In one economic order? Or side by side as in isolationism?

All this -- everybody is sound asleep in the United States now with moral indignation as a substitute for thinking. We are back to 1914, because you actually think we can do as we please. We cannot, gentlemen.

The United States live in one world in which World War III has become impossible.

IV IN TOTAL CONTRADICTION TO OUR REAL POLICY

1

That's new -- you have to think very boldly and very differently from what you think. There is already one economy, as the oil flow shows, and there is still sovereign nations. And they can't get together.

And the talk going on now over the Voice of Europe -- Free Europe and so, is in total contradiction to our real policy.

2

We haven't done a thing to help the Hungarians, but the Free Radio Europe has told them for 10 years that we are going to do something. So split are we, so torn to pieces. We don't know what we shall do, because there are two different ages in our politics today.

One is Herbert Hoover, Sr., who calls himself "junior" -- because I think he's much older than his father, and who just thinks in terms of America and nothing else. And he's perfectly hopeless and helpless, therefore. He has no policy, as you may read in every report. The good man probably went to Princeton or Yale.

And the other problem, the other people who see a little deeper, they have no voice at this moment in the matters, and we have no solution.

3

But if you deduct from our real situation, gentlemen, the problem of one-world economy already in existence, and the possibility of war, practically for a practical statesman, out of the question, because he cannot will the total destruction of a third of his country, then you see that we are living today in one world.

4

Well, I said this before. I only wanted to explain -- it's a very strange list of the land in this whole list. If you come to Southern Italy, you find --

who are the people from Italy represented here? Please? Where do we begin, which number? (45.)

Ja, I should say.

V 13 PHILOSOPHERS FROM SOUTHERN ITALY

1

Abicharmos is 23. Yes, and Pythagoras goes from Samos from Asia Minor, he goes across the whole Mediterranean Ocean -- you must think of it as an ocean in terms of those little yachts and the sailing boats. He goes over to Croton.

Then we come immediately to Caracops and Petron. They are all southern Italy. Brantanos, Hippasus. That's the numbers 15 -- so from beginning with 14, you have all people living in southern Italy. Down to 19, Callifon, and Democedes live in Croton. They are father and son, Callifon and Democedes -- Parmeniskus is from Metaponte, which is also in the so-called boot of Italy.

2

You know, this is called the "boot" because of the heel on the one side, at the Bay of Tarantum and Appolia -- Calabria forming the toes.

Xenophanes is -- Parmeniskus is from Metaponte. Then comes Xenophanes and Heraclitus, they are not. But Epishamus -- Alcmaeon is from Croton. Echus is from Tarant. Paron probably from Croton. Croton is also in southern Italy.

And then comes Parmenides and Zeno, the great heads of the Eleatic school, as I told you, south of Naples. Then Empedocles, we find on Sicily, in Girgenti -- today Acragas. Sybaris is again southern Italy. Ministo comes from there. Of Xudos and Boidas we know very little.

3

Now would you draw a list -- just figure out how many on this first page come from southern Italy and Sicily. Also Theagenes and Number 8. My information says he's from Reggio.

That is -- at the Straits of Messina. What is it?

Sir? You have no book? Nothing? Absolutely nothing. All right. Your neighbor, will you kindly tell me? How many names did we find from southern Italy on the first page? No, no. (13.)

Six, seven, eight, nine, 10, 11, 12. I have 13. I have 13 on the first page. And Pythagoras, Number 14, who transfers his loyalty from the East to the West.

4

I think it's then quite important if you then look at Asia Minor, we have how many, on the first page only?

Samos is Phokus, Number 5. Tenedos, that's next to Troy. Number 6. Syros is Parakides, by the way, a very important man. I may say a word about him. Thales, of course, our great beginner, our pioneer, is Number 4. Anaximander, Miletus; Anaximenes, Miletus. These are 6. Pythagoras is Number 7. Chalcops is Number 8. We aren't quite sure of this; so very little known about him. Xenophanes is that Number 9. Heraclitus, 10. And Millisus, 11. So we have -- ja?

(-- wasn't he a member of the Pythagorean school?) Well, the school certainly is in southern Italy. (Weren't they centered in Syracuse?)

Oh, no. Croton. K-r-o-t-o-n. So we get 11 names here, gentlemen.

How many names did we have in southern Italy? (13.)

VI ECCENTRIC

1

Now, so you see this 24, and the whole center has only then given us 10. And that contains this very fabulous man who really also belongs to the outskirts and should really rate with the people in Tenedos.

This is Tenedos lying right here in front of Troy. Here is Troy. Allorplus then would come from these shores -- from the Dardanelles. Here are the Dardanelles. And therefore I think we should put him off and give these people 9, and these people 12, and these people 13.

And you see therefore that the two wings really crush the center.

2

Now I think that is something which we now can follow up on Page 8 -- Roman viii once more.

The names partly there are printed. I haven't found the principle of this lady. With some people she gives kindly enough the birthplace and with others she doesn't. The reason is unknown to me.

Let's go across. Pitsicus is near Tenedos and Troy. -- Let's go up from Number 74. So will somebody kindly help me figuring this out.

3

Pitsicus is east. Abdera -- where is Abdera? Where are the Abderites, the famous funny people of antiquity, the people of whom every joke is told? It's like Podunk here, the stupid people of Abdera. You don't know where it is?

Macedonia, in the north. So it is also eccentric. It is like Thrace -- Thrace, not a country really of the genuine Greek character. But there the great come. Democritus comes from there. If you look at Number 68. Anaxasius, 72. Quite. So the great men of the Democritean school, of the atomistic school.

4

So we put them on a special list, these three.

Then we have Pitsicus for the easterners; Smyrna, Theognis, Number 71; Chios, of course. Nessas is from Chios, Number 4. Ephesus: Antisthenes, the Heraclitean. -- Ideos -- does anybody know where Apollonia is located? (*Black Sea.*)

Ja. So far away, too. Eccentric.

Then we come to Lampsacus. Where's Lampsacus? Also in Asia Minor. Cleidemus I think is unknown. Apollonia, we have. Will you keep count of this? I won't.

Anaxagoras comes from Clazomenae, also Asia Minor. Lycon comes from Italy. Simus Mionidas from Poseidonia. That is modern Paestum.

We talked about Paestum the other day. That is north of Elea, on south Italian ground, very near Naples.

So Number 56, Poseidonia. Damon and Phintias, 55, come from Syracuse. Protos, Amiklas, and Klineas -- they are quite important. One from Tarentum, the other from Kyrene.

Does anybody know where Cyrene is located, or Kyrene, as the Greeks called it?

VII THE STORIES OF THE GREEK COLONIES

1

It's very strange, gentlemen: in the whole archipelago, in this whole cosmos of the Greeks, of which there were cosmopolitans, in this wonderful galaxy, we might call it with an appropriate word, of this archipelago of Greek colonies, there is of course in France already at that time Marseille, Massilia.

That's a Greek colony, of which they are very proud. It was founded from a country in the east, of Greece, from Euobea, from Phocae.

And the other Greek colony of which they were very proud is in Libya, Cyrene. The Cyrenaica -- you have perhaps heard this term in geography -- the Cyrenaica is the bay at which also the Phoenicians had Carthage, and at which the modern Libya is lying.

2

Cyrenaica is this big part of the Mediterranean shoving in from the East into the African coast, so that it bowls out a big bay window into the coast land. Cyrene, then, is a Greek colony there.

And Pindar, the Greek of the Greeks who sang the Olympic victors, one of his most famous odes is in honor of a man from Cyrene. And it tells the story of the Greek settlement in Cyrene by divine guidance, how the gods decided that this north African colony should come to pass.

3

If you read these stories of the Greek colonies, then you understand a little bit of the story of Israeli, gentlemen.

I had to moderate a very strange meeting two days ago. And people have no idea how life is carried on, on this globe. It is carried on by migration, by colonization -- like this country, too -- and not by legal papers. And the idea of these Arabs, that there can be no change on the map of the world strikes me as very impractical. Effort, and bloodshed, and sweat, and toil -- that's what colonizes countries, and nothing else.

And the idea that somebody says, "This is my country" is just foolish. He can defend it. Then it becomes his country. But by sitting tight and doing nothing and having a desert left and right, you are not owning your country.

4

So to me, Mr. Mandaville, your viewpoint is just childish. And you should know better, having lived in these countries, that by sitting in a desert, you are not the ruler of this desert by a long shot.

I was very depressed that this is all you had learned in the Near East.

If you just read the Bible, you would know a little better. It's just nonsense, what you have seen. Illusions.

VIII THE WHOLE GREEK COLONIZATION IS A FAIRY TALE

1

Colonization, Sir. The whole Greek adventure was one of sacrifice and risking their lives and doing something and building cities on foreign soil. The Greeks didn't own one inch of all this country when they began. Not one inch. They were everywhere, however. And they were there, and they colonized this country, and they all became Greek and began to speak Greek.

All southern Gaul was Greek and for 800 years.

But you have to do something. And these Arabs in Saudi Arabia have just done nothing. Absolutely nothing for a thousand years, and very definitely so.

2

(You advocate then that the Arabian { } the Phocaeans and the Syrians should attempt to integrate themselves into the Islamic religion?)

I don't advocate anything. I only describe how changes on this globe have happened for the last 50,000 years. And I bow to the evidence. And I know that this is the way life goes on, on this globe. And there is no other.

And you won't have life. You just want to have dead order. An order that doesn't exist; empty spaces are not in order.

3

Well, that's a long story. We may sit down and thrash it out.

But I want to say that the whole Greek colonization is a fairy tale, and you find it especially in this school in Cyrene, and this was quite a considerable school.

The man of whom I'm speaking here at this moment is Theodorus, Number 43, who lived in northern Africa.

4

But I think your picture of Greece is quite wrong, if you do not see that that what you call today "Greek civilization" has very little to do with the motherland only. But it has had this tremendous force because it went outside and there had to face a hostile universe and therefore had to justify the existence of any one city, by a philosophy common to the conquered and to the conquerors; or the colonizers, you may say, and the natives.

That's perhaps more friendly expressed, and I think also in a way, very true.

IX *THE SOCIOLOGY AND POLITICS OF THE GREEK PEOPLE*

1

The Number 35 comes from an island in the Mediterranean, Thesos, near the Asiatic coast. Chios again, an island like Samos. And like Thasos. Then Damon is from Athens. Hippon again is from Samos. Hippodamus is from Miletus; and Frilius is from Chalcedon. So Anopodes is from Chios. Hippocrates is from Chios. Theodorus we said Cyrene.

Then we come to southern Italy. Tarentum is Philolaus. Arrodus is from Italy. Archipus, Lyssus, and Opsimus are from southern Italy. Archytas is from southern Italy. Ochelos is from Lucania, which is also near Tarentum.

There are three parts in southern Italy: Calabria, Apulia, and Lucania. And then Timaeus is from Locri. That's in southern Italy, a colony. There were Locri of course in Greece. But this Locri is a colony, like the cities here. Hartford, Connecticut, gave birth to Hartford, Vermont. So of course, the names have been carried around.

2

Hikates and Ekphantus are from Syracuse. Xenophilus is from the north, from where Saloniki now is, from the Chalkidiki, where the three fingers point into the

Mediterranean Sea. And the people in 53, however, they are a little colony in Phlius, and that's south of Argos. Not south of Argos. That's the north -- it's between Corinth and Argos, on the Corinthian gulf.

Choros, from Cyrene. I told this already.

3

Now, would we take then the sum of this all? How many do you put east, and how many do you put west, and how many have we in the center? What is the statistics? Did anybody kindly check it?

(You've got 12 on the east side.) East side. Lower East Side. And on the west? *(I was keeping 10 in the East.)* Only 10? And in the middle? How many? *(Are you counting the islands as part of Greece or --?)*

Sure, sure. Asia Minor, not Greece. Because that's considered -- they felt themselves as being so near the Persian Empire, that they never rated with central Greece before Athens stepped in and conquered them.

So Samos, Chios, all this is we have always figured to be on this side, here.

(There must be more than 12.) Quite. *(You got seven more islands over there.)*

Well, let's do the -- Thasos, 1; Chios, 2; Samos, 3; Miletus, 4; Chios, 5; Chios, 6; then for quite a while nothing. Anaxagoras, 7; Metrodorus, 8; Antisthenes, 9; Apollonia, 10; Nessas, 11; Metrodorus of Chios, 12; Smyrna, 13; and Pitsicus, 14.

Here is 14.

4

So on the other side, in Italy, how many there? Made the count by now?

You understand, I'm anxious to spend some time. All these things will slip your mind. But I think this very primitive work which we are doing here should nail down in your mind the fact that the history of Greek philosophy has something to do with the sociology and the politics of the Greek people, that it is a problem of mental colonization, and that philosophy has something to do with dynamics of political migration.

It's no use your looking at these philosophers, impractical men living somewhere in a brown study. They didn't. *They represented the way in which these new cities and new foundations tried to find their place*, through a decent respect of the opinions of mankind in the universe. When there is already a settlement and new, additional

settlements are needed, then there comes a need for a philosophy, for a critical assessment of what the new order should do in comparison to the old.

Then ideas play their part.

X 13+12+14

1

So how many on the left -- on the western side? (*Thirteen.*)

Thirteen. That sounds reasonable. Ja, we had this already. Fourteen and 13. And in the middle? How many are left to the middle? (*Twelve.*)

2

Now see, as we go on, the middle part is strengthened. The effect of the movement on the wings, on the sides presses home, to the homeland. And of course, you get in 400, when this list ends, you get the center of thought planted into Athens. And you get the academy of Plato.

3

But you would do wrong to this Platonic Academy if you simply said, "Plato is an Athenian, therefore his school is an Athenian thing". It is the result of pressures from the wings on Athens that finally Plato comes to the decision not to become the mayor of Athens, which he could very well have become, or the prince of Athens, like Pericles, but that instead of being the Pericles II, Plato becomes Plato I, and founds this philosophical school, which then can rule the world empire of the Greek mind in Athens.

But with all the other cities having made their contribution, so that Plato, as we shall have to state then in considering his works a little bit more, that all these cities from West and East are represented in his Academy.

4

Gentlemen, the speakers in the great political dialogues of Plato are non-Athenians. That's very important, that the contribution is made: one, by Crition; in his *Timaeus*, the man is a Pythagorean from southern Italy, who speaks.

XI A GREAT VISION OF UNITY ACCOMPLISHED

1

This we have to understand, because the Academy is the antidote against the parochialism of the Athenians, against the 100-percent red-blooded Americans of our days, gentlemen.

You can't have an academy supported by Mr. McCarthy. That's against the academic spirit.

2

The academic spirit is that element - what I tried to show you, there - that reaches into a nation, into a polis as a responsible voice for the larger universe. And the story of this table of contents then therefore is a very dramatic story, because if you read the end, the last four names -- 87, 88, 89, and 90, they probably are at home in Athens, and the last in Sparta.

That is, at the end of these so-called pre-Socratics, before Socrates enters the scene, the philosophy does come home to the center of Greece. But only under this gigantic pressure from the wings.

3

If you look at the last page now, you find that Mr. Protagoras, and Mr. Gorgias, and Mr. Prodicus, and Mr. Hippias, that they all visit Athens. And we know of their visits through the Platonic dialogues. And there is before, already, Anaxagoras, that's a little older, 59.

And it is the visit of these people, and the information from the existence of these people, which brings up the center, the homeland, the Greek homeland to the level of discussion, and to the fiery life of the philosophers who first woke up to their task at the outskirts of this Greek civilization.

4

And in this sense, you perhaps now understand why I feel that you understand this history of Greek philosophy, if you really compare it to the military dream of the catalog of the ships.

Here what was once done in the body of soldiers, a great vision of unity, was now once more accomplished by a great unity of minds over a vast body of sea and land, under the most unpropitious circumstances of separatedness, from island to island.

And these islands there were far apart. It was each time a journey with a question of life and death.

It was like coming to this country in the 17th century. You didn't know if you would arrive. It was dangerous.

XII A HISTORY OF GREEK PHILOSOPHERS

1

Yet they established this great unity of the mind, these great philosophical schools and this common approach to dividing man's thought into logic, physics, and ethics, in such a way that the living generation would know

*what laws to pass,
what physical parts of the universe to discover,
and what the ritual should be by which we should worship the gods.*

2

And therefore, you must look at this history of Greek philosophy perhaps better as *a history of Greek philosophers*. And the philosophers were bold pioneers in action. And they were the wonders of the age.

And you remember -- this is all perhaps now coming back to you -- I tried to tell you that the wonder in philosophy is always threefold.

You wonder about the man who philosophizes. He is the first wonder. Pythagoras is a mighty mind, and you stand in admiration before such a man, who thought that the whole universe could be explained by numbers and by harmonies of numbers.

That's a tremendous idea, and we still dream of it. And I think it is an eternal idea. It's a wonderful idea.

3

I had a friend who was the son of a man who published in 1878 a book. He was a great mathematician. And it was called *The Laws of the Divine Order of the Universe*. He was a professor at a technical institute in Germany. And has the same name as Mr. Wiener -- Norbert Wiener, this man in cybernetics in MIT. His name is also Wiener.

And this man Wiener in 1878 published this book which is strictly Pythagorean in an attempt to explain the universe and all its laws in purely mathematical terms, as

very harmonious and very beautiful. *Gesetze der göttlichen Weltordnung*. Laws of the divine order of the universe. Written still in the style of Lucretius, "divine" and "universe" put together as though they were compatible.

4

Now, so, if you see the one miracle, gentlemen, which you can get here from this table of contents, the philosophers themselves, that there should have been this electrifying stream that every one of these philosophers represents a new combination of the three problems: God, man, world;

*or the cult of a city,
the society of man,
the laws of outside nature.*

XIII THE THREE MIRACLES

1

Every one of these philosophers has another key to open this door of the relations between the three. So he is a miracle.

That's the first miracle.

2

The second miracle is the universe around us.

And the third miracle is the formation of a public that is willing to listen to the truth, and willing to reform, and willing to be taught. And they are represented in the case of Parmenides and the later schools by this group of young men, like yourself, who fall in love with truth and sacrifice everything to truth, and cease to be in the first place either jewelers and blacksmiths and miners or hunters or soldiers or citizens or sons of their parents, but become something other: students.

Students of the truth.

That which we try to make you into, and which we do not succeed, because your extracurricular activities prevent you from being real students.

3

Nobody in our Dartmouth is a real student, because the intellectual endeavors here are held in contempt. You are playboys, gentlemen. You are not students. Because a student -- what is a student, gentlemen?

By definition of the word, a student is a man who is willing to do more than his teachers ask him to do. And you all try to do less than I ask you to do. You are pupils, 6 years old. Because you all try to do less than I expect you to do.

You can never be a student, because "student" comes from "studius," from being excited. And to study means to be excited, and to be so excited that what I say is only half of the story. The other thing is what you do.

But you all expect me to be more interested than you are. Gentlemen, that I cannot achieve. It's a misproportion.

4

So, three reasons for wonder, gentlemen.

The philosophers, the universe, and the student group,

this free republic of studious people who are anxious, eager, and excited enough to forget their immediate interest.

Gentlemen, a student who cannot forget his immediate self-interest certainly cannot be a student of the truth. In any good moment obviously you are able to do that -- you have to forget your immediate aim, your immediate goal.

The goal which you are devoted as students are not what you get out of this course. That's always the ruin of all your studies that in all your naiveté, you put this impertinent, infamous, and criminal question, "What do I get out of this course?"

XIV UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER OF THE MIND TO THE TRUTH

1

Gentlemen, you have the great honor of forming a new public for the next truth, for the philosophy of the time now needed. And therefore you are needed, gentlemen. You are in demand.

Therefore, you have to give yourself. You have to surrender. Unconditional surrender. And if you cannot unconditionally surrender your mind to the truth, gentlemen, I have nothing to offer you.

2

Philosophy has nothing to offer you. The history of the Greek philosophy makes absolutely no sense. Perfectly worthless to you. It's perhaps nice for a smattering at a dinner table, or in a club, but that's different.

Like the businessman from Chicago who was asked by a friend of mine in Harvard why he went to Harvard, and he said, "It pays to have been to Harvard when you live in Chicago."

Of course, you see. Who is from Chicago? I have nothing to add.

3

So this list for you antecedes the central philosophers of Athens: Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. And you must never forget that these names, which overshadow today in most people's mind the prehistory of the Greek mind, are not greater names in the sense that they were greater men. They stood on the shoulders of these achievements of 200 years, from Thales of Miletus to Hippias, to Trasimachus, to Prodicus. And they are unthinkable without the greater sacrifices of these founders of Greek philosophy, gentlemen.

Under much greater danger, many of these people were persecuted like Socrates, and executed, by the way, too, had to flee for their lives. And the pioneers, the founders, gentlemen, always have a more heroic task than the classics.

4

I have written a pamphlet, "*A Classic and a Founder*," in trying to distinguish the role played in any movement between these two phases of life. I treat there the founder of physics and the classic of physics.

The classic of physics is Michael Faraday. And the founder of physics is Paracelsus. You don't know anything about Paracelsus. You know very little of Faraday, but you swear by Mr. Einstein.

Now Mr. Einstein is not a hero. He's a classic -- a late classic. Very late classic, as a matter of fact. Faraday is the greater man in my mind. And Paracelsus a much greater man, and had much greater hardships to overcome.

XV A SYMPHONY OF BIOGRAPHIES

1

In the same sense, I want you to understand that these first 90 names here in this booklet, gentlemen, are the hall of fame of Greek philosophy. And the classics get all their halo, Mr. Plato, from the sacrifice of these people.

And you will never understand then Plato or Aristotle if you look at them not at the harvest of lives lived before them, but as independent thinkers. They didn't want to be.

2

The difficulty for you -- that's why I've wasted so much time seemingly on this geographical business: I didn't mean the geography, gentlemen; I meant the spirit. The concentration of the Greek mind in Athens, is only of one moment when Plato's name shines brightest, and Socrates is executed there, and so Athens itself tries to become intellectual, which it had never been.

3

The inheritance or heritage, gentlemen, of glory by such an outstanding figure like Goethe in Germany, like Shakespeare in the Elizabethan age, like Plato in 400 is a phenomenon which you must understand in order not to fall into some idolatry.

I think the great danger today is that you say, "Greece, that's Plato, a great man." Then you better should know anything of Plato. Because if you do not see the tremendous economy and patience of the spiritual history of mankind, you think there was just one man who had a great genius.

I think you will waste your time in reading any one of his dialogues. And there is no direct access to Plato without seeing him in the middle of this ocean of thought, emerging and trying to organize these thoughts, these various schools.

The work of Plato, gentlemen, is the attempt to organize the miracles of the human mind that had gone before, into one galaxy. It is like the calendar of the saints of the Church, where all the feats of the first 300 years of the Church are collected, from All Souls, to All Saints, to Christmas, to Easter, to Pentecost.

4

So Plato is not the calendar of the mind, but the mental star, or constellation in which all these stars are placed. And that's why his various dialogues take up one of these great stars after another.

There are the Pythagorean dialogues, there are Eleatic dialogues, there are Heraclitean dialogues. There are dialogues from all the digesting, the contributions made in all these various cities, from southern Italy to Asia Minor, to Macedonia to the north.

And therefore Plato himself is an encyclopedia, but not in your sense of the word, of an alphabetical character, gentlemen, but it's a kind of symphony of biographies, symphony of lives of thinkers. It's an attempt to force into one heritage, into your and my mind something that had happened in various cities lying apart. And of course probably living in splendid isolation, more or less, having not enough intercourse, yet.

XVI PLATO - A COUNTERMOVE AGAINST THE POLITICAL DOMINATION OF ATHENS

1

Plato tries to put them all in one field of force and make them all fruitful so that they could beget each other, could -- how do you say? not "beget" -- fertilize each other. That's the cross-fertilization, that's what Plato is. He is a cross-fertilizer, his philosophy.

2

And only if you see this you can understand the daring of the man to settle in a city like Washington, D.C., certainly the most demented city of bureaucrats I have ever known. Where 1 million people do nothing but write regulations for other people who live elsewhere -- yes, it's a perfectly unnatural city. It's a purely idealistic city -- it has no basis in fact, has only basis in government.

It's a very strange city. One million people, writing rules and regulations for others.

3

And Athens, at that moment of 400 was ruling a big empire. It owned the islands from which these philosophers came, more or less. It was at that moment dreaming of going to southern Italy and conquering Syracuse. And that broke down, however.

But it owned the whole Mediterranean east of the mainland of Greece. And it owned the north. It went up to the Khalkidhiki, to Abdera and those regions. And we have now excavated Olynthus, and other cities of the north only in the last decades where Athenian colonies were established on the way to Macedonia, from where later Aristotle educated Alexander the Great.

4

So you must think that Plato is a counter-move against the political domination of Athens. It is the recognition on the part of a man from Athens that this vast empire contained germs of wisdom, and germs of thought which now had also to be made available in the center, in Athens itself. And there in a school, in a university, fertilize the thinking of these very, very egotistic bankers and farmers of Attica.

It would be as if the Chase National Bank and Senator Aiken from Vermont, who is a farmer, would try to govern the Near East, the Far East, South America, Middle America, as we try to do, and without any instruction, without any enlightenment. And then somebody like John Dewey, or other, would come and say, "Now let us digest all the wisdom from the East and the South and the North, before we put over our government over these outlying territories."

XVII MENTAL APPETITES AND ATTITUDES

1

With this, I can only recommend you that you read fragments of this book here as you go along – for example, Democritus and -- yourself. You are very easily understood. Loicoepus and Democritus form one school, that you also look into the tradition of the Pythagoreans.

Those of you who write on the Pythagoreans anyway in their term paper, will of course have to do this anyhow.

2

But I think it's no use for me demanding any one of you to read this whole book in one stretch. One cannot do this fruitfully. But consult it. And you will find that if you take some trouble, you may not succeed in every one case, but in 70 out of these 90 cases, you might find that the fundamental position held by these people is still today valid.

It is valid within a larger concept, just as it is valid on one moment to laugh, and the other to weep, and the other to be indifferent. These are mental moods, I told you, that recur.

3

The Greeks discovered the mental appetites and the mental attitudes which are part of a normal human mind, of a full-grown complete human mentality. And you will find that not one of these positions can be forgotten.

The history of Greek philosophy is not in your sense history, that it is bunk, and that it is dust, and that it is in the Hades. You can today read a prophecy from Isaiah and it strikes you as absolutely valid, and tomorrow you read Ezekiel, and the same; and then you read Amos, and you are struck that all these prophets have something lasting to say.

Much the same with these philosophers, gentlemen. Every one of them has, for a certain problem of ours, today, still something to say. You cannot say that they are wrong. You cannot say that they are obsolete. They are still important. They still give you a cue.

4

I mean, this whole modern physics, gentlemen, you have to go back to Democritus or to Pythagoras again and again to sharpen your wits and to know what you want to do when you explain the electrons.

On Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, they are waves. And on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, they are corpuscles. And that's already the problem of Democritus, and it's the problem of the Pythagoreans. The Pythagoreans thought they were harmonies of the numbers; that would be the wave theory. And the Democritus said it is the corpuscle theory.

But we haven't decided it, yet. We are still half between the Pythagoreans and the Democriteans. And you will never decide it, because the human mind discovered there its own operations.

"Electrons" is just your and my way of looking at the universe. Don't believe for a minute that the universe consists of electrons. It's only our necessity of speaking about the universus. But what the universe is, gentlemen, don't believe for a minute that it is electrons.

It's you and me. And I am not an electron; you are not an electron. You are just who you are. And you are much more complicated than is good for the physicist.

XVIII NOTHING CAN BE THOUGHT THAT THESE PEOPLE HAVE NOT ALREADY STARTED THINKING ABOUT

1

All simplifications, gentlemen, today, in trying to say that a man can be explained by electrons, the people have tried to do it. After the atomistic school, and after the Pythagorean school, which tried to run politics on physicists' lines, back comes some ethicist and says, "That's all nonsense."

"The laws of the city are the first we have to revise. And then we have to give laws to the universe, as though we were legislators of the universe."

2

So you find this all on these pages. And I can only whet your appetite.

3

But these few lines -- after all, the whole book has 150 pages - are just as important as the bigger and the smaller prophets in the Bible. They are the whole history of the human mind, believe it or not. Nothing can be thought that these people have not already started thinking about, because they were exposed to serious thinking, and you only fool around.

I mean, for you it's just a plaything in your bull sessions. It's not a question of life and death.

But to these people, for their political survival, the question: what is the small community and the large universe to me? and how do the two fit together? how much have I to be loyal to the laws of my country? Do I have to go to war for my country? Do I have to become a citizen of the world? -- all this has been thought out here -- very carefully, and much better than you think it out.

4

And you better dip then into these pages, if you want to sharpen your wits, gentlemen, because your wit is very blunt. Compared to these Greek people, you cannot think. There has been a great regress.

The intelligence of the American and of the European at this moment is I think at an all-time low. The primitive way in which you consider the questions of the universe can't be beaten. It's just all trash. It's on the level of things that can be sold

immediately by the millions, gentlemen. A newspaper by 5 million copies like *Life*, can only be stupid.

XIX WE COMBINE

1

So the miracle of these men remains very great, gentlemen.

In antiquity -- may I say this before we have a break, gentlemen?-- in antiquity, the individual achievement is greater than in our time. Our time, the last 1900 years have the task of combining.

2

Here you have to combine the Old Testament and the Greek philosophy, for example. We combine. And you have -- Hindu and Greek philosophy, and German and French, and so on. We can do many big things by combination.

3

But the original thinking, gentlemen, the stroke of genius is much greater in antiquity.

There has been no progress as to the quality of genius. It is the same at all times. The man who brought fire down from Heaven, Prometheus, certainly was a greater mind than anyone in this room.

Your idea is the opposite. You think that you are a greater mind than Prometheus. You are not.

We are much smaller, gentlemen. But we cooperate better. These people were more isolated. They had not the men and the machinery to fertilize millions of people with one thought. They had to be satisfied to tell 10, or 20, or 50. That's the only difference, gentlemen.

4

The quality of mind, gentlemen, is to this day -- and anybody who knows the Greeks will agree to you -- the genius of the Greeks, gentlemen, is greater than any genius of our own era. And that's why we have to deal with them. They couldn't come to fruition, because they were isolated. It was just this little Greek -- these little cities.

XX ARISTOTELES' QUESTION

1

And that's why I tried to place them in their tiny, small environment of islands in the sea, in the Mediterranean.

2

It's all just to you now specks. You fly over twenty of these islands in two minutes. That doesn't alter the fact that the quality of the minds, who lived in these islands, was a tremendous one. The fundamentals have all been thought there. If you think that modern physics had just to go back straight to the discussion of the Democritean and the Pythagorean school, only to know what they were doing.

Mr. Mayr, of the department of biology from Harvard came up two years ago. You probably haven't heard him speak about the problem of species in zoology. And it was pathetic. My colleagues in the biology department, and all the students were not up to his question. His question was the question of Aristotle, "What is species?" They had learned something, what species is, but they didn't know what they were talking about. It's a question of questions.

What is a species, gentlemen? And you may speak about the origin of species, and not yet know what a species is.

3

And so we are very great barbarians, and the discussion was, as I said, quite tragic. Here was a whole department of zoology. They knew all about the individual animals, but they hadn't idea what they were talking about with regard to the philosophy of their zoology. They didn't know what a species really ought to be.

And he spent a whole evening trying to explain to them that the problem already had been put very clearly by Aristotle, but it had been forgotten.

Let's have a break.

I THE HEROIC TASK OF PARTICIPATING IN THIS VENTURE

1

...could solve this problem. And at the end of Greek philosophy, I think it's a very fitting climax.

We have said we know only as much as we love. You cannot know things of people without loving them. This the Greeks did not want to know. And because second impressions are not the loving, but the indifferent impressions, the ones by which you are sober, by which you are objective.

2

Objectivity, gentlemen, does not lead you to knowledge, to real knowledge. It leads you to exploitation. You can use things which you know by your reason. But you don't know what to do with it. It's purely pragmatic.

So Mr. Mandaville, the answer to Mr. Somerset Maugham's student would be, that it isn't enough to study under a Hindu teacher, and it isn't enough to study with Plato. But you have to do things. You have to serve. You have to sacrifice. You have to love. You have to renounce.

Where you love, you know.

(Yes, but the point is this fellow -- he loved a woman, he considered that part of his life, he gave himself entirely to her, he sacrificed everything, and yet he still wasn't completely satisfied.)

Ja, the question is whether the search of truth is not bigger than your personal satisfaction. Why do you have to be satisfied? I hate people who are satisfied. They are disagreeable people.

(In other words, happiness --)

I mean, the real people are the people who are very dissatisfied, first of all with themselves, don't you think? *(How can you be content?)*

I say, you mustn't. You must never be content. No reason why you should be content.

(You said at the beginning of the course that you shouldn't always run after happiness. But you said also that people can be content. When?)

Oh, as a by-product. I said you probably will be content if you do what is right. But the attempt to be happy, or to become content, is silly. It's just silly.

(Running after happiness.)

It's a by-product. It's a result. Or, it's whatever it is. But certainly we can't aim at it. Anybody who aims at it is like the man who goes to 50 doctors in order to be healthy. He can never be healthy as long as he doesn't throw out the 50 doctors.

3

(Well, the story of John Stuart Mill's life, he was brought up by his father. But I suppose the type of education is closer to what you call seeking the truth, very strictly school and all the Greek philosophy, and as a matter of fact, strongly schooled in everything, mathematics at that time. And when he reached the age of 21, he almost had a complete and nervous mental breakdown because of this.)

And I was just wondering, if you don't think that there is also something besides the search of truth necessary for wholeness in human life.)

Well, I mean, there are victims on any battlefield, and if twenty people study and two go nuts, that's the usual price.

What do you mean? Here you see that poor Lannes has given up running the mile. He is a victim of the track. What does this say against the running track? Do you see it in the paper? He broke down, all right. Let him break down. Victims, everywhere. It's ridiculous -- the question's perfectly worthless, anything we do we can do wrong. Anything we do we can exaggerate. There are always victims.

And you have to have victims in order to reach the goal. Some reach the goal. Franklin perished at the North Pole, and was never heard of again. And the pole was finally conquered.

What else is there in life?

(Well, what I was trying to point out, Professor Huessy, was that these men, who were not victims, necessarily had something else in life besides what they were famous for, that balanced out their life. Maybe I'm wrong, but I don't think human nature has changed so much that they, unlike us, would not have something else --.)

4

My dear man, I may say some triviality. But nature is terribly wasteful if you look outside into the natural world. In order to fertilize one flower, any number of pollen is wasted. And so it is with all our enterprises, gentlemen. Hundred have to try so that one may succeed. There's just no other way of doing it. All these hundred find their satisfaction in the heroic task of participating in this venture. They also ran. But the one man then who is -- that's what I tried to tell you about Plato -- without these hundred heroes here, no Plato.

Yet you don't have now to learn the system of any one of these men, at full length. We don't even have their writings. And we harvest where they have sown.

II *YOU NEVER MUST DESPISE THE VICTIM*

1

Life is, in this sense, tragic, because obviously the better man may be killed. And the less-good man mince their laurels.

We have to be aware of this, so that you never must despise the victim.

2

What is so terrible in this country is that you identify the successful man with the martyr and the saint. And you don't wish to think of the martyrs; and you then glorify the cheap heroes, who only harvest what the others have sown.

3

And therefore, I want you to understand that in God's eyes, in our maker's eyes, these people who don't have success are just as much loved by Him, as much His children, perhaps even more so than the ones He allows to reach the goal. And if they were not greater souls, they wouldn't have stood the agony of perishing and of missing out in the eyes of the world.

And they probably reached their goal inwardly. And I think in the eyes of God -- in the eyes of His faithful, they deserve a niche.

4

That's why I think some relation, gentlemen, to the spirits of the past is necessary for you. I'm so sorry that you don't have it. You have no ancestors, no spiritual forebears, because you don't dare to read these people with the earth-shaking and heart-shaking experience.

Heavens! What greatness to sacrifice, to go through this darkness, and to hope -- to come out and to give up, not to feel frustrated.

III AGAIN: HERACLITUS VERSUS PARMENIDES

1

But life is serious, gentlemen. You may say tragic, in this sense, that the individual can only find his peace by knowing that many must run the race, and only one wins.

This is your problem, isn't it?

2

Before we now turn next time to the story of Socrates and Plato in somewhat more detail, I would like to say one thing about the Pythagoreans.

I have tried to tell you that the problem of the Eleatic school is to make the mind independent from first impressions to such an extent that the laws of the city, the laws of Elea or the laws of Samos or the laws of Miletus cannot be anything but illusion or transient, or you may say "trash" -- compared to the lasting truth which the philosophical group tries to face as the laws of the universe.

3

I tried to introduce you to this notion of a universe which was *pan*, all, that it would not be shaken by any phenomenon of a purely local, or a purely temporal character.

And Parmenides put these two worlds one against the other, and says, "The language, the talk of the town, the logos of the city, the words of the religion and of the intercourse of the citizens must not influence our study of the laws of the universe."

And I told you that against him Heraclitus rants, because he says, "This man destroys the loyalties of citizenship, the loyalties of piety, because he says this is all just limited, temporal and local. And I have lasting and universal truth only, not only with regard to the dead physical world, but even with regard to my loyalties towards this city, and towards the gods of my city."

4

And, for example, take the very practical question of service in the war. From the Parmenidean standpoint, there is no way of ever explaining that a soldier should fight for his country, because that is not being. That's unreal; it's illusion.

And so the Hindu attitude, for example, of nonresistance, of nonfighting which you love so much, goes very well together with this Parmenidean philosophy, because it

says that wars are illusions. The parts of the universe are already united, and if we can't unite them, we go to war; we misunderstand our position with regard to the true laws of the universe.

IV DESTRUCTION OF THE FIRST LANGUAGE

1

What I'm driving at is, gentlemen: the destruction of the normal language of man is the first result of philosophy.

And in my paper, I have tried to show you that Heraclitus is opposing this destruction and this replacement of pronouns like "being" and "that" and "this," and "the thing" for the named orders of this city of Miletus or Ephesus or Elea, in which I say, "I'm not a citizen of a city, but I'm the citizen of Elea, and I'm very proud of this."

And if you say, "I'm Eleatic," you act differently from when you say, "I'm just a citizen of one city".

2

If an American says, "I'm American," he's proud. If he says, "I'm a citizen of a little place in Illinois," that's quite a different feeling, because he even suppresses the name, because he assumes that you don't even know the name.

3

So we today have this experience: always the philosophical, "I'm a citizen of a little town there." That's one out of many. But "I'm an American," that's not one out many. That's what you are. You can't get out of this, by saying "I'm a citizen of one of the nations of the world." You'll never say that. You always say, "I'm" -- you are an American.

4

Philosophy making every city, only one out of many, reduces patriotism, reduces religion to relativity and reduces also the love of family and the love of friends to something which can be exchanged for a hundred other things. And it weakens man.

And it makes you into these mental decadents, which you are. In your head, the abstractions rule. You really think that a nation, a city is as good as your nation, and the city -- my city.

It isn't, gentlemen. It's something totally different. For your city you have obligations. For a city you can do city planning. You can be hired as a city planner. But you can go to any city to plan it. And it isn't your city. Something quite different. And your family is one thing, and families in sociology quite another thing.

But that's a constant thing introduced by Parmenides into the world. And it destroys the first language of mankind, the native language, the idiomatic language, which is always religious, which always begins with the word "God," with the word "prayer," with the word "devotion," and then goes onto praise and thanking and scolding and judging and so on.

V PYTHAGORAS

1

Now gentlemen, Pythagoras -- this is what I'm driving at, steps into this dangerous zone. He says, "If we could find a language of the universe, we would not have to have an idiomatic language in our hometown. We could abolish Greek and Egyptian. We could abolish Doric and Attic. We could not and would not have to speak dialect, because there may be a universal language of the universe."

And the great temptation of Pythagoreanism, gentlemen, is always that you can perhaps hope to find numbers and to express the secret of the universe in numbers only.

2

If you say that an octave relates as one to two, in music, you feel there is no contradiction possible. It's valid for all.

And therefore, gentlemen, I thought I might make this point, that whereas Parmenides destroys language, Heraclitus tries to save it; Pythagoras tries to replace it.

3

He is the first man of rank who sees that when you abolish your first impressions -- and that is your native language, and its power over your heart and mind -- then you have to find a second language. Parmenides doesn't find the second language.

He abstracts to say being is not a language. That's just thinking. That's inside language. It is without force into the outside world.

Well, you can never hope to tell a farmer what being is. It's only for philosophers, the Parmenidean language. The language of thinkers is a language of thinkers. But the language of Pythagoras, that's what Pythagoras hoped, might be expected to penetrate everybody, if and as far as it is possible.

4

So Pythagorean teaching of numbers is a remarkable venture. And it has the great temptation in our time again.

And Pythagoreanism has never died out and will never die out. And it has great wisdom, under one condition that you understand it a little better than it is understood today.

VI THE QUALITY OF NUMBERS

1

Pythagoras says that everything can be expressed in figures. But the second sentence is always omitted from your brain. You don't know that figures have qualities.

2

I've written a whole book on this, *The Multiformality of Man* -- some may know it -- in which I've tried to show that 2 is not just 1 and 1. It has a quality of its own; 3 has a quality of its own; 4, 7, 9.

You laugh at this. Today, it is considered a superstition that there are nine gifts of the Holy Spirit, the Church has always considered seven sacred, like the Jews, with the seven-day Sabbath, which has very profound reasons that it should be seven days.

And you laugh, and call "superstition" the quality which the ancients felt to be in the various numbers.

3

In order to explain to you what this means, I have great hardship.

Give you an example of the Pythagorean thinking, which is adopted, by the way, in the Catholic Church to this day, that if you want to speak to the world, of the nondivine part of our experience, the created world, the universe, without the logos, without God speaking, what you call "nature," that it can only be covered by the figure 4, and not by 3.

Divine is the Trinity; 4 is the world; the two together are 7.

To you, that is mere bunk. If you talk to a Unitarian, if you talk to a modern rationalist, if you talk to a Free Mason, they cannot understand this.

To me it has simply the full ring of truth, gentlemen. It means not that , and 1 and 1 and 1 make 4. And then you should stop and say, "Worship 4." That would be superstition. The reason for the Pythagorean, so-called tetractys –

who has already read about the Pythagorean tetractys? Who's writing on Pythagoras? Well, you'd better get going, Sir. It's very exciting.

4

If you have the word "God," gentlemen, the Trinity means that we have to make three starts before we understand what can be meant by God. If you do not bring yourself into three different positions, the best you can say of God -- that is, in your mind, like a man.

A man you can conceive of by one. I meet you, and that's one.

Now obviously, the divine majesty, who has created the world before we were, who lives at this moment, gentlemen, who is to be at the end of the world accomplished, will use us as His instrument in the process, cannot be had in one breath. You have to allow yourself time, before you are aware of the divine majesty.

VII A VERY SIMPLE EXPLANATION OF THE TRINITY

1

It's just disrespectful to deny the Trinity, and to speak of God as one which you can have in one concept. God is not a concept. God is more alive than you and I. And He is at least three -- what you think of three different people: the founder of your race, perhaps; your best-loved contemporary, that's your wife; and the final product, the last man. They together may give you an idea who God is.

That's a minimum.

2

So the Trinity, gentlemen, is not really God Almighty himself, but it is that minimum -- perhaps I should put it this way to explain my thought, before you can dare to say that you have a right to take the name of God into your mouth without blasphemy, is that you may take the trouble of giving it time.

And you have to make three starts.

3

That's a very simple explanation of the Trinity. Before, you haven't breathed three times, you aren't even near the divine spirit.

For human affairs, you can spit out all your words just at once. But if you deal with somebody so superior to ourselves, we have to give it this amount of time that three times we have to break down our little logic, and are willing to see the same truth in three different sides and three different manners: Son, Father, and Holy Spirit.

4

Now, the same is true of the world.

The Church and the Pythagoreans agree, that before you could know what the universe was, you had to look into four directions. That comes from the very primitive experience of north, south, east, and west, that there are four directions of the globe, and it comes from the very interesting fact that nobody, except man, can move in all four directions of the globe.

The sun can never get north. The moon can never get north. The stars in the North which you see, never move. They are the polar stars, who move around the pole. And therefore the cleavage in the real world is, gentlemen, that its parts can never get to each other.

Only man can move in this universe.

That's one of the reasons why the four was chosen.

The other reason is that the world is not God, because it contains death. And God is not subject to destruction, to death. The world is. So the element of death enters wherever you want to distinguish "world" and "God," it's very simple. That which is mortal belongs to the world.

That's another consideration.

VIII *WILLIAM JAMES, GENERAL SMUTS*

1

What I'm driving at, however, is simply this: reality has to be looked upon at least in four parts before we can be sure that we have reached its tremendous abundance, its multitude, its plurality.

2

William James has rediscovered this. He was a Pythagorean. He said, "I'm a pluralist;" it is impossible in one system, in one mathematical equation, in one physical theory to exploit the wealth of the universe. It's just nonsense to say, "all is electron."

One of you asked me why it shouldn't all be electron. Well, if I'm also electron, I'm so many other things, too. I'm vocal, Sir. Electron doesn't speak. If you describe me as being electrons, you omit the best feature about me, that I can prattle.

3

So the four means that a whole, a total, a globe, a universe can come to your and my experience only if you make four attempts.

4

Four then is the minimum for understanding holism, as General Smuts in South Africa has called it, a whole. You understand, the problem of the four then is that it is that minimum of effort to get hold of a universe, of a whole.

IX *THE REALITY IS ILLOGICAL*

1

You can't have it just by going logically, as you think you can, in a system, in a nice system. Most physicists think this, too, most so-called philosophers. Begin with A, and then come to B, and then by syllogism work it up to C.

And Pythagoras said, "That's good for logic. That's for your brain". But your brain never gets into reality, if he doesn't break away from this inner logic, which is dualistic: object-subject.

2

The reality is illogical. It is translogical.

You certainly are only confining yourself to brain operations inside yourself, if you do not look out of the window and say, "There are four directions of the globe. There is life and death." That's perfectly logical. One thing is here today. It isn't there tomorrow. Perfectly logical.

3

In logic, I saw this thing here. Why isn't it still with us again? Because it died. What's death? I don't understand.

The first thing the philosophers try to say, "Death doesn't exist. You are immortal." Just fiction.

Very bad philosophy, but it has been held by many philosophers, like the Stoics.

4

By which I mean then that Pythagoras was very superior to the logicians. Pythagoras wanted to limit logic. And so he said the tetractys is the beginning of wisdom.

I may say a word about this next time.

FOURTEENTH LECTURE: THE NUMBER 4 HAS THIS GREAT MERIT THAT IT FORCES YOU TO STAY WITHIN EMPIRICAL EXPERIENCE

(This is the second side.)

I WHAT TO READ (PYTHAGORAS, ARISTOTELES)

1

...respect, or reverence for the great power that is in numbers. They are brazen enough to say, "If I can number a thing, so what?"

Anybody who deals with the Pythagorean paper should think twice before he delivers it to me, because I will not accept any impertinence or brazenness or insolence.

It's a very solemn thing to hear the harmony of the spheres.

2

And who deals with Pythagoras? There's only one? Well, ja. You do well to read in a translation, of course -- this is a very brief thing -- at least the *Timaeus* by Plato, once through. It's a short thing to read, but there you find the response to Pythagoreanism by a mind like Plato.

He wasn't a Pythagorean, but in his old age he heard also the harmony of the spheres. And as a matter of fact, the greatest expression of the Pythagorean secret is today for us in the *Timaeus*, a dialogue of the latest years of Plato.

3

With regard to Aristotle the opposite is true. There is so much we have from Aristotle's pen, that I have never thought that you could read everything -- that would be even useful to recommend an extended reading.

I would suggest that you take up two books in full. Either *Politics* and *Poetics*, or the *Constitution of Athens* and the *Nichomachean Ethics*, or the book on politics. But there have to be at least two full-fledged books which you analyze in your paper to get to the method. You can also get his books on animals and plants, because he created, as the first man in history, the power to describe something objectively.

4

And so it's a question of your own selection. And I don't want to prescribe anything, because Aristotle is really of an amazing universality. And if I would cut out a certain book, I would prejudice your own taste.

Anybody who is interested in the natural sciences will go to his natural scientific writings. They are, with regard to style and representation just as exciting as the political writings or the literary writings.

II TRADITION OF ARISTOTELES

1

I don't think there is - in my mind - any one writing by Aristotle in which his greatness is greater than in the others. If you always keep in mind that with Aristotle we reach this moment of quiet contemplation of the width of the universe, of the famous Greek "*pan*," including man, including the variety of states.

2

Also if one of you writes -- who is dealing with Aristotle?

All of you want to do is to meditate on this tremendous undertaking of his that he had 158 constitutions of different states worked over and represented objectively, not swallowing them all up in a neat system of politics, as we write our textbooks on government today, but expounding carefully the workings of 158 different systems, so that everyone could be done justice and could stand out in its own light and on its own merits.

3

We have only one of these books today. But the principle of his assortment, of his selection, of his undertaking deserves a clear statement in your paper, because in addition to the -- you may say - notes his students got from his lectures, which we now today call his books, many of his real writings, which he wrote himself, dialogues and others, are lost.

And it's very unfair today to compare the Aristotelian bulk of literature with the Platonic, because the proper doctrine of Plato was never written. And his dialogues are sideline books. And he says so himself in his Seventh Letter.

Who is dealing with Plato?

4

So first, to finish my words on Aristotle. Be careful not to be dismayed by the lack of beauty in Aristotle's books. Most of it has been preserved by notes, taken down by his students.

III CHRIST AND PAUL, ARISTOTELES AND THEOPHRASTUS

1

(How should we treat Theophrastus with Aristotle?)

Well, as much as you can. He is the real son of Aristotle. And he adds to Aristotle the dealing with characters, with human types. So he tries to go on from the animals and plants and even follow this into human nature.

And his characters to this day are outstanding descriptions of temperament.

2

I think I must leave this to you, just as I leave the selection of the writings of Aristotle to you.

I think in Theophrastus, it becomes clear what the ultimate is. The highest.

3

Gentlemen, most great men reach their achievement in their best students, in their best pupil. You cannot understand Christ without Paul.

It' has been the fashion of the last hundred years to say that Paul spoiled Christianity. But he didn't. He made it understandable, and he has saved it. And nobody understands Christ who doesn't understand Paul.

And this habit of killing Paul in order allegedly to love Christ is a very bad habit. And I think it's wearing off today. It has been done with a great ruthlessness, and great lack of taste.

So with Theophrastus and Aristotle, it's similar. He's his best pupil. And the real man, the man who got it all from Aristotle, and where it stands out very clearly.

4

With regard to Plato. Every one of you has to deal with the *Seventh Letter*. The *Seventh Letter* is his own statement about the relation of his writings to his teachings. If you don't read the *Seventh Letter*, then you do not understand the place which he gives himself to his literature.

And you are all so paper-minded and paperbound-minded, that you think when a man writes a book, that's the man. Far from it, gentlemen. You don't know Plato if you don't see his life.

His achievement is the great eighty years, which he lived from -- what are his dates? Who knows the life dates of Plato? Well, then I have to assume that you haven't even started on your paper on Plato. That's the first thing, after all.

When a man writes about another man, he goes and looks up his dates and learns them by heart. Otherwise you can't know anything about the man.

Funny idea. Do you know when you have been born? Well, without it, you are lost. If you don't know whether you are 15 or 28, you don't know how to behave.

IV FOUNDER - AND: BORNE INTO SOMETHING

1

This is not ridiculous, gentlemen. I assure you that as long as you haven't put down the dates of Plato and made clear that he was 28 years old when Socrates died, in his absence, to his great dismay -- and that is the real tragedy of Plato's life, as I told you -- then you don't understand Plato, how he spent the rest of 42 more years of immortalizing Socrates.

2

That's a very strange relation. Twenty-eight is 4 times 7. These are four phases of growth. And there were left to him how many more years? -- 42 years, is that right?--and that's 6 times 7.

And you can see that his life consists of at least six stations after the death of Socrates. And these stations are very important, because he changes constantly and finds new ways of doing what the death of Socrates obliges him to do. He's under the spell of this event for the rest of his life.

3

So the dates 428 to 348 are of utmost importance.

They are also of such importance because you must take down the date when Aristotle was born. When was he born? Does nobody know that? (427.) That's Plato. And Aristotle? (385.) Are you sure? (385 or 384.)

Ja, I think it's 3-8-4. Well, that's very important, because the Academy is founded in 3-8-7.

So you must think that Aristotle is born into a going concern. And that he is such a classic that he hadn't to pay the penalty, hadn't given his blood for the blood bank of founding the Academy.

4

That's a great difference, gentlemen. If you are a founder, you have to waste your time to make people see what should be done. If you are born into something, you can proceed to do it.

V THE GIFT OF ALEXANDER AND THE ROMANS

1

And that's the real break between Plato and Aristotle, gentlemen, that Plato's whole life is consumed in making to the Greeks this point clear that there should be a center of free studies not subservient to any one city. That's the Academy.

2

And we have led up to this.

All the time, I've tried to explain to you that although Plato is an Athenian, and although he is founding a school in Athens, the school is not of Athens, but is the heiress, the heritage of the achievement of all of Greece, like the Trojan War.

Just as all Greeks waged the war and came to common consciousness in Homer, so a second time the Academy brings together all the achievements from all the cities of Greece, including the colonies in the Far East and in the Far West, in Africa, and Cyrene, in Italy, in Sicily.

And it's a homecoming of all these stormy petrels. And that's a great scenery. It's much different from what you learn.

Plato founded the Academy in Athens. If I had let you believe this, you wouldn't understand what's its importance. Any Podunk in America today can found an academy. And if you just take the words "academy" and "city," you have no idea what Greek philosophy is about.

3

Now with Aristotle then, the dates are again terribly important. And when he dies, the whole western Mediterranean, gentlemen, is no longer governed in cities, but by kings, in big states.

Alexander has come, has smashed up all these hundreds of cities. And he has been the new Achilles. And whereas in the Trojan War, Achilles dies and the Greeks return home, you can say that in the Alexandrian empire the cities, with all their named heroes die, lose their independence. And what is remaining is the Hellenistic one world of the Mediterranean to be inherited later by the Romans.

What you call "classical civilization" is the gift of Alexander and the Romans to us.

4

So, gentlemen, perhaps you see now the tremendous way in all your papers, you will have to be aware -

who is dealing with the Stoics? The Stoics only come into their own after Epicurus, too -- when the world has already become one. When nobody can hope to live in one city, because you already live in tremendous territories.

Alexander has come and learned too well from Aristotle, what to do. Alexander is the pupil of Aristotle, and you cannot say the "student," because he certainly did not carry out Aristotle's dreams or visions. He is not a disciple of Aristotle. He's not an Aristotelian. He's a young god who sows the relativity of this academic and peripatetic knowledge by doing the very opposite.

So the greatness of this century, of the 4th century, gentlemen, is then in these very dates. Socrates is born when? (169.) Is it -- 340? I thought he died in 348. Isn't that right? (347.) And Aristotle dies when? (342.)

VI THE ALEXANDRINIAN DREAM

1

Now, here is the reign of Alexander. Here is the famous Peloponnesian War. Here, before, go the tremendous battles of liberation of the Greeks for freedom against the Persians.

2

Which are the two great battles? (*Marathon and Thermopylae.*)

3

Quite. So from the outside, Greece is saved for another 150 years.

But then, from their own Prussian North, from Macedonia, which is very much like the Prussians in Germany, comes the unifying force, Alexander overrides all these hundreds of cities, unifies them, and the payoff is that he makes all the other realms around the Mediterranean Greek. After this is the battle against the older civilizations, here. Persians -- and that includes Babylon and Egypt -- all the pre-Greek empires are smashed or are stopped here.

Then Alexander comes -- marches into Persia, defeats the great king of Persia, and what remains after 323 in the Mediterranean world, down to Babylon and down to Assyria, is Greek.

4

So he replaces the pre-Greek empires with Greek-speaking empires. They are kingdoms subdivided under, but they all speak Greek.

When the Romans come, it's like a natural rehabilitation of the Alexandrian dream.

VII GREEK THOUGHT WAS VACCINATED ON THE WHOLE MEDITERRANEAN

1

Alexander the Great carries, as the pupil of Aristotle, the Greek thought of the Academy, of the Stoics, of the Epicureans, of all the schools of Greek thought -- also into the non-Greek world.

2

And we have it for this reason today. You may say that as a vaccine has to be vaccinated first on a little culture -- and then it can be sent to all the schoolchildren in America -- in the same way, gentlemen, in antiquity,

3

Greek thought was vaccinated in a test case on the whole Mediterranean, and today if you go to the United Nations, that's very Greek indeed. And our Olympic Games in Melbourne and our United Nations in New York are the Greek aspect of the world -- it isn't the whole aspect of the world.

You can't live the United Nations alone. And you can't live by the Olympic Games alone. But it's an essential part of our existence. And it has all been exercised or trained into us for the first time 2,000 years ago. And that's why the games in Melbourne are called the Olympic Games.

And that's why the term which is used in the United Nations incessantly is "politics," that's the Greek word "polis." We have not taken over the word "empire." We have not taken over the word "theocracy" from the Egyptians or the Babylonians. We speak of "politics." That's Greek.

4

And if you could see these dates, gentlemen, in their true light, you should learn them, gentlemen -- as you learn skiing, or as you learn any practical thing. These figures are full of significance, because it shows you how long it takes, to develop a new serum, a new vaccine to immunize any one city of man against seclusion.

To open it up, and to put it into connection with a mental process, that is bigger than McCarthy in Wisconsin.

VIII *THE TRAGEDY OF SOCRATES*

1

Socrates dies from the hand of Mr. McCarthy in 399. The accusation is that the gods of Athens do not suffice for him. And I think the accusation was true. And I think under the laws of Athens, he was justifiably condemned.

2

And this is for you a hard lesson, gentlemen.

But the story of Greek philosophy is that the intrusion of a new dimension of thinking, this universal dimension, that you think for the whole world, has to be bought at a price.

What you do not understand, gentlemen, is that in a tragedy both sides can be right.

2

And in the death of Socrates, to which I now wish to turn today, especially, the main problem is - and is acknowledged by Socrates in his *Criton*, and we spoke about this before - is that progress in humanity does not come about in the simple and silly way that one man is wrong -- your parents are wrong, and you are right; or you are wrong and your parents are right, gentlemen - but your parents are right, and you are right. And then life becomes interesting.

They defend something important, and you defend something important. And at one moment, it isn't yet decided how the two can live together. And therefore both sides are right. And both sides are too narrow. They haven't yet found a way in giving room for this other life.

3

So the Athenians from their point of view can be called blind men -- just as the Jews, when they crucified the Lord -- narrow men, deaf men, but they were not in the sense unjust, according to their own law. The law has to be fulfilled, even if it hasn't yet been abolished.

You can only conclude from 399 that the Athenians now had to open up a place in their suburb, called later the Academy, in which a Socrates could exist without being accused by the citizens of Athens of heresy, and of defying the Athenian gods, because he was trying to make the Athenian gods rhyme and square with God in the universe.

4

So the main point I wish to make about Socrates is, gentlemen, today that he was the tragic figure in which the new element of universal thought, of a thought of second impressions, of critical thought, came to blows with the world of first impressions.

IX THE HOLY RESISTERS AGAINST ABSTRACTIONS

1

To you, who live in such a loose world of only second impressions, you live by abstraction, your head is full of abstractions like philosophy and politics. And that's all abstract, gentlemen. And you are full of theology.

2

If you analyze the vocabulary of an American senior in college, out of nine words which you use, eight are abstracts, and one is concrete. And you don't even know what an abstract is. Most of you think that the abstract is concrete and the concrete is abstract.

You know how to define concrete? What's the difference between abstract and concrete? (*{ } the other is more his ideological idea { }.*)

Well, I would go so far to say that you are full concrete, you are not a concept. You are concrete. So the complete concrete cannot be covered or explained by a concept.

A concept always takes some generalization. You can only conceive of something if you abstract from its specific thing and put it into some class. You have to classify it.

And when I begin to classify you, I do you wrong. You are quite unique, Sir. You are a human being, but I haven't said very much if I say you are a human being. And your wife can't do anything with a human being. She can only do something with you. We marry one person.

3

So a person is concrete and is not abstract. And persons, of course, are the holy resisters against abstractions, and I tried to show you that in Greek philosophy, the saving grace has always been the philosopher. He is the one concrete miracle which remains undissolved. Pythagoras himself, Plato, Socrates, Aristotle. Unshaken, he is a person.

And you remember that I tried to show you that there are three miracles, and not one. Instead of what you think, yes.

I wish to have intellectual curiosity.

I may be surprised why the earth turns around the sun. That's only the objective miracle. That's a fact. But the first who can discover this, that this is a miracle, is more

miraculous. The big brain of Mr. Einstein is miraculous, much more miraculous than all the laws of relativity.

4

I had to deal in my *Sociology* which just appeared with the problem of the Freudians, for example. And I say that there should be in every generation a man like Sigmund Freud, or like Karl Marx, or like Plato – he is much more important than the doctrine of Freudianism, because it is more important that in every generation a new doctrine can be proclaimed.

You must see this. If you say, "Psychoanalysis is everything," the result might be that there might be no heroic men, because we think of every great man later than just as a lunatic who has an Oedipus Complex. And if you declare every great man in the future as a man who comes out of *inhibition, repression, Oedipus Complex, inferiority complex, superiority complex* et cetera, then out goes greatness. Out goes innovation, because you have then analysts who put these people in their strait-jackets. That's all that happens to the great man then.

So the person of Freud is much more important, from my point of view of life, in the community, and the future of this country, that there should be in the next generation freedom again for a man to teach -- I don't know what. I don't know it, but I must make room for his appearance.

Same with Marx. You see it now with the trouble they have in Russia. By having deified one doctrine, they can't go on. They are absolutely hamstrung at this moment, a dead-end street, because they have declared that a doctrine developed in 1847 is the ultimate doctrine, which is utter nonsense.

And that's the nonsense about Bolshevism. Not what they teach, but that they teach that this is ultimate doctrine.

X THE REAL PROBLEM OF FREEDOM

1

So gentlemen, you can only cure yourself from this, if you see that the Greeks in Socrates, in Plato, in Aristotle, in Pythagoras, in Thales, in all these sages have names to conjure with, to save themselves from the mere admiration of the objective statements of these men.

2

So to admire the philosopher, gentlemen, is the corollary to admiring the philosophy. If you do not admire the philosopher, the creative spirit who has brought up the philosophy, you will admire a makeshift, a manmade mannequin, a philosophy. Whereas you have to admire the tremendous brain that is able to develop such a philosophy.

And these we need at all times. This is the real problem of freedom.

3

Gentlemen, we owe our freedom as general citizens of the world, as millions only to the deep conviction of any civilized group, that they have to make room for genius. It's genius that saves you and me from being herded to the polls in a one-party system, because in democracy we say we don't know the next leader. We must give the minority a chance to become the majority.

Now that's exactly the same story as Mr. Freud's life story, who was for thirty years rejected by everybody. And now in this country you run amok with him. But that will wear off, of course, and there must be room for somebody else who contradicts Mr. Freud or has something else important to say, I don't know what.

4

So the third miracle, gentlemen, then is: the currency which greatness and genius is given in a community that hates it at first, that the ethics of the process of teaching of knowledge, of education, that we have to learn that Socrates executed for high treason and blasphemy in 399, in 387 can become the god of the Academy -- or the good spirit of the Academy in the suburbs of Athens.

And that people, although they have strangled his physical existence, bow to the evidence, are overcome by a new ethics, and therefore, the logos of Socrates becomes the ethics of the Greeks on the physics of the universe.

You remember my constant repetition of these three items?

XI *THE LOGOS IN ACTION*

1

And therefore there are three miracles in the world, gentlemen.

The *logical* miracle, there are great minds, in seeming contradiction in every generation renewing the life of our race.

The *ethical* miracle, that although at first they sound impossible and madmen, we finally bow and make room for the current which they create, for the stream of life which they impart.

And third, that the *universe* looks different when we bow ethically to the logical power of these spirits.

2

You will find it again and again that without this careful division of the logical and the ethical and the physical, you have no philosophy.

Today man in modern society has no philosophy, because he treats genius also as physical, and God also as a fact.

3

God is not a fact, gentlemen. It's a power that makes you say something new.

That's something quite different. That's the best I can tell you about what we know of God.

The first thing we know is that you can make a declaration of love today where you haven't made one yesterday. That's such a tremendous fact in your life that you know that God is the power who allows you this freedom. Yesterday, you said, "I'll never marry a girl from Cleveland. It's a terrible city." Tomorrow you go and propose to her. You are overcome by a new power, a new affection.

I mean, that's a joke, you understand.

But you might have said that you will never marry a Jewess or you never marry a Muslim girl or a Negro girl. And tomorrow, you'll go and you are overcome by the new truth that you have to do just the very thing you have defied before you'd never do.

4

This is the new logos. This is the logos in action.

That's not what you call "logic," of course. And I warn you, what Americans call philosophy and ethics and logic, has nothing to do with Greek philosophy. What

you call "ethical" is what your Aunt Elizabeth thinks is ethical. That's not ethics. And what you call "logical" is what an accountant can do in arithmetic.

Of course, arithmetic is very good, but has nothing to do with philosophy, gentlemen.

Philosophy is the discovery that in every one moment new truth is breaking in, and that you may be the vessel of this new truth.

God speaks through you, every minute, unexpectedly, against our will.

XII THE KEY TO YOUR TREATMENT OF YOUR TERM PAPERS

1

Most people, gentlemen, who have proclaimed the new truth, have been very reluctant to do it. The people who are very eager to proclaim something usually don't proclaim truth.

2

Walter Winchell doesn't proclaim truth. He's very eager to proclaim something every day over the radio. But it just isn't truth. Don't tell him, because otherwise he'll attack me, too.

Well, such a scoundrel -- what have you, I mean? There is no truth in this. There is no logos. That's sadism. That's black joy, the misfortunes of other people.

3

So this is and remains then the key to your treatment also of your term papers, gentlemen. You must always see that the coming in of this philosophy at a certain time, as a power, integrated into the life stream of all our thought ever since, is the problem to be respected.

It can't be brushed aside as, "Oh, he just says this. So what?" You have to say, "Imagine! One day a man discovered the sanctity the quality of numbers."

4

And - at this point, I'm now back to Pythagoras.

XIII *THEY HAVE EARS AND DON'T HEAR*

1

We ended the last time, as you remember, with the tetractys. And what is remaining in Plato in the *Timaeus* and in Aristotle, out of the Pythagorean thought is something that we have to reconquer today, the quality of numbers.

2

You only know that numbers are quantities.

You think that 4 -- you remember, we talked about this before -- are only 1, 2, 3, 4 and then you go on, 5, 6, 7. But gentlemen, a century even has a quality of its own. A century is not a hundred years, or 36 524 days, according the astronomical calendar. But you and I are members of a century that overpowers you and me.

Because we belong to a certain century, we can't think differently. When this century ends, it will dismiss our posterity from this same hypnosis.

But we poor people are in the 20th century. So we, if we don't discover the power of the quality which a century has over us by some truer worship of truer gods than the spirit of the times, we are just contemporaries.

3

Most of you at this moment deny that numbers have any spell -- yet you all boast that you are Class of '57, or Class of '56, or Class of '58, Class of '59. And the greatest example of this was given in 1940 in this college.

A colleague of mine, Professor Bartlett, gave a paper to write on St. Augustine to a student. And he got the amazing reply, "Here I am, a senior in Dartmouth College in the year of the Lord 1940. I think that my predecessors in this college who went to war in 1917, were pretty stupid. They were taken in by warmongers. And I feel very superior to these people who went before me by 23 years. How can I be asked now to write on a man who died in 430 A.D.?"

That was his logic.

That's a typical contemporary boasting of the spirit of his own day, and not seeing the quality, the limitation of only being a spirit of his own day, and being unable to understand the importance of a man who lived 1500 years before him. The total impotency.

4

And I think it has hit most people today, they are impotent to listen to any truth that has nothing to do with the spirit of the times. You are quite sure that you know everything you have to know from reading the newspapers. But they stifle your sensibilities, gentlemen. They make you deaf.

They do exactly what the Bible says, "*They have ears and they don't hear. And they have eyes, and they don't see.*" That's the business of the newspapers. They make such a noise. And they have so many pictures that you cannot see a little more on the long wavelength of all the times.

XIV THE FOUR CARDINAL VIRTUES

1

Therefore, I go back to something simpler, gentlemen. I tried to tell you that the so-called tetractys of the Pythagoreans meant that when you deal with anything in the world, you must never be satisfied by reducing it to two or three. Like capital and labor.

2

I have written a whole book, *The Multiformity of Man*, to say that if you do not take the salesmen and the engineers, the inventor in the business of industry, you'll never understand industry. Industry is not management and labor. It's sales, as well as inventions, innovations, technological change, which is neither labor nor management, but grows in another potato field. And there again I have made the –

who knows *The Multiformity*? Some of you must have read it.

Well, it's just another attempt to be a Pythagorean. That is, not to deal with anything worldly, with fewer instances than at least four.

Only when I take four different points am I sure that I am not forcing the issue by my little logic here, up here, by the play of my mind. The outer world, gentlemen, is not logical, but has to be experienced in its vastness, and four is the protection.

3

Now in Greek philosophy, this played a tremendous part practically then, with Plato, with Aristotle, because of the four cardinal virtues. Already in the 5th century, before Plato and before Socrates, it was recognized that you cannot describe a man's virtues by saying "He's virtuous." That would be empty, or "He's good."

As soon, however, as you try to analyze, you found at least four qualities, which may not be sufficient, but at least four. And you know which they were.

Everybody knows the four cardinal virtues, of the Greek. Please.

(Temperance, justice, courage, and --)

Prudence. Let's put them here. They can of course be expressed in different terms. Courage and -- what's the word for justice.

4

Now you can say justice is the distribution of prudence, temperance, and courage. That is, you can put justice, if you like to, in the center, and have the three go out like rays. Or you could put them in a square.

The important thing is, don't try to reduce one to the other.

XV DON'T REDUCE TOO MUCH

1

Don't try to say that you can say courage is temperance, and prudence is justice. As soon as you do, resist this temptation of all the little logicians. To have lesser and fewer and fewer things and reduce everything to this big monism -- number 1, everything is water; everything is this -- then you are a Pythagorean, because you have given the number 4 this quality to deal with reality.

2

Will you take this down, gentlemen? *The number 4 has this great merit that it forces you to stay within empirical experience*, and never get out of it with neat, logical tricks.

You can argue by argument everything has been proved. I can prove that you don't exist. And you can prove that I don't exist, gentlemen. But then I slap you in the face and you suddenly, empirically realize that I do exist. The whole argument hasn't proven anything.

3

And therefore, gentlemen, don't take this lightly. Through the whole of Greek philosophy, we have inherited to this day this assumption that there are four virtues: *prudence, temperance, courage, and justice.*

The argument has only been what they are, how they relate to each other, how you should deal with them, when you should be courageous, when you should be prudent, how you can combine them, et cetera.

4

The great achievement of the Greek mind has been to let them stand.

And if you think back to Thales, whose power was to reduce, to unify, to generalize, to say, "There is a common denominator, water" in 582, you see suddenly that the answer now is: Don't reduce too much. There are certain source qualities, genuine, primary elements which must never be reduced.

XVI THE MINIMUM PEG IS 4

1

And therefore, if you read now up on Pythagoras and on the theory of numbers, you must understand that there is something that has nothing to do with mathematics, but with your best logic. I warn you to try to develop a system in which the flourishing, luscious universe is ever brought under too few articles of faith.

2

As you know, there are, on the other hand, in dealing with the gods, the three supernatural virtues. There is hope and faith and love. And there is a deep reason why God can be explained by three terms.

All what we call the world, gentlemen, contains death, contains corruption. And the world therefore has always the elements of four. When we are forced to speak of forces that rule this world, create this world, restore this world, regenerate this world, judge this world, three is enough, because death is not contained in our description of the Trinity.

3

So I have promised you last time to show you that the numbers 4, and 3, and 7 are not arbitrary at all. They are not to be gotten by your little brain by numbering 1, 2, 3, then 4, 5, 6, 7. They are only gotten by coming down to the infinite of your own spirit, of your sense of wonder, and trying to peg numbers on your experiences.

And the minimum peg you have to hang onto the word outside of your senses, is 4.

If you don't, you go and become a lunatic in a lunatic asylum. Most lunatics with megalomaniac ideas have systems of thoughts that have given up this important respect for reality and talk just of one or two principles.

4

In the whole 19th century, you had this bias of the so-called monists. They said God is just an excrescence of your brain, everything is just soap bubble, and everything is energy, or everything is atom, or everything is wave, or everything is electricity.

These are very stupid people, but they had a tremendous following in the 19th century, because people had given up this spirit of observing their own existence.

XVII 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 ARE QUALITIES OF EMPIRICAL LIVING

1

In as far as you can say something that is true, gentlemen, in hope and out of faith and in love to the person you want to convince, to save by your saving word, three is enough. The divine -- that doesn't take up space, that doesn't corrupt like the living word can enter your experience in this form of three.

2

I can't go into the whole theology of this, but I only warn you: don't poke fun at the Pythagoreans, and don't poke fun at the Trinity. As long as you poke fun at it, you don't know even the problem that has given rise to both statements.

These both statements come from a real experience. And your statements comes from a silly reaction of a schoolboy who learns figures in arithmetic.

3

That's not experience, what you learn in school, that you can count up to a hundred. That's repetition. That's an echo of other people's numbers. You have learned after all just empty words. And as long as you think that numbers are quantities, you have not entered the problem: what's the relation of numbers to thinking?

The relation of numbers to thinking is that 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 are qualities of empirical living.

4

I can't say more at this moment. I know that you will not agree with me at this moment. It is beyond your own experience, probably. But all I can do is to put this up as a warning.

Despise the people, the grownups who poke fun at these mysteries. They say there are no mysteries. What they only say is that they are shameless and that they have lost their sense of wonder.

XVIII A VERY COMPLEX RELATIONSHIP OF MINDS

1

The very fact, gentlemen, that Socrates, and Plato, and Aristotle were needed to fill the world with Greek thought is miraculous. And you can't get out of this fact that one man couldn't do it, that you had to have three generations.

And for example, the three-generation principle of the life of the logos is a tremendous principle.

2

You have it in Christianity. You have John the Baptist, we have the Lord, and the Apostles. Without this, there is no revelation possible. Jesus alone can't do it.

He has to have somebody who announces Him, so that people can wait for Him, and be promised. And He has to have somebody who takes Him up on this. And without the apostolic church and the prophesied church, there is absolutely nothing to Jesus. He is just then out of place, and out of time.

3

So believe me, the deeper you study the history of Greek philosophy, the more you must look at the march of these great spirits through time, and you must understand.

So far, I have given you this abstract list of seventy or ninety philosophers here. At this moment, however, we are turning towards the centerpiece of the history of Greek philosophy, from Socrates to Aristotle.

And the first thing then I want to say is, there had to be three. You couldn't have it cheaper. You couldn't have it in one man.

If you understand it, you will understand that there is an element of admiration, of miraculous ethics in the relation of Socrates to Plato, of Plato to Socrates, of Plato to Aristotle, of Aristotle to Socrates, and of Aristotle to Plato.

So when you have three, you have already a very complex relationship of minds and spirits. And it is still debated.

4

But the people who debate the relations of Aristotle, and Plato, and Socrates, always only figure out: what did one say? I'm overcome by the miracle of their collaboration, of their mutual influence, that the spirit did flow, that what one man did, the other didn't have to repeat. He could do something else.

XIX A DIVISION OF LABOR

1

So Socrates, gentlemen, and Plato and Aristotle represent the first, and you may say also the last success in Greek philosophy for a division of labor.

In these famous century from 399 to 322, you may say, Greek philosophy for once had this great, miraculous experience, that three independent spirits acted differently and thereby created a unity, something that after this is always exemplified by these three names.

If you speak of Greek philosophy today, you cannot simply say Aristotle; you cannot simply say Socrates; you cannot simply say Plato.

Isn't that very strange?

2

I hope that what I am trying to do is, gentlemen, I have invited you from the beginning to admire these great geniuses. Today, I'm asking you to admire something that brought three of these geniuses into focus, into mutual dependency, into something that is more than just sequence in time. It's a division of labor.

And that is very miraculous. And it remains miraculous. And you can ponder for a whole life, whenever you read any of these writings of these three men, you can never forget that the two others faceted and varied and made more meaningful one of these three men's sayings.

3

They belong to each other. One begets the other.

But it is in a way, as though Aristotle and Plato were already contained in Socrates, and as Socrates had to linger on in Plato and Aristotle. And as soon as the Socratic quest died in these Aristotelians and Platonists of later time, and they just repeated their being Platonists alone, they remain sterile.

4

You have to contain today an element of Socrates, an element of Plato and Aristotle inside yourself if you want to philosophize.

Nobody today can say he's "an Aristotelian." Nobody can say he's "a Platonist," and nobody can say he's "a Socratic," gentlemen. This is utterly stupid. An element of all three is necessary to get yourself moving, to get yourself into real life.

Let's have a break.

I IN ORDER TO REMAIN THE SAME WE HAVE TO CHANGE

1

The greatest miracle in these philosophers is beyond your reach. The form of their lives -- I tried to tell you that Plato's biography certainly is a very miraculous display of a spectrum of colors out of one light. I mean, the consequence of his life, the logic of his life, of his biography is very great.

And yet it is constant transformation. He is every ten years a new man in order to be the same.

The motto in my own book sign reads, "*Mutabor tamen manebo.*" That means "I shall be changed, and for this very reason, I shall remain the same."

2

Now I think any living person, gentlemen, has this problem. In order to be the same, you have to be different in every age of your life. That's very strange, but that's how it is.

In order to be the same, because an element of your sameness is that you are, for example, vital. Now you can't be vital if you only do for 20 years long the same thing. So in order to remain vital you have to do after 20 years something different, so that you are still the same man of whom people said, "He still had some vitality left."

3

Now most people don't understand this, *that in order to remain the same, we have to change.*

That is the greatness of a man like Aristotle or Plato and of Socrates. And I can't ask you to do this. It's beyond your art, and your skill, and you have perhaps to have a dim impression that the greatness of this man is in his fulfillment of this tremendous task, to do as much changing as is necessary to save his aliveness, his vitality.

For this, you have to change.

4

And in Plato's life, it isn't as difficult to grasp, as with Aristotle, because we know Aristotle also had a highly dramatic life.

To be the teacher of Alexander the Great is not a minor matter. And to go to a foreign court and to go to Asia Minor and then return to Athens, and so on and so forth.

So you can also dramatize the life of Aristotle. But to see it in connection with his problem of saving the heritage of all the previous thinking from Homer to Socrates, that I think is beyond your ken.

And therefore, I'm perfectly satisfied if I've given you the task, just to describe for what Plato stands as the founder of the Academy, and not in what phases of life he produced these results.

II ALWAYS STILL SOMETHING AHEAD OF YOU

1

The second thing, this biographical miracle, I think you should keep in mind that we worship these people as miraculous revelations of the human art of living, but I think that has to wait. And I hope you will not give up the Greek philosophy, because you have unfortunately taken a course and written finals in it. That's always the end with you, with any subject matter that you think, "Never again."

2

Greek philosophy is something to accompany you.

You can take any of these dialogues of Plato and read them with the greatest amazement for the 15th time. It's just like Homer. I read Homer every year, and I read a Platonic dialogue every year, and I've always totally forgotten that I ever read them before.

And that does not mean that I haven't read them very attentively and very fruitfully, but they have this freshness as a Shakespeare play, or the Bible. You can read this first chapter in the Bible as though you have never read it before.

3

And that's the problem of living. You must meet your wife after the silver wedding as though you had never seen her before. If you can do this, you can say that you really have loved your wife. If you say after 25 years, "I know her by heart," you'd better get a divorce.

So there is always still something ahead of you. If you describe Plato's philosophy as expressed, for example, in *The Republic*, I shall be very satisfied indeed, if you can do it.

This is obviously, gentlemen, on your part only a first attempt. And you treat it as a first attempt. And I hope you don't have to write a second term paper on the same man, but you should know that it is just an attempt to come near these men.

And you are not through with them after you have written the paper.

4

Therefore, it's so hard for me to say from what point you shall approach it. I have given you great leeway. You can pick out two or three symptomatic and outstanding contributions of these men, and you can't misread them totally, and something will stand out.

To this I must now turn.

I turn back to Socrates and then we shall not devote too much time to Socrates himself, anymore, and then after the vacation next Tuesday, we will settle on reading the fourth book of *The Republic* here together.

Not that this is all you have to do. I hope you will read the rest of the three books preceding it, yourself, in the process. But I want to give so much time so that the strange text comes up word by word here in class.

So next Tuesday, please bring the Platonic dialogue.

III THE SOCRATIC QUESTION

1

Today I have to repeat and to brush up on the problem of Socrates.

Socrates is a legend. He was a legend in Greece, and he's a legend today. That is, there is more talk about Socrates than we possibly can know. That's a legend.

We know very little about Socrates. Or you can say we know so much that we haven't the faintest idea what is really fact, and what is imagination.

2

The cue to Socrates which you must never forget, and which is very hard for you to understand, but on which you must build your thought, in future years - and I take it there will be in future years on your part the desire perhaps to understand what it is all about, this getting out beyond the commonplace -- is that he asks the questioner.

I told you that the problem of Socrates was to turn the process of questioning so far that he would question those who questioned.

If you do not see this second power, this asking to the square, you will always mistake the curious question of a child, "Mother? How are the children born?" Or "Is there a God?" Or: "Has God a white beard?" for a Socratic question.

That's not a Socratic question, gentlemen. That's just a stupid question.

3

In this country, every question is admitted. As long as you cannot cut out and excise stupid questions, gentlemen, there can be no progress, there can be no education, there can be nothing. The best answer to a stupid question remains to this day not to answer it.

Nobody seems to have the courage in this country to say, "That's such a stupid question that I won't answer it." You answer every question, and thereby you always get into deep water. That is all you expect. If you ask a stupid question, that somebody is stupid enough to answer it.

Never forget that one fool can ask more questions than hundred wise men can answer. That's the first rule of all thinking processes, gentlemen.

4

Why?

I remind you. I told you: questioning means the desire for participation of the ignoramus in a going concern. You ask for the road in a foreign country. You ask for the cost of a ticket at the booth. He knows, you don't know.

All questions presuppose an expert.

You can only ask as long as you think there is somebody who knows.

IV THE CONDITION OF A QUESTION

1

If you drop this qualification of questioning, that it is an attempt of the outsider to get inside society, you cannot understand the limitations of all asking.

A question only makes sense if there is a pre-established answer, which this man doesn't know, but which all the others know.

2

That's how we all move in a foreign country. That's how you move in a foreign world of grownups. When you enter a new thing, you have to ask. And people are kind enough to show you around, as we say.

And as long as this is the relation of question and answer, everything is safe and sane. But of course, a child, for example, asks too many questions, because it just doesn't know where it wants get into. It is so far away from the way of the grownups, that it asks anything.

3

So the one condition for the question and for the questioner is that he is seriously loving the group which can answer the question. If you haven't the real desire to ask for the road to the harbor, because you want to go on this road to the harbor, you don't deserve an answer.

The child that asks about the white beard of God doesn't deserve an answer, because he doesn't intend to pray to God. It shouldn't be -- it's blasphemy. Don't answer it. It's a stupid question.

The condition of a question is that the questioner wants to join the community.

4

That's a very simple rule, gentlemen, and explains the whole Platonic, Socratic, and Aristotelic obsession with the city of man. All questions must remain related to the city of man. Otherwise they do not deserve an answer.

V A VERY DISAGREEABLE VOCATION

1

Therefore, Socrates comes in and asks, and tries to prove that the questioner has to be asked if he is really serious. Does he really mean business? Does he want to be *good, courageous, prudent*? A good citizen?

Or does he just ask to show off as a sophist, just to show that he can prove anything for the sake of argument?

The whole of Parmenides is written about this topic. Or the *Gorgias*, or the *Protagoras*, the *Ion*. For the sake of argument you can argue anything. But you must remain related, as Plato then formulates it in his dialogues, to the good.

The good is the sum of serious participation.

2

If you have not the desire to get inside, or to stay inside, whatever the situation is, your question is not a good question. We are full of this nonsense today, gentlemen. This is the era of the sophists. And never have the sophists ruled this country. They call themselves, I don't know what they call themselves -- broadcasters or intellectuals or quiz kids or what-not; \$64,000 question. The only good thing about the \$64,000 question are the \$64,000, but not the question.

The question is a nonsense question. They are all nonsensical those questions they ask on this idiot quiz game, so you can't get excited over this.

But obviously you are much better off if you don't know the answer.

It's like this yes-and-no examinations, gentlemen. I mean, it's not important to know these "yes" and "no."

Any term paper written on the Stoics, it can't be just that bad as these papers where you have to guess 50 percent of right, with "yes" and "no." That's not worth answering, because you are not serious. You don't want to know the good. You do not want the help of the answering by this question to join the community and contribute something to the communal life.

You don't want to find a road into the good life.

3

Now, it's very important, gentlemen, because you open a book by Plato, or Xenophon on Socrates, or all the traditions on Socrates. He is parroting wrong questions like a stupid child at first sight. So don't get annoyed.

Make this distinction clear to you, gentlemen, that the Socratic method sifts the questions. You are absolutely lost if you mistake the form of question as being the same between Socrates and a child.

But this is today the average error, because everybody in this country thinks that he is a philosopher, and that every philosopher is rated as to be as stupid as the man who reads up on philosophy.

4

But philosophy is a vocation, gentlemen, a very disagreeable vocation. And in the case of Socrates, it ended with death. In the case of others, it ended with exile. In the case of others, it ended with madness. In the case of others, it ended with persecution or with poverty or illness.

Because it is the attempt to throw down the usurped questioners, the intellectuals in a community, the sophists, who at that moment will not, if they are aesthetes, and celebrate poetry for poetry's sake, or art for art's sake, or politicians for politics' sake, they will not give answer to the question: "What's the good of your question? Why do you ask this question?"

And the Socratic answer is that you must thereby be led to lead a better life, otherwise the question cannot be answered, because you have no yardstick. The mere jumbling, juggling of tossing-up and tossing down of words makes any answer possible, gentlemen.

The difference between the sophists and Socrates then is that Socrates wants to be a sophist who tries the sophists.

VI WHO IS STOPPING THESE OBSCENITIES?

1

And I think it only natural that therefore he should have been crucified. It's a very disagreeable, a very unpleasant task, and nobody is liked.

2

My friend, Mr. Samuel Eliot Morison now gave some lectures on the trash and on the hypocrisy and on the insincerity of American education. And he had to go to Canada to deliver these lectures, because in America nobody would have listened to his provocation.

3

The sophists are always in command, if not somebody sticks his neck out and risks to ask them, "What are you doing with the mind, with the brain, with your logic, with your quizzes?" Who is stopping Walter Winchell?

That's the question. And it's a very serious question. Who is stopping these obscenities? Who is stopping the comic strips? Who is stopping the nonsense that's going on in television, and what-not? Who is it?

The philosopher.

If he doesn't exist, if such a healthy force doesn't develop, the country must go out of hand. And you have then some mental, moral, or financial crisis.

4

You just have to read the behavior of the people in the '20s, when they said that all the laws of the universe were successfully abolished. Saving was ridiculous. Death would yield. People would become 150 years old. And you had to live on the installment plan.

Well, the doctrines are nearly as equally mad at this moment. But not quite. In the gay '28, you prepared the crash, because there was nobody who was listened to.

Sinclair Lewis came home from Europe in '28. He went on Fifth Avenue to his publisher's office. He looked down on the street, and the publisher said to him -- "You -- how do you like it?"

And he said, "I think the world here is insane. Absolutely insane."

And Sinclair Lewis, after all, a man of quite superior intelligence. You may have heard of his name. And the publisher thought that Sinclair Lewis was mad. And Sinclair Lewis thought that the publisher was insane. Well, a year later, the issue was settled.

VII *BINDING TOGETHER SECOND IMPRESSIONS WITH THE FORCE OF PRIMARY ETHICS*

1

But a man like Sinclair Lewis was the Socratic element in America. There's no doubt about it. From *Babbitt* on he has acted as a Socratic element questioning the people -- who put all the silly questions into people's mind. The daily philosophers of the moment.

Because it was a philosophy in '28, that saving was ridiculous, that tomorrow would be better than yesterday, et cetera, that death was abolished, sickness was abolished. Children didn't have to behave -- their parents -- everybody had to sleep with everybody else, constantly.

2

A friend of mine in '28 was in New York when a man in a cocktail party went to him, "Oh, you know, I have a funny feeling my wife's just sleeping with a Negro."

He said, "What do you say?"

"Well, you see, we after all, we are civilized men. I couldn't forbid it. She wanted to have the experience."

Well, she had the experience.

That's by and large the age of the sophist. You always get this, gentlemen. You always get this tremendous temptation by argument from outside the polis. If you have this abstract thinking, you can prove everything to anybody, if you forget the good life, that the generalization, gentlemen, the general thought must create a better city.

3

So now you see perhaps that the Socratic element tries to bind together second impressions, second thoughts, critical thoughts with the force and authority of primary ethics, of primary truth, of the cult of the city, of the worship of the true gods. And make sure that what's going on in this more general room of schools, and thinking of the Eleatics or Miletus, always remains within the fruitful process of landing into something concrete and real.

This is the service rendered by Socrates.

4

And since the city of Athens hated the sophists, his being the super-sophist, the sophists, too, around their suspicions couldn't understand what he was doing, because he did it for the first time.

VIII *THE INCOMPLETENESS OF THE RESPONSIBILITY IN THE CRITIC*

1

On the other hand, gentlemen, Socrates seems to have fully understood -- I say this tentatively, because everything we say about Socrates is tentative -- he seems to have fully understood that you could not turn the clock back, that Athens, as the capital of the whole Greek world, had to digest these sophists, as they came from Sicily, from Italy, from Asia Minor, and so that he had a certain amount of tolerance.

2

It's a combination then of criticism of these critics and of tolerance which seems to have impressed all contemporaries. The great thing about Socrates is: he never wrote a line. And therefore, we have no authentic utterance of his own thought. We only have him in the descriptions of others who had their own philosophy, who built on his questions already answers.

And therefore, we do not know how much in Plato's dialogue is Socratic, and how much is Platonic. Because Socrates had given the question, Plato then gives the final, composite answer.

And what I call the division of labor is put into a high degree in Platonic dialogue, developed there with great skill, that the desire, the zest for questioning, all these critical positions of the Eleatic School, of the Pythagorean School and so, is then driving Socrates onto a positive solution which he obviously has never given in his lifetime, but which is the Platonic solution.

3

And I have perhaps to put in one word here at the end, before I dismiss class: the Platonic obligation to clear up any misunderstanding about Socrates' intent forces Plato to go one step further, to go beyond the question of the questioner and to create a utopia.

It is very hard for me today -- you may be different -- but for me to be patient with Plato's utopia. I think his utopia, his polity and so are terrible. I want to tell you frankly that I couldn't live one day in the Platonic universe, and it's a terrible utopia.

But I can do justice to his necessity of saying that he meant business, that he wanted not to remain a critic. Therefore, he said, "I wish to prove that there is a best city, a better city."

And the word "utopia" is needed for us. "Utopia" means nowhere.

It is not a Greek word, gentlemen. It was invented in the year 1560 by the great British Chancellor Thomas Morus. And it means nowhere. No-where. "Topos" is the place. In no place.

4

Now today, everybody speaks of Plato's state as a utopia. It is not the word of Plato. His word is the "best state," which is quite different.

You see, you have Athens. You have the better states of all these critics, of the critics who questioned the individual states. And you have then Socrates proving that none of these critics really had a complete picture of the city.

Socrates proves -- will you take this down - the incompleteness of the responsibility in the critic. He argues some point.

IX THE BETTER STATE - THE BEST STATE

1

We shouldn't have election every four years. We should only have them every eight years. But the whole of democracy is not in their minds. They don't care for the existence of the city for their survival. They only care for their immediate criticism, for their witticism.

2

You can criticize any little particle of a system, of a whole order. I can criticize that I call my parents "parents," if I do not understand what the whole family is all about. And people have done this in the last years, as you know.

They say, why call father "Father"? Call him "Charlie." And they have done it, because they didn't know what the family was there for. That the family was a representative -- created in the image of God.

Well, you can't call God "Charlie," therefore, you can't call your father "Charlie." That's a real answer, gentlemen.

I mean this. It's not a joke.

3

If you don't understand, however, that the family is created in the image of God, then you cannot understand why your father cannot be called by his nickname "Chinaman" or what-not.

And they have driven this in this country, the sophists, so far, that the families have been destroyed by this.

Therefore, Socrates said, "The critics don't have this city of man at heart. They don't want to return into the community." And Plato says, "Therefore I have to give them the best state." And that's his obsession.

4

Now, there is a relation between the good state, the better state, the better individual items -- I shouldn't say "state" here. That's not right. The better measures, "better laws" perhaps is better, or better customs, and the best state.

Plato is the first Greek philosopher who feels obliged, in order to dam up these wanton criticism of single teachers, to give out of the mind a full-fledged picture of our destiny.

X THE GOOD, THE BETTER, THE BEST

1

That had never been done before: an unreal city, to be developed out of philosophy, so that all the witticism and criticism could fall into a special pattern, and not be any one exaggerated.

And so Plato was the first utopian.

2

It's a great topic now in Europe to write on utopias. I have several friends who at this time are concerned with producing books of 600 and 700 pages on utopia.

And of course the Bolsheviks have a utopia: the *classless society*. That's a utopia, a nowhere, a best state.

3

But you must understand the Socratic problem is bound up with the final solution of Plato. If Socrates says, "All these people who know better know nothing, because they don't know the good."

So Plato comes in, "Then we must know the best."

4

Will you kindly try to put down this strange climax: the good, the better, and the best. I must invite you -- otherwise you will not understand the relation of Platonism to the good and to the sophists.

And you will always remain Greenwich Village intellectuals otherwise.

FIFTEENTH LECTURE: *WHO IS THE BEST MAN TO RULE THE CITY?*

I *THE TROJAN WAR*

1

...you can still -- who has seen Indian reservations?

Only so few.

You know a little bit about their religious ceremonies and their dances. It means that 24 hours of the day the tribe tells the individual what to do, what is right with regard to the spirit, to what they have to say, what is expected from them to say in prayers, in songs, in ceremonies. And today there is a great interest after all, in this ritual, in these dances, folk songs. Everything today is up and coming.

2

Now in any group that is secluded and complete, my political behavior and my physical environment are on all fours. The tribe goes hunting, so the deer belongs to the tribe. Then it is sliced up and distributed among the tribe, so the woods and the outer world, sun and moon and rain and snow, everything is shared as the physical environment, of this group; and the spirit of this group inspires the individual to report and to say and to judge what this group needs.

Therefore, this tripartition, gentlemen, of logic, and physic, and ethics, is not pronounced.

3

As soon as you get to the Trojan War -- and that's the first time in human history that this happens, and you must know that Homeric man is a new invention -- the Greek mind is something that hasn't existed before.

Sir, put out your pipe.

That is, that in this Trojan war, people were forced to separate their logos, their physic and their ethics. That the physique, the physical environment created by the Trojan War, was much wider, and approached a universe.

4

And I think you can say that a Greek who read Homer was more universal-minded than Mr. McCarthy, or Mr. Briggar. They are isolationists. That is, they still hide in Central America, called the Middle West. And an isolationist dreams of this good life which you can have when ethic, logic, and physics coincide.

II *GOD CREATED THE UNIVERSE, NOT THE UNITED STATES*

1

You must see then, gentlemen, that the awakening of the mind is a cleavage between the area covered by physics, by my ethics and by my logos, by the speech, the spirit that fills me with enthusiasm so that I can go to war as an Athenian, or today as an American.

2

You see it very clear in the Suez Canal business, and the oil business, that we have an economic way of reasoning which is worldwide, by which we equate physics and economy. You have high tariffs and a Chamber of Commerce and junior executives and options for companies, and outstripping the other countries in foreign markets. And there the ethics are coinciding with the United States of America, and they contradict the physics of our knowledge of our geography.

Because after all, God created the universe, and not the United States. Or at least the United States only under the condition that they admit that God created the earth and everything that therein is.

3

So your physics and your ethics do not coincide. In this very moment, the gods of the America, the red-blooded good American with the little school -- the red schoolhouse and the little white church - is suddenly confronted with the question of, "Who is the real God? Is this church still praying for God Almighty? or only for God Incorporated?"

Oh, my dear people. Most gods to whom you pray are incorporated and very limited indeed. You are quite sure that they do not hear or see you outside Sundays from 11 to 12. Very few people believe in God Almighty. Most people believe in God from 10 to 11, or from 11 to 12 as the case is -- for the Catholics at 9. That's limited. That's incorporated.

4

So you have made the gods members of your city. So the logos, whom you seem to represent, is quite of a different expanse than the universe.

III CONFLICTING PROCESSES OF THINKING, ACTING, LIVING

1

Now my whole course of lectures has tried to show you that philosophy is the attempt to equate the questions raised by ethics, by physics and by logic.

Logic is the power that makes us speak.

Will you take this down once more, gentlemen?

Ethics is the power that makes other people listen.

And physics is the order by which people behave as we say, and as we are told.

2

The atomic bomb you can construe. That is, physics is what we think it is, because it explodes. That is, the physical universe can, by our reasoning processes, be recognized and understood, interpreted. And so the physics is that which common reason can interpret as being so.

But to whom do we talk about the atomic bomb?

3

Gentlemen, the physicist talks to the Germans and to the Russians who construe now the next satellite, the new moon around the earth. They don't talk to you and me. They have a family in physics which differs totally from the family on Thanksgiving dinner, in their home. So they live in several communities.

And we all do, today. You take it for granted that in your own field you must know -- in medicine, for example, or in chemistry, what people in other countries know.

With regard to President Eisenhower's policy, it's much better not to know what the other nations think of it.

4

So we live today in three worlds. Every one of you is a battlefield, gentlemen, of conflicting facts, of conflicting processes, *of thinking, of acting, of living.*

Most people, of course, go to the country club and forget all about it. And then they are very surprised when they wake up next day and have to go to war, or something like it, or the stock exchange is off 10 percent since August 9th. How strange. What wicked people must live in the world to cut down on brokers' income.

IV A WORLD OF APPEARANCES

1

So there is philosophy only as long as this dialectic exists. As soon as we would live in a universe, in which the physical environment, the political environment and the functions of all people would be made to be congruous, all thinking would stop, as it did stop in the United States during the last two years.

2

We had prosperity, we had a seeming peace, we had no immediate danger, and therefore people stopped to think.

This happens always, gentlemen.

The same happened in 1928. People do not want to philosophize. And it is unnecessary for those parts of the population, for which, like for a baby, these things are congruous. For a baby that lives in a cottage in the woods, there is no philosophy. His ethics, his logic, and his physics coincide. There is absolutely no reason, no discrepancy between these three circles.

As soon as these circles, however, do not coincide, man has to begin to think.

3

And now I tried to show you, gentlemen, that the great step into philosophy was done by Parmenides, because he says, "Let us think about this conflict outside the city." And he settles with his staff of juvenile disciples outside the walls of any one individual community, and begins to think about the community as though this was just a semblance, a transient thing, what he called "an appearance," a phenomenon.

Today we have a school of thinkers still in this world -- we had several members of the department now, they are no longer here - who call themselves "phenomenologists."

You have heard this term? Who has heard this term?

Well, it means that we have the power, like Parmenides, to look at the world as a world of appearances. And we look behind the appearances. Or we are at least not compelled to do anything about this appearing there. These are just phenomena, like rain or shine, and very tempting for the human mind always.

4

Phenomenology is nothing new. They invented this Greek term.

But it is the constant attitude since 500 A.D. to try to get outside these terrible cities where men are slaughtered for the glory of the city in war, or where they are condemned for injustices for atheism, like Socrates. And you can therefore say, gentlemen, that philosophy lives by this, what I call today the liberal arts college, by institutions that carry into every nation general thought and remind the people in the city that the environment inside which they live is greater.

And never is there any congruity between nature, ethics, and the spirit that makes them speak themselves.

V GOD IS THE POWER THAT MAKES YOU DO SOMETHING

1

And I told you these are the three miracles that man discovered. The miraculous world, the bewitched world, the enchanted world in which the old Egyptians or the old Assyrians or the Chinese lived, down to 1911 the Chinese had sorcerers. This bewitched world had not split into these three divisions:

the power that makes me speak, my god, makes me say something new, which nobody has heard before. I suddenly have to burst out into a song, or a curse, or an oath, or something.

That's the power that overcomes me. Any power that overcomes me is such.

2

Look at the Hungarians. These poor people didn't know six weeks before that they would ever all be shot dead or refugees. They had no idea. But they did it. And you can't understand them. They are miracles.

Probably you would never have done this, you say. You wouldn't resist tanks, Russian tanks and blow them up with your bare hands. You couldn't have done that. They didn't know that they could do it. They didn't plan this. They didn't know that they could do this.

3

That's always a power, gentlemen, that is stronger than my preconception, than my reasoning, which we call God. *God is the power that makes you do something yesterday you thought you couldn't do.*

That's the only definition of God that holds water, gentlemen. Everything else is, I think, valueless. But every one of you, when he proposes to a girl, I hope, only proposes after he has said to himself the evening before, "No. I won't be such a fool to get married."

The test of love is, gentlemen, that you have to do it against your will. Anybody who wants to love, shouldn't ever get married. He can go to girls another way.

Marriage is a torment, because it's a sacrifice; it's the renunciation of new inventions. And you cannot marry, gentlemen, really, and you get a divorce, if you, like a boy of eighteen, say, "Oh, it's so nice."

4

Gentlemen, marriage is not nice. I prefer the bridegroom who has a splitting headache on his wedding day to the boy who goes into the wedding dancing. A wedding is too serious. That's bad as a funeral. I mean it. I prefer a man who sweats agonies on his wedding day than to the man who thinks it's all wonderful. That isn't so simple, gentlemen. Your mother-in-law isn't wonderful, let alone the father-in-law.

Really, gentlemen. You are absolutely silly, and what you call idealists, to me you are funny.

I just talked to a boy in the Hanover Inn, and he asked me how I could believe in God. Just so, after lunch, before class. And he said, "How can you be so dogmatic?"

And I said, "How can you be so funny?"

VI IT - THE NEUTRAL UNIVERSE

1

Now, gentlemen, if you take this year 500 as the appearance on the scene, after a hundred years of groping from the Ionian philosophers onward, and Pythagoras, to put forward a constant attempt of harmonizing for every generation these three challenges according to the environment, according to the challenge of the day, then you see that in 399, this comes to a head in the trial of Socrates.

This old city here of Athens -- this being Athens, this being Sparta, this being Miletus, this being Elea, this being Syracuse, we need these cities as examples -- they are still strong enough to mistake Socrates for a man of this century, a sophist. That is, a man who tries to live himself outside the city, and only teach the city, correct the city, criticize the city, without playing the game himself, without saying what he believes, only criticizing, only saying, that his ethics are better.

2

And I call this the century of the better state.

Well, the mudrakers, the debunkers, the Charles Beards, or whomever you take -- the Lincoln Steffens, they are people of this sophist character. They say, "We know of a better state."

3

I told you that Socrates comes into Athens when all these attempts, from all these other states have been made, hundreds of sophists swarm over the Greek Isles, Italy and Asia Minor, and bring into the cities that the world is indeed larger than any one city, that people must try to exchange in a second language between the Spartan dialect and the Athenian dialect some general truth, that they must become in a way citizens of the world or of the universe. And they planned this new word -- the "whole."

I told you that in Latin, we only use unfortunately the word "universe." The Greek word for this is "*pan*". A very important word. And the important word, the fact about this word, "the universe," is that it is "IT."

4

That, gentlemen, is the victory of physics over ethics and logic that is proclaimed in the term "universe," because if you and I live only in a universe, then there is no power that can command me with the still, small voice. "IT" cannot command. "IT"

is dead. And if "IT is the only reality, and if I and you are only particles in the universe, then you are an atom. And I can treat you as an atom. I can smash you up, and you can smash me up. And it's a fight from all against all.

And all Greek philosophy, gentlemen, has this weighed preference for the neutral universe. You can say that Greek philosophy places the greatest stress on the fact that it wants to explain the universe, and that every ethical and logical problem of the gods and of man takes second seat.

VII IT ONLY HAPPENS ONCE

1

Now what's omitted in this dream of the universe, gentlemen? And why is the death of Socrates, with whom we are now dealing in *The Republic*, such a great event in the history of the human mind? Why does everybody know that Socrates drew hemlock?

Gentlemen, much better men have drunk hemlock and have been burned at stake. The Inquisition, and the Protestants, and the Catholics have killed many more wise men than this one man in Athens. Why is Socrates such a great man? Why is it such a great case?

2

Because it is the conflict, gentlemen, between life and death that occurs here for the first time -- the universe is dead, and it cannot die. And the whole promise of Greek philosophy is to say, "Death does not matter."

Will you take this down, gentlemen? *Death only matters for the spirit and for man.* The spirit can die, and we can die. And we do not want to die, and the spirit must not die. We shall not.

We proclaim that we are in agony.

3

Now, all Greek philosophy and all Dartmouth students pretend that they have no fear of death, that by philosophy you can eradicate this fear, because you speak of the universe. In the universe dead and living things are not distinguished. The sun is just as good as you and I.

But I don't care for the sun, to tell you the truth. I care for my own life, and I hope you do, too. And to have to die is a very serious business. It only happens once. And it isn't helped by saying that all men must die.

The existential proclamation of Mr. Sartre in France or from Kierkegaard -- it is not interesting to say that all men must die. But it's terribly interesting to say that I must die.

That's the whole distinction between philosophy, gentlemen, and living. In life the whole difference is that I must die, or you must die, in person. For the universe, it's just expected. *All men must die.*

4

Therefore, gentlemen, if we speak from the universe, we put reason on the throne. If we speak of men, we put the heart on the throne, because the heart is frightened by real death. The mind does not look in the direction of the death of the person who has this mind, in whose mind these pictures of the universe are floating around.

All modern talk is so ridiculous, and psychology, because they do not begin with the fear of death. They dismiss it. They investigate your retina reactions, and they investigate your muscle. And they speak of insecurity and such little things, gentlemen. But the general experience of humanity is that we must die.

And all wisdom, gentlemen, comes from the fact that we must die.

What you call the "soul," gentlemen, is the power to anticipate your death. The soul is the power in man who, from the very first days of a child being spoken to anticipates the death of the child.

The soul is not born at birth, but the soul comes into you as anticipation of your death. That's what we call the soul.

VIII TO DIE FEARLESSLY – BUT MEANINGLESS, TOO

1

Now Socrates, gentlemen, is the one philosopher in whom the relation of the universe to death becomes actual. He has not written a book. He's only famous for his death, because he has shown people how to die, how to die. That's the greatness of Socrates.

And therefore, in this distribution, gentlemen, of logic, physic and ethics, the logos, the demony of Socrates, the spirit of Socrates retains its sovereignty, because in addition to being a philosopher, that is, to have asked questions, he has shown people how to die.

2

Jesus teaches something quite different. Jesus has not taught people how to die. But he has taught us that we die fruitfully. The meaning of death He has revealed, not the circumstances.

Socrates had no fear. He was very pleasant. He said it doesn't matter. And he showed people to be unafraid.

Jesus didn't play with such things. He was sweating agony. He thought that God had forsaken Him. But His death is the most fruitful action that any human being has ever undertaken.

3

So the relation of Christianity to death is totally different from that of Greek philosophy. There's no equation between Socrates and Christ whatsoever. It's absolutely worlds apart.

But the thing we have to retain from Socrates is that it is possible to die fearlessly - but meaninglessly, too. The death of Socrates is not meaningful in itself, but it is instrumental -- you can say it's pragmatic, or how should I say it? - the circumstance, the condition of his death are model cases of virility and sobriety and temperance and courage.

That is, of the four cardinal virtues of Greek philosophy.

4

And therefore, we may say, gentlemen, that in Socrates the school of Parmenides, the school that took man outside the city, is reconnected with the city, because the man who is treated as a sophist erroneously, although he did take the sophists themselves to task, this man showed that he also is a citizen, even in a negative sense.

If the city puts him to death, he will not grumble. He says, "I still am grateful to the laws of the city." And the death of Socrates, gentlemen, restores the equilibrium between the laws of his own country and the world outside.

Not in his statements. We have none which is authentic. But in his life does he remain connected with the very city from which Greek philosophy departed, which it wanted to objectify, which it wanted to put into the universe as an inanimate matter, as something to be objectively studied.

IX THE CRUX OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY

1

Now objects do not talk back. But the laws of Athens did talk back, and Socrates said, "I can only objectify philosophy like Parmenides and the Eleatic school or Thales and the Ionian school, as long as I am also allowing the city to talk back, and to misunderstand me.

That's the risk I have to take. I have to belong to a city, while I am dealing with the universe."

2

As long as you do not understand this cleavage, gentlemen, of you and me, using here in the classroom a universal reasoning process and still remaining faithful to the laws of this country, you cannot understand the reason why we have to philosophize, because there is a conflict.

There is a real conflict. And that's a conflict lived to the mind's satisfaction, lived to the utmost by Socrates.

Socrates doesn't allow the mind to flee into stratospheres of mental screwballs and brown ivory towers. The ivory tower remains a taxpayer, and he pays the tax - Socrates, as the inhabitant of his ivory tower - and says he is glad to.

3

Most philosophers try to brush aside this, and just either they try to remain anonymous, or they say, "I haven't said anything," or they say, "Don't quote me," and they are noncommittal when it comes to public utterances.

And therefore the door is locked to these escapists by Socrates. He says, "At the same time that I am looking for absolute truth, I admit that I am under the temporary, absolute law of my city."

If you can understand it, understand it. But that's the crux of Greek philosophy, gentlemen, to this day.

4

There's a book in our library, it's called *Caliban*. It's a very terrible book. It's the book on a Swedish sculptor who came to this country, and defies all the laws of Sweden

and America, and is very proud of it. But at the end of his life, he writes his own life, he at least has the good taste to call himself Caliban.

And he is. He is just a human monster. He has broken all the laws of humanity. And the only repentance is not in the text of the book, but I think in the title. Like Mr. Drew Pearson, who now writes as "S.O.B."

Well, I think it's quite serious. I hope Mr. Winchell will do the same.

X WILLIAM JAMES'S TERRIBLE HEART DISEASE

1

So, perhaps you take this down as our formula.

Socrates represents the conflict between the universe and my time and place. "My country" is perhaps the best expression today, and "my own time." Any man's own time and any man's own country is ethically and logically still upon me.

2

That is, they speak to me, while I am dealing with the universe.

And if Mr. Oppenheimer has Communist affiliations, he is just dismissed from the defense program and sits in Princeton and doesn't get any information on the atom.

That's a similar case. It's in America, where there are no tragedies, it hasn't ended in drinking the hemlock. In Athens Mr. Oppenheimer -- or in Russia -- would have been executed long ago.

That's not saying that Oppenheimer is not the better man than all his accusers, but it says they have the right to misunderstand him.

You understand? They can misunderstand him, and he is under their sovereignty. I think he has been misunderstood largely. But that doesn't alter the fact that the decision is not his, but is theirs.

To be an authority is also to have the right to make mistakes.

3

Therefore the city in Socrates' case was given the right to make a mistake, because Socrates is not the overlord of his god and of his co-citizens. The ethic and the logic

never put man up as God himself; whereas to the universe I can prescribe the laws of my mind.

I can make them speak mathematic. The dead things have to obey me. But my neighbors and God Almighty just don't happen to do so.

I get leukemia at the very moment that I think I am at the top of my life, and I die. What about that?

3

When William James, gentlemen, had a terrible heart disease and was going to die and was one year before his death, he said, "But God can't let me die, now."

And his wife asked, "Dear Bill, why do you think so?"

"Because I just now feel fit to live. I just now, after 69 years, learned how a man should live."

It didn't help him. He died.

4

Well, you never take this seriously. Yet you really think that when a great man is a good thinker, that there is no conflict in his existence. The same thinker is very humiliated by the fact that about the lifetime that God gives him, he knows absolutely nothing. So what does it amount?

I know all the riddles of the universe, you know the psalm: "If I go to the end of the earth," -- you know the psalm? Which psalm is it? "If I take wings of the morning, and flew to the ends of the earth, and hid in the depths of the sea, what would it help me? God will still find me out."

Which psalm is it? Oh, gentlemen. You find it.

Who is going to study divinity? You'd better look that up.

XI THE PLATONIC ACADEMY - A CONSTANT REMINDER OF SOCRATES

1

So please don't believe that this problem is not with Socrates. Socrates solves it, however, in his taking his place between his physics and his ethics and his logic. If

the gods say, "Obey the law of your city," that's certainly against his intentions. But it has to be obeyed, because he is in the midst of a conflict between these three items, gentlemen.

Physis is that which my mind can dominate.

Logos is that by which my mind is dominated.

And my neighbors -- I can treat them -- you can say that all other men are prejudiced.

2

That doesn't alter the fact that they will exert their prejudices against you. It doesn't help you at all that you sit pretty and say, "Oh, they're just prejudiced against me." Unfortunately, they don't know this. They think they are right.

What you call "their prejudice" is in their eyes their privilege.

And that's the constant problem of ethics.

3

So in *The Republic* we enter the fourth book straight away. There Socrates is the hero. It's the centerpiece of Plato's founding years.

You may divide Plato's life into the years before founding the Academy in 386, and afterwards. He was then exactly 41 years when he founded the Academy, when it dawned on him that there had to be in Athens -- or in the suburbs of Athens, before the walls of Athens proper -- there had to be a constant reminder of the death of Socrates.

That's the story of the Platonic Academy, a constant reminder of Socrates.

And all his dialogues deal with this strange figure that represents himself a miracle of freedom, because he shows how to die, that shows the abuse of ethics against a man who's misunderstood, because he's taken to be the very thing he tried to combat, a sophist.

And the third thing, he's asking valuable questions about *la condition humaine*, as they say today, about the human condition, about the fate of man in the wide world.

4

Book Four -- you must know that Socrates is the speaker, is saying "I" in this dialogue. The Republic centuries later has been divided in 10 books, and that's not

the Platonic division. For example, he made the division on Page 202, and there we would have to re-divide *The Republic*. We would probably make the division on Page 202.

That's just an example, how careful you must be with those ancient texts. Many later librarians have done this division. The conception of Plato himself is much more artistic.

So we begin in the middle of nowhere, in Book Four, but that's just for lack of time.

Would you now kindly read the text.

Do you have it? Who has the text? Would you kindly show me how many are here? So who gets this copy? Page 217.

XII SEPARATING HAPPINESS AND GOVERNMENT

1

Now this is 386, in which this by and large is written. We don't know the date of *The Republic*. All this is under argument.

But I think it is in some way coincident with the founding of the Academy, with this knowledge that the best city had to be discussed in order to get rid of the mere criticism of the sophists about the better city.

And so Socrates is dead long ago. He is dead for 13 years when this book is written, or more than a decade.

2

So on the other hand, Plato wants him to speak to us, so the scene is laid out forty, fifty years backward. And so what we read is not a text. It is artificially archaic. It's laid out in a past that probably has never occurred.

3

So will you kindly now read?

"Adeimantus broke in here and said, `Defend yourself, if you can, Socrates.

Suppose someone says that you are not making your men very happy. And they have themselves to thank for it. The city is better than truth. But they get no such joy of it.

As others who have gotten laws, and built houses beautiful and large, collecting furniture to suit the houses, and making sacrifices of their own to gods, and became { }.

Yes, indeed.

It's exactly what you have just mentioned, gold and silver. And all of this is { } expected of those who are living in bliss. But these, he would say, appear like hired mercenaries of the city, sitting still and guarding nothing more.'"

Now let's pause here. He speaks here of the government of the best city. And I wanted to avoid all the first three books, because that's all leading up to this.

And he says right away, suppose it's a problem which the Bolsheviks had to face in 1919, when they fixed the salary of all the guardians, the members of the Bolshevik executive committee on \$227 a month. And they said no Bolshevik who was a member of the party was allowed to earn more.

4

Now this is the famous Platonic principle of separating happiness and government. To govern doesn't mean to be happy, because it is a duty that can only be filled by people who don't care to be happy.

XIII THE WHOLE UNREALISTIC APPROACH OF PLATO

1

And so the first law, gentlemen, of the best city, which I wish you to contemplate is: Is it a good idea that you have a cabinet of millionaires and one plumber?

It's certainly anti-Platonic. He thought it wasn't a good idea.

2

Now, I'm not a Platonist. And you can debate this. It's a very interesting point, however, that the best city for Plato is only a city in which the government is immune against money, against wealth, in which the people prefer to be poor.

This will plague us in the future, gentlemen. To you it is normal that it makes people happy to be rich. Sophie Tucker has said this. She has said, "I've been rich; and I've been poor. But believe me, rich is best."

That may be true for Sophie Tucker. But I don't care to be Sophie Tucker. That's the whole problem.

Is Sophie Tucker your standard? If she is, then you have to get rich, and then you have to use government for contracts. And then the oil people must run the government through the person of Mr. Dulles, and Mr. Aldrich, et cetera. Yes, we are governed by oil. The whole story is oil.

3

The first paragraph, gentlemen, then is unreal. As you see the whole unrealistic approach of Plato, because it is certainly easier to understand that government is by the rich and for the rich and through the rich, than to understand that it is by the poor for the rich.

That's a little complicated, isn't it? Because he had the idea that monks should govern the city. They are a kind of monks, with regard to property.

As you know, one of the three monastic vows today is poverty. And that's taken from the philosophy and from India, from the even more developed ideas of India.

4

Our monks, gentlemen, have a combination of three vows: chastity, obedience and poverty.

Now poverty comes from the Greek source.

Chastity comes very much from India.

And obedience comes from Judaism.

And our three vows are a very interesting combination of three influences, three streams. But poverty is already here in Plato.

XIV THE BETTER STATESMAN

1

And you have heard of Cardinal Woolsey, perhaps, the contemporary of Henry VIII.

2

Who has?

Well, Jeanne d'Arc is another -- in the whole 15th century, gentlemen, the European nations were in great difficulty of finding rulers, and they tried it with monks. And the deepest reason was -- Woolsey was not a monk, but others were -- the reason

was that they were the only people who, by their vows, came near to the guardians of the Platonic city.

It was tried. It wasn't executed. I mean, it was given up again.

3

But you have this constant problem: is the better statesman not the man who is poor, and who has no interest in money?

Lincoln certainly is a case in point. Washington is on the opposite side. We have both specimens. You can decide one way or the other.

4

I only want to raise the question.

It's an eternal question, and I think every generation will have to philosophize on this, because you can have too much austerity, if you have a bachelor who has no interest in money at the helm of the state, and you can go to the opposite: if you have only big business as government, something may go wrong, too -- because big business is very timid, and has no sense of honor. It has too large financial interest ever to do anything for honor's sake, or for keeping friends. They will risk nothing.

The poor man will be moved by quite other considerations.

XV THE BEST IS OUTSIDE THE REALITY

1

Now, only to show you that we are in the midst of an eternal question.

And perhaps you also see, gentlemen, that in ethics there has to come forward in government a philosopher in every generation. Because in every generation you can pervert the best state, the good order by going too far in one direction.

2

It is worth your while, gentlemen, to put here in your margin, this \$227 for the members of the Bolshevik party, as a reminder that Plato is with us.

And I won't prophesy wrongly that in 50 years it would be impossible in this country to have this cabinet which we have today. It would be impossible, because the people

would not stand for this wealth on the top. Because then you get such creatures as Mr. Stevens, God bless him. Yes, and all that is expected for those who are to live in bliss. He even uses this same expression.

3

So Plato himself is aware of his paradox, and it is an eternal paradox, gentlemen. I don't offer you any solution. Don't understand this.

But you must see that it is a great question. Who is the best man to rule a city? Because he must rule the rich and the poor. And so he must be in some third condition. And the whole crux of *The Republic* is about the best.

4

Because the best, gentlemen, is outside reality. It's utopian. And therefore, since in fact you only find rich and poor people, they are here with us. If you want to construe government, the best government, you will always dream up something that is outside that what you find.

You want to have something better.

XVI *BLUE, BROWN, BLACK OR GRAY*

1

Now what's the solution of Plato? What does he say? Who should govern?

The philosopher. So that's a third man. He's neither influenced by poverty nor by riches, you may perhaps say.

"Yes, I said..." go on, please. Will you take it?

*"Yes, I said, and all serving for board and lodging,
not even getting pay with their board like the others.
They can't even go abroad on a trip if they wish.
They can't make a present to a pretty girl if they wish.
Can't spend a penny on anything else,
and { } to or thought to be having a good time.*

All this and more like it.

But a lot of things you leave out of your list of complaints."

2

Now the next, please. Make the dialogue real. You have a copy? Who has? Here. You take over. And you.

"All right, said he. The soldiers, too. What defense shall we --."

No, the next. Ja. You, Richard.

(I have a different text.)

Well, you go on. "What defense shall we make, you ask?"

"`Yes, let's walk along in the same old path,' I said. `And we shall find --'")

No, that's -- you are the "I." You remain Socrates, Sir.

*"`First -- first of all,' I said, `There must be a fight.
I suppose our men will be athletes of war amassed against { }.'"`*

What? What? Where are we? They glued together, yes. You have sweaty hands. So. He wouldn't have noticed it.

*"`Let's walk along on the same old path,' I said.
`We shall find what to say. This is what we will say.'"`*

Come -- turn around. Those who have no copies can't possibly understand.

Get up and speak. Yes, get up. Sure.

3

"Should not be surprised that these also would be most happy in its way.

*Yet what we had in mind when we founded this city was not
how to make one class happy above the rest,
but how to make the city as a whole as happy as it could be.*

*For we believed that in such a city we were most likely to find justice,
and injustice again { }.*

Then we might examine them and decide the matter { } searching all this time.

*Well, then, now if you believe we are holding the happy { }.
We are not separating a few minutes, and putting them down as happy,
but we take it as a whole.*

By and by, we will examine the { }.

Suppose we were painting color on a statue, and someone came up and found fault, because we did not put the finest colors on the finest parts of the figure.

For the eyes, the most beautiful part, { } dark { }.

*Did you think it a reasonable answer to give him, if he said,
`Don't be silly. { } such a beautiful pair of eyes, that they don't look like eyes at all?'
So also the other part.*

*But look and see if, by giving all the parts their proper treatment,
we are making the whole beautiful.*

*Just so now, don't force them to { } happiness
as the guardians, as will make them anything but guardians.*

We couldn't --"

That's a very good comparison. You see the point. You couldn't give the guardians crimson color -- that is, make them happy. But then they would not have, as little as the eyes, their function.

Red eyes are just not good eyes, but they should be blue, or brown, or black -- or gray. Therefore, you cannot give the guardians happiness, as little as you can make the eyes crimson. That's the comparison.

Go on.

4

*"We could indeed just as well order the farmers to dress in purple and fine linen,
and hang gold chains about them.*

And till the land to their pleasure.

*We might make the potters put their wheels away, and recline on couches and feed,
and have drinking matches { }.*

And make their pots when they felt so disposed.

*We might make all the others live in bliss in that sort of way.
And { } expect the whole city to be happy."*

You see, that's by and large American Common Sense philosophy: make the people happy, and then everything will be fine.

XVII THE FIRST THIRTY YEARS

1

Now that's Plato's reply. If you say, "Make the people happy," you can't make the city happy.

2

Ja, ja. Just -- dear Mandaville, what's the -- problem?

(Well, I was just thinking, wouldn't the people be happy doing what their function is best for the city? I mean --)

Pardon me?

(Well, wouldn't the people -- since the city would work best with everyone doing their own pottery, wouldn't the people therefore be actually doing their function? If you let certain people do what they wish to, won't { } to do?)

Ja.

But you see, the condition of this is that they are already fit to be goldsmiths or poets. I don't think anybody is when he's born. I think he's very pliable and plastic.

3

The question is: what do you do with the people the first 30 years so that in the end, they believe that they have to turn a lathe?

My dear man. Your fiction is that already at birth, a man is a lathe-maker. Most functions today are not natural. That's your problem. And your optimism would mean that God creates as many distinctions or variations, as we need.

Far from it.

(Well, Sir, if one person who had gotten into a field { }.)

Oh ja. We come to this, but he is aware of this problem in a deeper sense than any other philosopher I know.

That is, Plato says that all must get everything, a little, so that you have specialists then out of the best, because you test all. So you get a common education even for women and men.

And at that time was quite unheard-of. He knows your problem that the amateur is necessary for the professional.

That's really what you are driving at, if I understand you right. You have to have a greater supply, a greater selection. Isn't that what your question is?

(Well, partially. But also it's { } for a man who is a potter then { } decides he doesn't want to be a potter. He really wants to be a farmer.)

No. That's so gruesome.

4

That's why I think today *The Republic* is a very dangerous book. I have very mixed feelings about reading this book with you. You can abuse it like the Bolsheviks. It's a Bolshevik book as much as it is a book of wisdom. Just what you stress.

It's dynamite.

Plato's Republic is not a tame book -- you think it is something that's just a good book, or a Great Book, as Mr. Hutchins cared to call them.

It is to this day a tempting book. You can totally abuse it.

Let's have a break here. Five minutes.

I NOT TO REPEAT THE PAST

1

Gentlemen, I have been asked a very pertinent question: Did Plato approve of Socrates' death in the sense that he would have said, "I want to die the same death"?

Now I think this question can be answered very frankly, gentlemen.

If any event, any tragedy in history is rightly understood, understanding means it must not be repeated.

2

There is a great sentence of George Santayana, "*Those who remember the past need not repeat it.*"

Perhaps you take this down.

And therefore, the fact that Socrates died implies that this must not be repeated, just because it has happened.

That is the idea of making death fruitful. If you say, "It doesn't matter to slay the righteous of the Lord," then you will repeat the Crucifixion. And therefore Christ then has died in vain.

And it happens in every generation that Christ has died in vain. But He must not.

Now -- no, no, I'm in the midst of an argument, Sir. How can you interrupt such a statement? Really? How can you throw me off balance in this manner?

The simple thing about *The Republic* is, gentlemen, that Plato writes in answer to the death of Socrates this book. What is the best city? The best city is that city in which Socrates would not have had to drink poison.

That's the whole story. For this the book was written. That's your answer. That's all we know, because I haven't spoken to Plato.

He's not a relative of mine.

3

So now, your question.

(A little while ago, several lectures ago, Sir, you mentioned that there was no validity in learning from the past { }. And wouldn't this statement by Santayana seem to say that we must learn from the mistakes of others?)

Well, it is only a minority that learns, gentlemen.

The liberal arts college is the place in the nation in which this is attempted. Since you don't it, I'm sure that the liberal arts college will disappear as a functional thing in this country. It is already disappearing.

And your question proves that you are not so sure that you learn here not to repeat the past.

4

You of course make all the same mistakes. That's perfectly true, because you are silly.

But the question of education is an attempt to make people remember the past, lest it has to be repeated. That's why we read this, my dear man, so that you will not kill either Socrates nor crucify the Lord.

But of course, it happens all the time that this is forgotten. You may rightly say that the attempt is very weak, has very little prospects. But it has to be undertaken.

If I see how few of you brought this book to class, and that not one of you has read the fourth book in advance, before coming to this class, I certainly have every intent to give up and to say, it's all silly, it is perfectly meaningless.

You don't deserve to be educated, and you certainly will repeat all the mistakes of the past, I'm sure you will. But that doesn't mean that somebody has to make the desperate attempt to prevent it.

So, please.

II "DON'T PREACH TO US LIKE THAT"

1

I mean, the only stumbling block, my dear man, to the validity of Mr. Santayana's sentence is you. The student at Dartmouth College. Nobody else.

You are the great handicap against which this country is fighting: the students of the liberal arts colleges. These do-nothings. Here.

2

("Don't preach to us like that.")

Very good.

*"For if we obey you, farmer will not be farmer. And potter will not be potter.
No other class of those which make the city will have its proper {force}.*

The { } are really no great matter.

*The cobblers who are bugglers may work badly and pretend to be what they are not and
may go to ruin with no danger to the city.*

*But if guardians of the city and laws are not what they are thought to be,
{ } they destroy the city utterly,
and they alone have the opportunity to make it well-managed and happy.*

*Then if we are making real and true guardians of the city, not marauders,
and if our critics talk to the farmers and sometimes having jolly time at a dinner or a feast,
not in the city at all, we must be talking of something else, not a city.*

*Consider then, with this in our minds, whether we shall arrange
that our guardians may have the greatest possible happiness,
or if we shall keep in view the city as a whole and see how that should be happy.*

*Then we must compel and persuade these assistants in all the guardians to do as I've said
in order that they may be the best possible craftsmen in their own work.*

We must do the same with all the other craftsmen.

And the whole city will increase and be managed well.

We must leave each class to have the share of happiness which their nature gives to each."

3

Now gentlemen, may I draw your attention to the sentence in the Declaration of Independence -- or is it in the Constitution, about the pursuit of happiness? It's in the Declaration, isn't it?

The pursuit of happiness, gentlemen, was a compromise between the Jeffersonians and the Washingtonians or the Adamses. You know what the idea behind the pursuit of happiness was, the religious idea?

"Pursuit of happiness" is a secular term on which Moslem and Free Masons and Rotarians and Catholics all seem to be able to agree. Happiness is individualistic.

The cobbler be happy -- just what we argued, Mandaville, at this moment. Everyone individually happy makes the people happy.

Against this, Plato is fighting. And he says the guardians must make the city happy, not themselves.

4

Now what is the category, what is the aim then of the guardian for himself?

He is not aiming at happiness. But what can justify his sacrifice, his austerity, his poverty, his vow?

Gentlemen, that was called for the next 2,200 years, till 1776, with the very simple term. What would a man do, if he did what he was asked to do by his destiny, by God's will? What would be his reward?

Not happiness. Something different, which today is in discredit, but which is a necessary category about which Plato is talking here.

And I think therefore, we have to restore it so that you see that pagan or not pagan, Christian or pre-Christian, there is a category of functioning right, which doesn't ask for private satisfaction.

What is this? No - salvation. Very simple. *Salvation*. The guardians work out their own salvation because they make the city happy. Any doctor who saves his soul, because he gives all his service to his patients. He's not happy, but he certainly goes to Heaven.

III *PEOPLE HATE THE TRUTH*

1

This is not a silly thing, gentlemen, for pious old ladies. The question is: If you served within a given order, your happiness is of no concern.

Why should Mr. Eisenhower be happy? They have made him president for the United States. And I hope that he will be strong enough to be very unhappy personally. He hates to be president. But he undergoes it because he thinks that it is more important that he should be president than he should be happy. Otherwise he would not have accepted a second term.

2

It's very simple, gentlemen. Now what does he strive at?

Knowingly or unknowingly, this is not happiness. You can't have a president of the United States who wants to be happy. That's silly. And the only thing I can tell you, is: if you ever should elect a man president so that he might be happy, you have no president. You have a nightclub entertainer. Sophie Tucker.

Ja, this is very serious, gentlemen. You have in your thinking, by saying "Make the people happy," abolished this higher functional order of the universe in which we do not care.

Since we want to be good physicians or good strategists or good generals or good presidents, we do not care for happiness. That's taken in our stride.

3

What do I care that I am happy, gentlemen? As long as I do my duty here to you, I certainly shall not be happy, because I meet with very much hostility. Because I tell you the truth. Who likes the truth? Nobody likes the truth.

The first experience that you will make when you begin doing anything in the world is that people hate the truth. And that's a Platonic sentence: they hate the truth. You can take this down, gentlemen, at the bottom of the whole problem of philosophy. *People hate the truth.*

People -- I have seen you, gentlemen -- you look into any family. Any outsider can know the truth about their problems. You cannot tell them. Most tragedies, most conflicts in any human family -- look into your own -- is that the people do not wish to know the truth.

4

I had a friend -- a lady, an Italian lady who was married to a lawyer in Germany. He was the greatest gambler in the city. Everybody knew it. She didn't. Nobody told her. It was impossible to tell the truth, because it would have broken up -- he went out and she didn't know that he was gambling away their fortune. One day he shot himself. And then she knew that he was a gambler. That was all.

That's a very simple story. By and large, that's the truth about most people. You don't want to know your own truth. And certainly you don't want anybody else to tell you.

So gentlemen, since truth is hated, these guardians are very unpopular, and they will have to undergo all kind of hostility. And they won't be happy.

IV THE TERM "SALVATION" IS A NECESSARY TERM

1

I read an article on the modern executive. And they said it boils all down to the fact that these people have sleepless nights not because of money, or not because of production and not because of taxes and not because of war, but because they have to deal with human nature, and they have to meet with so much hostility and jealousy and begrudging, and that's their problem. They lie sleepless, because they don't know how to tell the vice president what to do. Without losing him perhaps another firm. They don't know how to do it.

The truth is not liked.

2

You live in this optimistic climate, gentlemen, since you deal with silly truths, with platitudes, that you think everybody wants to know the truth.

Gentlemen, the whole problem of the truth is that it is not wanted. Who discusses any serious issue at this moment about this government? They're all propaganda speeches, or on things that are on the outskirts.

I told you, the real problem is oil. There's too much oil in America.

3

Now, what did I say, gentlemen?

Salvation is a necessary concept of Plato's philosophy. The righteous man or the wise man, or the just man is a man who cares more for justice than his own happiness. Therefore, the term "salvation" is a necessary term.

You cannot replace it by anything else.

4

And since 1776, gentlemen, the compromise was reached: translate it into secular terms, call it happiness. The United States of America have been a moral power in the world. It will be a moral power, gentlemen, as long as behind the term

"happiness" you can still hear in your own heart, when you read this term, the true meaning, salvation.

If you read the word "pursuit of happiness" with this glorious background of the churches of America, that it meant "salvation" originally, you will interpret "happiness" in no obscene terms. It will not be Mr. Jaeger's, or somebody like that.

But it will be salvation.

If you say, "I'm happy in the fulfillment of my duty, although it leads me to the scaffold, to execution," I'll shake your hand and say, "Well, what do you mean by happiness is salvation. We all agree."

Don't you understand? The question is: what happiness?

And in American English, which is different from British English, the greatest distinction between English English and American English is in the use of the word "happiness." For an American, happiness is inclusive of salvation. But in England, that isn't so. Happiness is just happiness on the secular side, and there you would have to speak of salvation.

Here, you can gloss it over, because in this democracy, we try always to use the lowest common denominator. Happiness is the lowest common denominator of all the religious denominations. That's the whole story.

V FORGO HAPPINESS AND YOU WILL BE SAVED

1

So once you begin to open your eyes, gentlemen, to American language, it is full of miracles, because the religious content is hidden behind a kind of shorthand. And if you wake up to your own city of Athens, to the United States of America, it is a much better city than it appears on the surface, I assure you.

And it is your privilege to read into "happiness" the meaning of the guardians, salvation; or to steep down to the night-entertainer levels of Hollywood, who misinterpret it as beating the income tax.

2

This is alone worth this page, gentlemen, that he is struggling -- what is he struggling for? -- with the ambiguity of the word "happiness." And he says, "The city is happy"; you are not happy.

3

Now we have enlarged this in Christianity. The Cross, instead of Socrates, means that we distinguish between the salvation. Jesus worked out His own salvation by going to the Cross. And in all practical terms, that's not happiness. So He made the distinction very sharp: Forgo happiness and you will be saved.

Functional, gentlemen, fulfillment of a man's life has nothing to do with happiness. You can be childless, and you can be blind, and Helen Keller has worked out her own salvation.

4

But it is very terrible to talk today, because you people have abolished this wonderful background of your own language. You try to only let the flatness, the soundlessness, the echolessness, the lack of sonorousness of the word "happiness" stand. And then it is impossible.

Then one has to contradict it.

VI WEALTH AND POVERTY

1

I have no objection against the wording of the *Declaration of Independence*. But you must know that happiness has two degrees of depth. The happiness of the city or of man, of mankind is one thing. And your private happiness, that's of no concern to anybody.

And shouldn't be your own concern, because the safest way of ending in a lunatic asylum is to try to be happy.

2

(Then if salvation is to be preferred to happiness, why { } towards happiness on the city? Why { } salvation?)

Well, the city, after all, is an instrument, an institution. And therefore, the people in the city, if the whole city is, as we call it "just," then they will fulfill themselves. They will fulfill their own nature.

So I would say your private happiness, my dear man, is a by-product.

But if nobody gives to the whole what the whole needs, if you aim at happiness directly, you can't get it. He who wants to save his soul, to earn his soul, must lose it.

This is a simple thing. It's a detour, you may say, but without squinting. You mustn't say, "Oh," like the alms giver, "It will stand me in good stead. If I give now the poor, they will make me a deacon of the church." I don't think that's a way of using your alms.

3

We had a man in our church who bought himself in this way into our church, by making a great contribution to the poor, which we didn't have, the poor, I mean. And he was made deacon, and I nearly left the church in disgust.

That's the wrong way. You must not consider the consequences.

(Well, if you had walked out, wouldn't that have made it even worse { }?)

But I didn't. Now, go on.

After all, I'm still a member of this church, unfortunately. So, go on. You will never know. This is the question that can never be answered. Go on.

4

"*Indeed,*" he said, *"I think you are right."*

"*Very well, there is something else -- there is something else akin to this.*

And I wonder if you will think it reasonable, too."

"*What is it exactly?"*

"*Consider whether it will ruin the other craftsmen also, and make them bad."*

"*Well, what is it?"*

"*Wealth and poverty."*

"*In what way?"*

"*In this way. Let a potter grow wealthy. Do you think he will care about his craft?"*

"*{ },'* said he."

"*Then he will become idle and careless, more than before."*

"*Much more."*

"*He becomes a worse potter then."*

"*Yes indeed,*" he said. *"Much worse."*

"Yet again, if he is too poor to provide himself the tools or anything else needed for his trade, his goods will be worse, and he will not be able to teach his sons and apprentices so well, and they will be worse craftsmen."

"Of course."

"Then both poverty and wealth make the craftsmen worse, and the things they make as well."

"So it seems."

"Then we have found other things which the guardians must guard against. They must prevent, by all means, from creeping unnoticed into the city."

"What are these?"

"Wealth and poverty, too. Because wealth creates luxury, and idleness, and faction. And poverty adds meanness and bad work to the faction."

"Certainly, but consider, Socrates, our city will be able to make more without having wealth, especially if we force the fight against the great city which has wealth."

"It is rather difficult to fight against one, but against two such, it is clearly easier."

"How can that be?"

"First of all, if there must be a fight, I suppose our men will be athletes of war matched against men of wealth."

"Yes. Yes."

"Very well."

Well, you should say "yes" to that.

"Yes to that."

To that point. Ja. Ja?

"Very well, Adeimantus.

One boxer is well trained as he can be against two non-boxers wealthy and fat, don't you think he would have an easy battle?")

Israel against Egypt, yes. Go on.

"Perhaps not. If they came on both at once."

"Not even if he could retreat and wait till the first man up, and then turn back and strike him, and did it again and again,

in the stifling heat of the sun.

Could not such a boxer beat a lot of men like that?"

"I should say so. That would hardly surprise me."

"But don't you think that rich men have more knowledge and experience of boxing than they have in the art of war?"

"I do."

"And it would be easy for our athletes, in all likelihood to fight twice or three times their own number."

"I will grant you that, for I think you are right."

"Then again, what if they send an embassy to one of the two cities and tell them the truth, saying, 'We use neither gold nor silver, and that is forbidden for us, but not for you -- then join us in this war and get what the others have.'

Do you think anyone hearing this would choose to fight against the pack of hard, lean dogs, and not be joining the dogs and tackle fat and tender sheep?"

"No, I do not. But if the wealth of the others be collected into one city, does not that bring danger to the one which is not wealthy?"

"Oh, blissful ignorance! Do you think any so-called city is worthy of the name except the one which we were constructing?"

"Why not?)

"We must have a bigger appellation for the others, for each one of these cities is, as they say in the game, 'Cities, cities everywhere, but city none for me.'

Each of the last two cities, one of them poor and one of them rich, enemies to each other, in each of these two there are very many smaller.

If you treat with them as one, you will lose everything.

If you treat with them as many, and offer to give the wealth and power, even also the people themselves, one or more groups of men from the other group, you will always have many allies and few enemies.

As long as your city is managed with soberness, as was laid down just now, it will be very great. I do not mean in fame, but in real truth very great, even if it has no more than a thousand men to fight for it.

For a great city, one in this sense, you will not easily find, either among the Hellenes, or among the barbarians, but many you will find which are thought to be as great, and many times greater than this.

Don't you agree?"

"Yes I do."

"Then here we might find { } for our rulers.

You decide how large our cities should be, and how much land they ought to enclose for a city of that size, letting the rest go."

Let's stop here. Bring it again, and I hope, a few more. We'll bring copies of this.

SIXTEENTH LECTURE: *THE RESTORATION OF THE OLD AGAINST THAT WHICH IS CHANGING ALL THE TIME*

I YOUR FIRST EXPERIENCE IS AT HOME

1

...dealing with Plato as the climax and heart of Greek philosophy. Why is he this?

Because in him, the whole of Greece, with all its questions already asked, comes to Athens to try to syntheticize all these fundamental movements, all these doubts, all these misgivings about the relation of the local religion, the local law, and the natural universe.

2

I was asked -- I think it was yesterday, Mr. Foerster was it? is that right? he here? -- the question is -- he's majoring in science, and so he is bothered by the problem of physis.

For you, gentlemen, in your abstraction, and in your strange mental uprootedness of any modern man who goes too long to school, it always seems that nature precedes society.

That's the Rousseau gospel. First there is a wonderful natural world, and then comes man who spoils it with his legislation.

Your experience, in Oklahoma City, or wherever you come from, is the opposite: that you first live in a society, and then you look out of the window, and go out to the Grand Canyon, or to Beehive, and that you call "nature."

3

The whole problem of the relation of physis and nomos, of the law and nature, is: which is your own first experience of law?

And your first experience is at home. The experience of what a law means must first be made, before you can learn and understand physics.

4

And that's against all your tenets, gentlemen. And that's the struggle of Greek philosophy in antiquity. And today we have to unwind the clock, we -- that is, you

are so philosophized, you only live so much by second impressions, that you have lost sight of the fact that you wouldn't understand what a natural law is if you hadn't had parents who brought you up in a lawful order in society.

II NATURE IS A COMMON EXPERIENCE OF MANKIND

1

And you don't believe it me. I am sure that in all weak moments or most moments of your life, you will relapse into this, what the Bible calls "original sin," that man is hipped on thinking that what he thinks at 20 -- at your age, is his first impression. That he can think these truths about nature and doesn't owe them to an empirical way of life, in which it was dinned into him what a law is, something that has to be followed, and which has dire consequences if it isn't obeyed. Spanking.

Now, nobody is spanked in this country; so it's very difficult to understand what a law is.

2

You believe -- that is, a majority of people today believe, those who are not real Christians -- 99 percent, that is, of the living people in this country believe that nature is their first experience, and society their second. And they want to measure society by nature.

This cannot be done, gentlemen. Because, what is nature, gentlemen?

3

Nature is that reality which we view, when we are already joined together. *Nature is a common experience of mankind.* All second impressions, which goes through your mind, your reason, are general experiences made by the commonwealth of man.

If you are a physicist, you do this in the service of the community, who allows you to study physics, who has divided labor in such a way that you can go into a laboratory, and the fire department in the meantime looks after the fires.

If they wouldn't man the fire trucks, you couldn't possibly study physics. It's impossible. You are their delegation.

You have already agreed then on the commonwealth, and on its functions, long before you can agree on any fact in nature.

4

So this is for Plato, gentlemen, and for the Greek mind then, the turning point. Discussing the best state, he's hit by this tremendous question: Which is first -- physis or nomos? that is, the polis.

What is first?

And in Plato, it is in a strange equilibrium, what you call his ideas, his famous idealism -- that's after all Plato's invention -- was an attempt to make the city and physis of the same quality, of the same quality of being original.

III PLATO'S IDEALISM

1

Plato is interested in two things: in the mathematics and the good. And he wants to equalize them. His last oration was on the mathematics and the good.

Physics -- physis is to be dealt with numbers, like the Pythagorean. And logos and ethics put together, being the world of the nomos, must be dealt with goodness, with "best." This strange word "best" comes in.

2

Plato is an aristocrat, because the word "aristos" means "best." You think "aristocracy," means, "the few." That has no meaning. "Aristocracy" means the rule of the best.

And he's haunted that in humanity, gentlemen, the best corresponds to numbers in physis. And if you put them both back against their origin, they come from eternal ideas of the good and the beautiful and the true.

3

And the ideals then, gentlemen, of Plato are an attempt to establish -- will you take this down? I think it's a good formula I offer you -- find it in no book: *Plato's idealism is an attempt to create an equilibrium between our political experiences and our physical experiences, to make them of the same original quality.*

The modern American, being purely pragmatic, thinks that his glands come first, and then history.

4

I've heard a man talk about universal history of mankind and say, "It's all a matter of the glands."

Now, such an idiot is allowed to speak in this country. He's feeble-minded. Yes, he made a public appearance on the American Historical Association in 1934 and he said, "Now we know!" It was just the days, where everything was glands. "Now we know that all world history comes from the glands."

Well, of course, we know, since man has a stomach, and genitals, all our history has to do with our physical existence. It's nothing new that we have glands. And I have always known that there are certain glands very necessary to produce children. So history has very much to do with glands.

But it is absolutely meaningless to turn to physics, to *physis*, to the things outside speech, the things which cannot speak, the universe which is mute, and say, "The speaking universe, you and I is produced by the mute universe, by our own objects."

IV NOT I, NOT YOU, BUT WE HAVE CONSCIOUSNESS

1

So gentlemen, the question of questions is: Which is the object of man? Nature or he himself?

If you are a naturalist, you say, "Nature has as its object the production of man".

If you are a spiritualist -- I mean, a Christian, who believes in the fact that the word creates, that the word is creative, you know very well that you cannot perceive the sun or the moon -- there is chaos with you, before you have given these things names, before you have looked out of the window together with your fellow man.

2

Nature is the common observation of mankind, gentlemen. There is no nature for the individual. The individual, gentlemen, put in nature loses his mind, goes panicky.

And if you have ever been in a desert, all by yourself, in the burning noon sun, you collapse. You run wild. You lose consciousness. You are found then, because you have fainted.

A man who is really alone in the universe is unable to stand it. I mean, you have just to think this through not with the example of a messenger who is sent through

a known way through the desert. He's still on the apron strings of society. You can see this. He's just a delegate into this desert.

But a man who suddenly feels that he's cut off from the rest of mankind, really cut off for good, is unable to remain conscious. He loses consciousness, because consciousness, gentlemen, is the representation of the kind in us.

3

You have no consciousness. I have no consciousness. But we have consciousness.

And when you think, what do you think? You try to think the truth.

What's the truth? That which I also have to believe.

So the truth, gentlemen, is always that holds you and me in its common grip. The mind is devoted to a common denominator, to something general.

Otherwise your thinking is a delusion.

4

Most of you are deluded, because you think you have a mind of your own. Nobody has that. I certainly have not, gentlemen. That's why I have a very good mind, because I have never the illusion that it is my mind.

I have privilege and you are privileged to light up, as an electric bulb lights up here under this glass. And can only light up where there's the cable and there is a common power plant. The light in this bulb is not of this bulb; and the light in your brain is not of your brain.

V PLATO'S PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF WHAT IS CALLED GREEK THOUGHT

1

That's Plato, then.

Plato makes this heroic effort to stabilize, gentlemen, the relation between physis and nomos, the law of man and the law of nature, in such a way that there shall be no preference for one or the other. That is idealism in Plato's sense. Both are of immediate divine origin.

2

We have in ourselves an idea of what is best between men; that's called goodness.

And we have an idea of what is best in nature; and that's called truth.

And we have an idea what's good in both; and that's called beauty.

And that is the idea of Plato's goodness, truth and beauty.

3

And perhaps you understand now why I have tried to give you a history of Greek philosophy.

This is not a course on Plato. It's a course in which I want to signify Plato's place in the history of what is called Greek thought, which you also could call "human thought." Whenever human thought tries to respond to a situation of time and space in limited ways with regard to reality, it has to reconcile the first and the second impressions of it. The disharmony.

(Would you please repeat what you said about the good, and the beautiful, and truth?)

4

Ja.

Goodness is the ethical relation between men.

Truth is the relation of reality with regard to nonspeaking, neutral objects, to the world of what we call "physis," the nonspeaking universe, or the world considered as not speaking, but as just being observed, or as being objectified.

You can say good is between persons,
and truth is between objects, between things.

Beauty is the harmony which permeates the whole universe, for Plato.

A Christian would reject this. For a Christian, truth, beauty, and goodness are not the standards. But for the Greeks, that was the highest they have ever achieved.

The harmony between the world of first impressions -- so their society -- and the world of second impressions.

VI "BEAUTIFUL" AS THE TIE BETWEEN THE POLITICAL AND THE NATURAL WORLD

1

Now after Plato, gentlemen, the balance shifts to a preponderance of nature that seems to them possible, following the Ionian first attempt to say that if we understand nature, we then can place the city of man inside nature, according to natural law.

But that's not Plato's concept. Plato, who's exactly the middle, he does not decide in favor of nature or in favor of the city. But he says he has the matrix of both of them in his access to the good and the beautiful and the true as the eternal ideas in some background, in some bed of reality out of which they come.

2

When you have the Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in the Christian tradition, that is, the life of man through the generations -- Plato is not interested in time, but in space. He sees the inner world of man and the outer world of nature, and as the Christians realizes, that he has to reconcile the age of the Father and the age of the Son through the Holy Spirit, so that the beginning -- Adam and Eve -- and the last day of judgment are reconciled as one story;

so in Platonism, gentlemen, the world of men, the inner world of the mind, and the outer world of things, of the bodies is reconciled by a similar trinity.

I always wonder why the humanists are so much down on the Trinity, and say, "That's abracadabra," and "That's a dogma." But when you talk to them, they never admit that "the true, the beautiful and the good" is a dogma.

I think it's a much more questionable dogma. Not one of you has experienced the good, the beautiful, or the true. It cannot be experienced. It's an idea; it's a mere faith.

3

All humanists, gentlemen, believe much more un-understandable things than any Christian. But I'm very glad that they are my brothers in the fact that they must believe something. And they believe in space, in the eternal order of a universe written large -- *Universe* -- as I told you, in Greek, the all, *pan*, in which there is life eternal, undying. There is no death, because things can be known as far as they are true--"are known how they are in truth" would be the correct sentence.

Men are good. And the universe is beautiful.

And the word "beautiful" then pertains to the nice bodies of young men and the stars and the organization of society; it all can be beautiful.

"Beautiful" then gentlemen, ties together, as you can see here, the political world and the natural world.

4

I think what most people who live in Greenwich Village by and large have the same code. That is, they would also say the highest standard, as for Ezra Pound, is beauty.

Beauty is so decisive, yet if something is beautiful, it cannot fail to be good for the city, or to be true in nature. The deepest insight in nature for a great poet or artist would be, "That is beautiful." And the greatest insight probably of an act of heroism would also be to say, "How beautiful."

VII *DEATH IS UGLY*

1

As you know, the Crucifixion came into the world so that nobody could say this anymore. The Crucifixion was atrocious, horrid. The blood of Christ is not beautiful, and His sweat, and His tears. They are horrifying.

The Christians hold that beauty has nothing to do with truth. And beauty has nothing to do with goodness. A man can be very good and very ugly indeed.

2

But the Greek idea is always to paint Christ as a beautiful young man. When you see a picture in which Jesus is beautiful, you know it's by a Greek painter. And most people today are Greeks.

I had a friend here in town. And he rejoiced very much when the young minister of the church was called by his confirmation class, "the living Jesus." He was a very beautiful man. So next day, he got a divorce.

That comes from such idolatry of beauty. The boys called him "beautiful," and they thought, that Jesus of Nazareth had also to be charming. He wasn't charming at all, gentlemen. He would have made a terrible figure at any cocktail party.

3

The universe, gentlemen, however, of the Greeks is purely in space, not in time. It is eternal. And therefore, gentlemen, the universe of the Greek philosophy, of Greek idealism -- or materialism, that makes no difference -- of the Stoics, of the Epicure, of the Pythagoreans, is construed as a deathless universe.

Because, gentlemen, death is ugly. Death makes you despondent.

We talked about this last time, that anybody who has to die in person cannot tap himself on the shoulder and say, "Old boy, it doesn't matter." It matters terribly. And fortunately all your wonderful superior attitudes as Greek young men, that "I don't care," you are just deluding yourself.

Because if there's nothing for which you care, you will end as a louse. Somebody will step on you, crush, and you can't complain. You have said all your life, "I don't care." So why should anybody else care for your precious life? Then what about it? You say all the time, "It doesn't matter, I don't care."

And then some police chef, Mr. Serlok arrives in Budapest and crushes all these students who have said, "I don't care." Well, what of it? Where's your complaint? "It makes no difference," you always say.

To the most vital decisions, I hear you say, "It makes no difference, it makes no difference."

4

Gentlemen, that is the danger of the philosopher, who is in constant equilibrium, and who doesn't want to go out on a limb and who says, "This is all wonderful. It's an eternal order. Everything is wonderful. Nothing can be destroyed. We are all imperishable."

Gentlemen, I am perishable, and you are perishable. And we are even corruptible, which is much worse. You see, we don't hold our own. Once you are good or beautiful, you cease to be a tomorrow.

VIII *CONCEPTS OF SPACE*

1

This is not foreseen in Greece.

In Greece, the picture of philosophy is always that once you have attained a certain status of perfection -- of truth or beauty -- it stays with you. You can hold onto it. It isn't every moment again in danger of total collapse.

And that's why the humanist loves the Greek picture of the world or the universe, because he finds there the release of his real fear that nothing is permanent.

2

We -- you and I - should know that nothing is permanent. But the mind, once you declare your mind independent, and once you say, "It's my mind," then the first attempt is to stabilize one's own mental picture, and that's in your mind, that's called a philosophy, the stabilizer of one mental picture as lasting.

3

Plato isn't that stupid. Plato is not thinking that man's mind is his own. Otherwise he wouldn't be an important philosopher. This is the common-sense philosophy, that my mind is able to stabilize the world around me. You call this "rationalization."

Plato's idealism is of a much more refined type, and a much wiser type. He says that there are from eternity to eternity certain ideas: the good and the beautiful and the true. And that if man uses his mathematical mind, as in Plato's dialogue *Theaetetus*, or in the *Timaeus*, he can find out the truth of things, of stars, and of all outer processes. And if he looks up to the idea of the good, and stares long enough, he will know what the good is.

4

So will you clear -- kindly, perhaps, as I think it's a useful handbill for you to say - all philosophy gives in antiquity a picture of the world in terms of space. The ideas are somewhere up in Heaven, or in the sky. And man is down here. And the things are outside, and the city is inside.

These are all concepts of space. First.

Then the equilibrium between the physical world and the ethical world are the great problem, and they are solved in Plato's idealism by the equalization, the equality between the good and the true. And the mediator is the beautiful.

Beauty is found inside and outside. Good is only found inside. Truth is found outside. The harmony of the good and the beautiful and the truth is the trinity of idealism.

And whenever anybody pokes fun at you because you believe in the Trinity of the Church, you can always reply that the other trinity is much more arbitrary.

IX THE UNITY OF HUMAN RESEARCH

1

Why is it arbitrary, gentlemen?

Because there is never any agreement possible on the good and the beautiful and the true. Not possible.

You can agree merely on the true. You can agree on the good. But there is no reason to believe that two people who agree on the good, like the colored woman who nurses your baby, and you can agree on the good. But she'll never understand the universe. You can't make her understand it. It's too much for her. Therefore she'll never understand the elements. It's too difficult for her -- in the universe, in this respect.

It takes a specialist to understand the universe. And it takes a specialist of the human heart to be a good nanny. And therefore, the people who are good together and the people who know the truth together are not the same, and never will be.

2

So idealism, gentlemen, is for an aristocratic group of people, for the chosen few, who have as much brain as they have heart, who will be in harmony between heart and mind. But the average mortal is not able to study relativity and be a good witness. It's just asking too much.

And the nurse who is a good nurse, and the mathematician who is a good mathematician certainly are not held together by what is beautiful, gentlemen. They are held together by some quite other quality, gentlemen.

3

If you come to know what holds together the physicist and the colored nurse of his baby, then you know why Greek philosophy is not the whole story. It is always only for the chosen few.

Philosophy, gentlemen, *philosophy is the assignment of the common conditions for thinking in all the fields of human knowledge*. It's for men, especially for young men, and it is the unity of human research.

4

And I can now define, gentlemen, what this story of philosophy is.

Philosophy is the process by which the human mind is renewed under the pressure of disharmonious environment.

We have seen what it is. The human mind is renewed under the pressure of a disharmonious environment, contradictory environment.

X THE PURPOSE OF THIS COURSE

1

I feel also bound once more to repeat, gentlemen: I do not pretend that I have here in this course to teach Plato as he is for all his own sake. I have announced this as a course in the history of Greek philosophy. And history has its own laws.

2

History of the Civil War is not a biography of Abraham Lincoln. You understand that. And that's the reason why I feel that first of all you should take another course on Plato alone.

And second, that I know very well what I'm doing. I think it is more important for you to understand the march of history of the mind -- it's much more difficult to understand than to do something you can always do privately, sit down and read these writings by Plato, with a commentary, which is very good to do, indeed, but which is not the purpose of this course.

3

Let's now go to the text, please. Will you have your copy? You have? Have you one? Have you? Here.

It would be true if I show it to you, but it wouldn't be beautiful. Or it would be good, I mean, but it would not be beautiful. Ja. It would also not be physically correct.

Where were we?

(221.)

221. We were just -- yes: "...how large a city should be."

4

Now, gentlemen, you see how bold a step it is to deal with best. I'm very much interested. This is a new chapter for a new aspect of the Greek conflict, gentlemen.

As you know, in Christianity, there is a thinking about first and last things. And that is called "eschatology."

Now, from Plato's point of view, he deals with a utopia. And nowhere - has anybody read *Sartor Resartus* by Carlyle? Who has read that?

Not one. I'm sorry. Well, utopia, as I told you, means "nowhere."

XI UTOPIA AND ESCHATOLOGY

1

Now gentlemen, the difference between the Christian eschatology and the utopia is very much like the difference between the Trinity and the good and the beautiful and the true. And it is just as much worth your while to understand the difference between these, as between the others.

The three ideals are: *good, beautiful, true.*

And the Trinity was: *Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit.*

2

Now, perhaps you will admit that you can experience a father and a son, or a mother and a daughter, but it's very hard to experience the good, the beautiful and the true. They are things of the mind. They can be thought. They cannot make the experience.

You cannot meet the good in the street. But you can meet images of fatherhood and of sonhood on the street of life. You can love them. But you can only aim at the true. It's only here in your mind that you can find it.

3

So in the same sense, gentlemen, the utopia is aimed at by our mind. The eschatology is an expectation of something -- what has already happened.

That's why the eschatology is the second coming of Christ.

Christ has already come, and He'll come again. That is, you all only repeat by expectation what your heart has already been shaken up by: the horrors of the judgment of the human race for its crookedness, for its wickedness, for its hardness, for its obstinacy, to see God come down to earth, that we don't wish to see that.

4

All utopia, gentlemen, aims from the point on which I live here into some unknown, fantastic space. It's "nowhere" in the literal sense that I am somewhere, and what I think is nowhere.

Eschatology is the opposite, is an attempt to make you see that the worst has already happened, and that if you do not anticipate it, it will overtake you. It is already in reality there. There is no eschatology as an idea, or as a thought. Then it is utopian.

I don't doubt that many Christians are just Greeks when they speak of "the other world," or of people going to Heaven. That's just another space for them, a real utopia.

XII *THE BEST CITY*

1

So today it's very difficult, gentlemen. Most Catholics today are Platonists; and they call themselves Catholics, but they aren't, because they have ceased to be Christians. They are just scholasticists. They have in their mind a utopia.

2

That has nothing to do with Christianity, gentlemen. When a man tells you he is a Thomist, you can tell him, "Then you are no Christian." Because that's all Plato, and all Aristotle, later too: my ideals in space.

3

So the utopia of Plato comes out very clearly in this sentence, which we read: "We shall determine which is the best city."

The best city is not created somewhere as a creature, like any human being or like the animals or the trees, like a redwood, that's the best tree you can think of, at least the longest living. No, Plato is going to decide this from where he stands projecting into nowhere. All modern philosophy tries to persuade you that you have to live

in this disastrous projection business, that we all project our desires, and our wishes into these pictures.

4

Gentlemen, we can, but we don't have to. I mean, projection is the first attempt of anybody, a fairy tale, a utopia, to construe. But I think you and I can very well distinguish between projection of our own desires and forceful imposition of God's will on us, which is very different, indeed.

XIII THE WHOLE CRUX

1

So, let's read there, 221. "Then here is another"--will you kindly--"Then here is another --" Yes, you, Sir, without the copy.

"Yes, I do."

Where are you? No, we are a little later. "Then here is another injunction."

"Then here is another injunction we must lay upon the guardians.

{ } guards in every way that the city be neither small nor seem to be large, but be just great enough as a unity."

The next, please.

"Quite attractive injunction for them, I should think."

Now, Mr. Socrates.

"And another thing is more trifling still, I suppose --which we mentioned before when we said that if a trifling kind of son should be born among the guardians, he was to be sent off to the others.

And if one showing excellence was born among the others, he should be sent to the guardians.

This was meant as a rule, but other citizen, also. One man, one work.

They were to bring each man to the work that was naturally his, so that each might practice his own work and be one man, not many men.

And thus the whole city might grow into one city, not many cities."

"Yes. This is a smaller injunction than the other."

"Really, my dear --"

2

Now, you see immediately that mentally speaking, philosophically speaking, this is a hard doctrine. He calls them playfully "trifles." Yet that's the rub, there's your utopia.

Has any man the power, the right, first to say that "I appoint this man guardian, and the other," that's the whole crux. We are here.

Whenever Plato says, "This is trifling," you may be sure that he means the most important. And you have to learn how to read, gentlemen.

It's like America, when they say, "We won't go to war." You may be sure next day they are in the midst of it.

3

Say one thing, and do the other. Especially when you minimize, what the Greeks called *meiosis*. Understatement. Where there is an understatement, there's a very important statement. You can be sure of that.

And this is a kind of this. Here we are, in your and my central point of decision: Do we follow Plato? Can we be Platonists?

And I think in these two sentences is the whole crux of the matter.

If you want to be a Bolshevik, then you say, "Hundred thousand Hungarians can be deported." That's what he says here. That's in this sentence. He can deport them, if he thinks fit. That's what he literally says.

4

You, please read this with open eyes. Here is the seat of the megalomania of the human mind. "Just a trifle," he said. A trifle, a most important thing. We'll never concede this.

XIV WHAT EUGENISTS LOVE TO READ

1

"Really, my dear Adeimantus.

These -- are not { } or great injunctions laid on them, as one might think, but all trifles, only they guard the proverbial one great thing equal, or rather not great, but sufficient."

"What is that?"

"Education and training.

For if they are well-educated, and become orderly men, they will { } see the way through all these things, and others, too that we have not mentioned yet -- the possession of wives in a marriage, and begetting children.

They will understand that all these goods, as the proverb goes, must be held in common."

2

Wonderful. Gentlemen, if nature is that which the mind perceives for the commonwealth, if I say 2 and 2 is 4, you all have to believe it, because it's mathematics. My mind operates for all minds who are healthy and normal.

You remember, I said: nature is that which the mind must think in all who are bound together in their observation of nature, in their exposure to a common nature.

Now here you see, if you carry this over into the city, then all women must be held in common. Because if you treat the ethical realm, the realm of goodness in the same way as the realm of truth, since you perceive that all things are equal with the mind, there is absolutely no halting, no barrier to concluding, that since all women are there to produce children, any woman is as good as anybody else to produce children. And the famous poly- -- how do you call it? polygyny?

(Polygamy.)

Polygamy. Well, no -gamy, just many women -- of Plato has its seat here in his attempt to equalize the outer and the inner world so totally.

3

And that's again a terrific sentence, gentlemen, which of course all our eugenists love to read. All women -- where is it? what did you read? --

"the possession of wives and marriage, and begetting children, they will understand"-- "understand," wonderful!

"They will understand that all these goods, as the proverb goes, must be held in common."

4

Now the next. "Yes," he said, "that would be --"

"Yes, he said. That would be quite correct.

{ } when a state once had a proper start, it grows as a circle would grow.

Training and education being kept good, engender good natures.

And good natures holding fast to their good education become even better than those before, both in the power of breeding like the lower animals, and in other ways."

"That is likely."

"Then to put it shortly, this one thing needful, training and education, is what the overseers of the city must cling to.

And they must take care that it is not corrupted insensibly.

They must guard it beyond everything,

and allow only innovations in gymnastic and music against the established order, but guard it with all possible care.

And when someone says of songs -- what is it people always want to hear?

the latest tune that's warbled through the air -- they would be anxious,

lest men may think perhaps that the poet does not need new songs,

but a new way of singing, and may crave this.

So we must not praise such a thing, or take that to be the meaning,

for to change to a new kind of music is a thing we must be aware of, as risking the whole.

For the methods of music cannot be stirred up

without great upheavals of social custom and laws.

So says Damon, and I believe him."

"Then you may put me down, too, as one who believes."

"Then the { } safeguard for the guardians must be built somewhere hereabouts, it seems, in music."

"Here at least, lawlessness easily creeps in, unseen."

"Yes, in the form of play, when it seems likely to do no harm."

"And it does no harm, if it were not that it makes itself at home, little by little, and gently overflows upon matters and practice.

From these, now stronger grown, it passes to man's business agreements.

And from business it moves upon laws, and constitutions, in a wanton flood, Socrates.

And so at last all public and private life is overwhelmed."

"Really? Is that the case?"

"It seems so to me."

"Then, as you were saying at the beginning, our children must hold fast to play of a more law-abiding type than the first, since when play becomes lawless and the children likewise, it is impossible that law-abiding and serious men can grow out of such children."

XV THE OLD STATE RAISED UP

1

Who has taken Philosophy 9? Well, you recall our problem of play and serious life. That's discussed here.

And the interesting thing is, gentlemen, that in play you need fashion, you need fads, you need the latest hit, you need the new play on Broadway, you need a new comic strip, et cetera. And the problem that we discussed here is that of novelty, as you can see.

2

Plato tries to arm against novelty for novelty's sake. So far we have seen how he is going to do it. But that's what he's up against. Novelty for novelty's sake.

Playing is appetizing, because you can in play change all the time without any danger. But can you play in the military establishment, can you suddenly say that Charles Wilson should be in command of the American army instead of General Eisenhower? Can you delegate to the secretary of defense the commander-in-chief function?

That would be something that you could expect to happen in a play arrangement, where the old coach cedes to a younger man for the time being and says, "I go home."

3

Now, go on.

"Certainly they must."

"Indeed it seems that when children begin by playing properly and receive it into themselves law and order through their music, just the opposite happens."

*Good order goes with them in all things, and makes them grow.
And raises up again whatever of the old state was lying in ruins."*

Aha. We have then the worship of the old, the restoration, gentlemen, of the old against that which is changing all the time.

4

"True indeed."

*"Then we discover again the custom, even playful which they were thought,
which goes before them and wholly destroys."*

"What custom?"

*Such as silence of the younger in the presence of their elders, which is { }.
And giving place to them, and rising before them, and honoring their parents.*

*The cut of their hair, the manner of dress and { },
their whole bearing and comportment, and everything of that sort.
Don't you think so?"*

"I do."

*"But to legislate about such customs would be silly, I think.
For they are not observed, and they would not last if laid down as laws in word and writing."*

"How could they?"

*"Anyhow, the fact is, Adeimantos, that whatever way their educations start them,
their future ways are of like quality.
It's a case of like always causing to like."*

"What else can happen?"

"And in the end --"

XVI USING UP A FORM

1

You see, here we have already this really terrible habit in the end of Plato's dialogues that the poor interlocutor is only allowed to say something totally empty. If you read these two sentence: "How could they?" and "What else could happen?" I mean, if they weren't there, we would be much happier.

But the whole dialogues are filled with these trifles. It's really trash. There the form runs away with the content.

2

Once he has laid down the form of the dialogue, he has to fill it out, even when there is no requirement for any response or answer, and there are very few dialogues in Plato which make you feel that the form of the dialogue is really necessary. We'll read later as a contrast the *Symposion* in which this is true.

The *Symposion* is a real dialogue. And this is not. This is a book.

(Sir, I was wondering. I noticed that { } one section where Adeimantus begins to talk about the infiltration, you might say, of innovation into tradition, while they're talking about { }. I was wondering if there's any meaning involved { } does seem to be an exception.)

Oh, that's a very great sentence by Adeimantus, sure. Here, on page 222, what we just read.

Oh, I hadn't said that every one of these answers is meaningless. But I gave you two examples, where they're really just fillers. And the proportion, I mean, in *The Republic* is already that two-thirds wouldn't be missed.

But there are other dialogues, of course, in the end in the *Timaeus*, and in the laws of Plato, in the old work, it is nothing but a stereotype what in the answer or in this interrupter is done.

3

So you may say the story of Plato's dialogues is a story of using up a form, and in the end it no longer is more than a form. In the beginning, it is necessary.

Here we are in the middle. Part of it -- I would agree with you, Mandaville, that this on Page 222, "And it does no harm if it were not that it makes itself at home little by little," is elementary, is of great importance. It's central. And probably he wanted to put it into the mouth of this young man.

({ } I was wondering why it seems like { }.)

4

Well, I think it's a flattery. Do you know who Adeimantus and Glaucon are?
(No, Sir.)

They are two brothers of Plato. So it's a very nice way, don't you think? It remains in the family.

XVII CITIES AS THESE SICK MEN

1

Now, let's read one more page and then have a break.

"In the end, then, I think you would say it would turn out to be something complete and bold, either good or bad."

"Of course."

"My opinion, then, let me tell you, is that for these reasons, I will not try to make laws about such things."

"With good reason."

"Ah, but for goodness' sake. Do say what you think about all this market business, contracts which different classes of people make in the margin and contrast with Artesians, if you --"

Oh, oh. Artesians?

(Oh. "Artists." Thank you.)

Artesian wells exist, gentlemen.

"And slander and assault.

*And filing of the declarations and finding juries,
for there may be dues to exact or to pay,
which have to be enforced sometimes in markets or harbors.*

*The whole multitude of market rules, or police rules, or the harbor rules,
and all other such, shall we allow ourselves to make {new laws} about these?"*

*"No, it would not be worth the trouble to give orders to cultured gentlemen.
They will easily find out themselves, I suppose, most of the lawmaking needs.*

"Yes, my dear { }.

If only God grants them safe maintenance of the laws which we have described already."

*"If he does not, they will spend their whole lives making such laws,
and amending them, and expecting to find perfection."*

"You may { } six men who are too undisciplined to give up their bad manners { }."

"Exactly."

"Oh, what a charming life they have, always doctoring themselves with the sole result that they make their diseases worse and more complicated.

And if anyone recommends a medicine, always expecting to be cured by it."

"Yes, that is just what happens to men who are sick in that way."

2

"Yes, indeed; and here is another charming thing about them.

They hate worst of all the man who tells them the truth, who tells them that nothing in the world will do them any good, not medicines, or burnings, or cuttings, or amulets, or anything else until they stop drinking, and gorging, and wenching, and idling."

"Not so very charming to be angry with one who gives good advice. There's no charm in that."

"You don't seem to approve of such men."

"No, I do not, I do declare."

"Nor will you approve of the city then, to return to that we were saying, if it does things of that sort as a whole.

Do not cities appear to you to do just the --"

Now, that's an important sentence, gentlemen.

3

And we'll go on from there. Please read this paragraph now. Mandaville, there's the case, -- who says this? This is Socrates, this is central here. "Do not cities appear to you --" ja?

"Do not cities appear to you to do just the same as these sick men, when they are badly governed, and forewarn their people not to meddle with their city's constitution, on penalty of death to anyone who tries to do this
?

But whoever serves them most pleasantly, governed as they are, and heaps favors upon them, and cringes, and forestalls their wishes, and shows himself clever in fulfilling them, there is their good man and true.

*There is their fountain of wisdom.
There's is the man they will honor."*

"They do seem to me to do just the same. And I do not approve of them at all."

*"Then what of those who are willing and eager to serve such cities?
Don't you admire them for courage to carry it off so lightly?"*

*"I do, except those who are really deluded and believe themselves to be real-born statesmen,
because they are afraid for the mob."*

Let's stop here. Thank you. Five minutes.

I UNPERCEIVED

1

As you can see - on Page 223, there is a phrase at the bottom of the page, "Yes, my dear friend, if only God grants them safe maintenance of the laws."

Now to any humanist this is very shocking that his beloved Plato still has the obsolete superstition of mentioning God. It's not necessary if you have ideas. Then why speak of God?

2

The difference between ideas and gods is, that we have to pray to God if He is alive. You can't pray to ideas. You just have them. You may stare at them.

So you may take down, gentlemen:

The distinction between the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit on the one-hand side -- and the true and the good and the beautiful--is that the good and the true and the beautiful can't be spoken to. They can't be spoken.

It isn't meaningful to pray to the good. It's something you look at, but the good cannot look at you. And the beautiful cannot look at you. And the true cannot look at you.

3

With the ideals man is immobile, in a speechless universe. In the universe, there may be these guiding stars. But these stars do not perceive you. You are not seen.

In Plato, you are not loved. In Plato you are not understood. In Plato, you are not embellished.

But you see the beautiful, you see the truth. They are in this sense -- you may say beacons, or aims, or stars, or ideals.

4

What you call an "ideal" is something very handy, gentlemen. That's why you and I cannot be idealists in seriousness. Idealists don't talk back. An ideal is what I make it to be. And no contradiction allowed from the part of the ideal. I say, "I have ideals." Poor ideal isn't asked any questions. It just has succumbed to my will.

That's why idealists are funny people, because they first make their god out of their mind, and then they say, "That's a god." It isn't. It's just an ideal. What we called a projection.

(Can these ideals somehow get around it by the process of empathy?)

But it's arbitrary. You may think it's empathic. But what is empathic about the good?

(Well, I mean { }.)

II NOT INVOKED

1

Didn't we talk about this communion with nature -- my friend here on campus who would interrupt our social intercourse and stop in the midst of campus and say, "Pardon me, I now have to hold communion with nature." I think he was a silly ass. And arrogant, too, because he wanted to be alone. He called this "nature."

2

There's no communion with ideas, or communion with nature, gentlemen. Don't be betrayed.

The simplest answer to an idealist is always that he meets no resistance. If you meet Jesus, or His Father, they tell you exactly that you should be ashamed of yourself. But an ideal is of your own making. If you talk long enough to the ideal, it will allow you any crime. Absolutely -- it has no resistance.

3

But there's something very important still to be said.

On the end of the page, I looked up the Greek text. Gentlemen, the Greeks have of course names for their gods. There is Zeus. And it has always been felt in antiquity that if a man really believed in God, he would speak of Zeus as a father of gods and men, and not of God in the abstract. Do you know what the difference between the Greek word "theos" is, which goes around in the word "theology," to this day -- and the word "Zeus"?

It's a very simple difference as between ideas and a living person. Zeus you can invoke. But the word "theos", which already is old, which is a sum of the gods, whose special name doesn't matter, has no vocative.

In other words, gentlemen, the Greek word used here at the bottom of Page 223, is the weakest word for the gods, because it is that god who is not invoked.

4

You will not understand this -- only perhaps if you think of the "Our Father in Heaven." If you think of the most common prayer of Christianity, you will understand that if there wasn't this invocation, "Our Father," there would be no prayer. It is perfectly enough for a man to say in an agony "Our Father," or "for Christ's sake" - that's a full prayer. All the rest is just execution of a minor character.

The logic of the prayer matters much less than the invocation, because you put yourself face-to-face with your Father in Heaven.

III A MISTAKE IN CONVERSATION

1

The Romans felt this very sternly and very heavily. You know the word "Jupiter" is the vocative. The word "pater" is abbreviated in "piter," and the word "Jovis" is abbreviated in "Jup". And therefore Jupiter is the form of the prayer.

And then it became to be the final name of the god.

That is, gentlemen, a true god can only be spoken of in the vocative, in the shortest form, in this form, "Jupiter," or "Our Father."

2

Why?

Because if you believe in God, He is present. If He is present, you cannot speak of him as though He was absent. If we really believe in God, gentlemen, you must behave all the time as though He is present.

3

Now, to any present company, you have to address your word directly. I cannot speak of you as "he." It is very impolite while Richard Siles is in this room to speak of him instead of taking him into our conversation and turn to him and say, "You will agree." I must not say to you, "He agrees." That's very impolite.

And many people make this mistake in conversation, that they speak of present company as "he." You mustn't do this. That's always an insult. And it hurts to be called a "he" in my own presence.

While you're talking of me, here, when I can hear it, you must turn to me and say, "Am I not right, Professor?" That is, by saying "Professor," you reconcile me to overhear your talking of me, because then you agree that I'm still alive then -- and a part of the spiritual conversation that takes place.

4

All this is lost on you, gentlemen. You live in an inanimate universe. You have been ruined by your schools, and you think that to speak of God is decent.

Gentlemen, it's indecent. You can speak to God, and you cannot mention Him. You can be silent. But you cannot speak in bull sessions about the existence of God. That's just funny. And it is insane. And it leads nowhere, has absolutely no meaning, this discussion about God, because any discussion about God has already made the decision that He doesn't listen in.

So it's a forgone conclusion. You have already decided that there is no God, then you discuss Him.

The result is that everybody goes home and says, "It can't be proven." Of course, not. Because you set out already in a situation in which you had decided that He wasn't there. If you assume one thing, you cannot be surprised that we never get as a result the other.

IV SPEAKING AND LISTENING (READING)

1

That's why all the discussions about God Almighty are so very strange -- meaningless. Any man who opens his mouth believes in God.

He may deny it. There are decided atheists who say it's very harmful to speak, and to allow other people to pronounce this fact. That's atheism. But the atheist believes that he is right, and he believes that he is true. And so he always believes that there is a common spirit among men.

2

Anybody who speaks and tells the truth to somebody else is this man's father.

And anybody who listens to somebody else and learns something from him is this man's son;

because father and son is just the relation of hearing and speaking, of learning and teaching, of instructing and receiving.

Whatever you take, I mean. In any relation, you read a book: this author is your authority, and you are on the receiving end. You are in this moment his son. You can be 20 and I can be 70, if you teach me something, you are my father and I am your son.

3

That is, in the relation of speech, of speaking and listening, there is always the relation of older and younger, because the man who says something knows one minute before the man who hears it, what is true. You cannot change this.

*Who says something first is always leading on.
And who hears something second is always following.*

There is nothing to get around about this situation of speaking and reading.

4

And all you people who want to become writers or teachers or lawyers, or whatever it is, or salesmen or advertising men, you always assume that there is in reality father and son, as an eternal category, that we all take turns.

Sometimes we are in the position of the son. Sometimes we are in the position of the father. And as long as there is life, you will constantly be switching between these two positions.

SEVENTEENTH LECTURE: *THE LOGOS COMES FIRST*

I *COMMUNITY*

1

In all your papers, gentlemen - and I'm going to read them; and even if you copy from somebody else, I'm going to find out.

I've just to separate three boys into the other course because of dishonesty.

So please be careful. They have to leave college. It's really stupid. But a man who thinks that his teacher is so stupid has to be severed for lack of intelligence.

I come back to the one thing which I would like you to learn, which seems to be impossible however for you to understand, that there is at every moment when a man's mind is at work, that is, when he ceases from sleep, we are after all gentlemen, in several states...

[tape interruption]

...will not understand that while you are in the morning awakening, have breakfast, and then before you go to sleep, all day long, your mind is at work by associating with the living -- preferably with those people who seem to you more alive than yourself, like a beautiful girl or a wise man or the opera or the radio -- or whoever you listen to.

2

That is, you try to find life, you join up with life. And you try to agree in the process of joining others -- friends, of looking at the world together, because you are quite sure that it cannot be true if you only think of the world this way.

You want to have agreement on all your statements and ideas about the world; before your comrades have not agreed, there is no world in which you can trust. That's just your own imagination, wishful thinking, you call it.

3

So anybody who wakes up and takes breakfast, gentlemen, makes a decision: here are the people in whose judgment he has to trust. We call this "community." You call it your "friends," because you overlook the fact that these friends and you speak American slang. They speak English, and that's a political order, inside which every word you speak makes sense. Democracy.

Nobody in Iran understands "democracy." They think that's a Cadillac, when you say "democracy" in Iran, because that goes together with "America."

But you understand democracy because you live in America.

So even though you don't speak to all Americans, you still are within the logos of America, here. And you speak to the people who are in this logos ethically, owing each other the truth about the world.

So in every minute, gentlemen, the frontiers between logos, ethos, and physis are changing.

You get up, gentlemen, and you shave. As long as these whiskers are on you, they are part of you. Once they are shaved, they are thrown away. They are dead. Therefore, you have carried, from the living to the dead, something. It has become purely natural, whereas before it is an integral part of you -- the painting, the portrait which the painter paints of you, your own beard.

4

And so with everything, gentlemen.

You throw over Europe and you say, "Ooh, Europe is dead," or you say, "England made a mistake now; Eden is just finished." He's finished. Well, you can only say "finished" of somebody you bury, you declare to belong to the realm of the nether world.

You do it all the time. You are very cruel in this respect. There are any number of people whom you declared to have died already long ago.

And probably in some cases you may be right. But I also think that most of you haven't yet been born, so I also would consider you pure nature, and I have to treat you this way.

Any man who copies from another man, is separate from college -- is treated as an object of dismay, and dismissed, because he cannot be a member of this community.

That's the whole story.

II *YOUR OWN EXPERIENCES*

1

Would you then kindly resume our approach now to Plato, to this quandary of every human mind who is honest with himself, and who is not dealing with the trash which most of you use, in your daily language.

You are not aware, gentlemen, that every word that comes out of your mouth moves the frontiers between the things that are less alive than you, and the people and the forces that are more alive than you. In every moment, you try always to join up with the powers that be, or the powers that you think that are important. And you are going against those forces of deadness and boredom and mere quantity, which you think you can exploit, and which you can cheat, or which you can manipulate.

2

Ask yourself, gentlemen, you think of course, you can manipulate your professors. You can perhaps also manipulate Dean MacDonald. But there are certain people in the world, I'm sure, where you know very well that if you would try to manipulate them, they would lose their ultimate importance for you.

People you love, gentlemen, if you would try to manipulate them, you wouldn't love them.

You know this very well. You can rape a girl, or persuade a girl to sleep with you; but you know exactly, too, if you do wrong by her, that you don't love her, and that you have treated her as an object, you have treated her as physis. You have not treated her in the spirit of love.

And therefore it is your own temptation, gentlemen, your own decision how you treat this girl. In any moment, you can treat any girl, God Almighty, too, just as a thing to be manipulated.

You can go as a hypocrite to church and say, "It's good for my income tax if I go to church, because I can deduct so 10 percent of my income for charities." Well, you then know that you have treated God as though He was just a part of the world. And you know very well that you have deprived yourself of the possibility of living with anybody who is a little better off, a little more alive than you yourself.

3

My whole point today is, gentlemen, that logos, ethos and physis are your own experiences.

This is important for our approach to this book, because in Plato, he officially deals with everything as physis. And he wants to know the physis, the nature of the state, for example. But on the other hand, he puts this in the form of dialogue. And so, the funny thing is, gentlemen, the content of Plato's philosophy is nature, the form is ethical.

A dialogue is an ethical form of thinking, because there are more than one person involved. And you owe each other the truth.

4

Where is Mandaville? He isn't here today. I'm sorry, because he raised this question last time, when we read one sentence or one paragraph of Adeimantus, and he said, "Isn't that a real contribution to the dialogue?" And I had to admit it, that this was more than just a stilted form, and that more than one man were needed to know the truth.

III *THE IDEAL FRIEND*

1

Now that's a big recognition of Plato: Plato's relation to the humanity comes out in the form of his philosophy. Plato's ideas about the world come out in the content of his philosophy.

And most of you do not know, gentlemen, that form is already in itself an act of faith.

2

If you take your hat off before an old lady, that already is an ethical act. You don't have to say anything, and you don't have to give me your creed that old people deserve to be kept alive, and don't have to be shot. Or given over to salvation. Because you took off your hat before this lady, I know you have some reverence before old age, you have to say nothing.

And I have to know of any philosopher how he behaves to his neighbors before I know his full philosophy. What he says and writes is only a little part of what he really thinks.

3

Now in Plato, it should be obvious to you that he is the ideal friend, because his ethical code demands that the truth is conveyed to us by several people bringing it

out together. So the cooperative fellowship is constitutional, it's fundamental to his ethics. And though he may not have written, like Aristotle, ever any treatise on friendship, that he is a good friend is implicated in the form of his works.

And therefore the Ethics of Plato can be fathomed in his approach, in the form of his writings.

4

And I thought I should try, at least, to convey to you my conviction that Americans think that the ethical things should be stated in blunt sentences: "Be good," and so. I doubt, though, that this form of indicative statements of ethics ever works, because ethics is not something that you can write down as you can write natural science. You can say, "2 and 2 is 4," but what it is to be good is so doubtful.

Good is such an abstraction, that if you don't give a living example how you treat your neighbor, I don't know what you're talking about. What's good? Good is what everybody thinks is good. We wouldn't know what Plato calls "the good."

We talked about it yesterday, you remember. We wouldn't know what is his good. Somebody else stopped me on the street -- who was it? -- about the absolute good. We wouldn't know about goodness if we wouldn't see this goodness at work. And if you don't see goodness at work by abstract statements, gentlemen, by systematic observation - I can only believe that the man knows what is good by seeing him in action.

IV GOOD IS

1

Now the action of Plato is the style of his works. And the thought is something different again. That's the content.

2

It's very hard for you to understand and to believe me -- that ethics cannot be expressed in abstract statements. It is the curse of America that this is still believed.

The result is then in the Orozco fresco of the schoolteacher who makes all these little children sexless and repeat stock phrases. Have you this picture in mind? It's so awful, because you don't see them behave cordially or neighborly. But you only see them stand there and being filled with these silly doggerels on morality.

3

Morals cannot be stated in the same way as natural facts. You can state, "The rose is a flower." All right. What of it? But you can never say, "Be good." Mothers say it, and they ruin their children, they get a complex.

Yes, a mother who slaps her child in the face and gives her candy the next day can educate a child. But a mother who constantly says, "Be good," to a child spoils the child, corrupts the child, ruins the child. We don't know what is good, except concretely in one action. "This is good, and the other thing is bad" is a wanton addition to the act.

4

Good is -- if you have A, B, C, and you write around this "good," then you only say it that in your family these three things are done every time. There is breakfast, there is lunch, and there evening supper, and then you say, "This is good." But without your having experienced that breakfast is appetizing and nourished you, and that luncheon is there, and supper, you wouldn't know what good is, as in my paper called "Being," where Heraclite tries to tell Parmenides that being is only meaningful if you already know what it includes.

In the same way, goodness is not meaningful unless you have acted in various ways and you remember all the positive actions and say, "This I call good." Otherwise you don't know what goodness is.

V *THE RIGHT OF CRITICISM*

1

Now in Plato, there is this realization that in every moment where he says something about physis, he must act ethically to the people whom he wants to convince of the truth in nature. The truth in nature and the goodness to the people who want to share this truth must always be congruous in him.

And today, I mean: throw all the books on ethics written in America in the last hundred years into the fire, and they won't be missing, because they are all trying to express ethics in terms of natural knowledge.

You cannot express ethics in terms of natural knowledge. It isn't natural, because it wells up in you, because you are face to face with a human being. And with this very definite human being. I'm good in my behavior towards my parents and I'm good in my behavior towards you, or I'm wicked. But in every moment, I have to behave differently.

2

(Yeah, but this is okay for the first impression. But what if you and I come from different societies? And you've been taught that this is good, and I that is good. And then we try to generalize, we try to say something that's true for all of us, for both of us? Then don't we have to become abstract? In general?)

I would be very careful in this.

I would say if an American and an Englishman meet, or -- I have to go through this proceedings now, gentlemen, of reconciling my American citizenship and my stay here and my feeling of home here, with my German relations. And they know this very acutely, that I'm balancing. I shall very much avoid to have any generalization for all the world. It must be concretely between Americans and Germans.

And it is this immodesty that Mr. Malik tries to sell you a world ethic, a Syrian-American ethic, which makes me, for example, not trust Mr. Malik of Syria, who is a very good man. I mention him because I have great respect for him. But I think -- do you know who he is, Malik? Who has heard of him? He made himself quite popular, but it is an illusion to think, that goodness between two concrete people can ever be expressed in generalities for the whole of mankind.

3

I give you two examples, and it's terribly important that we should now keep from Plato, in this discussion just of the state, the difference between the natural aspect of any city -- where people have to eat and to live and to get married -- that's all natural, after all, because they are animals who have to exist -- and goodness.

The dialogue of Plato, I say, is his ethical contribution, his immense friendship. And Aristotle expressed it very beautifully; he said of Plato, "This man was so good, that the wicked ones do not even have the right to praise him."

That's a very wonderful saying. He had this impression that on the highest level not everybody has the right to talk. Not everybody can even judge. And therefore, a man who says, "Plato was a good man," is already taking upon himself to insist that he has a right to judge Plato. And Aristotle says, "Nonsense; the wicked ones have no right to praise him."

The emperor of Austria, the last great monarch of the world, Francis Joseph, used always to say when the papers praised him for some utterance, or for some act of kindness, he said, "An emperor must not be praised, ever, because then also these same people have the right to scold him. And an emperor must be beyond good and evil, or he cannot be the emperor of 14 different nations," as he was.

And therefore, the praise of a man also includes the right of criticism, and so he ceases to be beyond the parties.

4

These two examples may show you - Aristotle's saying of Plato, and the emperor Francis Joseph's own insight into the dangers of praise -, that this presumes that the man who praises has any understanding of the quality which he praises. That would make every idiot the critic of every highest spirit in the world. It would abolish awe and reverence and respect; and it has been, of course, cauterized out of your existence very largely.

VI AWAY OR TOWARDS

1

America perishes because it has no respect. And since people cannot live without respect, you distribute your respect always to the idiotic values of Broadway, or DuPont, or rich people, or some such silly asses. They don't deserve your respect and your reverence.

There are other people who deserve your reverence, like Helen Keller, or some such people.

2

But you have been told, "Be independent," "Every man is as good as every other man. I am critical. I cannot be taken in." But you cannot live without awe. You cannot live without authority.

So officially in this country, the most terrible people receive celebrity. If you read the book, *The Power Elite* -

who has seen this book? Power Elite? Haven't seen it? It's quite an interesting book, because it shows how the abolition of true superiority, gentlemen, has led to the necessary substitute of false values.

Nobody can live, gentlemen, without ethics, that is, without recognizing that you have people who are better than you. That's what we call ethics. And the people who are less good than you. The scale of values is in ethics always necessary.

3

So we put this, this way, gentlemen.

All physical facts can be expressed in the form of indicatives. But all ethical facts can only be expressed in emotional form of "yes" or "no," in the sense of "Let us do this," or "Let us avoid it."

If you get a murderer, your reaction is: "God forbid that I should ever be found in this situation." So a crime creates an ethical reaction in every healthy person, that you don't want to be found in the same predicament. And any glorious action -- like the Hungarian people now -- gentlemen, that cannot be stated in the form of report, that this happened, you have to say, "I'm proud of them," "I admire them."

4

You'll remember what we said of admiration, that it is the fundamental fact that human beings are either to be admired or to be despised. Therefore, I call this not an indicative sentence. But that's always a subjective sentence.

All ethical problems are problems of "Let me be this way," or "Let me not be this way." That is, they are always movements back and from -- away or towards. That's perhaps the best expression.

All ethical statements, gentlemen, are movements away from this feature, this event, or towards this event.

VII FIRST THINGS COME FIRST

1

As long, however, as you live under your physicist's cloud, you don't believe this. You think that ethics is a science, which of course, it isn't. Ethics is the decision on who is on your side -- or on whose side you are on, and against whom you are.

Against, not in any hostile sense, but what is less important, so that it can be manipulated.

2

All the means, for example, all automobiles are just means. If a child is born, you must forget about the sale of your automobile at that moment. The child comes first.

You can express it in a very simple way. First things come first. You have heard this at home, probably. Your mother may have told you that first things come first. I hope she has.

3

If she has, gentlemen, it means that in all ethical decisions, there is a hierarchy. There is something more alive, and something less alive. And it is true in every minute, gentlemen, that you have to decide who is more alive, so that you have to serve him and help him.

If you find a great genius, or a poet in your community -- like Robert Frost, who's going to speak to us on Thursday-- obviously you go there, you flock there, I hope, because it will be your last opportunity of seeing this very great man. If you go there, you act ethically, because you acknowledge that the higher attracts the lower. You don't say anything about it. You don't make a statement. And you don't say much. You say, "Robert Frost is a great poet."

4

The only thing I will believe in your judgment if he makes you go, because you take your heart and allow your heart to speak. That's ethics. That's all it is.

VIII THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE COMMUNITY

1

I want to give you two more examples, because that's the terrible misunderstanding around Plato.

Plato has said in his *Seventh Letter* that he never said the deepest secrets of his life in any of his books. And so at this moment, what do I do? I draw your attention to the fact that his life was his ethics, his life with his friends, and that he impressed people as a saint, as the greatest spirit of antiquity, because of this sincerity of his dealing with his friends, or with his people.

And we know from his *Seventh Letter* that the best is not expressed in his dialogues.

2

And I would therefore say the best, however, appears in the form of these dialogues, at least. We have an idea how smiling, how cheerful, how merciful, how ironical, how sympathetic, how sharp, how he could be when he was speaking with his friends. In the dialogue, he gives away his dramatic secret of being a person acting out his role in life within a godly company of men.

3

Gentlemen, I once was in a difficult position in the army in the First World War. It was in the Battle of the Somme. And I suddenly got the report that my youngest officer - he was only 18 years old and an ensign -- had been found sleeping on guard. You know you are spelled every two hours on military guard. Battle was raging, and so of course it was a very terrible crime. And under the penal code of any army, a man who is found sleeping on guard has to be shot. At least he has to be court-martialed. And he certainly would, as an officer, be immediately degraded, lose his qualities. So life and honor both were at stake with this man.

And he came before me to report his case, because he had been reported before, with a helmet on, and all the bandoleer, and everything -- as we say, in full glory -- battle dress -- glory. Dirty, it was. It was November. It was a very hard time for everybody. And here was this boy. And his whole future was at stake. And if I had acted out my simple military duty, he would have been ruined for life.

On the other hand, gentlemen, it was serious business, and something very drastic had to happen. I couldn't let this pass. And I couldn't say, "I shall use" -- I couldn't say an indicative sentence, as you would think, from the morality of your little schoolhouse teacher: a sermon would do. No sermon could make up for his crime, because he had let down, after all, the army in a battle.

4

And I want to repeat, gentlemen, ethics is never to be stated in the form of a proposition. Wake up to this fact, and you suddenly cease to be so superstitious, as you all are. And you think that ethics is a part of your worldly knowledge. It is the knowledge of the community, the polis, in which you really think to live.

IX *BROTHERS IN ARMS*

1

And in the community one does move and is moved but never makes reasoned statements and judgments, because "Judge not, lest ye be judged."

It is not my business to judge such a man, gentlemen, but to do something with him.

2

If you could only understand this, you are all judges of the whole rest of the world all the time, because you are so frightened that you might be shaken out of your

intellectual security. As long as you think that I am under your judgment, gentlemen, you treat me as a piece of nature. Because you put me outside of you, somewhere.

I'm not then a part of your own life.

3

Well, I first finish -- no, I may interrupt this by a kind of excursus: on last Thursday we had the installation of a minister. And such an installation is given by another minister, telling him what to do. The other minister had been his co-pastor in Keene, New Hampshire, for the last three years. And he said, "Thank you, Roy, for the kindness which you have shown to me. You were asked to pass judgment on me to the board of appointments for the ministry in Boston. And they asked you -- gave you a questionnaire.

And you wrote back, "This man is an integral part of myself at this moment. We are brothers here in arms. And as long as we are together, I shall not pass any judgment on him. I shall not answer any of your questionnaires. It would be a break of the unity inside of us, where I must not even try to reason what qualifications he has. He's just part of me, and I am a part of him. And just as little as I know really to judge myself, I shall not give you any such qualifications."

4

And then the minister also mentioned that his comrade in Keene had done this after some consultation of myself, that we had been cahoots and had been thinking, could a man in honesty serve the congregation as a minister, with another man, and at the same time, sit down and say, "He is such-and-such,"? "He's good and he's bad."

And the result was that he cannot. If you pass such a judgment, the man is outside you. And then he has become a part of nature.

X FATHER AND MOTHER

1

So it's morally very important, gentlemen, that you understand this. Then you wouldn't answer such questionnaires as Mr. Bender here used to put out: Whom do you love more, your father or your mother? That's the devil's question. In the moment you answer this question, you have ceased to love either your father or your mother, or both.

2

If you cannot understand this, you are lost to philosophy, because philosophy knows of this separation of the ethical attitude and the worldly, the physical attitude. And if you think that your father and your mother are part of the physical world, then you can say whom you love more. But then you neither know what a father is, nor do you know what a mother is, nor do you know what love is.

You think love is a fact. Love is something that at this moment you have to battle for. You have to pray that your love doesn't give out. And how can you continue to love if you dissect it and try to know who is dead. One of the two you put on the dump, by making this decision.

3

And I hope you will never know whom you love more, your father or your mother. I couldn't tell to this day whom I have loved more. They are both dead. But do you think I know? And I don't want to know.

There are things that you must not know, in generalizations, Sir.

4

This is what one tried to think, that there could be general statements of this nature. They must not be. They must not be tried. But you must move back and forth, towards and away from things.

XI ANY ETHICAL ACT IS UNIQUE, SINGULAR AND CAN NEVER BE REPEATED

1

Well, what did I do on the battlefield of the Somme in 1916?

Gentlemen, I slapped this man as heartily as I could into his face. And there was the staff sergeant, and there were several men. And they saw it. And that was his redemption.

And I decided that by slapping him in the face, I treated him as a boy. He was 18, after all, and you can treat such a man as a boy. And therefore I declared him simply not to have been of age at that moment, of his action. And everybody was very happy.

Seven years later, the boy brought me his wife and said, "Here is the man who saved my life," to her.

2

And that may be qualified as ethical truth, which I discovered at that moment, that I had to create a new relation to this man. In treating him as a child, as a boy, I could get him out of his position as an officer. It was of course, in a way, a momentary degradation, because you don't slap an officer in the face. But should I wait until he was degraded *in actu* by the authorities, by the martial court? Would this have been wiser?

You would, of course, do this, because you think it is unethical to spank a person. Now I assure you, gentlemen, it is much more ethical to slap a man in the face than to have him degraded and put for 10 years into prison.

But you don't understand me, and that's why you don't understand the Suez Canal.

3

Yes, you can't. You have ethical statements that it is always bad to hit a man. It is not always bad to hit a man. It is sometimes bad.

I don't say that you always have to hit a man when he has slept on guard. I claim, gentlemen, *that any ethical act is unique, singular, and can never be repeated*. And you must never recommend an act because it has happened before. It's no reason to repeat any such action. But that doesn't abolish the fact that it was necessary to do it at that moment.

4

If you can begin to understand it, you see why an ethical act cannot be generalized, Sir. It loses its character of an ethical action when it is repeatable. Then it is a legal action. And the law is the first naturalization of a unique action.

If you say, "I can write something into a law," and it becomes repetitive, then I treat it already as an external thing, of outside nature.

The way from the act into the law, gentlemen, is the way from ethics into physics.

Would you take this down?

The way into the unique act into the law is the way from ethics into physics.

XII JUDGMENT AND JUDGING

1

And so we get quite a series of things.

Here is the spirit, the logos. He says to me, "Save this man". And I try to find a way out, and I treat him as a child. I slap him in the face. If I found out this to be an excellent way of saving people's lives by a momentary act, as in school, for example, that I haven't to dismiss the man from college, because justice has been done and he can stay, then I would make it a habit. And then I would make it a law.

So you have the act, you have the habit - or the "precedent," is perhaps better --and you have the law. And finally you have the natural law. And you see how important it then is, that you see the connection between the ethical world, and the world of nature.

By the concept of the law, ethics are always transformed into physis.

*Law is experienced act,
respected as precedent,
transformed into rule and regulation,
and finally applied to the world outside as always having this implication.*

2

For example, you say, "Of course, the people reacted in Hungary." Now, there you take it as a natural phenomenon. But of course, if people hadn't once rebelled in this glorious way, as they do now, you wouldn't know this. They first had to happen in an ethical context, that you could admire it.

You think the other way around. You think, first there are laws the universe and then there are acts. And that's why you are no longer free men.

My slapping this boy in the face is such an example of freedom, because it was nowhere in the context of any martial law, or civil law, that there was this response possible to such a serious action.

3

If you cannot see this, gentlemen, that all actions in the New Testament are invented by Jesus on the spot, you don't understand the New Testament. When the adulteress is brought before Him, what does He do? He says -- what did He do? How has He judged the adulteress? (He { }.) Yes, and what happens? (They go away.)

They all go away. He creates an absolutely new situation. Nobody accuses her anymore. Don't you understand? So He creates suddenly a sphere of peace and protection for her, because all the other people withhold and withdraw.

You must just see this lively, that He creates this new dimension which hasn't existed before, the dimension in which people see suddenly that they themselves have tried to judge, instead of knowing that they also are judged.

4

It's always the same thing in ethics.

As soon as you say that you are under judgment, you stop judging.

XIII WORD - ACT - LAW

1

Gentlemen, the gist of the matter is this: the only ethical law which is adamant, is that a man who is of age has to listen to the experience of the ages. Before you elope with a girl, you are not competent to cope with the problem, if you cannot hear the voices that contradict your move, that warn you against it.

If you are just in a frenzy, you must expect the full fury of the law and of wisdom, and of precedent coming upon you, because you have acted without listening.

2

So gentlemen, the logos is the ruler of the ethos, because to listen means to let the intellect, the spirit enter your mind. You must be willing to bring your ethical action under the word.

And that's why the whole Bible is written around the word of God, gentlemen.

The word precedes the act. And the act begets the law.

3

The words of the past, the words of wisdom, the words of experience, the words of suffering, the words of love and sympathy a man must listen to. "Listen"- or "hearken Israel," it's called in the Old Testament --"listen" or "hearken" is the one ethical command that is true, that is permanent.

I had at that moment to consider, that it wasn't an action of mine of mere rashness that I slapped this boy. It was an act by which I tried to contradict the authorities who said, "He has to be court-martialed."

This, if you can think this through, is an intellectual act on my part. I had to face up to the rules of the game as they had existed so long and so far. This is intellectual. This is logos.

4

Before I have made my own original contribution, I had first to weigh whether any of the precedents would have done the trick, the same trick. Perhaps then I would have had to fulfill it. If court-martialing would not have entailed his utter ruin, I would have -- and in other cases, it does.

Think of the Marine sergeant. There was not way out. You had to go to court with the man. But then it could be pardoned.

So it is the hardest thing for you to understand the relation of logos, ethos -- ethos and physis. And I tried to do it today, because I think if you could see this, you understand Greek philosophy.

The Greeks had always this relation between the knowledge of what is good by precedent, by what already was known to be wise men's acts. The problem of friendship, that is, what to do to a person you are in sympathy with at this moment.

XIV WHEN TO BREAK, WHEN TO FOLLOW A LAW?

1

Now just take Prohibition era, and a man who gets drunk. And you are for Prohibition. That doesn't help you at all when the man is drunk. You have to take care of him.

2

Take in 1922 or 1923. You are against drinking, but your best friend gets drunk. What do you do? Can you simply say he shouldn't have got drunk? Doesn't help you at all. There you are. You have to treat him as your friend.

3

So ethics must say, "Too bad. Prohibition really should have been followed." "You must listen to the law."

But you can also create for this friend a refuge from the law.

4

So all the time, gentlemen, the word in the sense of already intellectual preparation, of foreknowledge, of anticipation, is with us. Everything has already been thought through in some form. The existing social order tells you about any action: this you can do, or this you cannot do. It does not however help you at all, because you must know:

*when do we have to break the law?
And when do we have to follow it?*

Any minute you have to create actions which are far beyond anything that could have been foreseen before. But you have to have listened to the words of the wise. You have to be a law-abiding citizen in the sense that you must know what the law is.

XV YOU MUST LISTEN

1

I once challenged another student in the University of Heidelberg to a duel. I went to a very fine man. His father was prime minister of one of the German states, and so he was quite high up in the ranks of authority and loyalty and good behavior. And he had just been made baronet, and was quite proud of the new title of "Baron," or "Freiherr." And I asked him to be my second. You know, you have to send to the other fellow whom you challenge a man, and he is in your stead, you can't see him yourself, and he has to organize the conditions of the battle. And so he said, "Well," -- I said, "Would you do this?"

And he said, "Yes." And then after everything was settled, before leaving the room, he said, "Well, you have studied the law -- he was a medical student - "so you tell me, that's punishable under the law, is it not? It's an infraction," because duels were forbidden officially in the penal code.

And I said, "Yes, it is punishable."

And he said, "It doesn't make any difference to me, but I still wanted to know."

2

And I think that was a very good and sober statement. He wanted to know that he was breaking the law, and then he decided to do it, just the same. So he has never been rash in his life.

He is still alive and a very, very slow, meditative, and important man. He's considered to be the greatest doctor of Germany at this moment. And he said this very wonderful saying, "It is punishable, is it not?" "I'm going through with it just the same."

That's ethics, gentlemen.

3

So please take this down, gentlemen. *The relation of ethics to logos is that the logos comes first.* You must listen; otherwise you are a wild animal.

If you then feel urged to act to the existing code, yours are acts of freedom, you have not broken the law, in the same sense as an animal, which has to be punished, because it just was out of bounds.

4

It's very strangely unknown in this country. You think the ethical command is both: intellectual, truthful and good. The true and the good and the beautiful aren't so simply unified.

The stream of consciousness reaches you through what is said, as order. Then your neighbor suddenly impresses you with the necessity of sympathetic or antithetic action, whatever it is. And that provokes you to your new response. And that is up to you. And you never know whether you should follow the law, or should not follow the law.

In 99 cases, you may be perfectly safe just to do what the law requires. I don't say at all that in many cases you will never feel any conflict between what the law requires that you do and what you have to do. But the one case is important, which explains what is ethics.

Ethics is when it is upon your conscience.

XVI CONSCIENCE AGAINST KNOWLEDGE

1

Here, where is this man Forrester -- (*Foster?*)

No, you are the wrong one. Well, he has left? Well, I just had a discussion with a man who called the conscience a dynamic thing. I said -- well, here you are. (*Porter.*)

Oh, pardon me. Porter. I should say. So Mr. Porter?

Now you know why there is no dynamic conscience. There is conscience against knowledge. Your conscience must be informed about the existing law. And then your conscience is creative at that moment. Under the impact of what has been said, and the conflict with what is there, to make your decision.

Let's go back now to the text after a little break. Five minutes.

I ENCYCLOPEDIA

1

"But really, I should not have thought the true lawgiver ought to have the trouble of working out things of that sort in laws or constitution, either in a badly or in a well-governed city.

In the one, because they are useless and do no good; in the other, because sometimes they follow naturally from former conduct. For it's not anyone {to} find out what to do."

"Then what more could they want for in their legislation?"

"For us, nothing. But for Apollo and Delphi, the greatest, and finest, and { }."

Now, just to show you the absolute indifference. This we have read already, and nobody told me this. Terrible.

2

"The founding of temples, and sacrifices, and the worship of God, and spirits and heroes besides. { } began.

And whatever services are due to those in the next world to keep them gracious, for these are matters we do not know ourselves.

And in founding our city, we will obey no man if we have sense, and we will use no interpreter except the god of our fathers, for this god, I take it, is the ancestral interpreter of such matters for all mankind.

And he sits in the middle of the earth, upon the navel, and interprets."

Well. There's an old saying, gentlemen, which you just as well may retain: "*Repetitio mater studiorum.*" Repetition is the mother of studies.

So we have read this last time, so we read it here again. I told you something about the center of the universe.

3

Gentlemen, in the Bible, and in Christianity, the middle of the universe is in time. Christ is the center of history.

In Greek thinking, since time is cyclical, and just moving in cycles and in circles I'm afraid, too -- the problem is to find the navel of the universe, the center. And that's why you know that we have a Greek book which is called the Encyclopaedia Britannica, which means the knowledge in a circle. "Encyclo" -- that's "encyclopedia,"

to be educated -- *paedia* means -- with the Greek word here, of Plato - education. And this is then, gentlemen, the center paragraph, in the heart of *The Republic*, by which you can get hold of the Greek mentality. The idea is to be in the center of the universe; in Boston they call it how? ("*Hub.*")

The hub of the universe is considered a wheel. But the whole problem is always thinking in terms of space. You are in the middle of something you can mentally overlook.

4

This is important, gentlemen. You must get hold of the fact: what is the Greek? what is mind? - what is humanism? You are all thinking that humanism is something that can stand on its own legs.

Humanism is the arbitrary half of reality.

It's time to organize the world as space. You are sitting in the middle of the universe, and you look at it -- out to the periphery. And you buy the Encyclopaedia Britannica, as though this was the periphery of all your knowledge; and inside of this you sit in your museum, or however you call it. And anybody who looks through this Greek thing, knows of course that this is a strange abstraction, that it is much more important to have the Book of Books, which is written through 1500 or 2,000 years and can be continued backwards to the beginning of history and down to the last days of judgment.

II TO KNOWWHAT NEXT

1

The title of the Bible, gentlemen, is *Book of Books*. The Bible is not a book, but "biblion" in Greek means "book," and it means "the book of books." That is, all the books ever written have their meaning in this.

That is the antithesis to the Greek mind. And you and I, gentlemen, we are condemned to deal with two possible mentalities: one thinking in terms of time, and one thinking in terms of space.

And Plato is only, I'm afraid, one-half of the approach to reality which you always try.

Oh, Mr. Batchelder? Oh, pardon me. Please, by all means.

2

At this point here, we may stop -- because we have reached the very naive statement of Plato. He thinks that this is not ridiculous. To you, to speak of the navel of Delphi as the center of the orb -- we have no approach anymore. But in this sublimation of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, we still all believe in it.

And here you can see the difference, gentlemen, between the conditions of the philosophical mind -- first impressions, where there is Apollo in Delphi or the priest sitting on the tripod and it's called the navel of the earth.

The Greeks made out of this an ideal world. The very word "ideal" comes in here and says to you and me, "Let's have an encyclopedic knowledge."

3

Gentlemen, an encyclopedic knowledge of the universe does paralyze us. You take a man who knows the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* by heart, what about his ethics? Can he act? Can he be a statesman?

He cannot, because he knows so many things that he cannot possibly know what to do next. It's impossible for him, because he knows too many things.

4

The problem of a statesman is to know what next. In other words, to rule a state, you have to know the timing. The problem of timing is the essential political quality. And therefore, philosophers must never be kings.

And Plato has put in *The Republic* before us the solution, that if philosophers could be kings, then the state would be in the best of shape.

III THE HEART OF THE MATTER

1

This is the ultimate in space-thinking that has ever been thought of, and whenever this comes true, gentlemen, you get the cruelty of the Bolsheviks. In Bolshevism, the philosopher is king. And you cannot breathe. There is no freedom. You are just a part of the system, of his system. He has thought out every law.

And the natural relation of logos, ethos, and physis is destroyed.

2

As soon as a philosopher is king, I'm afraid ethos and physis coincide. In one form or other, the physical law and the mental law of your own mind crush any freedom between friends. This you must see.

And the strange thing is that on Page 225, which is usually overread by most of you, gentlemen, and in America nobody pays any attention to this sentence about Apollo, it looks so perfectly silly, and who is interested in Plato, in the navel at Delphi?

Yet you have the heart of the matter.

To think that a philosopher can be king is exactly the same as thinking that you can know the center of the universe, because then you construe a world inside of which, by total knowledge, you know everything potentially, what has to be done.

3

The only thing, gentlemen, that a man in life must know is what next. You will be very happy if you know what to do next.

I assure you, nobody knows what to do after next. Nobody. Even the wisest one doesn't. And so it is much more difficult to know what is next, than to know everything, because next is not everything, and everything is not next.

4

Next does not exist in Plato's philosophy, because all philosophy cuts up the reality into space. An outer world of nature, an inner world of ethical conjunction, and in a world from above, of inspiration from logos, which tells you what you are up against with regard to your comrades in arms, or your co-citizens, or your family, and with regard to the plants, and stones, and mountains, and enemies outside.

But it never tells you of history.

Plato is anti-historical, gentlemen. Plato is utopian. And therefore today, gentlemen, *The Republic* I think is a very dangerous book. If you would take *The Republic* literally, you would become slave drivers. You would become administrators of forced-labor camps, et cetera. And all the Russians -- Mr. Lenin more than anybody else -- are Platonists.

But it is a tremendous temptation. I think most of you are under this spell.

IV FIRST EXPRESSIONS OF TIMING

1

Shall we now go onto the Fifth Book, please? Please. Page 246.

*"Then with good enough right, I call such a city an institution in such a man.
 { } blundering the others.
 If this one is right both in the managing the cities and their manner of
 furnishing the soul of individual citizens that are classical –
 four conditions of wickedness."*

"What are these?"

"I was going to give a list of them in order as they appear to follow one after another when Polemarchus, who sat a little way from Adeimantus, stretched out a hand and caught hold of the upper part of his brother's wrap near the shoulder, pulled him towards himself, and leaning forward, whispered something in his ear.

I did not catch what it was, except this. Shall we put them off, then, or what shall we do?"

You take Adeimantus.

"Let him off? No."

Ja?

"Exactly why don't you two let off?"

Ja?

You.

2

"Why -- but why, exactly? You are shirking, we think.

*You are cheating us out of a whole chapter of discussion,
 and by no means the smallest, because you don't want to discuss it.*

Do you imagine you will get away with remarks you dropped in that like way?

*What was it about women and children { } anyone did you say,
 that friends will have all in common?"*

"Well, wasn't that quite right, Adeimantus?"

"Yes, but just that."

"Quite right" warrants explaining, like the rest of it warrants.
How they shall be in common, there might be many ways,
so don't fail to tell us which way you mean.

We have been waiting ever so long, hoping to hear what you have to say about child getting.
How will they get children? How will they train them when they come?

And all this community of wives and children of which you speak,
we think it will have a great and capital effect on the state,
according as it is rightly or wrongly done.

You are putting your hand to another constitution
before you have properly finished this,
and so you have heard, we are now resolved not to let you go before you
have discussed all these things like the rest."

Now, somebody playing the Glaucon. Here.

"Put me down as voting likewise for that."

And Thrasymachus said,

"Oh yes, we are all decided on this, Socrates. Take that for granted."

3

"Oh, dear me. What a thing you have done, challenging me like this.
What a debate you are stirring up.

It looks like doing the constitution again from the beginning.

I thought I had finished now, and glad indeed I was.
Quite happy if I could just be accepted, and left alone as described.

And now you demand all this, too.
You can't imagine what a hornet's nest of words you are waking.

But I saw it and passed it by to prevent trouble."

"My dear man. That's what these people have come for.
They left all to come and hear words.
Do you suppose they are looking for a gold mine?"

"Words, yes. But not words without end.
We must draw the line somewhere."

"Draw the line at the end of life, Socrates.

For a man having sense, when words can be heard such as these.

But never mind us. Just get on and answer our questions.

Tell a story in your own way, only don't give up.

What will be this community --"

Just stop here. Gentlemen, here, this is an example of the best ethics of Plato.

4

You remember that I said the dialogue is the ethics of Plato, the form of the dialogue. Now here are four men coming in. Two first, and then Glaucon and Thrasymachus and Polemarchus joining him, yes. And there are the first expressions of timing.

If you look at the sentence I had to read -- of course, today it's always overread -- these are the problems of waiting, of expectation. And he says this may go on -- "draw the line at the end of life."

V TO KEEP A SECRET

1

These are all temporary notions. Ethics has always to do with timing.

The whole problem of moral life between citizens, gentlemen, between good people, is when to tell your mother that you are going to marry this girl. You can break the confidence and trust of your good girl if you say it too early. You can lose the confidence of your mother if you say it too late. The whole problem of telling your parents whom you are going to marry-- it is always tragic news to them -- is to know when it has to be said.

2

Never too early, gentlemen. Don't rush. When you have seen a girl once and tell your mother at home, "This is the girl I'm going to marry." Because you aren't going to marry the girl if you have to tell it too early, I assure you.

Premature saying is just immature saying.

And immature love shouldn't get married. So wait long enough until you have proven to yourself that you can keep a secret. And tell people so that you can show to yourself that you have the stamina to confess to the world what your opinion is. It has to be weighed both ways.

3

All the time, gentlemen, ethics have to do with timing. And in this dialogue, every good, ethical statement comes from the relation of the speakers.

Here, these men say, "You aren't through. You made it too much in a hurry. Dwell on this." He says, "Well, I didn't want to stir up a hornet's nest."

These are profound, moral quandaries. These are the real problems in life, gentlemen.

*Ethics is the problem of timing.
Physics is the problem of spacing.*

We have to place the thing -- this makes you the expert on a thing, where to put things. Then you know what things are. But when to say things, and when to be silent, shows that you are a human being.

4

A man who cannot keep a secret doesn't know what ethics is.

In this country, where everything is publicized -- when Mr. Hoover, Jr., lost his parents and had to be woken up at two o'clock or at four o'clock at night because of the Suez issue, and was found trembling, Drew Pearson could write it up the next day in his terrible letter. And we knew that there was panic in Washington.

Gentlemen, a great nation cannot afford to appear as panicky in the eyes of the rest of the world. That's high treason. I would have said, "This is high treason." Because if the government was panicky -- I don't want to believe it -- then it should not be told. It is terrible that the Russians could then laugh at us and say, "We have driven the Americans into a panic." Then of course, they can say, "We send volunteers to Egypt." That's what they said next day.

If they hadn't known that we had lost our courage, they wouldn't have said that.

VI SECRET AND REVELATION

1

So gentlemen, this is very difficult for you to understand, because it brings up the whole question of knowledge.

If you have only physis and logos, then all knowledge is good.

If you have any ethical situation, gentlemen, then knowledge has to be timed.

And certain things must not be known by everybody. Knowledge, too, has its history. And knowledge has its timing.

2

And if we wouldn't have this terrible publicity stunt in this country, and the quiz kids and all this nonsense, if you hadn't the dogma that knowledge can be made known to all people at all times.

Well, the result is that you can't have any foreign policy. And that we always lose the initiative, that we always are licked, because in a democracy, you have to tell everything to everybody, so you can only talk about unimportant things.

What you can tell all the people, gentlemen, isn't worth telling.

3

Theodore Roosevelt had a postmaster general who wrote his memoirs. And he said that when the Russians went to war against the Japanese in 1904 and '05, there was a famous battle of Tsushima -- you may have heard of this -- in which Togo, Japanese admiral, defeated Mr. Rozhdestvenski and his Russian fleet when they came into the straits between Korea and Japan. And Mr. von der Langer -- I think is his name, or something like that -- Langacke -- ja, von der Langacker, German descent he was -- writes in his memoirs:

"We were all agreed in Washington, that in our case, in such a war, we couldn't have delivered this fatal blow to the Russian fleet, because the Japanese fleet had to be in the straits of Tsushima for six weeks in advance, because it was so uncertain when the Russians would finally get there.

Now it is impossible in America to keep a secret -- where the whole American fleet is for six weeks -- from the public. Our democratic way of life just would make a victory, as in Tsushima, utterly impossible."

4

That is a good example, I think, of the problem of ethics. Ethics always will divide the world of knowledge into silence or secret and revelation, opening. Knowledge about nature doesn't know this distinction.

VII THE PROBLEM OF THE TRIAL OF THE ROSENBERGS

1

There is no distinction about what you know of plants today and tomorrow. Let's know all the facts, because they are dead.

But the battle of Tsushima is a secret. And you can see how the tragedy of the last 20 years -- Mr. McCarthy -- has been this naiveté, that all the facts can always be known, and that the atom bomb can be given to the Russians. Because why not? Everybody must know everything.

2

From a scientific point about natural science, it's perfectly logical, that everything can be known by everybody at all times. From the point of security of the United States, it's high treason if you do so.

The whole problem of the trial of the Rosenbergs is here involved. From a purely knowledgeable point of view, what is knowledge, you can never say "Why not?" This is physics. And in physics, there is no distinction between secret and open publicity.

And you try to treat politics as publicity stunts, and therefore senators have to debate with quiz kids.

3

Well, if this is so, then the senator is an unimportant person, because I'm only interested in my good senator from Vermont -- Senator Aiken and Senator Flanders, because I think these two men can keep a secret. And therefore I trust them.

A representative government is impossible if you don't trust people that they can keep a secret, and that I can rely on their doing a good thing without my knowing it. If you have to tell everything to your constituency, you are unnecessary. You are just a mail carrier.

4

And we have today the system of mail carriers -- that these poor boys in Washington have to count the letters they receive from the public. How can I know what these people know in Washington. I hope they know a little more than I, because they have their secrets. In their committees, they know facts I do not know. And they cannot tell me everything at once, why they have to vote in this manner or in this manner. I

can of course show them my trend of thought, but if they do otherwise, I have to feel they had good reasons for doing this.

VIII LIFE NEEDS SECRETS

1

Don't you understand that you can't have representative government unless you assume that people going to Washington have a little more insight than you have?

2

But you don't believe this, and that's why the Congress has nothing to say anymore. As soon as the representative in Washington is only reporting that 1500 letters were in favor and 200 letters were against it, he's absolutely superfluous, because if he then has to decide by the 1500 letters, why did you send him to Washington? You can have a referendum on this. And you don't have to have any representative government.

3

So ethics, gentlemen, have to do with these two things: timing, secret, and divulging secrets. And without secrets there is no life. Any life needs secrets.

And people are so dead in the modern world because they have no secrets. They don't know what a secret is.

A secret is something that has still to grow into public life, because it is immature. And it is as any bud before the leaves open.

4

Gentlemen, nothing can bud after all into a flower that hasn't gone through this process of ripening.

IX RETARDATION

1

A diplomat visited me a fortnight ago. And he said to me, "Nothing can grow anymore. We had it"--it was just after the Suez incident -- "it all was growing up a nice, peaceful understanding between the various nations, but this damn publicity has destroyed everything."

He didn't go into the details. He just came from Europe, after a number of interviews -- or not interviews, I mean, conversations with statesmen there. And he said, "It is simply terrible. The general public has to be taken so much into confidence all the time, prematurely."

2

You know treaties arrived at in public discussion and open agreements, this famous phrase of Wilson -- what's the phrase? You remember?

("Open treaties openly arrived at.")

Yes. "Openly arrived at." Well, what can you openly arrive at?

You cannot propose to your girl on Times Square with all the lights blaring, and the floodlights playing on you.

But all life is like proposing to somebody and being accepted.

3

I only wanted to make an example of what I call "ethics."

The first two pages of the Book Five of Plato's state - they are always omitted from the picture, they don't seem to be important, yet they give you the tact, the artistry of Plato, as a dramatist, as a former playwright and poet.

Plato had to have a very deep understanding into the process of timing, when to say something. And here, this is one of the most famous places of retardation.

4

All great art is retardation.

That's why the movies are not interesting as art, because they don't know how to retard. They always think they must promise you quick communication. Say everything at once, far too much. Rush. Quick, quick, quick. Shoot, shoot, shoot. Don't bore people. Don't stop them.

XI WHO MURDERED THE CHILD?

1

Well, all great art begins, gentlemen, in such a way that you know the whole story in advance. In the first verse of *The Iliad*, you know the whole end of the Iliad. And then it goes on for 24 hours.

And that's great art. There you are treated as an ethical comrade who undergoes the tension, and the expectation, and the disappointments. Although you know the whole outcome, you read it breathlessly.

2

In a movie you don't know -- detective story: that's the most stupid kind of literature there is, mystery stories; only for idiots and mathematicians, and -- yes, because in a mystery story, you are kept -- that's no art. In the last line, you finally know who murdered the child.

I don't want to know that. I'm not interested. The murder shouldn't have been committed, that's all. And that's interesting. But who murdered the child? Heavens!

[tape interruption]

**EIGHTEENTH LECTURE: NAMES OF MUTUAL AND RECIPROCAL VALIDITY
AND THE WINGS OF CONCEPTS**

(Side Two. Thursday, December 6, 1956. Reel number 19.)

I ATTEMPTS WHICH YOU ALL MAKE

1

In the New Testament, when the Apostle Paul speaks of the -- *we have on this earth no permanent stand, but the eternal we are looking for*, the future we are looking for -- who had gone to a place like Dartmouth College in Tarsus, of course, tried to inherit, or to supersede this Platonic utopia.

2

We all live in the same predicament. At this moment, we are American citizens, and we know very well that God did not create America directly. He created man, and the destiny of man is not to be Americans, gentlemen. It's to be a man.

And therefore, we have to admit that we are in a temporary stage of the affairs of the world, whether we like it or not.

3

This is the eternal question of philosophy.

Therefore you have to use my tools which I have offered you, the three tools of logos, ethos, and physis. And therefore these are the two demands made on you, to use these tools, so that you can make understandable the drive behind any one of these schools.

4

These are not luxuries. These are attempts which you all make, knowingly or unknowingly.

II MINIMUM DEMANDS

1

The other day, a man came back from Cairo, Egypt, and said to me, Most American businessmen are Moslem. They think they are Christians, but in fact, Moslem is the

most simple religion for men. It doesn't take care of the women. Women have no place in Moslem life."

But the American businessman, if he isn't under the thumb of his wife at home, and escapes into the business district and to Rotary clubs and Dartmouth colleges -- I mean, where no women are admitted, he immediately arranges a world of mind which is very simple: a mixture of Moslem -- Islam and Stoicism.

2

Most of you are Stoics, gentlemen. In America, you find practically no Epicureans. Everybody's here a Stoicist, or an idealist, or what he thinks, a materialist.

Epicureans -- you find them in France. That's an Epicurean country.

The hope of the world is that the French Epicureans and the American Moslem get together. Both are horrid in their insulation. The French, they have no government. And the Americans have no mind. They go from one craze to another here.

Because they have not this center of the inner beatitudes, which is the gospel of Epicure, that the city of man, politics should not influence your salvation.

3

Well, in any case, there are minimum demands. A representation of what these people really were doing with the tools of logos, ethos, and physis as the eternal reason for philosophy.

And I would take it as a complete bankruptcy of your paper if you would not give to me to understand that you understand why philosophy is in every grownup person a necessity. He cannot escape it.

4

Philosophy is not a course you can take, gentlemen, as you can take zoology, or leave it -- or chemistry. You philosophize either poorly, or you philosophize well. But whether you philosophize in imitation of some overhanging prejudice which is in the air of your time - more I cannot say, because every one of you is left to his own devices to go to these philosophers himself.

III CITY AND TOWN

1

I may add, however, today, one more problem. Last time, as you know, I tried to clear you up on ethics, and I tried to make you understand that in ethics we deal not with a naturalistic code.

And that your idea that ethics is a course, which you can take in a school as you can take mathematics, is of the devil.

2

It's the Anglo-Saxon diabolical devil - the temptation to think that the rules of behavior, of moral behavior can be learned by heart, and you can learn the penal code, or as you can learn the families of phylloxera or of lizards.

3

In the city of man, gentlemen, this is the Latin word "*civitas*," and this is the Greek word -- and here, I put the Greek word, that's the Latin word. And the Anglo-Saxon word in this case would be "world," and in this case we have no English word for the political entity, because the tribes were christianized so early that we say at best "city," or "state." These are all words of Latin origin.

There is no Anglo-Saxon term for the community.

4

I don't know of any. Do you know of any? "Community" is Latin, comes from "*communis*" in Latin. So it's very strange. Anglo-Saxons have no native term for the political order.

(*What about "town"?*)

If you feel that it works -- I'm very glad. Very nice. "Town." Sure, good. Yes.

"People" doesn't work, because it comes from "*populus*," Latin, again. So "town," very good idea. Thank you.

Do you know the root of "town"? Not sure, but I think it is --. (*French.*) It's not German, at all. It's perhaps -- Celtic. I'm not sure at this moment. (*French.*)

No, it's not French. But the ending, in *hautun* and so, that may be contained in it. You see, that's a Celtic ending. Most in Gaul under Caesar, most cities ended with the ending "- *dhunum*." And I don't know if "town" had anything to do with that.

(I think it was originally "ton," or something, with t-o-n, which was a division of a hundred, which was a division of a shire in England.)

Well -- in any case, it's useful. Let's use it. *Ton -- town*. You can say "ton." And it's quite important, because in this connection, I cannot deal with it explicitly.

IV WORLD - NATURA - PHYSICS

1

But you may take this down as a rule, gentlemen.

Any word in our civilized language -- in French, German, English, Italian -- has three forms: Greek, Latin, and native. And it is only digested when you have it in all three forms.

2

That's very strange. Why that is so, is a long story.

I've written a whole book on this topic, that to digest a process in the world outside, it takes the native approach, which is the homely one, the familiar one, the low-brow one; and it takes the high-brow, the religious one, which comes from the Christian Church, through the ages usually in Latin like "nature"; and then we found a special science like physics, when we use a Greek term.

So the theologian speaks of "*natura*," nature. We speak of "the world" in our native tongue. And the specialist speaks of physics, or physiology. And so he makes out of this *natura* something Greek.

3

Well, that leads us too far.

But only to make you feel that it isn't quite wanton if I draw your attention to the fact that there are three terms for the same thing under a different aspect.

When you philosophize, you use a Greek term.

When you theologize, you use a Latin term.

When you speak idiomatically at home, you use the Anglo-Saxon term.

That's a good rule for you.

4

The religious language has come to us as Latin. We say "religion," "*religio*". But if you have the Greek term, "theology," you are in the learned bracket of the divinity school. "Theology" is Greek.

You have this strange relation. Here is "*religio*," Latin. The Greeks had quite a different word for that.

V THE REMISSION OF SINS

1

Now to come back, however, to the main problem today.

The main problem today is the question of the appearance of the logos with regard to things and the appearance of the logos between people.

2

I have tried to show you that ethics comes to people through action. You know what a man is morally worth, not from what he says, because he can be a hypocrite. And most people are hypocrites, because they have some standardized, ethical phrase in their mouth. And I don't care in the least what they say.

Many will say, "Lord, Lord," and will go to hell.

But you have to see what the man is doing. And I have tried to give you some examples last time of what ethical action is. The creation of a free, non-natural situation, gentlemen: that's ethical. If you treat your neighbor as a new person every day, and find yourself free to change, with regard for him, then he is free.

3

In my *Christian Future*, I have expressed it in a simple way: God re-thinks His creation every day in the light of the fate of His children. And when we make terrible mistakes, He allows us to find a new way.

That's called "the remission of sins."

And after your parents have seen that you can't go to college, for example, they allow you to become a carpenter, because they rethink their prejudices from love of you.

The same is done by God. Our creator always has still a way out. Here, we haven't made peace for 10 years, but that He will not perhaps find a way in which He will allow us to come to terms with the world.

4

At this moment, that's in the making, as you know, in the most circumstantial way. With landing in Suez and such things, we are finally forced into taking seriously the fact that we must make peace.

We never have made peace.

VI RETHINKING IS THE ESSENCE OF THE LOGOS

1

So will you take this down, gentlemen:

that the word, in the respect of the ethics of our town, has to be rethought every day because of the mistakes man makes,

and how could we ever mend the mistakes if our maker would not then give us new opportunities?

2

So because we do not do as our Father in Heaven likes us to do, He has to rethink His creation. Otherwise there could be no government of the world.

3

Then rethinking, gentlemen, is the essence of the logos. The logos is more free, still, than you and me. We are handicapped by our mistakes.

Today, the mistakes made in our foreign policy cry to Heaven. If Heaven responds, it means that He allows us once more to start -- although we have made this mistake. But they haven't been legal. There is still a time of grace given to us. But the plan of God obviously was not to do the things.

4

You just look at the Orozco frescoes, when God each time throws up His hands in despair and says, "This world has to come to an end. It's just impossible." Three times in these frescoes, God says, "Finished." But there is a new start.

And you wonder how long it can go on, how long He can find a new way of letting this continent be peopled by idiots.

VII *OUR FIRST IMPRESSIONS COME THROUGH MEANING*

1

Now gentlemen, the logos is the power with which we speak to each other, and it is the power through which we come to know the universe, the objects. And these are two different ways. And I want to tell you how to understand the eternal conflict between my dealing with the forest or the stars, and my dealing with you.

2

The stars I must first see. That is, the first thing is an impression made on me through my senses. Preferably the sight, the eye. But I can also hear a sound. I can smell a flower. I can touch a stone.

Therefore, gentlemen, the first impressions of the physis go through the senses.

Now the materialist says to you, "All first impressions go through the senses." However, gentlemen, I tell you and I remind you of the fact: your first impressions as a baby in the cradle do not go to your five senses at all. They go through your parents' words and their manners. You are sat down at a dinner table and see suddenly that you don't have to grab for food, but that it's coming to you, that your mother distributes it, you lose all animal fear that you might be curtailed in your dealings.

Think, this is not natural for an animal. If you have five chickens and you feed them, all the chicks try to get the food at the same time. It's not possible to stop the other four, because they have experience that they all get something; they will not wait. We do.

3

That is, gentlemen, we can understand in the city: our first impressions come through meaning. It makes sense to us that our mother should treat her five children as equals. And should therefore quiet their fears, and they immediately understand

that the mother is in charge, and that they don't have to watch out for themselves. Somebody else does.

4

Now therefore, our first impressions here comes through sense. It makes sense to us. And we are told this; that is, our first impressions in the city come through speech and through being addressed.

VIII DISARMAMENT

1

Now you do not deal with stones by addressing them. That's witchcraft. It doesn't work by magic. Stones have to be lifted out of the way, or you will stumble over them. The five senses tell us what to do with things, gentlemen.

First impressions of things go through the senses. But first impressions of people, gentlemen, they go through functions. They go through speech. Because you hear from your mother that you are "Johnny" and she is your mother, you distribute the universe outside between your mother and you. What you cannot do, she will do. And so you disarm.

2

All speech, gentlemen, leads to disarmament. And all sensuous experience leads to armament. That's why the term "Moral Re-Armament" is an idiotic term, of the Coles Group, of the Buchmanites, of the Oxford Group. You have to disarm between people. Not arm.

(What do you mean by "disarm"?)

Well, you are disarming, Sir. So that's why we can talk to each other.

3

You at this moment confess that you do not understand me. That's a disarming question. A blusterer, a vain person would say, "I know everything. You can't tell me anything." That's the relation of object and object in the universe. They try to remain impenetrable; they try to defend each other.

If I try to behave as an individual and you as an individual, we can never understand each other.

It takes always an amount of humility, of disarmament in the sense that you can get under my skin and I under your skin, because otherwise we wouldn't talk to each other.

4

You must accept my word as a part of your truth. And I must accept your word as a part of my truth. This osmosis is a condition of speech, because for every speech, you remember, you need the listener as well as the speaker. And speech is only complete if a speaker has made another person listen.

Therefore, since the listening process is part of the word, speech, we can only get together by disarmament.

You take two suspicious people, take now the Russians and we cannot speak to each other, because you always find ulterior motives. While we haven't disarmed, therefore, we can talk and talk and talk, and every word is just misinterpreted.

IX WHAT IS REASONABLE WITH REGARD TO OBJECTS

1

This is very serious, gentlemen. The nature is armed to the teeth, and man is, in the city, disarmed.

In your naiveté you have a kidnapper and you go to the telephone and telephone the police, because you trust the police. They come in, armed to the teeth, but they won't use the arms against you, because you trust them. You can also say, Sir,

mutual trust leads to disarmament.

However you put it, it's literally true that frigid women -- that's a problem for all of you -- cannot disarm. Frigidity is the impotency of disarming. They have their willpower always in and they want to dominate, and the frigid woman cannot love, because love is disarmament.

2

(We learned that the same is true of our parents; we learned a thing, we learned to say, now "This is a stone, this is a book, and this is a light.")

Well, that's pitiful. Objects of nature you should learn by touch, by the senses. It would be better if you first experience the objects, the objects of the world through your five senses.

(Yes, but the point is though that we learned to name them through speech, and speech is a disarming process. Therefore already through speech are we not disarming --?)

But you don't talk to the stone, here: Stone. But you say to your mother, "This is a stone," because you trust your mother. She has put this idea that this is a stone into you and you accept it. So she can get under your skin and enrich your whole inner life, because what she has is like an ocean penetrating your shore, your dry shore. The flood of the spirit is then welling up in her and in you.

She has of course accepted this on good faith. And she imparts it to you. It's like waves of the spirit moving through you and her. Or light waves, you can compare it to this. That's what the mind is. The mind is the community of people, taking place in every newborn citizen, entering him.

3

(Well, why should we learn about the physis through our senses from the first place, since we need this union from a parent also?)

Well, because the meaning, of course, of the world outside, the physical world can only be complete if it includes the fact that the stone is something that must be known by contact. I name "rock," a "cliff," a "mountain" something that I can only learn in its density through --.

(Define education, then. You're not really implying anything, except just the fact that this becomes real when I touch it and not until I touch it.) Yes, well. I don't quite see your argument.

(I'm a little confused, myself. This business of having to experience the physis through the senses is really only for the sake of education, then --)

Ja, ja. And in danger of misunderstanding, if you only get the word, which you must understand. The mother has experienced the stone and knows what is called "stone." If you only learn by rote the term "stone," you might apply it to something that isn't a stone. Isn't that right?

4

Well, gentlemen, you learn that in all philosophy today, which is all only natural philosophy in this country mostly, and not at all moved by considerations of the ethos and the logos -- it's all glorified physis you learn that first something is in the senses, and later it is in the concept.

That is, the thing is here at the blackboard.

Now you try to form a concept of a blackboard. First, you see it. And then you may even grab it with your hands, and feel its consistency, and then you say, "I call this a table," and you call this "define your terms." And you are very proud when a speaker gets up and says, "I shall first define my terms."

Gentlemen, that's only reasonable with regard to objects.

X THE TRIPARTITE SITUATION

1

Terms can only be defined before speech with regard to physical objects.

Take this down. It's very important. You don't believe it.

It is perfectly hopeless for a man who speaks to somebody else to define his terms. You cannot say, "Sir, I consider you a gentleman as far as it goes in my terminology. Because I know gentlemen who are scoundrels." If you say "gentleman," you must mean it. Otherwise you are lost. And so on it goes.

With any word you say to any audience, by addressing them, you cannot insult them by defining their terms and saying, "As far as it goes," or "You know what I mean." I mean, then they will say, "He calls us gentlemen, but he means we are scoundrels." That's innuendo.

2

You can only define objects which are neither the speaker nor the listener. The speaker and the listener must always trust each other.

And if you define the terms of your listener in any of your own terms, you insult him. You cannot define your listeners as "These are Americans, therefore they don't have the intelligence of Frenchmen, therefore they don't have the beauty of Italians, they don't have the *grandeza* of Spaniards." My dear man, this American from New Mexico will stand up and say, "I have as much Spanish *grandeza*, and as much Italian singing capacity, as any man in Italy. I have just made a point to develop my human qualities beyond of what you call 100-percent Americanism."

3

Gentlemen, you have always this tripartite situation.

You speak to somebody about something.

You can define something.

You can never define somebody.

Somebody to you must be as mysterious, and as dangerous as your wife. Don't define your wife. If you do, you are divorced.

4

(Well, isn't it that the essence of logos is rethinking, you said that's the essence of Plato's logos is rethinking?)

No. He tried to avoid it by this memory idea. That's his lack. That's his flaw. But that's why he finally avoided the word "logos". He had news for the brain, and he had ideas.

That's not the same as logos. The ideas don't talk. They don't speak. The weak point of all Greek philosophy is the idea that speech was something natural, like an object.

If you want to know more about it, read *The Cratylus*, the poorest dialogue of Plato; it's on language. And you can readily understand by reading it that he just didn't succeed in knowing what language was.

Modern linguistics can do absolutely nothing with the Greek standpoint on language. It's just dropped -- superseded.

XI OUR TOWN (THORNTON WILDER)

1

Here, Gentlemen, all speech between real people, between the speaker and the listener of any description, mother and child, father and brother, soldier and captain, councilor and mayor, judge and police -- wherever you have social relations in a community, whatever their relation be, boss and worker, slave and slave owner, whatever it is, where there are human relations -- what they call today "human relations" -- the way is from reciprocal address, gentlemen, from reciprocal address to rescue the other from loneliness and despair, to agreement.

The way from here is *from the senses to the concept*.

2

You must take this down, gentlemen. You find this unfortunately in no textbook, because, as I said, all Americans are quite one-sided conceptualists. They believe in concepts as the only way of human understanding. They think that if you haven't a concept for a thing, you haven't understood it.

Now my dear man, you understand very well the United States, but you will never have a concept of the United States. You must love it, you must be a part of it. You can say, gentlemen, the community, or the town -- *Our Town* of Wilder --, Wilder is his name, Thornton Wilder, you know this.

Who knows *Our Town*? Good. Well, today the unfortunate thing is that the best things are only in poetry or plays, and not in philosophy.

3

Thornton Wilder is an essential contribution to the philosophy of reality, because *Our Town* means that the people in this town are not objects for each other, and that's why we call it Our Town. Wherever you have the word "our," all philosophy about things stops. There are no things. There are only brothers.

"This happy band of brothers," as in Shakespeare's famous prologue of - is it not *Henry V*, or where is this? "This happy" -- Don't you know it?

Well *Our Town* is a similar attempt to bring you to your senses that between people in our town, there are no objects which we can define.

Not one of the persons in the town can define the other person, because they talk to each other.

4

Will you take this down, gentlemen? People to whom we talk, or whom we want to talk to us, cannot be defined, because we are expecting them to say something beyond their definition. In as far as you can define a person, you know already what he has said. But since you meet him on the street, you hope he will say to you a friendly word.

XII SPEAK ENGLISH

1

Now, you delivered a speech yesterday. If you meet a neighbor on the street and he says, "That was a fine speech," - if you could define a man beforehand, the value of his utterance would be nil, because he would just be a machine-object, and so out in automation, there he would stutter out these empty phrases, "This was a nice speech."

You mean, however, when you hear this about yourself, that it was really a fine speech. And you can only believe this one sentence if this is in addition to everything

you have known by him before. If it comes as a wonderful surprise that even this old fox now says something nice about you, you will not value his praise at all, if you treat him as a dead man.

And if you say, "Oh, he says this to everybody," then you would already dismiss his word, as not really living word.

And there are of course such people who use these stock phrases. But we despise them. We say they have died long ago. They only can repeat these empty phrases. They are either hypocrites, or they are gone to seed.

2

So you see the more a person is alive, the more it is impossible and harmful for you to try to define him.

You cannot elect the president of the United States for everything he has done before. You must expect from him that he will do something that you couldn't do. That's therefore something beyond your comprehension.

3

Therefore, anybody with whom you live must remain beyond your comprehension. Because otherwise it wouldn't be worth living with them.

The difference, gentlemen, between the wife of the president of a corporation and his workers is that from the workers he expects things he knows very well -- what they consist, and he expects them to do exactly what he prescribes. But his wife, he cannot marry by prescription. He cannot put on a chart, "My dear wife, I expect orange juice every morning," because the first thing his wife will do -- she just tear up this recipe, and go off with the dandy, because she can't stand it. She is not to be lived with by prescription. She is a surprise every morning.

4

So please, the greatest heresy in all your minds, gentlemen, is that it is meritorious to begin a speech by saying, "I shall define my terms." On no important thing can you do anything but speak English. And English is much richer than the definitions which you can give any term.

You just look up the dictionary; every word is a poetical word, and it has 10,000 shades of meaning. And it is your business to use the word so that the other person gets all the shades of meaning which you wish to stress. It's no business of yours to define it beforehand; that's making the speech all trite.

XIII *THE PLUNGE*

1

But it is deep in you, gentlemen. And that's why you are very unhappy people. You are fed up. You are slaves of your concepts, because you carry over the idea of conceptual living into marriage, into friendship, into politics, where they don't belong. And the Catholic Church I think is right when it thinks that in marriage, this whole business of conception and anti-conception is of the central order of your relation to the spirit.

2

If a man thinks that he can live by concepts, he will also think that he can prescribe when to have a child. I don't believe that. That's not within your or my power, that's also defining your terms, the terms under which you wish to live, gentlemen.

You can have this in certain limited things, as an hour of work. I don't think that in your marriage relations, you can do this without running the danger that when a child is born, just the same, to treat this child as a mere mischief. It isn't. The child that is born without plan is certainly more your child than the child that is born according to plan.

It's obvious. It fulfills much more the purpose of marriage that we should be self-forgetful there, to be allowed to forget ourselves and all our plans.

That's the meaning of marriage, the plunge.

3

These are very serious things, gentlemen. It all centers around the word "concept." If a man is thinking that he always must define his terms -- he may be a lawyer, a good lawyer, because what is a lawyer? A lawyer is a man who treats part of community -- the other party in law as nature, as an object whom he wants to conquer, to vanquish.

Therefore, a lawyer must speak in concepts in the town, inside the town.

But if you go to Thornton Wilder's play, the town crier, and the man on the cemetery there -- as I recall it, they don't talk legally.

4

Gentlemen, to speak legally means to speak inside the city in concepts. And concepts are for objects, for things against which we must arm. And you can see, the lawyer is moral re-armament inside the city.

There is a break of law. There is a criminal, there is a complaint, there is a defendant, there is an accusation. There is a condemnation. There is a demand. There is a claim.

For all these things you need concepts, because one goes against the other.

Where we stand against the world, gentlemen, we need concepts, because we want to define our terms against the world, and against people whom we treat as world. The lawyer must treat his opponent as a part of the outside world, and knows nothing but that this other man here abused him.

Therefore he must arm to the teeth. His legal brief is armed to the teeth. So that he can't understand him.

XIV SPEECH IS MUTUAL BEFORE IT IS DEFINABLE

1

So gentlemen: the road of the nature is through the senses to the concept.

The road of nature is through the senses to a concept.

The road of the community is through reciprocity to agreement.

Because if the mother says, "Son," and the son says, "Mother," they can agree. If the son says, "Do I love my mother?" there's enmity. She's an object then of psychoanalysis.

Very important, gentlemen. As long as you give the other fellow in the community the name he wants to be addressed with, and he grants you your name, you are at peace; you are in agreement.

2

So gentlemen, the communal logos is mutual address. The physis, the nature is not mutual address, but conceptual interpretation of sense reaction. Something totally different.

I cannot understand you, and you cannot understand me by any concept. You're just Donald Prensner. Stop it. Period.

As soon as I go behind you, begin to analyze you, you become an object. And we are estranged, because you must be afraid of me.

I may now like the Nazis, or the Fascists, or the Communists -- I may now look for all your weaknesses, and I may try to exploit them. I may play on any one of your objective, natural qualities. And we have ceased to trust each other.

3

If you only could learn this, gentlemen, it would be the great boon for the birth of philosophy in this country.

There is no American philosophy today. It doesn't exist, because people have made the logos one-sidedly nothing but the definition of terms. That's only one-half of the story. All the semanticists do this nonsense. But you always ask them: how can they express what they do, if they don't speak anymore?

Speech is mutual before it is definable.

4

All these people must first learn poetry and prayer and song and drama and literature, before they can then legally, suspiciously put those things that are pure objects of sense observation into their place.

XV TWO ROADS

1

Why do we have to deal with nature by concept, gentlemen?

For the simple reason that the natural objects cannot talk back. But you can talk back.

2

Your response is correct if you feel addressed, if this has an appeal on you. If I can say to this man, "Richard," and he comes, that's all we can want. Then "Richard," his name, is a better word than any concept I have of the man. Because the concept of the man is not between him and me. It's just in my mind, doesn't show us anything. But his name is something I use, and he complies with.

3

Gentlemen, that's very fundamental.

And the logos then is broken up into two roads -- two highways on which it travels.

The logos travels through names of mutual and reciprocal validity into the human community, into Our Town.

And it travels with regard to the chemicals and the elements of the universe on the wings of concepts.

If you take an atom, if you take a Faraday, if you take a Volt, if you take an Ohm, if you take all the terms of our modern physics, they are defined terms by the Congress of Physicists every year. And you have Ampere -- you know what an Ampere is -- you know Volt.

4

Well, who is Mr. Volt? What is Volt? That's just the name of the man who discovered, voltage. -- What was his name? (*Volta.*)

Volta. An Italian, yes. And Ampère was a Frenchman. And Gauss was a German. And on it goes.

So there you have clear definitions.

Why?

Only for the sad fact that atoms cannot talk. They cannot respond when we name them.

XVI SPEECH IS RECIPROCAL

1

I have a friend at Harvard, in the government department, who always harps on this simple fact that he says the natural science is much worse off than we.

We can talk to the people, and by their response, they say if we have understood them. But these poor people have to weigh the things and measure, because they have no way ever to know whether the goal is satisfied. They can never get the vote of the things in nature.

2

This is true. I have tried all the time to tell you that the real history of philosophy is from the city into the world. And you are all obsessed by the devil, because you think that nature is first, and man is second, and society is second.

Communism, Marx, for example, is on my side. He rediscovered the great truth that the city is before the nature in our lives, that we first must talk to each other before we can deal with third things.

3

(Plato mentioned that when he was developing the city in The Republic, that men got together in the city, because they needed food and physical comforts. Well, I was wondering if he wasn't intimating in that sentence -- .)

Yes, that's the Greek tyranny, although the real story is that the Greek city first contained people who could speak to each other. And in Plato is already this lack of linguistic understanding.

All Greek philosophy is hampered, and Thomas Aquinas still is handicapped by the fact that they think speech is natural.

And I say speech is political. All speech is ethical. And as long as you say speech is natural, then it is a tool of any individual's whim. But it is reciprocal, gentlemen. Any word of the human language is based on the assumption that I must say "Father," so that he may say "Son."

Don't you see that "the boy's father" makes any sense only on the basis of the fact that somebody is the son.

4

This we have lost sight of, because we are dealing with third objects.

You see, in our town, my father must speak to his son. In general, however, in nature, there are chickens who have a rooster as their begetter. So the rooster cannot say, "My children."

We can say, "my child," because we speak.

XVII CONCEPTS AND NAMES EQUALLY ORIGINAL

1

This word "mine," and "our," and "your," is the difference of ethics and physis.

In physis, gentlemen, there are no possessive pronouns. There are no secrets. There are no inner and outer worlds. But there is only the outer world.

Physis only deals with an outer world. And in outer worlds, there are no possessive pronouns. And nothing in the outer world has any name to itself.

2

Therefore Ohm -- Volt describes things by human names, because these are nameless electronics. They have no names of their own. Arbitrary. They can't understand them.

We domesticate animals and then give their names inside our own community to attract them into our town.

If you take *Our Town*, by Mr. Thornton Wilder seriously,

and if you stop smoking,

then you will understand that our town underlies opposite rules from nature.

In nature, you can always smoke, because the tree will not protest. I protest.

3

Now gentlemen, the logos then comes to us through concepts and names. And both processes are equally original. And you don't believe this.

And this is why this country for the last 150 years has not seen thinking, straight thinking, because it has not observed the facts of life.

In a pioneer country, where one man has to brace himself against the Rocky Mountains, you may easily understand that nature was so overwhelmingly strong, that you saw the objects in nature as the only thing that needed explanation. You can't understand it. Men were so much on their own, they were so lonely, that they thought if they had a picture of the outer world, of the cosmos and the physis, that was all that mattered. And the city of man came after that.

We must now turn around and see that every child of man becomes a human being only after it has been spoken to. Even these pioneers, of course, had been brought up in a foreign land from a mother and a father. But this was not made the basis of their investigation, of their thinking.

4

Reciprocal naming, gentlemen, and sensuous conceiving: these are the two roads on which the logos travels. One into physis of general objects; and one into the city of my own -- you have really to add this -- of our own members. Where I am a member of a community, these are my people.

This possessive pronoun is totally lacking in the universe. In the universe, nobody owns a farthing. Nobody owns anything. He's just himself an object in this vast universe.

XVIII ALIKE AND DIFFERENTLY

1

So your mind is very troubled, gentlemen, because you start with the universe.

Fortunately our Father in Heaven didn't mean it that way. He says, "Grow up in a community with brothers and sisters and mothers and fathers and children. And then you can together go out and look into nature.

That's why I've tried to tell you, gentlemen: nature is the common impression made on the family of man.

That's very fortunate. Nature is not the impression the world makes on you alone. But you are only an ear and an eye for all men living together as a family of nations, or as a family of man, or as a human family, or as our town, or however you call this inner world in which we can talk to each other.

2

The inner order of life, gentlemen, means that we speak to each other. And fortunately every one of us is inside. And after we have spoken to each other, we are strong enough to arm against the universe, and *a sea of plagues*, and to look out of the window of this community and to observe the facts of nature.

Ohm, Volt, gentlemen, they are all common observations of any man who uses his reason. They are valid for all men.

That's the essence of natural science.

3

So gentlemen, in politics everybody is placed in a different position. In nature, everybody is placed in the same position. Natural facts are facts that appear to everybody alike. Political facts, or ethical facts, or moral facts, or historical facts, or however you call these facts, they are facts that appear to everybody differently.

That's the result of these two roads on which we travel.

4

The logos, gentlemen, gives you the power to have a different point of view on everything human, and to have an identical point of view on everything worldly.

What electricity is, we can all agree on. But what Mr. Nixon is, nobody can agree totally with anybody else. That goes from vice-president to SOB. And we'll never agree.

XIX THE REAL BODY POLITIC ALLOWS EVERYBODY TO HAVE A DIFFERENT REACTION

1

If you could only see this tremendous act of liberation that should befall you, gentlemen, that these two realities can be now labeled the "inner world" and the "outer world."

Nature is the outer world, in which everything appears alike to everybody inside the community of man. And the secrets of the inner society are those experiences, gentlemen, which must strike every living member differently, because as a member, he holds a different position in this community.

2

It is not obvious, gentlemen, that my ear and my toe, as members of my body, receive the same impression in a different manner. And that cannot be changed. And obviously, you and I react to the news from the outside world differently than Mr. Dulles. He must see a different position in this body politic.

3

But you don't see this. You have still this same terrible idea that in political life, we all also should see everything identically. There would be no life left. We would not form a real body of men.

The real body politic, gentlemen, allows everybody to have a different reaction.

That's so wonderful about real life, gentlemen, that your child has a very different response to the same event as you have. Don't ask it to have the same reaction.

(Is that the { } of all Plato's { }?) That's where he falls down.

4

Because -- now comes the Greek one-sidedness.

XX MY FATE HERE FOR TWENTY YEARS AT THIS COLLEGE

1

Heraclitus had insisted on this very fact. He had said time and again that the logos appeared to everyone in the opposite manner. One would swim up the river, and the other would swim down the river. The meaning however, was the double movement, and not the single movement.

He would always say, that all opposites only are the way in which we respond to the same universe.

Plato has wrested with Heraclitus. But in the dialogue *Cratylus*, which is not, unfortunately, in this selection, he deals with a Heraclitean, and dismisses the whole problem. It's negative, the solution. That's the last dialogue in which we feel a trace of Heraclitus in Plato.

2

Cratylus is a disciple of Heraclitus, and he was so disgusted at the end with the world, that he would only nod his head, and move his little finger, because he said, "Everything is misunderstanding."

Quite a man.

He probably was right. I very often have this feeling here at Dartmouth College. And I shall leave you, gentlemen, after this term this year with the firm conviction that it

has made no difference that I have been here or not, that the misunderstandings are just as numerous as the understanding. And so the equation is zero.

3

Cratylus is right. Today the basis of understanding is lost, because you do not expect understanding in the city of man. You live in nature. And nature boys, gentlemen, cannot be spoken to.

You want to have definitions.

You get what you want. Anybody gets what he wants, because he will not accept anything else.

4

Gentlemen, you cannot give anything to anybody who doesn't want it. And since you do not expect living truth, but only dead truth, you get dead truth.

That has been my fate here for 20 years in this college.

XXI *CARRY THE BALL*

1

Most of you expect, gentlemen, facts. You expect objects. You expect definitions. You expect something to learn by heart. You expect assignments, to read three pages a day. And that you think is intellect and mental life. You end up with these mechanized examinations with "yes" and "no."

2

Well, gentlemen, that's good for donkeys, and for horses. It is not good for men.

You remain on the level of a trained animal, because the world of objects is for trained animals, because man is there alone with the world of objects. But the higher order of life, gentlemen, is to come to an agreement, although we do not see the same objects.

One lives in Colorado, and the other lives in China. If we can agree, although all the objects outside are different, then we have the same religion; then we believe in the same god.

That's the question of mankind. That's the logos.

3

You insist that I spoke to a student, and you know this story. It's always repeated.

"I must marry young," he said, "because I want to play football with my son." That's not a good reason to get married. He wants to have the same object, the same ball in the hands of his boy. He has given up all hopes that he might give him the same religion.

An agreement, despite the differences of age, of objects and natural environments: that would be a father.

He only wants to be his boy's playmate. That's a very poor logic. But that's here, today the best, to think of his son as somebody to play with, on equal terms. That's the natural world, where the ball is everything. "Carry the ball."

4

But speech means agreement at the heart, and at bottom, although the scene daily changes. And in a changing scene, one in Europe, and the other in America, and the third in Russia, and the fourth in Africa, there to be of the same faith and the same love and the same ethics: that's something. That's difficult.

XXII SUPERHUMAN AND SUPERNATURAL

1

And your forefathers did it. They remained Christians in this foreign country. And if there is a greatness in America at this moment, it is that it is the one country in which the other countries find some eternity, some eternal things, still.

2

But don't throw it away, gentlemen. Don't get lost in objects. Don't get lost in concepts.

3

Gentlemen, the logos appears in Plato in great models, because the one thing that can be expressed in any language is the name of the hero. And the myth in Plato, for example, plays this part, that it brings in some figures like Zeus or the gods...

[tape interruption]

...what you call something superhuman.

The logos can only be imparted to you and me, gentlemen, as superhuman and as supernatural.

4

And there are two roads then to the logos: the supernatural, that is, it must be not simply objects of nature. "Supernatural" simply means "not an object."

XXIII *SADDLED WITH RESPONSIBILITY*

1

Don't be frightened by the word. I don't like it myself, but in this moment it's a useful thing. "Supernatural" means it consists not of objects which can be explained by concept.

And it must be superhuman, gentlemen.

2

You have heard of the many jokes that have been made up about Nietzsche's superman. Gentlemen, don't laugh it off. Superman is the most natural experience of the logos. Nietzsche meant simply that a man can be the carrier of enthusiasm, of logos, of divinity. And so he is a superman.

Of course, he is. How can you deny that you all are supermen, in all your light moments, better moments? When you summon a criminal to court, gentlemen, you are superhuman, gentlemen, because you are not just a human being, but you know what's right. And you have to say this.

3

It is terrible that this country has fallen below Benjamin Franklin even and his practicality and his utilitarianism, by saying that superman is funny; "Nietzsche was crazy because he spoke of superman."

Gentlemen, anybody who speaks is supernatural and is superhuman. As human beings, we don't have to say anything with authority. But the whole human society

is based on authority. Somebody has to say at this moment, "This is a crime," and "This judge is in authority."

And I had to dismiss yesterday a boy for forgery, for plagiarism, and so I was in authority. It was very disagreeable, but there I was, saddled with this responsibility. And he will leave college, and I say so. And it is done. And that is superhuman.

4

If you don't see that this is superhuman, you do not understand what is human.

As a human, I have only one of you. But as superhuman, I can put a human being outside the city. I can excommunicate him. And that I do not do in my own right. I do it as bearer of an authority, which is superhuman. It goes through my mouth. The logos streams through me, but I am not interested in it as a party. I am an officeholder.

It is my office to do that. President Dickey is only interesting as president of Dartmouth College for us. Not as a personal friend, not as another human being, but for his superhuman authority, that what he says goes.

XXIV *SAM HOUSTAN AND TEXAS*

1

It is high time for you, gentlemen, to recapture the sense of the divine in the very modest way that you say, "The divine is first of all not natural, because it is not an object."

And it is secondly not human, because it has authority to change the order of things, to close the door, and say this word to capitulate.

2

The man who can surrender a city and say, "Emerge," like Sam Houston when Texas was made a part of the Union: God spoke through him, and so he couldn't go back on his word. In 1861, this same Sam Houston resisted in the South as the only governor in the whole South, he resisted Secession.

And it will always be a point of my greatest admiration, that this old fox and scoundrel and drunkard, that he was divinely enough inspired that he said, "I brought Texas into the Union in eighteen-" -

when? ('45.) Yes. Sure. And -

"after nine years of independence. And now I cannot 15 years later say I secede from this same Union."

3

That's divine, gentlemen, to bear the cross of one's own word, and to acknowledge that this word was not set by himself as a whim, from a salesman, as an empty promise. But he meant it, that he felt he was in authority to have Texas enter the United States.

He couldn't go against the divine authority that had spoken out of him in 1845. And he went to pieces, and he perished ignominiously in 1861. But I'm glad to see that there is still a city called "Houston" in his memory.

4

And this is the relation, gentlemen, to the logos. You use of the logos that founded the state of Texas as a part of the Union through the name "Houston." And in this sense, you have, because without this one name, "Houston," Texas would have no history. Texas would just be an accident.

XXV TRANSCENDENCE

1

So gentlemen, the logos remains in evidence through the names of the people through whom the spirit has spoken. Very simple definition,

through whom the logos has spoken.

The logos cannot remain with us through definitions.

2

And therefore, gentlemen, the logos of Greek philosophy speaks to us through the name of Plato. Plato is the Houston of the Greek realm which corresponds to Texas here.

Can you see this? You have to remember Plato's name and life in order to know what the logos is. Plato sacrificed his allegiance to Athens. Therefore, we don't know him as a member of the city of Athens, but as a member of the Academy, that is, as a person who left the city of man, and left the natural world, and became a representative of the logos in his own right.

3

What I have tried today, gentlemen, to show you, why it is true that even with men like Plato, whom you would tap on the shoulder, and say, "Well, Mr. Plato, one more cup of coffee?" that Plato represents in this world that what is not common, because it doesn't belong to nature, and it doesn't belong to this community. The word, gentlemen, by which the philosophers have always tried to express this strange situation is "transcendence."

4

We had the Transcendentalists in Concord. You have heard this word. That is, gentlemen, a man climbs higher than nature and than his own city, if he wants to speak through the ages.

XXVI SAYING "JUST"

1

The logos is that power which makes a man superhuman and supernatural. And perhaps for the first time in your life it may dawn on you why my division of ethics and physis is still very modern, because you always keep apart "superhuman" and "supernatural." But these are two sides of the triangle on which we move.

2

When you speak with authority, gentlemen, in founding the United States, in writing the *Declaration of Independence*, these founders, these signers were inspired. They said something for the first time. So they were not in agreement with anybody of an existing city. The British loathed them. And it wasn't natural what they said.

3

And therefore, I plead with you, gentlemen -- you are such modest men, and such kind people that you say, "I'm just a human being," and so you decline to admit that a man ever is superhuman. It just strikes you as silly. And also if I say something is supernatural, it strikes you as even more silly. You say, "I'm just natural."

Gentlemen, by saying, "I'm just natural," you are supernatural. And by saying, "I'm just a human being," you are superhuman.

It is not a part of a human being to say, "I'm just a human being." This little word "just" is a humility of the God in your heart, of the divine. And if you would only discover that you all plead to be vessels of the divinity by saying "just."

These four letters: j-u-s-t, are a great arrogance, because it means you know. It means that you can judge your own place in life.

4

Who can this? Does the elephant know? Most people don't know. You can.

But that is superhuman, and that's supernatural.

XXVII *TO SIT ON A THRONE*

1

If a man in the community only wants to keep up with the Joneses, he gets his judgment from everybody else. He doesn't say, "I'm just a human being."

2

If I judge the people in the Easter parade on Fifth Avenue right, they want to be seen as one of the crowd, as one of the gang. They don't want to be told, "I'm just a human being." They want to be told that they had the best diamond necklace on the whole street. They want to be seen for what they are worth, and that they are on the Social Register, and that they are pious people and what-not.

3

And therefore, gentlemen, human beings add tremendously to their stature when they say, "I am just a human being." That's much more than the usual human being wants to be told. The usual human being wants to say, "I may become president of the United States." That's a human being. Or "I shall have an income of a million dollars a year," or whatever your ambition is. That you are, as "just a human being."

But to say "I'm just a human being," that means to sit on a throne from which you can authoritatively, look down on your own humanity, and on your own nature.

And you all do it.

4

And therefore you believe in some kind of divinity or devil. Whatever it is. Certainly in something higher than yourself. As a mere self.

As self, gentlemen, and as an American, you are on the level of humanity and nature. As speakers and judges, you are always sharing God's authority, the logos.

Sorry -- but this is, after all very important.

Now, I allow me. I didn't make an intermission. And I'm sorry for this. I intended to. But will you allow me simply to carry through? Perhaps you get up for a minute and get down again, if you stretch your legs.

I THE QUANDARY

1

As the historians of Greek philosophy, we have a great privilege. Plato had to speak of physis. He had to speak of ethics, of the city in general. And he had to speak of the philosopher. We are privileged to be specific.

And I say to you, we have been talking of Athens, of Plato, and of the universe. That is, we have replaced the abstract philosopher, gentlemen, by the name of Plato, by which we can talk to him, and he can talk to us. And we have re-placed his word "polis" or "town" by "Athens" for his Greek word.

Here, we should, write the unspoken word "*pan*." The whole, the word "universe," being the Latin word.

2

And those who write on Stoicism, as Mr. Pitzner -- where is he? -- know that they are pantheists, because they worship the "pan," as god, as the universe. In the word "pantheism," the "pan" is the god. "*Pan*" is the Greek word for universe.

And that's important for you to introduce this word "*pan*" perhaps into your vocabulary.

3

Well, gentlemen, by a stroke of genius, Plato himself has solved the quandary between the city and Plato.

There is a quandary, because Plato is the logos.

The city is that part of the logos in which people speak to each other.

The universe is that part of the reality, of the universe in which we speak about things, where they don't talk back.

You understand that when Plato is logos, the city is ethos, and the *pan* is physis.

4

Now Plato, in his modesty and humility, and in his wish to impart the best city to all other men, and to make him -- Plato -- only the first good citizen of the best state, by talking other people by persuading them into it by his eloquence, Plato had a very profound insight which is today still used, and is with us. And it is the greatest heritage, or legacy of Plato to us.

II THE ERROR OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY

1

He said,

*"The city of man is organized like the human being.
And the human being is organized like the city."*

If so, he could say Plato is the city, and Athens is Plato.

And how did he do it? He said the city and Plato consist of mind, heart and stomach. And the city of man, therefore, must also consist of mind, heart and stomach. And there he obliterated the distinctions between the logos and the ethos, between Plato and the city.

2

It is very dangerous, gentlemen, to say that the city is simply nothing but man written large.

But that's what Plato, and later Aristotle did.

Plato said, the mind or the head. He said in the *Timaeus*, the head; in *The Republic*, he said the mind. There are two terms for him. In the *Timaeus* the heart, here the courage. This would be reason. And in *The Republic*, he says the passions, and in the *Timaeus*, he says the belly are in you and me. We all must eat. These are the liver and the bladder and the genitals, these are the passions. We must feel, we must take courage. We must breathe. That is the region between the neck and the diaphragm, the lungs and the heart. And we must think. And that's the head.

And all Greek philosophy thinks that the head should be master of the heart and the passions.

3

I think it's a very wrong philosophy, but all Greek philosophy has the idea that the mind is the head, because it's up here, is superior to the heart.

Now the Duchess of Windsor doesn't think so. And I don't think so. And no Christian can think so.

4

Gentlemen, the error of Greek philosophy is to think that because the heavens are up, and the sky is up, and the head is the highest, that's why the head must be better than the heart.

If you, however, analyze your own existence a little bit more carefully, you will understand why our brains and the cells of our brain are *the roots of the matter*, we are rooted in the sky -- it is as though we were standing on our heads.

We are not standing on our feet mentally, intellectually, and in our existence as being. But we are hanging through our reason in an earth, in a soil.

Because here is the nourishment which we receive in these brain cells. But we are free with our limbs, and our whole body to go into the world and create something new.

III THE LINES OF OUR INDIVIDUAL HUMAN ENDOWMENT

1

And therefore, it is very dangerous to use the Greek idea that the head is higher -- as high as Heaven over the earth, and therefore better. That's the Greek idea, however.

And now look what it did. The equation of the individual, in *The Republic*, and *The Timaeus*, the individual's three great qualities, with the qualities any good city should have, enabled Plato to disappear behind the city, and to say, "The philosopher is nothing but the small edition of the city."

And therefore he organized the city with the head on top, with the heart in the middle, and with the passions below. That is, he said, "There must be always three parties," as in India today in the caste system. There must be the priests, that are the philosophers; there must be the warriors who have courage. And there must be the craftsmen and the peasants and the artisans, who must take care of the passions, of the skills, of the body, of the merely physical talents and endowments of our physical nature.

2

Now this is then the most deep-seated legacy of the Greek political mind, gentlemen, and the Greek natural mind, that the individual is built as the city, and the city is built as the individual.

I would say that even in the tripartition of the judiciary, the executive, and the legislative branch of the government, you probably still have a reminder of the three things. The executive, the military is for courage; the legislation is for the economic interests; and the judiciary is for the reason, for justice.

3

And so you have still in Montesquieu, and in our Constitution, an echo of Plato's idea of government having to follow the lines of our individual human endowment.

The individual for Plato is consisting of head, heart, and belly. And therefore, the state must organize itself in such a way that on top are the guardians. On top is reason. Then come the soldiers, and below come the farmers and artisans, and the people who deal with the material world.

4

This is the thing that later already by Aristotle was a little transmuted.

Who works on Aristotle? Well, what's the theory, my dear man?

He does not follow Plato so simply, but he says that the great empires, the Egyptians, and the Persians, they cultivate the skill in their temple building, in their medicines, and in all their arts, and they serve the belly.

Because the individual is not free there, but it works as a Hindu craftsman would work today.

And then the tribesmen of the North, they are the courageous people. They are warriors. You have warriors, then Aristotle. And he says, the Greek compromises between the two. He puts -- as he always does with his happy mean -- Aristotle puts the Greeks in the middle of the story.

IV TO BE PATIENT WITH PEOPLE

1

Now this however in Plato is not the case.

In Plato,

the wild tribes are the courageous people.

The great empires are the belly people.

And the Greeks are the head people, the reasonable people,

the people who think, who can tower above the passions and above the generosity, the movements of the heart, the courage, generosity, what else would you say is business of the heart, faith, loyalty, all the emotions of the nobler nature?

2

But I think the exciting thing is that now for 2,000 years, gentlemen, every human being in the West has believed in this authority of Plato with regard to politics.

That's quite a story. And there I thought I should tell you this. Whether you read Plato yourself or not, you live in a constitution that is Platonized, that in a certain manner has tried to make us believe that head, heart, and belly must be organized in a city in three layers.

*The government must be reasonable;
the economic interests must follow passionately their self-interest;
and you must have an army that's courageous.*

And we haven't changed that much.

The secular society of today is still thought of very much in the Platonic pattern.

(*Did you want the people at the top of government { }.*) Well, you are right. ({ }.)

Well, since he tries to persuade other people to found this city, and to make the philosopher king, therefore Plato, if he's the head of the city, he himself is the best man. Then he represents the logos in the city.

Because the logos is connected with the city through him. That is, through Plato the logos would enter the next city, and it would therefore be the best.

3

He couldn't get out of this quandary.

We all want to have children of our own spirit. And I have no objections against this that a man should be the model. And I think he was a very noble and generous soul. For Heaven forbid that I would belittle him.

I only don't believe that the city of man can ever be governed by philosophers.

We talked about this before, why that shouldn't be, because you have to wait until the last child can agree. And that's not the business of philosophers, but of servants of the public. It takes quite a bit of character to be patient with people. A philosopher

doesn't have to be patient with people; he has to think the truth. That's a certain different quality.

4

Well, I think this is a very great scheme which has then been carried over into all form { }.

The secret is, gentlemen:

*if you have ethos, you have a community;
if you have physis, you have millions of objects, what you call "nature,";
and you already really say more than we can prove that this is one world.*

You can say there are many worlds.

Plato had already the idea of one universe, because to all members of one community, we can talk sense about the universe through mathematics. That was his great dream that nature was general, the same to all.

Not to the Hindus; that's not true. But to the Greeks it was.

One universe for the citizens of the human family.

V MACROANTHROPOS AND MIKROPOLIS

1

Now the logos, gentlemen, is, so to speak, saved in the Platonic philosophy by saying that the qualities of the individual perfect man are the same as the qualities of the perfect city. But I don't think we have any reason to believe that. I do not see this identity, that because I have a head and a belly and a heart, I have to believe that the city of man must have a head and a belly and a heart. The government of a city be made of quite different parts.

If I want a compromise between citizens, you have still to prove to me that I myself, as a compromiser between the two, have to consist of the parts of the citizen himself.

I think it's very arbitrary.

2

And so I have never been struck by the truth of this thing, but by the genius which, through this identification, gentlemen, you get the power of philosophy over the

city. Only if the individual philosopher has in himself the same order as the city can he claim authority to rule the city.

That was Plato's discovery, or saving grace. Seeing his city goes to ruin, he said, the best man is the model for the city. The city is man written large; man is the city written small.

3

Therefore, gentlemen, you should never use the word for the Greek philosophy, as you always read, that man is a microcosmos. That's a very silly word, it should be buried.

*Man is the micropolis; he is the small city.
And the polis is the macroanthropos.*

The city of man is man written large, macroanthropos. And man is the micropolis.

He is the city of man written small. But he is not a microcosmos.

4

Some other philosophers have believed this. But that is not true of the bulk of Greek philosophy. The real Greek philosophy is a little more profound. It says man is the city written small. And the city is man written large.

Please keep this. This is a very important thing.

VI

1

To most people one cannot talk today, because they take these slogans like "microcosm," and they have never thought it through what it could mean. Since we do know the principles which join the world, the cosmos, nothing is said if you say, "man is a microcosm," you would have to know the cosmos a little better for this.

2

Today it would boil down to the fact that we have some electrons inside ourselves. And the cosmos has some electrons inside ourselves. You will admit that this doesn't make us into a microcosm, because we function like the whole cosmos.

But the city is a different story. If you say you function like the United States of America, then the United States of America functions as you, you can talk back and forth.

So, let's stop here.

NINETEENTH LECTURE: *THE ESSENCE OF LOVE IS THE NEW NAME*

I *THE ETERNAL CONTRADICTION OF PHILOSOPHY*

1

...with a very poor word, "nature," which you should try to avoid in dealing with philosophical problems. It's a misleading word today.

These two words -- these two worlds do not coincide. The world of the United States in which you live is much smaller than the universe of all the suns, and all the stars. And the order which the United States proclaimed to you, by its laws and its manners and mores, and your parents and your teachers, and the order of the universe are absolutely contradictory.

2

This society in which you live is a soft society, and assumes that no wrong can be done by students. They have always to be pardoned. There is an eternal mercy, called "*momitis*." And in nature, everything is hard, every cause has an effect; it's absolutely merciless.

3

Now what shall we make of a nature that is merciless, gentlemen, and of a society which even calls the most terrible murderer still somebody who has to be pardoned and coddled, or at least fed for a lifetime in a prison, because you hate capital punishment?

Absolutely contradictory.

In the animal kingdom, obviously there is the survival of the fittest, and has been proclaimed as a tremendous truth. And you yourself behave as though you can be a misfit totally and you have a right to live.

4

This is the eternal contradiction of philosophy, gentlemen. And there can be no day of human history where this trouble is not going to arise, because even if we have the whole globe organized, there is still Mars, and there are still the suns, there is still the universe outside, the stratosphere. And never, never shall this dilemma end, gentlemen.

II A GIFT OUTRIGHT

1

The human mind is placed between two sources of information which mutually exclude each other and their conclusions. And as long as you do not see that physis and ethos are at opposite ends, you cannot understand logos.

Because logos is an attempt to see the same meaning, the same truth, the same revelation, the same wisdom at work in the stars and in the human heart.

2

Now the stars collide. You must not collide on the highway. So here is collision, God's law, or divine law, or natural law. Call it as you like. And here in society, there is the law, no collision.

Hitler, falling under the spell of natural law, said, "Let's have all the collisions. I collect collisions, because that's natural law. Man is an animal." Concentration camps. Forced labor camps. Collision.

Give you an American example. Yesterday -- who died yesterday? Saw it in the papers who died? Very interesting man. Who died? Gentlemen, that's unethical. You are just nature boys. Nature doesn't care for death. Ethics do, I'm sorry.

Mr. Weyerhauser died.

Who is Mr. Weyerhauser? Who is he? What did you say? Nobody knows who Mr. Weyerhauser is?

(He was the heir to a large timber fortune, and a family out on the West coast, I think Oregon.)

Sure. He died in Tacoma, Washington. Washington is even more his domain, Oregon and Washington. Yes.

Well, Mr. Weyerhauser, gentlemen, is of a family who plundered the forest reserves of the United States in the first generation so shamelessly that Congress published such a volume against them in 1913. Now they are the great philanthropists of America. And they have 9,000 tree farms and in 1941, the man who died yesterday at the age of 57, founded the first tree farm. So it took him 29 years to make amends for the shock he had given the forests of this country, the resources of this country. And he today, as you love all these robber barons so deeply, he now today is worshiped, and revered, and of course heads the Republican Party.

3

And it's a joke, gentlemen, because for philosophers, gentlemen, the question is: Why couldn't Mr. Weyerhauser operate in the same way in 1913?

This is the eternal philosophical question between ethics and physis. In physis, no mercy. But if you have a country you live in, gentlemen, if you have "a gift outright," as Mr. Frost has put it about the American soil -- you have heard his poem, haven't you? "*A gift outright*".

Who knows this poem? Well, that's, gentlemen, that's the Magna Carta of America. You'd better go and read it.

I think it's preposterous that there is anyone in this classroom who has not read it or heard it. Be ashamed. How can you be Americans and not know this poem, gentlemen, which says everything about your relation to your own land? He should send back his two doctorates of Dartmouth. You don't deserve him as your honorary doctor.

4

It is not an honor to be honorary doctor of Dartmouth. But it is honor for Dartmouth if some people accept the degree. Because for your intellectual merits, gentlemen, it is not a distinction to belong to your group.

I'm serious, gentlemen. This is incredible that Robert Frost can live here on this campus, and here, you are seniors and juniors and you don't know this poem, "A Gift Outright," which made him famous all over America.

III CONSERVATION

1

The problem of American soil is a very serious one. As you know, it's shrinking. And we have not only the dust storm problem in Texas, but the whole problem of the future of mankind on this little soil is still unsolved.

2

Obviously with the humanity increasing as it does, we probably have to go into the deep sea to be fed - and very soon. And the Weyerhausers, gentlemen, put a philosophical problem.

Why?

Physis, gentlemen, if it is just an object of men's exploitation, it is under mercilessness, under the law of just struggle, survival of the fittest, exploitation. You carry that to the extreme, Mr. Weyerhauser is absolutely right.

3

But gentlemen, the appropriation of a part of the universe entails an obligation to find out the will of its creator. The destiny of this soil. And this soil has to be reproduced. It has to be -- as we call it today in this country - "conserved." "Conservation."

4

"Conservation" is a very poor word. But in this country, you have no better word. But you must always know the real problem is that man is the mouthpiece of all other creatures, and that he has to deal with bees, and apples, in their own manner.

You cannot go from Chicago to Africa and kill all the elephants and the tigers off as they do now. It should be immediately forbidden. It's just an orgy today of --.

I have met these millionaires. I was in Egypt studying and there they came -- I have told you this story -- flying in, and just shooting, shooting, shooting. And the lady sitting in an armored car just looking at her great husband. And that's done -- you do it now, because you can't do it anymore in this country, where we have killed the bull moose, and the wild pigeon, and everybody else.

IV HE, SHE, IT AGAIN

1

I say "everybody else," gentlemen, because you see what an ethical problem it is. At which point, gentlemen, does the sun, and the moon, and the elephant, and the trees become our own brothers and sisters? When do you have to call them "he," and when are we allowed to call them "it"?

2

That's a great problem. Your car is "she." The ship is "she." Because you know that your life depends on them. So you couldn't say "it" of your car. And you couldn't say "it" as the Britishers couldn't on their island call it "it." That's the reasons why both are "she."

3

Now, gentlemen, as long as in this country we cannot speak of the forests as "hes" and "shes," as we speak in poetry today of the sun and the moon. You haven't done right by this physis, because you have not taken it across the boundary of ethics into your city of man. It hasn't become a living part of your humanity. And that's the whole trouble with this country, that the pioneering days allowed man to squeeze a farm dry like a parchment, throw it away and go to the next farm. And they said so.

4

I knew a farmer who said, "I have squeezed 25 farms dry in my life," and he wasn't sent to prison. In any other country the man couldn't be a citizen.

V WHAT IS A TREE FARM?

1

Now Mr. Weyerhauser was exactly this kind. It took him 29 years after the report of the Congress to recover his senses. And in 1941, he started the first tree farm.

2

Gentlemen, what's a tree farm?

It's a poor word for a good thing. We call it "forest" in Europe. It's a forest. And any forest in Europe is something that has to last a thousand years.

3

Gentlemen, the percentage of woodland in Germany and Austria has remained the same until the French marched in, in '45, and took their revenge and killed the Black Forest. That was the most barbarous invasion of thousand years. Neither the Thirty Year War, nor the Peasant War, nor the Seven-Year War, no war has ever killed the woods. Only when the French were permitted by the Americans to pose as victors did they murder the Black Forest.

And the man in charge of the forest in his despair committed suicide. And the French were felt so deeply menaced by this suicide that the man's death could not be announced in the papers in '47, that they forbade even to publicize that the man had killed himself, because it was a demonstration.

They behaved like Mr. Kádár behaves in Hungary, because a forest is a living thing in Europe.

You know, there are many songs to the forest. And very true feeling, that a tree has as much a right reproduce, as a family. And in 1000 -- 1150, gentlemen, the percentage of wood land in Central Europe was 27 percent. And in 1945, it was still 27 percent.

4

If you think of this, gentlemen, you know that physis and ethics are in constant cahoots, in constant conspiracy. That it is a deep problem, to know that physis poses an ethical problem, just as you and I pose a physical problem.

*We have to eat. So we are part of physis.
And the earth is to be respected, so it's part of ethics.*

And therefore the lines are constantly shifting between ethics and physis.

VI THE BATTLE OF THE BULGE

1

And perhaps I have now made some step forward to make you understand that philosophy is not a luxury, and not an invention of a department, but that every one generation is saddled with this relationship between ethics and physis.

2

It has to be said what the relation is. When do you call a tree "it," and when do you call it "she"?

That's a problem; and every generation has to put it differently.

If you have an abundance of trees and a few people, you burn all the trees as a clearing, as you did 200 years ago here. Very understandable. But it can't last. Now we have many people and fewer trees, and the thing becomes quite serious.

3

The logos then, gentlemen, is the apportionment, the apportioning of ethics and ethos and physis to reality. And to prove to you, gentlemen, that this is something

you yourself are immersed in, let me now give you an example of the moment, of the present day.

A naturalist, gentlemen, deals with -- let's take a simple example - bulges, curves, waves; and he describes them so that anybody can see them.

Now the historian, or the ethicist deals with the *Battle of the Bulge*.

Has anybody heard of the Battle of the Bulge? Who has?

Only a fraction. Well, gentlemen, when I and you deal with the Battle of the Bulge, which was fought at Christmas time 1944 and into the January, which was the last stand Hitler took against the Americans, where the famous "Nuts" were said -- where? (*Bastogne*.)

Bastogne, sure.

4

Now we have here a very interesting problem. The high point was probably the resistance of the general in Bastogne. But the battle is rightly called the Battle of the Bulge.

What's the difference, gentlemen, between bulges in physics and the Battle of the Bulge? Can anybody tell me the situation of the logos with regard to a physical event, that something bulges like a dress, and the historical event that something is called "the Battle of the Bulge"? What's the difference?

If you approach it in a spirit of investigation, what is proposed to you, what do you have in front of you when you look at a bulge, and when you hear of the Battle of the Bulge? What's the difference?

VII NAMES ARE WHAT MOVES HUMAN BEINGS

1

If you can understand this, you come nearer to understanding another aspect of this eternal battle between ethics and physis. And it must be my attempt to make you see that all history of philosophy today, all the books, the popular books on philosophy are so nonsensical, so valueless -- they give you anecdotes. But they do not tell you that there is in every year of the Lord the same question necessarily asked. Always the same.

Philosophy has one theme and nothing else.

2

And you don't believe this. You think philosophers are brown-study men who think of something, they don't think of something. They think of the one dilemma, in which ever son and daughter of man is immersed.

That you have to distribute your loyalties between bulges, gentlemen, and battles of bulges.

Why?

3

I'll give it to you, because you won't find it, gentlemen.

If you speak of the Battle of Waterloo, the historian, the philosopher, the thinker, the man who comes later, it already has a name. And as this name shook the roof.

The Battle of Waterloo makes the fortune of the Rothschild bank. It made the English put the monument of Wellington in front of their stock exchange. It brought about the restoration of the Bourbons. And therefore every Frenchman to this day who is a leftist trembles with respect to the name of the Battle of Waterloo.

That is, gentlemen, *historical, ethical, political* events, events in the society of men, express their reality, their significance by names, which meet with mixed feelings, which create tremendous emotions and tremendous actions.

If you name Kossuth, the name of Kossuth in Hungary at this moment, it inflames the workers' council against the Russians. And it therefore is a reality in society which, when you talk to the Niagara Falls about Kossuth, has no corresponding response.

Nature, gentlemen, cannot be spoken to. Human beings, however, are ruled by words, by names.

I can arouse your feelings by any wicked name I give you, or give something you love. I cannot call your father "SOB" (*Son of a bitch*) without your coming out and say, "Take this back. I'll hit you hard."

Right you are.

4

Names, gentlemen are that what moves human beings. Nothing else.

Nothing else, gentlemen. You cannot get any soldier to go to war if you cannot say to him, "Go to war." That's why you are so silly when you say, "War is murder."

VIII WHAT COSTS FRIENDS

1

I hear people often confuse these things. Or when the Puritans -- not the Puritans, but the diseased Puritans thought that marriage was obscene, because you had to get children.

Gentlemen, what you *call* a thing, that's what it is. Love and marriage are angelic, are heavenly powers. Prostitution is something quite different. It has a different meaning, and rightly so, because it is something different. It swings in a different context.

I know that many marriages today are not better than prostitution. And there are many honorable harlots. But the main thing is that even though the names themselves, gentlemen, carry weight.

2

Perhaps you take this down, gentlemen.

The Battle of the Bulge carries weight with you and me. It moves us to action, because the name itself is a part of the event. An event has only happened after it has received its name.

The Battle of Waterloo was only the Battle of Waterloo after the English had decided to call it that way. Blücher tried to call it Belle Alliance, the good alliance, and it didn't work. And there was another name proposed. It didn't enter history. The French and the English have decided to call it the Battle of Waterloo.

In German textbooks, you still read the name "Belle Alliance." And for the Prussians who didn't enter the spirit of the French Revolution at all, it made not much difference; the downfall of Napoleon had no immediately political democratic repercussions.

3

The Battle of the Bulge, gentlemen, cost me some American friends.

We were seated at New Year's party together while these news came in, and this was the one time that the Americans really trembled. There was a shock. It was unexpected. It was a setback, after they already had felt that everything was over.

We all were of course terribly grieved. But my friends, who were dear friends by that time ten years, broke with me inside, because they said, "This is a German. Well, who knows? He's one of these wicked peoples." They ascribed to me the Battle of the Bulge. Anything could happen with me, because I came from this cursed country which offered a defeat to the victorious American armies.

It was quite a shock to me, I can assure you. There we were, good friends, in a close company, in a private home. And you just felt that they had to take it out on somebody. So it was me.

4

That's what a Battle of the Bulge does.

In the world of ethos, gentlemen, we are ruled by names. You know very well the difference between "Negro," "colored people," and "nigger." It's a difference. And it has different consequences -- which word you use. Very great distinctions as a matter of fact. So it is with "WASP" (*white anglo-saxon protestant*), and it is with "Christ-killer," and with all these nice words which the American language harbors.

IX EXPERIENCE OF LIFE AND DEATH

1

And it can't be helped, gentlemen, because we know each other by names.

You give me the name "Professor." I give you the name "student," and that gives us each other status. And we cannot be natural with each other. We have to be ethical.

And it is Rousseau's and Thoreau's error that he thought men can be natural.

2

I have tried to tell you that ethos is always older than nature. Nature is the common impression of second thought, on all of us. But society is my role with regard to other people's roles. It's reciprocal. Nature is a second-rate experience. Nobody can experience the space except with others together.

All nature, that is, all mere space outside, can only be observed if you are firmly grafted in the common sense, in the common life of a society. No individual, no baby can observe nature, because it is fearful until his mother has said, "You can look out of the window. I'm with you. I'm protecting you." Any physicist has a fire department, and has you and me, the taxpayer, supporting him before he can be delegated to the front of nature looking out for us into space.

3

If you can once see this, gentlemen, space we all have in common, but your lifetime you have for yourself. And therefore, your lifetime has to be reaffirmed by the name given you.

The president of the United States is now president for four years. He is it only because we say so. The man in Haiti today resigned as president of Haiti on December 6th, and now he calls himself just nothing. Therefore the law has been broken.

Have you seen it in the paper? A funny man. He resigned as president because his term was up. He didn't allow a re-electio -- a second election. He took command of the armed forces. And now he is a nameless somebody, and everybody has the right to declare that there is no law in Haiti. And he didn't know this, this idiot. He probably went to an American prep school, where nature and ethos are confused.

4

All of you, gentlemen, are sick because you don't know this distinction. All of you think that life is experienced in the same way in society and in nature. In nature, you never experience life. You only experience death. You only experience things. What you call experience, gentlemen, is not what you think it is.

In society, we experience how people call us. That's what you experience, and how they expect you to call them. That's a real experience in society.

X THE WALL BETWEEN NATURE AND SOCIETY

1

For example, if you have the experience of your first love, you understand that your girl expects to be called by a name she has never heard before. If you can't invent a name for this girl, she'll never love you right. Any young love can demand that the persons involved are called with a name never used before on them.

2

That's what makes a poet. That's why poetry is necessary in love, because you go to the poet and borrow some of his epithets so that your girl may give you a date.

Better be poetical.

3

But this, gentlemen, is an experience which you cannot make in nature. You cannot make an experience of this kind, because you cannot speak to nature. Nature can operate on your five senses, but it doesn't make sense.

But if your girl suddenly calls you "Johnny," and is reconciled to your advances, you have made a tremendous experience. Somebody spoke to you who did not speak to you before.

That's the difference. And that is experience.

4

All the words you use, "life," and "experience," you abuse, gentlemen, because you have lost the wall between nature and society.

XI DISTINCTION OF EVERYTHING AND SOLIDARITY

1

And that is the deepest reason, gentlemen, why Marx came into being against the liberals. In this country liberals today are Communists. But gentlemen, there is a wall between liberal thinking and Communist thinking.

2

And what is the wall?

The wall is that Marx said, "It's all society, it's how we call each other, how we speak to each other, how we treat each other, reciprocity." And all the liberals, every American philosopher, statesman, and thinker tries to deny that we are anything but natural beings.

And there is no understanding, therefore, on the real Marxian issue today in this country, gentlemen.

3

Marx has nothing to do with what the Russians do. That's politics. Marx was a very profound thinker who saw that Rousseau, and Thoreau, and Franklin had abolished the wall of the eternal dilemma, of the double household in which we live.

You live in a family of human beings who call each other by names, by the right or the wrong names. And you live in a natural world outside, but only if you huddle together, if the society is ruled, gentlemen, by solidarity, despite every man's own time.

Nature is ruled by distinction, despite the unity of space.

4

Will you take this down?

Society is ruled by solidarity, despite the distinction of every member's time, or lifetime, or time span or time.

And nature is ruled by the distinction of everything, despite the unity of space.

Well, Sir, I wish you would write this down, too. Why do you refuse? I shall treat you as a piece of nature from now on.

XII HITLER

1

*Society lives by solidarity, despite the distinction of every man's own time.
And space lives by the distinction of everything despite the unity of its space.*

If I speak to you, gentlemen, I have declared my solidarity. I can only speak to people whom I grant life, and who grant me life.

2

Whenever you speak to a person, he is pardoned.

There was a great law in the kingdom of Spain, when the king -- or the Roman Emperor, too -- when a man - a judge, or the king, or the emperor, or the dictator -

speaks to a man who is condemned to die, the man is pardoned, because the sanctity of the society demands that when the living word reaches one of the members, the highest power, the supreme power, he thereby has received it.

In the old times, gentlemen, in any tribe, in any Indian tribe, when the father of the family receives the child and gave it his name, the child could no longer be exposed, and his life couldn't be destroyed. By the acceptance of the personality of this child, by giving it its own name, the child only made the threshold between nature and society.

3

That is, the ancients, gentlemen, knew very well that it is only the word spoken to somebody who takes him across from physis to ethos. We do this.

Gentlemen, we don't have to do it.

Hitler snuffed out, as you know, all these 6 million Jews by giving them a number. And at the end, they had not even their own name. And at that very moment, he felt strong enough to find helpers to extinguish them. As long as they had had their name, I think many of his hangmen would have shuddered by his lawlessness. But first, he flipped them outside society on the dungheap of nature.

And once you deprive a person of his name, and you don't even know that he has a name, he's just a number, you can easily reconcile your conscience, and say, "Oh, it's for the good of country, that these people are wiped out like lice."

And that's what he actually did. He said in the beginning, "I shall weed them out like grass -- like weeds. And I shall teach people to look into them the character of weeds."

4

So gentlemen, ethics and physis are political problems. Philosophers are always in politics.

XIII *CHIANG KAI-SHEK*

1

At this moment, gentlemen, this country is without any thought, without any mind, I think the all-time low, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., a man panic-stricken, with shit in his pants. And that's representing us to the outside world. I mean, it's the all-time low in foreign politics that has been reached in this country.

Fortunately the man is dismissed. Even they find out in Washington.

2

And it's a great scandal, gentlemen.

But foreign policy now, we cater to Mr. Nehru's policy. Mr. Nehru has now to tell the American public what's ethics and what's physis.

If you read carefully how we cling to this Asian-African bloc -- why? Because everybody has now -- European thought? - can't be listened to. Europeans in America, like myself, can't be listened to. But we can listen to this idiot Mr. Nehru.

If you read his Universal History, it's the stupidest book that has ever been written. It is available in Talplit's for 80 cents. There has never been anything so miraculously stupid. But he's a "great, wise man." Because this country has no philosophy. It has declined to listen to philosopher, so it must listen to any sorcerer from the outside.

Once it was the Chinese who was beloved. Now Mrs. -- what was her name? Mrs. Chiang Kai-Shek, yes. You have a time to remember that. But I can assure you, in my time, even my horse got his name from her, because a young friend of our house was such an enthusiast. And her family gave Mrs. Chiang Kai-Shek a million dollars. And so she got the right also to name my horse; now it has a Chinese name.

3

Only to show you that every 10 years, some other influence in this country, of some allegedly philosophical nature is at work.

And I just come from Boston, and I have a dear friend there. She was always progressive. She even voted for Wallace. And now she's so progressive that Mr. Nehru is her idol. And I said to her, "Do you always have to have an idol?"

She said, "Yes." She has to have an idol, because she has no philosophy.

4

Mr. Nehru today in this country is such a joke, because there is nobody who hates America more than his delegate here, Mr. Mennon. He is a great -- yes, he is a great hater of this country. And he tries to degrade us. And we listen to his -- because we need something new, something --.

XIV LA FORÊT

1

The only philosophy in this country is fashion, the latest mental fashion. Because you evade the issue, gentlemen, you have to have a philosophy, because if not, you have another man's philosophy.

2

Because at any moment, you must know whether the trees in Oregon can be cut down or not. The people in Oregon, Idaho, and Washington have to have very appropriate ideas about Hell Canyon, and conservation. They are very much harder hit than we. They have a philosophy of government there.

I have a friend there who worked in the Columbia River power development, and he is in politics, and I know how deeply the people there have for this limited area, at least, a definite philosophy. Very strongly developed, and that's how they defeated Mr. McKay, and Mr. Welker.

It's a partial philosophy, but it's something to know that people know the difference, gentlemen, between a forest that is alive and between a forest that is a thing. That's ethos, gentlemen.

Take it now down.

Ethos is the treatment of the universe as much alive at least as myself or more.

And physis is the treatment of the universe as less alive than myself, or dead.

3

You have a hell of a time to appreciate *The Tempest* by Shakespeare, because the world there is ethically treated by Ariel and spirits and Caliban, and the whole Island is alive. And that for you is a joke, gentlemen.

I doubt that it is a joke.

I have in my long life, coming from a big city with too much blacktop in the streets, had to recover my senses. And I think I have. I now fully understand the necessity of speaking in gender, of the "la forêt," as the French do. It isn't a thing for a Frenchman to call it "la forêt", it is alive.

And the sea, the same. What is the sea in English? Which is "she" and which is "it"? How about the sea? Isn't there in English a distinction? Which sea is feminine? No. S-e-a. Sea.

({ } *the Atlantic Ocean is maybe compared to a "she," but "ocean" in general is "it."*)

4

Because that's why I mentioned it to you, gentlemen. Where there is a complete name, there is personality. Atlantic Ocean, she can be she. And thereby it moves up to the grade of life. It's your equal. That's the great story.

The abstract sea is a thing, neuter. It. The named thing alive.

XV IAGO AND CASSIO

1

St. Augustine's -- I told you about this incest explanation and my famous example, gentlemen. In the old Roman law, and in St. Augustine, there is found the explanation why we can't marry our mother and our sister.

You think that's something natural. Nothing in nature, gentlemen, that would forbid you to marry your -- the animals do forget who's their mother and who's their sister. And they do mate. So it is perfectly natural. It has nothing to do with unnatural, incest, gentlemen. It has only to do with ethos.

And St. Augustine has put it in a nutshell when he said, "I cannot make love to my mother and sister, because I already at first have received them by another name of love. And therefore the new power of naming would be impoverished. I could never supplant"-- how do you say -- supplant? -- "supplant, substitute, replace one name of love, the first name, mother by the new name of love, which would ring absolutely unheard-of".

The essence of love is the new name.

2

It's a very profound, and I think the only profound explanation of incest. It doesn't belong to the biologist. It doesn't belong to the geneticist. It belongs to the ethicist.

Ethos is hurt if what you have received in a tepid mood, or a lukewarm mood, or warm mood, mother or sister, suddenly is obliterated by the explosive force of

sweetheart and love. We must not evade all these serious issues by putting them, like genetics and eugenics, into the department of zoology.

But gentlemen, you and I will never be a zoological being. It is hopeless for you and me, because we are shocked by wrong names. If somebody calls you a liar, you can say a thousand times it's just a word. It burns you up.

3

Yesterday, Mr. Booth read Othello.

Who went there? Oh, you are not freshmen any longer, so you are through with Shakespeare.

Well, there Cassio is dismissed from his office by Othello, and he runs around and says, "I have lost my reputation, reputation, reputation." It's a very wonderful scene, because the grasping Iago is already the naturalist and says, "Oh, the body. If you were wounded, I would pity you. But reputation? It's nothing. Reputation? Reputation? After all, everybody who landed on these shores usually had already lost his reputation in Europe. So what's the difference? Reputation, it makes no difference."

But it does, gentlemen. Unfortunately Mr. Cassio is moved through the whole play through his loss of reputation. And Desdemona perishes, because she tries to restore his reputation.

(Well, Sir. Iago equivocates though, because later on he says, "He who steals my purse steals trash, but he who filches my good name is taking something.")

Well, Iago of course is the devil. The devil is the man who knows the importance of ethics, but refuses to believe it..

4

The real problem of faith, which I have already tried to tell you I think in other classes, is that people who know something won't believe it. You always think that on the one side of the ledger is faith, and on the other is belief. And so you divide science and religion and you say, "Religion is belief that which cannot be known, or which is stupid, or which is the opposite of science. And science is the facts."

Gentlemen, that's not the story. The problem of knowing and believing is quite different. Iago says, I know," but he doesn't act on it. And therefore he doesn't believe in it. That's the devil. Believing -- it means action, to act on something.

XVI EXPERIENCE OF SPACE AND TIME

1

I told you the story of Mr. Steffansson, the Arctic explorer, who went to Washington in 1942 and said after Pearl Harbor, and said, "You know for 400 years that the earth is round, don't you?"

And they said, "Yes."

"But you have not believed in it. And you don't believe in it, and why don't you?"

They were very much surprised. You know the story? And what was his answer?

(I believe that he meant { } Iceland)

In which context was this important for our war effort? *(Flying.)*

In flying over the Kuriles, yes, and the Aleutians, instead via Hawaii. If the road on the Equator is twice as long as if you take the shortcut, as the periphery of the ball, the globe. And they had known, but they hadn't believed it.

2

The same is true of Iago, Sir. And the same is true of you, gentlemen. You know that men should have solidarity. But you don't act it out in Clinton, Tennessee.

So this was my duty for your paper.

First to state once more that logos, physis, and ethos, gentlemen, are realities, because the city of man speaks to us, but is small. The universe doesn't speak to us, but is big.

3

You can also take down this as another sidelight:

we always experience space as a whole, and then subdivide it into things, into smaller things. First, you wake up and there is this whole space, until you come to an hindrance. And then you can subdivide it into seats in this room, and places, inside. The experience of space is first as one.

And every division of Egypt and Arab countries and Africa and Europe is belated, is second.

Time is experienced the other way around. *You experience first the one moment of your own life, and then perhaps your own life.* That all time is one has to be created. Has to be believed. It is not natural. It's nonsense to tell you that all time is one. Not an experience. It's a thought. It's just a creation of the mind, an act of will.

Most people never realize it. Most people live as though they were the only people in the world, and their own time was the only time that existed.

4

Now most people don't know this. You always speak so glibly of space and time.

Take it down, gentlemen: to put space and time together in this manner is a mere superstition. It doesn't exist, because

all space is first experienced as singular, as one space; and all spaces are fragments and fractions of this one big space, the universe.

But your lifetime, gentlemen, is first experienced as this time to yourself. You cannot share it with anybody. It's the existential problem. You only have your own time. And you have nothing else, at first.

Given: your own time; given: the universal space. They are two facts.

XVII UNITY OF TIME AND DIVISION OF SPACE ARE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LOGOS

1

If you can say, however, that your little home is not for sale, because it is yours in this universe, and if you can say that all men of all times, the ages, belong to you and you belong to the ages, then you have done something that is not natural. That's purely ethical.

That's a creation of the logos.

2

The unity of time, gentlemen, and the division of space is the achievement of the logos, arbitrating between the space of physis and the time of society. The unity of time, gentlemen, and the divisions of space are the achievements of the logos, of the words spoken to these times, and this space.

To space, we say, "Make room for a nation," for a little nation, too. To time, we say, "Be one, from the beginning to the end," because it isn't by nature.

3

We have no experience of any time before your birth and after your death. Can't be experienced. Purely fiction. But a fiction you can believe in. That's the dream castle which we build.

Let's have a break here.

I ZAUN (FENCE)

1

...gives us a good Anglo-Saxon term for "society."

(It's not Anglo-Saxon. It's Assyrian. I looked it up, too. It comes from {kenon}.)

(I got mine from Webster's Unabridged.)

(I got mine from Webster's Academic. 1850.) Well, I

(But there is an Anglo-Saxon word however, which we thought of the other day, "burgh" – b-u-r-g-h. And I'm fairly certain it's Germanic in origin, "burgh.")

Oh yes, it's burgh, there's Newburgh, and the word "burger" comes from it, the citizen. Of course, that's in German, too, the same, Bürger. And "bourgeois" is the same. The French "bour," from which "bourgeois" comes. That's exactly the same word, "burg," "burger." It's Dutch, too.

2

But that's not the story. The burgh is after all the fortified place. But the minimum for a settlement in the old days, was a hedge. And in German, this is pronounced like "town," so it could also be spelled this way. And in English "t" in German is always "z."

You have English "two," and we have in German "zwei."

You have English "ten," and you have German "zehn."

And you have English "town," and you have German "Zaun."

And the Zaun is today nothing but a fence.

3

Now the important thing is, gentlemen, that our ancestors were good philosophers. You have lost their insight that men can only exist behind a fence. "The fence of the law," the Jews called it. That is, human society is only able, by some distinction from nature, to begin to exist, to live.

And therefore the word "town" and the word "Zaun" in German, or the word "fence" today, the fence of the law, means that people among themselves accredit each other with life and personality, and grant each other the right to live.

The Human Rights Day was yesterday, and you know, the president had to say that it was very poor at this moment, how it was handled. But what you call "human rights" is this living behind a fence where we cannot be treated like nature.

4

You cannot treat a man inside your Zaun, inside your town. Inside *Our Town*, we have to treat each other as alive as we ourselves, or as I said to you in the definition, more alive. You look up to a judge, and a minister or priest or a good mother as more alive than yourself, I hope, or to the poet. And therefore receiving dignity, authority.

II *OUTSIDE THE PALE - NO MEANING FOR YOU*

1

What is authority? Dignity?

Recognition that they have more life than we have. We grant them therefore recognition as of a higher life.

2

It's all very simple, gentlemen. The whole gradation is constantly made by every one of us.

I have seen young children snub an old man of 85, and I have seen them revere him. And that's then a decision they constantly make.

If they treat him as nature-boys, then they think because a man has no teeth and no hair left, he is just dead; and they treat him in nature as less alive than they are. If they live in a good society, with the fence of the law around them, they'll get up when an old man enters the room, or an old lady, and will show their reverence.

3

And that's the difference between outside the fence and inside the fence. And today assumption of the young brat is that there is no such pale. "Outside the pale," no meaning for you.

The juvenile delinquent has totally conquered society. The juvenile delinquent thinks that he is outside the fence, that everything is nature. He can shoot anybody in Central Park.

4

That's nature.

This business of town, then, and township, is something very simple. Really, the recognition that the whole difference between ethos and nature and physis is in the fence.

Everybody inside the fence has a right to live. Nothing outside the fence can claim it, because it doesn't speak to us. We manipulate it, we treat it, we make war against it. We exploit it. We make it as a garden into the city, and plant the flowers there, and treat them as domesticated animals or domesticated plants, then they come to life with us.

III ALL SOULS 1915

1

Now this is the last day today on Plato. Will you kindly look up *The Symposium*?

I said to you that the greatness of Plato in *The Republic* is that he identifies the individual and the republic. That all the powers of the republic as a whole, the organization of mind, heart and belly is found as well in any city as in the individual.

That we should use the word "micropolis" for man in Plato. Man in Plato is a little city. And the other is a macropolis. And therefore, that's an ethical concept.

2

Plato has for men and society nothing physical. But to him it's ethos. You speak of microcosmos, and macrocosmos, and think that's Greek philosophy. You are mistaken.

In Plato and Aristotle, man is the city written small.

This is very important, because I said to you, Plato and all philosophers ever since, gentlemen, are a community inside themselves. Any philosopher must be able to voice inside himself the voices of the whole community. He is not a philosopher who cannot speak the jargon of a king, of a mother, of a worker, of a slave, of a technician, of an inventor inside himself and make all harmonize.

The philosopher is a small city inside himself, gentlemen.

That is since Plato the solution, it may not be true that you and you are little cities. You may just be individuals. But a philosopher, one man in the city must be like the city. A little acorn, the egg, the seed of the whole city.

(*{ } that Democritus, according to Aristotle { } said that a man is a small world.*)

3

Well, there you have a kind of derailment. I mean, he should have said he's a small city, I'm sure. That is the break in the tradition. Today we all say "small world." That is microcosm. Microcosm, small world.

Gentlemen, I warn you. I give you an example of how I experienced this very practically.

It's 40 years ago I was a soldier in the war. And I was deeply moved, of course, by the conflict. At the front it was, in the second year of the war, I saw the possibility of unifying all the veterans of all the different countries, and make them turn around and face the home warriors, and these journalists, and these home patriots and fight them, instead. Because soldiers at the front are really very much of the same breed as against the ladies at home.

And I fumbled around with a literary project. And I had the soldiers and knights and officers of all nations meet in my imagination. The manuscript is still there.

And it's something -- it has probably got to be done about it sometime. And the last speech has this as its content.

I offer this to you to make you understand the practical importance of this definition of a philosopher as being a city in the nutshell.

4

They had met regularly and discussed the future of the human race. And on All Souls, at the end of the year of the Church, in November, the ecclesiastical year goes to an end. Advent already belongs to the next year of the Church. November 30 is the last day of the Church year. I had one man stand all alone.

And he said, "All the others," there were 72, "seem to have relinquished me, have deserted. I am here alone. What does this mean?"

And he said, "That's the real triumph, because in this year we have been welded together to such an extent that everyone can now represent the 71 others, too. Everyone has taken over the other nations' viewpoint, and the other nations' character -- so much that he is now empowered to speak for all. And so we have

multiplied. Out of 72 individuals there have now come 72 people, who can speak every one of them, for all 72."

IV THE VAST DISCREPANCY BETWEEN MICROPOLIS AND MICROCOSMOS

1

Now that is, in a small way, Plato's experience in *The Republic*. That at least he, Plato, must have filled himself with the positions and the experiences of all men in a city, and in all potential cities, before he can propose the best state.

2

(Then you're telling us, Sir, we can't treat men in any way that's natural or objectively { } human behavior?)

Well, if you take a tree, Sir. If you have an apple tree, the apple that is able to produce a new apple tree must have a certain wealth of potentiality. If you begin to treat the human mind as a real thing, and not as a flimsy abstraction, you will understand that man can only bear fruit in political thinking if he has really become the apple of the whole tree.

3

That's all I want to say at this moment. I don't want to stress your question so much.

If you could only see, I'm moving in quite a different direction from your question.

The important thing is that Plato is not thinking in the abstract, but he has filled himself with the life of his city. And so he has become now an acorn or an apple. And the apple tree, Athens, can now wither on the stem and perish, because through Plato, the Greeks' free city is safe for generations. From generation to generation, you can read Plato and inherit the glory that was Greece. And also the limitations that were Greece.

You can't find in Plato anything beyond the Greek city.

4

The important thing that I wanted to make is: you nowhere find the American tradition the distinction again between nature, according to which the human being would have to be a microcosmos, a small nature, a small world -- and the micropolis, the ethical problem that a man must have inherited all the good ways of life, of his

city, the lawful order, the quality of law-abidance, of virtue, before he can speak about government.

And there is a very vast discrepancy between being micropolis and being microcosmos.

V THE GRAIN OF SEED

1

Modern man seems -- in this era of chemistry it is understandable -- to boast that he is a microcosmos. But then he would have no direction, and he would not know what is right and wrong. Because nature has no direction, and nature has no right and wrong. And nature is merciless.

In nature, everything is just itself. Nature is based on selfhood, on impenetrability, on resistance, on gravity, on no escape. Society is based on interpenetration, on mutual understanding, on reciprocity, and on inheritance. And I can inherit acquired faculties.

And the micropolis therefore is Plato.

2

And please say to yourself, all Greek philosophers try to form this micropolis in various degrees. Some thought you could dissolve the polis into physis, as Epicurus and Lucretius. And they tried to be microcosms.

There's no doubt that Lucretius and all the Epicureans and Democritus tried to give the weight to physis and said the city of man is a burden on us. Let's go out into nature. But that's only one strand.

Then you get Heraclitus, and you get Socrates, and you get Plato. And they struggle violently to restore the balance, and to say, "The philosopher must inherit the ways of life of a city. Before, he cannot lay out the next city. Before, he cannot philosophize."

3

(Well, if the philosopher has all the parts of the city within him, what would be the objection to having the philosopher be king?)

Too-muchness, too-muchness. He would take away all the freedom from anyone. Nobody could be creative. Since he knows it all, the others would become automatons. Because he knows too much.

The grain of seed must fall in the ground and die before it can bear fruit. The philosopher is the grain of seed before it has died.

If he rules himself, he can teach. And if then in 72 others his doctrine comes to life, they can found a city.

Alexander could conquer the world in the next generation. But Aristotle had no right to rule. That's the difference. The philosopher himself must not rule, because by his own self he would extinguish the spontaneous life, the freedom of all the people he ruled.

Can't you see this? Overweight.

4

That's the mystery between Church and state, gentlemen. The Church teaches, but it must not rule. As soon as a church rules, it is horrid. It becomes a great inquisitor.

It's the same problem. The wisdom of the Church has been that it is on a different planet. It does not rule itself. But it teaches. It instructs. It corrects. It criticizes. It prophesies. It leads. It converts. But the people themselves must act in the state.

And that's why the separation of state and Church is profoundly true.

This Plato did not know. Plato is not a Christian, because he lives before this separation of the gods and the laws. That's why he's even called *The Theologian*, and he wanted to be king. And you can see that would be a pope who would be emperor, and an emperor would be pope.

VI PLATO OUTDONE

1

That's why Plato at this moment is a great danger to be read.

Lenin read him. And the Bolsheviks read him. And you read him. And you think it's harmless, gentlemen. If you unite Plato's claims in yourself, you become intolerable tyrants, because your insight is one thing. You can use this for teaching.

2

Or you are fumbling in the political game, like Mr. Nixon, who's just an opportunist, that's more harmless, because he's just always out for one thing. He has not a straight

thought in his mind. But he can't do much harm. He's not a tyrant. He's not like Lenin, or Marx, or Stalin. He has no philosophy except Nixon.

This is very strange. But Nixon is only in Plato's thought one little side issue. Therefore he isn't so preponderant.

He cannot be so destructive as a man who says, "I know it all."

3

Gentlemen, Plato has in *The Symposium* in a certain manner outrun himself. His whole philosophy is between the single philosopher and the city. In *The Symposium*, however, there's a little more of unity between people because the truth comes out in such a way that everyone has to contribute something. There is in this sense no philosopher in *The Symposium* who is alone. But there is an orchestra of philosophers.

And that's why it has always been felt that in *The Symposium*, Plato is greater than himself, that he transcends himself, that his love for people and his love of Athens and his love of the arts and his love of love make him explode his own system.

And that's a very beautiful spectacle, gentlemen. A living soul must always be greater than his own mind. The love reality must be greater than cleverness. You must be better than yourself; the Bible calls it, "Let us be more than conquerors."

The living soul is always greater than he knew yesterday to be.

I mean, you say, "I can't do this," and tomorrow you have done it, because we live. And the life of the next day must be more than my thoughts of yesterday.

4

And Plato in a way has outdone himself in *The Symposium*. And we cannot read it together, but let us look up just a few lines.

It is the only place in Plato in which a woman can say something. And who is she? Diotima. "Honored by Zeus" is her name.

VII THE STORY OF THE TWO SWIMMERS

1

It has been the downfall of Greek philosophy that women were shoved aside, that the experience of married life, for example, was not ever utilized for explaining any

comradeship, or community, and that Plato, even in laws, and the city, treats marriage as though he was an owner of the stockyards of Chicago.

It's butchery. It is a stud farm. And he even demands that in denial of intercourse a wise woman be present then to judge the eugenics of the case. He is horrible in this respect, because he tries to treat love as natural, and is unethical, anti-ethical.

2

This is not true of *The Symposium*. In *The Symposium*, the spirit gets hold of a woman. And that's why I think *The Symposium* will always astonish within Greece.

Of course, the Greeks had one very great poetess. Who was she? Sappho. But even this poor woman was condemned to lesbian love by the circumstances. Nevertheless, she was a very, very great woman. I can never read her poetry without being deeply moved. And she holds her own and with any great poet. Although we have so very little of her, every shred of paper we have of her, puts her into the first rank.

3

Will you kindly read 115? No, wait a minute; 114 - I'm mistaken. Can you? Who has a copy? 114 -- "Now with your leave."

"Now with your leave, we will take the battle --"

Alcibiades, the most beautiful, and the most successful statesman of Athens speaks of Socrates, and tries to say what Socrates meant for him.

"For it is fair to say { } and there was that --"

That's Socrates -- "him" is Socrates.

"For there was that battle after which the generals actually gave me the prize of valor."

So Alcibiades is talking. He was distinguished by the order of merit. It's a little bit like the story now of the two swimmers. You have seen this, the story. One won in the heat, with 3 minutes 52, and the other won in the Olympics. Who was it? What?

(Jones.) Jones was the other, was he? What's the name? Haven't you read the story? (Green.) No, no. (Yeah.) The 400 meter? In swimming. (The 800 meters. The 1500 meters.)

Well, didn't you see in Melbourne, he said, "I still consider the man who won the heat as the champion." (That was the race. That was running.) What was it? How do

you spell it? (*Track.*) Really? What's the name? (*Jones.*) Jones. I know this. And the other? (*Tom Courtenay.*) (*No. Charlie Jenkins.*)

Jenkins. That's it. Now we have it. All right. So – Jenkins gave me the prize of valor. This man.

Please, go on. That's Socrates.

4

*"I would not { } other person came to my rescue and saved my life.
I was wounded, but he would not leave me.
He saved my weapon, and me, too.
Then I made { } myself, Socrates, to you the prize of valor."*

There you have the Jenkins-Jones situation.

VIII ALCIBIADES

1

*"And here you will not find fault with me or say I am lying.
But the fact is, when the generals looked at my rank and wanted to give me the prize,
you were more eager than the generals that I should get it and not yourself."*

*Again, gentlemen, it was worthwhile to see Socrates
when the army was routed and retreating from Delios.
I happened to be there on horseback and he on foot.
This man and Laches were retreating together in the rout.
I met them and told them to cheer up, and I said I would not desert them.*

*There indeed, I had an even better view of Socrates than at Potidaea,
for I had less to fear, being on horseback.
First I saw how he had kept his head much better than Laches.
Then I really thought, Aristophanes, to quote your words,
that he marched exactly as he does here, with swaggering gait and rolling eyes,
quietly looking around his friends and enemies,
and making it quite clear to everyone, given a long way off,
that if anyone laid a finger on this man, he would defend himself stoutly.*

*And therefore he came off safe, both this man and his companion.
For in war, where -- where men are like that,
people usually don't touch them with a finger,
but pursue those who are running headlong.*

One could quote many other things in praise of Socrates, wonderful things."

Would you kindly underline this, if you own the book, "wonderful things." We have to dwell on this word "wonder" right away.

Go on.

2

"Of his other habits, one might perhaps say much the same about another man. And yet it is not his being like any other man in the world, ancient or modern, that is worthy of all wondering.

*When men like Achilles might be found.
One might take, for example, Brasidas and others.
And again, men like Pericles, such as Nestor and Antenor.
And there are more besides.*

And so we might go on with our comparisons.

*But as for this man, so awed, both the man and his talk,
none could ever be found to come near him, neither modern nor ancient,
unless he is to be compared to no man at all,
but to the Silenuses, and satyrs, to which I have compared him, him and his talk.*

*For indeed there is something which I left out when I began,
that even his talk is very like the opening Silenuses."*

That's the companion of Bacchus intoxicated with wine.

*"When you agree to listen to the talk of Socrates,
it might seem at first to be nothing but absurdity.*

*Such words and phrases are wrapped outside it like the hide of a boisterous satyr.
Packasses, and smiths, and shoemakers, and tanners are what he talks about.
And he seems to be always saying the same things, in the same words,
so that any ignorant and foolish man would laugh at them.*

*But when they are opened out, and you get inside them,
you will find his words first full of sense, as no others are.*

*Next, most divine and containing the finest images of virtue, and reaching farthest --
in fact, reaching to everything which it profits a man to study
who is to become noble and good."*

Now, will you take over? Go.

3

"This, gentlemen, is my laudation of Socrates.

*And I have mixed in as well some blame by telling you of the way he insulted me.
I am not the only one he has treated so.*

*He has done the same to Charmides, Glaucon's son; and Euthydemus, Diocles' son.
And very many other whom he has tricked as a lover
and made them treat him as the beloved instead."*

This is a warning to you, Agasthon, not to be deceived by this man.

*Try to learn from our experience; and take care not to be the fool in the proverb,
who could only learn by his own.*

When Alcibiades --?"

Al-ki-bia-des. That's the Greek pronunciation. Let's stick to that. Al-ki-bi- a-des.

*"-- Alcibiades had ended his speech,
there was much laughter at his frankness, because he seems to be still in love with Socrates.*

*But Socrates said, `You're sober, I think, Alcibiades,
or you would never have wrapped all that smart mantle around you,
or tried to hide why you've said all this,
and put your point in a postscript at the end.*

*For your real aim in all you said was to make me and Agasthon quarrel.
You think I ought to be your lover and love no one else, and Agasthon should be --"*

Ag-a-thon, I think we have to say. I think that's the tradition. Agathon. You have a point. In Greek it would be A-GAH-thon. Who knows Greek? So. When the last syllable is long, then the accent in Greek has always to be on the second syllable. So it would be in Greek Agathon.

"...should be your beloved and loved by no one else."

Ja. Go on.

*"But I see through you.
Your satyric and Silenic drama has been shown up.*

*Now, my dearest Agathon, don't let him get at anything by it.
Only take care that no one shall make you and him quarrel."*

4

One moment. Gentlemen, Socrates here is shown as the miracle. He himself is the miracle, the wondrous person.

And I have tried to show you that this is the problem in Greece that man, the philosopher, is the wonder. Because he contains the whole city, and therefore, the secret of life -- he's the micropolis appearing in him, and can bear fruit.

And then you have the sense of wonder with regard to physis.

IX WOODROW WILSON IN DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

1

But in *The Symposium*, there is a third element which you don't have at any other of the dialogues: admiration. That's the miraculous to humanity. "Admiration in your language, has very little to do with "miracle." But I'm afraid to say, it has the same root, and it is the same feeling, that you are aroused to admiration, because something strikes you as miraculous, or somebody strikes you as miraculous.

And so in *The Symposium*, gentlemen, it is the only place where Plato has given a picture of the Academy. Neither one philosopher, nor the whole -- the old city, the city of man going to war, and planting cabbage, and begetting children, but in the Academy, you have philosophers admiring each other, and loving each other, and living together in the realm of the spirit.

2

The ethos of Plato appears here, because here is Alcibiades: great statesman. And here of course is Plato himself, and here is Agathon the tragedian. And here is Aristophanes, the writer of poetry. All the people of the spirit and of the mind, connected with each other in a peace of love, in a banquet of a drinking bout and good talk.

And that is more than the city, and more than the individual philosopher. And in this moment, the Academy, which is the unity of spirit between good men, are united in a selfless company, in a higher service.

3

When Woodrow Wilson came to Dartmouth, gentlemen, unfortunately this speech is forgotten. It's not even printed in his collected speeches. He made a very wonderful

speech in 1909. Every one of you should look it up in the addresses of Dartmouth College.

It was at the occasion of the inauguration of President Nichols. And Woodrow Wilson gave a wonderful speech and said that a college must be a friendship and an unselfish company. "An unselfish company." If it wasn't, it was no good.

He also raised the question in this great address, when he said, "While I look around here in Dartmouth Hall"-- I think it was Dartmouth Hall, yes, Webster hadn't been built -- "I came to think if it was possible that this group here could produce an Abraham Lincoln. And I had sadly to confess to myself that it couldn't."

4

You have again the problem: philosophers, you can produce in a college, but not Abraham Lincoln so easily. At best, Nelson Rockefeller.

X *THE OTHER WORLD*

1

Where's my crayon, my chalk? Here.

So I think to end today's picture of Plato, I have tried to show you that Plato is himself the micropolis. And perhaps I should write him with a capital M. One man at least has achieved in antiquity that he is the whole city in his own person. There is in him then the logos.

2

That is, he can by his doctrine reconcile men's existence on this globe in a city and under the domination of the beautiful and the true on this globe. Then there is the city. Either Athens, that's the old city; and the future city, that's the republic. The best city. That's his republic.

Now obviously, gentlemen, that's the ethos of Plato. And we haven't been able to deal much with the physis, but you can believe me that he also has a doctrine about physis.

3

Now in *The Symposium*, there is a subject, because the Academy, the orchestra, the living-together of these philosophers is not of this world. It's Heaven. It's the famous ivory tower of which you talk so much.

But I would like you to understand that the ivory tower is not just negative. It's very easy to dismiss the ivory tower. With *The Symposium*, if you read it, and I like to think that some of you will take to it and read it themselves. In there is mutual admiration.

You call a mutual admiration society, gentlemen, but without admiration, life is intolerable. We have to admire each other. That's not negative. We just have to in order to stand each other. If you don't admire each other, you will kill each other.

4

And therefore, gentlemen, Plato plus Plato plus Plato -- that is, a multitude of Platos -- is that heavenly society, which ever since has been called "the other world." This idea of another world, gentlemen, which you think is connected with Christianity, is not a Christian idea. It's a Greek idea.

XI LIVING IN HEAVEN

1

Plato takes refuge in this world of ideals, in this ideal world, that *The Symposium* describes how good people can rejoice in this so-called other world.

Why is it "other"? They are not concerned with establishing the best city. They do not step down into reality, but they are released to their own best devices, their own cheerfulness, their own joy in each other. And this mutual love of *The Symposium* is what I tried to tell you is the exuberance, the sufferance begotten by the philosophizing spirit, where two, three people can meet in the mind.

2

That is neither logos, nor ethos, nor physis. That's Heaven. There is peace. There is redemption. There is already at least mentally achieved the unity of this dilemma.

In *The Symposium*, there is no conflict. Everything seems to go easy. It's the Beatitudes. It's the Island of the Blessed. What the French call "*Les Champs Élysées*." That means Elysian, what all ages have always tried to construct: a Heaven in which all these -- not only dilemmas, but these paradoxes would be dissolved.

3

The Symposium is what the *Seventh Letter* of Plato says: "I have never written down what I really mean to be the kernel of my philosophy," he has said. I could answer, except in *The Symposium*.

The real kernel of his doctrine is that people can already in this world live as the wise can live together, in harmony, despite their differences.

There has been no despotism of one ruling the city.

4

And therefore -- always when you talk of Plato, put *The Symposium* on quite a different plane from the dialogues, or from *The Republic*. *The Republic* has to deal with a physical city, and an ethical city to be brought down to earth. But in *The Symposium*, you are living in Heaven. You are living in one good hour, in a festive hour. It's the difference between work day and festive day in the philosopher's life.

All the other works of Plato are hard work, and something to be learned from it. But *The Symposium*, gentlemen, is not the question of learning anything. Any fool who analyzes the doctrine of love in *The Symposium* deserves to be chased out of the town of the philosophers. Because this is Heaven, and in Heaven, there is no argument. There is just enjoyment, and good talk, and in friendship, and in mutual love.

XII THE RIGHT USE OF THE SYMPOSION

1

Now I find many pedants--you probably have found in your textbooks men like Will Durant or some such gentleman. He will put all these writings on the same plane and go to work and make mincemeat out of *The Symposium*.

2

But *The Symposium*, gentlemen, is a work of art. And it is a unity between thought and scenery. And woe to you if you ever come to deplore, to rape *The Symposium*, gentlemen. That's not a question of argument, but that's a question of joining in.

3

If you can in your own friendship establish such an evening with your good friends, then you have made the right use of The Symposium.

TWENTIETH LECTURE: *LOGOS IS NOT LOGIC*

(Number 21, 13 December 1956.)

I NO UNIVERSITIES, ONLY SCHOOLS

1

...of all Greek or all philosophical thinking, at any time, gentlemen. This problem is called the problem of the universals.

2

And as you see that it has only a Latin term, it was not discovered before the Middle Ages, under this term, "universals." That's a Latin word, and the medievalist philosophy was Latin, and not Greek, when it came into the Occident.

3

However, it is a Greek problem.

The Greeks had the problem, and it appears in the relation between the sophists, Plato and Aristotle. And in other words, when I talk now of this problem of the universals, I talk of the relation of Plato, Socrates, the sophists and Aristotle. And I want to stress in this history of Greek philosophy the unity between the various thinkers.

I'm not interested so much in their separate systems. And the relation of Aristotle, Socrates and Plato is a very mysterious one. And before telling you the story of the universals, as they were called in the Middle Ages, and as we now rediscover them as the permanent question of all thinking -- it is perhaps worth your while that you first for a moment stand in some amazement before the three men, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, in their common achievement.

4

The Greek mind is predicated on single names, on individual men. Everything we have said before pointed either to the single philosopher or to the founder of a school. And the tragedy of all dialectics of men, gentlemen, of all thinking, is that when you disagree with your master in antiquity, you had to secede from him and found a new school.

Even Aristotle, although he always called Plato his friend - in his Nichomachean Ethics, he especially says, "They are friends" - he set up his own school, against the successors of Plato, the Peripatetic School against the Academy.

So the tragedy of antiquity is, gentlemen, that they had no universities. They only had schools.

II FORCED DOWN EVERYBODY'S THROAT

1

A university is a place where different schools can coexist.

And ancients had no universities.

2

In many of the popular American books, gentlemen, on Greece or on modern times, or on education, you find this baloney that the first university was Plato's Academy. That's not true. The condition of a university in the Occident in the Christian era is that opposite schools can teach in the same institution. And that a student is exposed to a Platonist as well as to Aristotelians.

That's the Christian spirit.

3

In antiquity, that wasn't so. You had to break with one school if you wanted to go to another. There was no room for opposition. That's why Plato's state and the Bolshevik state have so much in common. The Greeks did not know that the mind had to be left free. They wanted the truth, the whole truth; but they wanted it then forced down everybody's throat who entered the sacred grove of the school.

4

Yet, gentlemen, despite this pagan attitude -- we call "paganism" gentlemen, the impenetrability, the relative impenetrability of one man, one people, one nation, one city, one religion against the other.

That's pagan.

III TO BELIEVE IN ONE GOD

1

Paganism is a very definite thing. Any divine force is impenetrable. Therefore there are many gods. If you see that the divine is one, you know that there must be one god.

2

Paganism is something you all have. You are pagans in many respects. All your department thinking, that something is a biological fact, and the other is a psychological fact, that's all paganism. All what you call your departmentalization. That's the modern form of polytheism.

You all are polytheists.

Something is true in medicine. Something else is true in religion. On Sundays you believe one thing. On Saturday another thing. In Smith, one thing, in Dartmouth, another. And on it goes. In your family, something else again.

Most of you are pagans.

3

What is paganism, gentlemen?

It's departmentalization. It is the splitting up of the universe, according to the accident of space or time in one thing, and then you move elsewhere -- another time it's different.

Most men today are polytheists. There are very few people who believe in one god. It's so cheap today to say, "believe in God." The deists, the philosophical believers, allegedly on God: they don't believe in one god. They believe just in one world; but they don't believe in one god at all.

They have the double standard of truth, which you have abolished allegedly in sex, exists in every other respect. One thing is right for Negroes, and one thing is right for white men, and one thing is right for Jews, and one thing is right for Christians, and on it goes.

4

To believe in one god, gentlemen, is an act which you have to daily perform.

It doesn't help you to say, "I believe in one god." I want to see it.

IV WE CANNOT LIVE BY AGREEMENT

1

And the Greeks were pagans. And therefore they broke in parts. And every school had a different ideal, and a different wall around it. And you either had to be an Aristotelian or a Platonist, later on.

2

What I'm driving at, is that for us the unity of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle is the miraculous thing, not the difference. There is a contrast in the teaching of Aristotle and Plato, to be sure.

Plato believed in ideas, and Aristotle did not. Plato believed that before man is born, there is already the eternal good, beautiful and true somewhere in Heaven. And that we all are only the special editions, the particular editions of this universal idea of a man, a good man, or the idea of a lion. These are his eternal ideas.

As we shall see, Aristotle rejected this.

This is a very minor matter that he rejected it. Of course, two people will never agree on everything.

Why should they? That's the question.

3

The assumption of pure philosophy, of misunderstood philosophy is that all people should agree on all things. And that is the besetting sin of Plato's politics, that he thinks that in a city, all men should agree on everything.

But they couldn't live if this were so. It is part of our life, gentlemen, that we disagree. We cannot live by agreement. It's nonsense. We must live by contrast. I mean, a marriage in which husband and wife always agree would go to pot after half a year. The whole interest in marriage is that the people disagree. You can come to an agreement, but there has to be a struggle. If you agree, just don't marry. That's homosexuality.

4

Homoerotic is when equals love each other. But real love loves a person of absolutely different mind. That's just the incentive to him and her. It's the only way you can penetrate a girl is that you marry her although she is a sweet idiot. Or vice versa.

V HAYDN, MOZART, BEETHOVEN THE MIRACULOUS UNITY

1

Now the philosophical idea was that you had to agree on everything. That this was an ideal state.

If we brush aside, gentlemen, this presumptuousness of philosophy that men should be like mathematicians, be able to figure out the world so that everybody had to agree with everybody else on everything, there is still this miracle of the sequence of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle as a meaningful sequence producing something in unity which not one of them represents by himself.

2

You can see it in music, in our history of music between Mozart, Haydn and Beethoven. That obviously the three together are a greater achievement of the human spirit than any one of these three geniuses by themselves. You can't have the Ninth Symphony without the Jupiter Symphony of Mozart. And yet the Jupiter Symphony of Mozart had nothing to do in itself, it seems, with the Ninth Symphony.

This happens in great periods -- you have the same thing in Spenser and Shakespeare and their contemporaries, Ben Jonson, that a number of people are needed to constellate. And the real miracle, obviously, is the constellation.

And this is not in our books.

3

I read yesterday a book on Beethoven, a very good book, as a matter of fact, a very famous book, by Riezler, and -- it's a German book -- it's a fruit of 40 years of work with Beethoven.

There are two things which I do not approve of, which disappointed me. There is not this unity seen in the whole work of Beethoven. Every work is analyzed, and very well analyzed, and very wisely analyzed, but nowhere is it said that the great miracle of Beethoven is his life work of 133 operas.

And that that is the miracle, that you could write one quartet after another, and one symphony after another, and one sonata after another.

What do I care for the individual sonata? There are too many to enjoy this in a book. What I would like to read in a book on Beethoven is the unity of this effort.

That's much harder to express, gentlemen, because the title page says "Sonata, Number So" -- and you go on to another, and you say you can leave one sonata out of your mind and go up over to the other.

4

The same is true, of course, with Plato's dialogues. You can like one of the dialogues. I'm not interested here in this classroom with the individual dialogue. I'm interested in Plato. Therefore I have to try to show that all his work forms a miraculous unity.

VI THE FINITE SEQUENCE OF POSSIBILITIES

1

Now we take one further step.

In Beethoven, obviously, it is more interesting to figure how Mozart, Haydn -- or Haydn, Mozart perhaps -- that's a better sequence, and Beethoven form one unique musical constellation. Like *Child's Wain in the sky*.

And how the same way Socrates, Plato and Aristotle are much more important because they are three in one.

I could add some others, like Theophrastus or Xenophon, or so, and even form a galaxy of such bright stars in the sky of Greek philosophy.

2

But with Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, it seems to me, the unity is overwhelming for this reason, gentlemen: that although they live after each other, one after another in our understanding, they fill a space in three different places of this space, of this realm of thought, which are eternal, which had to be occupied. It is as though one man who writes poetry pushes the other in another direction.

Has anybody read the poem by Milton about Shakespeare? Who knows it? Can you tell me? What does Milton say?

(*About Shakespeare wrote his own mind { }*.)

Does nobody know it by heart? Gentlemen, who goes for writing? Nobody here?

Gentlemen, anybody who writes should learn this by heart, because it's the comfort of the successor of the *epikoron*, of the later comer. It's a deep sigh in which Milton complains that Shakespeare has taken away all place for him, all liberty. That's the real greatness of the poem, gentlemen. And it's already preoccupied.

What do you do if you come after Raphael and Michelangelo? You have to paint abstract. What do you do if you come after -- yes, of course. I pity these people.

3

Hindemith said to me -- the famous composer, here in this town - he said to me, very charmingly -- he's a very charming man, you have heard of Hindemith? He has written nothing for the trumpet - he said to me, "I'm up with Mozart. I can write any Mozart sonata myself. I have to write atonal just to keep awake. I go to sleep with Mozart. This is too boring. After 150 years of Mozart, I can't hear it anymore. That's all given away."

4

So these people are driven into a corner. Don't think that atonal music is arbitrary.

On the other hand, don't think it's beautiful. It is just an act of despair.

The same with abstract painting. The world has been given away. It has been done. You can't repeat it, the performance.

Who tells you that there is an infinity of possibilities? There is a finite sequence of possibilities. Once they are exhausted, they are exhausted.

VII WE CANNOT BE ORIGINAL

1

This is very serious, gentlemen. You have to understand these artists. They want to be real artists; that is, they have to offer something new. But there are so many innovations that have been used up. Out they go. Harmony has been used up.

2

You see it in Epicurus and Lucretius and the Stoa. Anything that had to do with the concrete single city had been done by Aristotle. He wrote 158 different cities. You

don't find in Epicurus or in the Stoics any interest any longer in the individual city-state. It's over with. That has been done. Can't repeat the performance.

That's why the Stoics, as we said, were cosmopolitan, and the Epicureans were private. That was the two ways out of the achievement that already was done.

3

And there you see, gentlemen, you think, "History is bunk." But Greek philosophy can show you what it is. It is the taking possession of potential steps of the mind. Once this is done, it is done.

The history of the Greek mentality is a complete story of the human mind. You cannot think one idea and one thought, gentlemen, as a philosopher, and as a circumstance of generalization and universal systematic thinking, which has not been thought in Greece. We cannot be original. We can only be original in patching together different thoughts.

4

I think I am very original, gentlemen. I had many new ideas. But that's why I don't stop to be a philosopher. I'm a sociologist now, because there is still a field where something new can be thought.

But not in this physis business, in this business of a general world of one space and one time as the Greeks' mind was fumbling with, or thinking for.

VIII *ASK THE OUTSIDER*

1

Well, if you understand, gentlemen, that every thought the Greeks took is a final conquest of some possibility of the human mind, it is very important that we should ask ourselves what Socrates, what Plato and Aristotle together have conquered or occupied forever, why any one of us who mentions philosophy has to know a little bit of Socrates, a little bit of Plato, and a little bit of Aristotle, because they come back in us when we think. And therefore, we don't have to repeat their effort, if we make them evident to us; it's simpler.

2

So I already put on the blackboard once before these figures. only to remind you, Socrates dies in 399; Plato dies in 347; and if the same age had been reached by

Aristotle, it would have been 304. That is not quite it. Socrates was 70. Plato was 80. And this man was 60 when he died.

But in order to compare, it is quite wise to see that the years of their deaths cover a whole century.

3

Now this one century of Greek philosophy places Socrates at the point of questioning the questioner, the asker. You remember I insisted that you should see that the Socratic system is not the schoolboy idea.

In America, where all schoolboys think they are philosophers and treat all philosophers as schoolboys, you always mistake the Socratic method with the schoolboy method.

But Socrates doesn't ask children, and he is not a child that asks questions. But he asks the sophists, he asks them to question everything. That is, a new system of questioning the questioner. That is, questioning the troublemaker, asking the man who disturbs the cult of the city and the laws of the city, the unity of the city - ask the outsider.

4

You can put it in the terms of Mr. Colin Wilson today, who wrote this book, *The Outsider*, this collection of fragments. You can take his expression and say, "Socrates is the outsider for the outsiders." He asks the outsiders.

All the heroes of his dialogues are philosophers, are scientists, are lawless people, or whatever they are -- sophists; they are outsiders. They are people who have already asked themselves.

IX DOUBTING THE DOUBT

1

Now. So Socrates brings the individual anarchist, gentlemen, back into the fold of a common tradition of thinking. Without Socrates, there would be not a history of Greek philosophy, but scatterbrains; one in Syracuse, and one in Miletus, and one in Crete, and one in Athens, and one in Sparta would have his own philosophy. As they had in the 5th century.

2

I haven't mentioned all of them, like Empedocles. You find them in Mrs. Freeman's book. The erratic people who starts something. Socrates is the first -- I couldn't say brain trust, that would be obviously wrong, because there's nothing of a trust in him. But he is the brain for the brains.

I don't know how to express this. He invites all the people who have something to say, -- where do they lead? what does this lead to? is it good? are they responsible in their criticism, in their doubt?

3

So doubting the doubt, gentlemen, it seems to me is perhaps at this moment a valuable interpretation of Socrates. You hear so much about doubt and about intellectual curiosity, and it is all so flimsy and so cheap, gentlemen.

Intellectual curiosity is worth nothing. And doubt in itself is also worth nothing. We are forced to doubt. That's very painful. And the place of doubt is the return into life. We have to doubt enough to restore the goodness of our existence. Doubt is necessary. And a man who cannot face doubt is a coward.

But just to recommend doubt as a pleasure, that's wrong. It is not a pleasure to doubt. And in this country, all the parts of the mental life are treated as so arbitrary, they are recommended as "fun."

Gentlemen, I can do nothing for fun.

4

Yesterday, a young lady said to me, she was so overwhelmed when she found that her parents, when she was already 70 still had fun with each other, because she found them handing each other's heads. I would have liked to slap this lady in the face, to call the sacred love between her parents "fun." That's not fun.

That's a great story that after 18 years of marriage you feel really then this is a great thing that you have this other person. Is that fun, gentlemen?

It's a sacrament.

X *INDISPENSABLE DOUBT*

1

Don't reduce therefore all these things to nothingness by calling Socrates the eternal doubter. His discipline is that he makes the doubter aware where he doubts, in what context he doubts, what it should lead to, to doubt. This is then much more positive, but much more difficult.

And that is the grandiose scheme under which he lived and died, that he should coerce the whole doubting community, to see what they do when they doubt. Then they also teach us how to proceed in such doubt, once it is made fruitful.

2

But please take this from this course, gentlemen: don't mistake the schoolchild for a philosopher, and the common-sense man for a philosopher, and the philosopher for a schoolboy, and Socrates for one of these quiz kids, which is by and large the mental state of this country, that quite a different level in the higher power is squared off with the childishness of a man who like my two-year-old grandson all the time asks questions, because he is afraid to be left out in the cold otherwise, from the rest of the family.

3

The second -- gentlemen, that's an eternal necessity. Here you are. Your questions must be channelized. They must be made fruitful. They must be pressed into the service of the future.

And that's Socrates' merit of the treatment of the question. The question which he only deigns to let pass and which he purifies and which he sets up is the question that, if unanswered, jeopardizes, endangers the future of the city, of mankind, you can say today.

That's something glorious, gentlemen. That's a problem of purifying the question, and only letting those questions stand that are of the superior order of - what do you say in English?--of life value? I mean value for the regeneration of life, I mean, valuable, I mean, necessary. Not sales value, but the opposite, value without which -- "indispensable" perhaps is the best word.

They are indispensable.

3

So the indispensable doubt, that's Socrates.

I think that's quite a good term to describe what I have tried to tell you about it. It's not doubt in itself, but indispensable doubt.

This is not Plato's manner. I said to you, Socrates asks for the better.

Plato asks for the best.

His best city is the absolute, is an attempt to put men under the stars of eternity. It is not this doubt at this moment, in order to find the better. But it is absolute order. What is the order for which we are created in all, forever, always, without change?

Aristotle sees and overlooks the world in a different manner, gentlemen.

He takes the Socratic doubt for investigation.

He keeps it. He keeps also the idea of the best and then he compares what we have. That's why he's called a realist.

When he writes these 158 constitutions, of which we only have one volume, on Athens, that has been found as a papyrus in 1892, and we are very lucky to have at least one of these books, he measures in a concrete, particular, the specific, as against the best thing, of which he gives a theory in his Politics, where he has this mixed-government idea, that you should have a government mixed out of democracy, aristocracy and monarchy,

as we have it in America, here Mr. Nixon is the crown prince, represents the monarchical element; the judiciary represents the aristocratic element; and the House of Representatives the demagogical element.

4

Any government, gentlemen, of the Christian era is a mixed government. It is not true that America is simply a democracy. It's just the accent on democracy. But without the common law of England, and without the judiciary and without the fight of Marshall for the Supreme Court, and his right to test the constitutionality of laws, we would have a mob rule. You cannot deduce this judiciary from the democratic principles. It's an aristocratic principle.

XI CRITICAL, IDEALISTIC; REALISTIC ATTITUDE

1

And the sooner you learn this, gentlemen, that the United States also have a mixed constitution, the sooner you will understand the slogans of this country as in great danger of killing us.

America can only win the Cold War against Russia if it insists that it is not a democracy of the 19th century brand, which the Russians had every right to supersede, but that we have a mixed government and that therefore we can laugh about the dictatorship of the proletariat, because in wartime, we have also the necessary dictatorship of the our chief of executive.

2

Dictatorship at times is inevitable, is indispensable. It's absolutely indispensable.

Out of the blue, Mr. Roosevelt, without any money, with anybody knowing it, spent \$2 billion on the atom, and half a billion dollar on Mr. Donovan's cloak-and-dagger organization. That has to be in wartime. I am very grateful that we did.

But that's dictatorship. And fortunately you can't win a war without dictatorship. If you try to, you get the United Nations.

The sooner you see that's Aristotle's, that's Plato's insight: mixed government is the best. And so he could write on 158 governments in the light of his best insight.

3

So if you have the world as it is, the commonsense world of yours, Dartmouth College, et cetera, there are three philosophical attitudes:

better, which means --how did I call it?-- indispensable criticism, indispensable doubt;

best, the creative power of our mind, or of our imagination -- of our hope, of our own;

and then you can have in Aristotle *the sound judgment about the existing order*.

4

Now that would be the *critical* attitude, gentlemen. That would be the *idealistic* attitude. And this would be the *realistic* attitude.

XII CONVERSATION

1

Now Socrates and Plato and Aristotle, they develop one after the other, and you can't have one without the other.

Aristotle's realism is not your realism. What you consider a fact is a prejudiced fact. That's just common sense. That is - it cannot be judged, because you are inside of it, and you have no judgment.

You have neither gone through the critical doubt, nor through the wish to have the best; you have not desired, you have not hoped, and you have not looked back and said, "How does my hope -- my criticism compare to the reality?"

And therefore you cannot judge the reality with regard to its abuses and its uses. What is good and what is bad in the reality you cannot know from the inside -- would be Aristotle's claim.

2

(What is the relationship of the way you use the word "logos" to the meaning that Aristotle uses in his works? Same meaning?)

The word "logos" is untranslatable. And therefore I use it in order to shock you out of your idea that you understand what I'm talking about.

You must first notice that you don't understand it.

We have killed this by the idea of thought. Where you think that you first think, then you speak, gentlemen, this is not true. We have taught you to speak, and most of the words you say are repetitions of things you have heard. You can refrain from saying on something that you have heard. You can modify by thinking your speech.

But thinking is not preceding speaking. You could not think if you hadn't learned to speak. Every thought is in words. And if it isn't, it is hazy.

And thinking is nothing but talking to oneself. It's a dialogue within oneself. It's a conversation you carry on inside of yourself. And as long as you believe that thinking precedes speaking, there's no understanding of the word "logos."

3

Logos in the Greek tragedy is conversation, is dialogue. And for Heraclitus, the same. For Heraclitus the word "logos" - the logos which dominates the world, the

word logos in the gospel of St. John – is the conversation which God carries on with Himself.

Richard Wagner has said of the Ninth Symphony, of the last movement -- who has heard the Ninth Symphony? Good, then we can play with this.

I just read in this book on Plato that Goethe expressed his admiration in these words: "When you hear the coming-up of the melody on joy, it is as though God-Father and God-Son had talked to each other before creation, before human language was created, in the depths of their divinity, so primeval is this melody."

4

Well, gentlemen, that's the logos. The logos is conversation, creative conversation. And since you ask me the question, I have to make -- that's sidestepping my own question. But frankly perhaps you're entitled to an answer, and perhaps it helps you others, too.

XIII LOGIC

1

Logic is the attempt to treat the logos as a part of physis. That is, what you call "logic," gentlemen, a syllogism, all the wonderful forms -- who has taken a course in logic?

Well, don't do it. Logic is the dead part of the logos. It is the repetitive part of the logos.

All logical conclusions, the logical things are the things that can be foretold: all men are mortals; Socrates is a man; therefore, Socrates must die. That's a typical, logical conclusion.

2

Not one of my lectures, gentlemen, is built this way, as you very well know. Yes, but I represent the logos to you, and not the logic. And the logos is the power of the truth to reach you, gentlemen.

And it is not the repetitive process by which you can prove that 2 and 2 is 4. That's logic.

3

In this country people think that the whole mental process should be caught in the strait-jacket of logic. But logic is only the dead part of the logos, that which has already been thought before and therefore now can be reproduced.

Unfortunately, my logos is still alive. I am not dead, gentlemen. And you demand a dead mind. That is, in a dead mind, the logical processes can run off mechanically. You can repeat them ad infinitum.

4

Mathematics -- lower arithmetic, at least, geometry are the lower parts of the logos, because they deal with dead things. Of you and to you, gentlemen, I cannot talk logically. I must talk sense. If I want to convince you what profession to choose, gentlemen, I must not deduce anything logical, but it must make sense to you.

In which way I achieve this is left to my creative effort, and your creative listening. Quite obviously it doesn't make any more sense to you, when I convince you by arithmetic, or when I convince in some other way, by a simile, by an analogy, by an example.

There are a thousand ways in which a man can be convinced.

XIV HOW THE EXISTENCE OF GOD IS PROVED

1

If you read Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, you find a very good display of his insight into this higher logic of eloquence. Any good speaker knows that, he gains his audience not by logic, but by applying to the whole man, to every mental faculty in you, in all imagination, in all the emotions, everything.

No, the relation of logos and logic is such, gentlemen, that for the last hundred years in the western world, logic has replaced logos. That's the story of the last 150 years.

2

When you read Marx, or when you read Hegel, or when you read the English logicians like Bradley, these poor people thought that the logos was restricted to logic. But logic is only the predictable part of the logos, that which already has been used, has occurred, that which therefore can simply be repeated.

And that to me is very uninteresting.

3

Of course, I can prove to you that 2 and 2 is 4; but I won't waste my time on this. That's for children. Logic to me is child's play. What you call "logic," gentlemen, is that element of the logos which every child can immediately apply himself to. Any man in high school, any boy in high school can use logical rules, how to prove a point.

But that's not the way -- how the existence of God is proved to you, my dear people.

I have to prove to you that I believe in God.

4

How I state this, I may not have to say one word. You just realize that I do. And I hope that makes an impression. Otherwise, I am lost. By any argument, I cannot prove the existence of God. If I try, I am a fool.

Because God we call that power which is always alive, always ahead of us, never repeats Himself, and therefore if I would try to prove God's existence by argument, I would condemn Him to be dead, and to belong to the past and to be just a thing. And I could talk of God then as "it."

XV LET THERE BE LIGHT

1

So I only obey the orders of God if I treat Him as very much more alive than you and I are. If He is more alive than you and I, I cannot prove him by logical argument, because logical argument is known argument. But He is unknown, gentlemen.

Or you don't believe in God, if you don't think that God is still unknown.

2

It's very serious, gentlemen.

The same is true about the United States. If you love this country, you cannot prove by argument that you must be a patriot. If you don't give the United States an unknown future, a grand future far beyond all reasoning, you cannot prove any love of country. It cannot be proven.

And yet, that doesn't mean that -- the less it can be proven, the more hope is there that it is alive. And that I can convey to you the beauty of the potential of this country.

3

So -- make a distinction, and that's my answer to you.

First of all, logic is not logos. Logic is that part of the logos that already can be traced, retrieved and traveled over again and again, because it is already dead. It is that part of the logos that has already been incarnate, embodied and done with.

When God said, "Let there be light," gentlemen, the logos is in action. Something imaginative, a tremendous creation takes place. Today, the solar system is already on its way, getting cold and colder. And therefore you can now use physics for that which once came into being by the logos. Now it's there, it's embodied. Embodied things -- the deader they are, the more easily can they be proved and examined by argument, and logic.

4

In this sense, gentlemen, this famous sentence, "Socrates is a mortal, therefore he must die," is only a half-truth, because we still speak of Socrates as very much alive in this very moment.

Therefore: logic says he's dead. But the logos says he is not. Now what's true?

Both are true. As far as his physical existence goes, he had to die. As far, however, as his immortal part goes, he has not died.

XVI THE LIVING LOGOS

1

Why should we talk about him every day all over America? That's a fact. We don't mention a dead donkey who died 3,000 years ago. But we do speak of Socrates. How did he do it?

Because the syllogism of the logic: that *all men must die, and therefore Socrates is a man and therefore he must die*, is only a half-truth. Because as carrier of our divinity, as carrier of the logos, the syllogism isn't pertinent. It's just not true.

You and I keep Socrates alive. And therefore, we deny that he's mortal.

2

(Sir, -- I've seen quite often that Aristotle is discovered in the 13th century in Europe and with the organization of theology, that is, that his logic was applied to the best theological material that accumulated, and was classified. Well, in this sense, in the utilitarian sense, it is useful. Well, isn't that true? The theology was not dead material, really; but it's reoriented the theological argument so that Aquinas could { }.)

Oh, you want to save the serviceability of logic.

Certainly, Sir, gentlemen. I think everybody today praises logic, and says, "Be logical," and he wants you to say something very stupid, then -- so I have to talk against logic as something cheap.

3

I don't say that it isn't necessary. I don't say that it isn't useful.

But I say it is cheap. It has very little to do with philosophy in the higher sense. That you must understand, because it only deals with the dead part of the universe. And at this moment, a defense of logic is all right with me, but it wouldn't be however in place here in this context. I have nothing against using logic.

We shall see immediately that part of Aristotelian logic is far superior to what is called "logic" today. And I think that was useful.

4

So we may use this.

Gentlemen, the logos that is poured out in Socrates, in Plato and Aristotle is the living logos. One asking the skeptical question, or what you call, "critical question," the other raising the standard of the ideal, and the third making the judgment -- apply the criticism and the ideals to reality: you see immediately that the logos is above the individual, that this one logos disperses, as a spectrum of colors disperses the light, in these three brains, in these three geniuses, in these three great men.

XVII THE GREAT LABYRINTH OF HUMAN SOLIDARITY

1

I think that is something to be admired.

And philosophy is admiration, or it is nothing. It is astonishment. And I'm astonished that once, in the history of the human mind, in the last 10,000 years on

this earth, in one century, the three possible steps of any mental process -- doubt, laying down the law of the highest standard, and then measuring all the facts in nature and politics by this standard -- that this has once been united as one process.

2

To me, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle form one person. That's my trinity, my human trinity.

And if you want to understand the divine Trinity, you better study this unity first in Socrates, in Plato and Aristotle, to understand that the Trinity is not a superstition, gentlemen.

It is the admirable experience of the universe, that we, poor mortals, cannot have in one moment the whole story. And you could think of a man, like Socrates or Plato or Aristotle, being all three during his lifetime. First, a critic -- and then an idealist, and then a realist.

But it is much more merciful for you and me that we have this great right now to rest on the three names -- a boon for us that these three men were good enough to remain separate.

If one man had run through the whole gamut, we wouldn't be able to recognize this.

3

I have a friend who is a biologist and who for 30 years has fought this thesis, gentlemen, that every phase of the life cycle, of the story of the species on this earth is to be lived out by one person.

I had a discussion with one of you the other day -- who was it? -- on this topic. That anything that is in you as 5 percent or 1 percent, has to be lived out as a whole man in some form so that you can get hold and master your own 1 percent.

That what is in Kierkegaard, gentlemen, for example, is in every one of us a little bit. The poor man was nailed down on his cross of being just Søren Kierkegaard. That is, something that is a passing mood in any one of us became flesh in him as a whole person, in order that we can get hold of this 1 percent in us, which otherwise would go unnoticed and just cause a ripple.

4

This is the great labyrinth, gentlemen, of the human solidarity. What we have as one-percent in our blood, takes shape in one person. And the larger the person lives, the

greater his importance, like Van Gogh, or Gauguin, or whoever you take, anybody, Christ Himself, included, the more we can master our own destiny.

You need these people around you, so that the criminal in you, and the genius in you, and the idiot in you, and the son in you, and the father in you, the brother in you, the lover in you - that they can become aware of what is inside of you. The rascal in you.

XVIII

1

Once you see this, gentlemen, you gain quite a different perspective in the human history. Human history is exactly a creation of species as biology, only it's made serviceable. The animals don't serve each other. We do.

2

Every great man whose name I have mentioned here, gentlemen, has something to tell you about some niche and nook in your undiscovered corner. You are much richer than you know. You are all sound asleep. Perhaps you never wake up.

Most Americans go to their grave after having traveled seventy and one hundred thousand miles, and after having eaten all the vitamins in the world, by the kilo, by the pound, and having never discovered themselves and all their own potentiality.

But for you it's all external movement, Cadillac, or what-not. But real people, gentlemen, love these names, because these names, they are all you: Socrates and Plato and Aristotle are in you yourself.

3

And why I say this is, gentlemen, that you must understand the economy of salvation, the economy of our human history is that if Socrates had also been Plato, and Plato had also been Aristotle, at one time in their life, they wouldn't affect you. There would be confusion.

The very patience of our creator is that He creates elephants and oxen and lions, so that alternately you can be an oxen, a lion, and an elephant. But if one animal was all three, the human species wouldn't benefit.

Let us have a break here.

I QUESTION - IDEA - CATEGORY

1

...gentlemen, we now come to the logos in Aristotle, gentlemen.

When you speak of a realist, you make the same error very easily as you do when you think that Socrates just asked silly question, "Is there a god?" like any school-child. Or: "How are the children born?" or you confuse question and Question.

I tried to tell you that Socrates asks on quite a higher plane: the meaning of any question, that's his question.

Now the same is true about Aristotle's realism. And what I'm going to tell you now is the story of the so-called categories.

2

You have heard the word "category," and you know that if you put a man in a category, it's very dangerous. You categorize a man, and he is out forever. He's just a controversial person.

If you want to get rid here in this country of a man, you say, "He's controversial," which should be a great honor, but it doesn't help him at all.

3

So gentlemen, what's a category?

Aristotle is the father of the categorizing. He invented this term, "category," just as Plato invented the word "ideas."

And perhaps you put this down:

the Socratic question, the Platonic idea and the Aristotelian category

can remind you of the essential unity of this process by which there came to be first Socrates, then Plato and then Aristotle.

4

And that's the unity, as I told you, that I wanted to make important for you. And therefore, we have still to pin down Aristotle on his return to reality. Plato and Socrates have taken man outside reality, outside the city of Athens, to be sure. Socrates

dies for this, and Plato goes into the Academy, the grove -- beyond the walls, the precincts of Athens.

II WHICH, WHERE, WHAT, HOW MANY, WHEN

1

Aristotle now comes back to the city of man, to the cities of man, to the plants, to the animals, to the poems. And he says, "I shall now apply what I have learned from Socrates and Plato, by laying down the rule, how we have pincers to pick up reality."

That's the category.

The categories, gentlemen, are the ways of the mind to meet any reality.

2

I've tried to categorize reality in my book, *The Multiformity of Man*. That's a categorical book. I have tried to discover that all men are either treated as duals, or as singulars, or as plurals, or as infinite.

Who has read the book, *The Multiformity*? Well, so I can't use it as an example for most of you.

But to categorize, in Aristotle means something so simple that you may wonder what there is special.

3

He says that if I want to deal with, let us say, a lion, I have to ask, *how many* -- singular or plural? -- and thereby already predicate what I'm asking for. I cannot invent this. It's either plural or singular. Perhaps dual. But you have to fall into one of the categories. You can't leave it indefinitely.

You have to ask *which* lions? That is, African lions, Asiatic lions.

You have to ask "*where*"?

You have to ask "*when*?" Lions in prehistory, lions in the Christian era, lions at this moment, lions in the future.

So when-ness is a question, is a category. When-ness. So - the *quando*, when, is an eternal category of the human mind. And if I want to fully understand anything, I must be able to give it its date. Without the date, the fact is not in.

4

The where, the when, the how many, the what-action, what does it do?--and there has been a debate, and still is going on: how many of these final categories exist?

III THE MOST INGENIOUS RETURN TO REALITY

1

Has anybody his book on Aristotle here, by any chance? There is in the preface a list of these categories. And we better leave this. I think it's page Roman xxxi, or xxvi, something like that. You can look in the index under "category."

No, that's the other introduction. { } are Mr. Wheelwright's { }. Do you have it? Ja, very good.

Aristotle distinguishes 10 types, and that has been debated. Later people have thrown out two of them.

2

*The first is its specific thing-ness, its **essence**.*

*The second thing is its **quantity**.*

*The third, its **quality**: warm, or hot, cold, or green.*

*Its **relatedness**. Where do you find it?*

*In which **connection**?*

Lions probably in a jungle, or in a zoo.

*Its **place**,*

*its **time**,*

*its **position** of posture. That has been debated. Vertical and horizontal. Such things. They may not be fundamental.*

*What it **possesses**, that is, adjectives, gray line, great line, big line, such things.*

*And in what way is it **active**? That's the verb that goes with it: a lion roars.*

As you know from the *Midsummer Night Dream*: there is nothing but roaring, and it is the lion. And in what way it is being passively affected.

These are the categories, the 10 ways in which anything can be said to be.

3

Gentlemen, this is the most ingenious return to reality. The man who is immersed by common sense and reality is not aware that he always says, "the state," but in fact he always means the plural of states.

The categories are very important, gentlemen, in all political doctrine, for example.

Any boy who goes in Europe to school, is taught something about the state. But if you go to Holland, and in Belgium, it is very wise to teach the children that there are several states in relation to each other, and Holland is only there because there is Belgium, and Belgium is only there because there is Holland.

That is, the categories can teach you that an alleged singular is really predicated on a plural, that it is only among many states, "civilized states" as we call them, or nations today, the individual nation has any standing.

4

Nationalism has identified the singular of "nation" with existence.

And nationalism is a lack of categorization. The world of states is one world of states, or the world of nations. And our United Nations, they are a desperate attempt to bring home to the French, and the English, and the Americans, and the Russians that they cannot judge the world from their nation outward, that they have to see their nation as being inside a world of nations in the plural.

IV *THE DANGER OF NATIONALISM*

1

This is an Aristotelian category, because the word "nation" was invented as a plural. And the singular of "nation" is quite artificial. And anybody who says that he is only part of a nation, and denies that this nation is part of the society of nations, or the unity of nations, or a world of nations, is living under a fiction, because the United States came into being into a world of states by a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

Therefore, the United States added only one new nation to the existing nations.

2

That's very difficult logic for you. You think that any man has the right to decide whether he should treat "nation" as a singular or as a plural. Today, the whole world is in flames, because this hasn't been decided. The category of "nation" naively sometimes has been interpreted as "nations."

The "Gentiles," as the Jews call it, and your own nation as "Zion." And then you see what happens: Zion against the Gentiles.

3

Now every church people sing about their own nation "Zion". Jerusalem, the golden one, et cetera. That is, we all treat our nation as the messianic kingdom. And the other nations as the Gentiles.

Very dangerous practice.

4

It has to do with the category of number 2, its quantity. If you know that the word "nation" should always be used in the plural, that's the way out. Then you are safe.

That's why the word "United Nations" is quite hopeful, if you learn what it means.

But you have to study Aristotle in order to understand what it means.

V *THE MINIMUM (LIBYA AND THE SOVIET UNION)*

1

It means that the plural, "nations," precedes logically any one-nation structure.

2

That's why we can impose, and must impose on Libya, or on Saudi Arabia that it has a parliament, and has some human rights. Otherwise it isn't a nation. They can call themselves a nation, as long as they want.

But Mr. Mandaville, Saudi Arabia is not a nation to this day, and probably never will be. It will just be oil, and Mr. Mandaville. But that's all. It is not a nation. However, if you import into these poor people's heads the notion that they can be a nation from

the inside out, without fulfilling their requirements that go with the nations of this world, we get into very great trouble, as we do now with Russia.

Same thing.

3

({ } the case today, the nations are actually countries, the people who live in a geographic area { } the Wahabi, the Wahabi sect of Islam. Now most of them believe in Wahabism because they all have the same { }. { } Wahabi sect religion. Is that not enough to make it a nation?)

No. I do think that for a civilized nation, there must be a certain degree of religious liberty. That is, if you have a state cult, it's not a nation. That's an old pagan state -- if Athens has its own temples, and you can't be an Athenian if you do not worship the gods of the city, it couldn't be a nation. I mean, you must allow in any modern nation that a man cannot be forced to pray to gods that are not his own.

I think there is a minimum. I resent very much that your oil company has a green flag over its camp there: "Allah is great, and Mohammed is his prophet." That's bad *Dollarica*, you know. That can't be done. That's a sin, Sir.

4

It's very serious, because you allow then as an American, who has founded the United Nations, the fiction that Americans will for the dollar sell out their own Christian faith, their freedom of religion in other words, because it's better business.

The English have not done this, Sir. But only the Americans.

It is terrible. It's high treason.

(And then you would say that Russia wasn't really a nation.)

Oh, they say it themselves. That's why they have given up the word "Russia" in the title of USSR. They are quite aware. They fight nationalism.

They certainly are not a nation. They don't want to be. They are the Soviet Union of Soviet Republics.

That's very serious with them. It takes some courage to drop your own country's name. The name "Russia" is not in the title of the government which Mr. Khrushchev represents. Have you never thought about that? That's a tremendous thing.

VI FRAGMENTS OF A WHOLE

1

Now, the categories, gentlemen, bring us now to the question of the universals.

Since Aristotle is able to the abuse of terms by his categories, for example, when "nation" must be used in the plural, and in the singular. I recommend this to you as one of the deepest insights today. It's much better than all semantics, Sir.

2

Somebody talked to me about semantics -- who was it? --in the intermission? Ja.

No semanticist has even grasped, that Aristotle knew much more. They use the same term, but tell me whether you use it, as fundamentally and existentially plural or singular.

The same problem is true about man. You say "man" is unequivocal. It isn't, gentlemen. If m-e-n is older than m-a-n, the result would be quite different, from your individualism, where you treat Robinson Crusoe as the normal human being, as all physicists and all scientists seem to do. They start with one.

I start with all. I say "all" when asked -- they have solidarity. I can only understand you because you are your mother's son, and I have to include in my humanity your mother. Just because I meet you.

3

I see a qualification in the use of the word "man," which the man who only sees the visible, what's in front of him, doesn't see.

The same is true of the nations. I see that the nation is a very painful process, gentlemen, in Christendom they have sprung up one after the other, always talking to each other, always relating what they did to the competition of their neighbor.

So I cannot explain a Frenchman without knowing something about the British; I cannot explain the British without knowing something about the German. Shakespeare is German, a German influence in England, because German drama made it -- the German Reformation did it. And on it goes.

That is, the nations are fragments of a whole, of mankind. And men, the same way.

4

These are the serious problems. And the categories of Aristotle allow you to discover, gentlemen, how to take your pincers and when you pick out seemingly only one leaf of a tree, you already decide whether you know that it's a part of the tree, or not.

VII AGAINST SOMERSAULTS OF MIND

1

Your own prejudices come clearly out.

You find a green leaf. You can treat it as a thing by itself. But if you use the categories of Aristotle, you will find out its belonging, that it has fallen down from a tree. You can't say anything correct about this leaf if you haven't seen the tree. If you do not presuppose that's part of the tree.

That's true of the nations. That's true of men. If you treat men as not a part of the tree, as not an acorn from the oak, you mistreat him. That's all.

And so liberalism has mistreated men by treating him as somebody who's uprooted, who is not sitting on a branch of the human tree.

2

You all, gentlemen, come from a century in which Aristotle has been despised. It's all a Platonic century. The natural sciences -- perhaps you take this down, gentlemen

-

the natural sciences of the last centuries have neglected Aristotle,

have despised him.

In the 16th century, there was a great man, Pierre Ramus, who said that he would pay \$10,000 -- it wasn't dollars, it was ducats, gold -- gold sovereigns -- to anybody who could prove that any sentence in Aristotle was true. So they tried to make Aristotle despicable.

3

But Aristotle is for politics, that was a time when science came to the fore, and things. And Plato's ideas seemed to be all right.

But Aristotle warns us against our own naive use of singular and plural, for example. And most political errors, like the treatment of nation, of state, of men, are predicated on these very slight tours – legerdemain -- how do you call them? - somersaults of your mind -- where you do not tell us whether you have first made acquaintance with the plural or with the singular.

4

This is Aristotle's lasting greatness: the warning from his pure philosophy, that when you step back into your own reality, your own city, your own garden, your own kitchen, you have acquired tools which allow you to treat your own backyard as though it was Madagascar.

VIII OBJECTIFYING IS ALWAYS DANGEROUS

1

Montesquieu has said he wanted to treat France as though it was as far distant as Madagascar, in his "Spirit of the Laws." That to this day has remained the Aristotelian attitude, that you can objectify the nearest of kin.

2

You all try to do it -- and it's a great thing, but you have to learn how to do it, gentlemen. The categories of Aristotle are a doctrine, or are an inventory of the mental means of getting hold of your closest part of yourself, your own prejudices, and putting them in front of you, holding them out of the window, and looking at them at a distance.

3

(Isn't this objectifying even the things closest to you as dangerous as a Platonic idea?)

It is. It is, very much so. And that's why I have always warned you against philosophy.

But at this moment, I've just to tell you what philosophy is. I mean, that's what it is. It is not the whole story. Allow me at this moment now not to criticize philosophy again. It is certainly in one direction a tremendous achievement.

4

It isn't the whole story. It doesn't help you when you have to go to war, and for your country that you have objectified its prejudices.

IX *POST REM*

1

Now gentlemen, we come to the universals.

Aristotle said, "No ideas live somewhere in the sky." The sophists, which are the enemies of all three men -- Plato, Socrates and Aristotle -- had said the mind can generalize at will. That is, if I have a donkey, and I have a lion, and I have a horse, it is my mind that says "three animals."

There are, in fact -- one is a donkey, one is a lion, and one is horse. The word "animal" is a generalization of the human mind. That is the first universal.

2

The first form of universalization or generalization, the form of universals, gentlemen, is a sophist's form. It says, "All things in reality are specific, particular. My mind generalizes arbitrarily, at random. I can call these three animals "animals". I can call them oddities. I can call them my property. I can call them my whim, or God's whim.

But I cannot be forced to generalize. They have not in themselves the power to convince my mind that I must subsume them under one common denominator."

3

And this is the story of the common denominator again.

We found that Thales of Miletus, when he said "water," was inventing the common denominator. Now we are with Aristotle and the sophists and Socrates and Plato faced with the fact: What is a common denominator? When do I have to form a common denominator? And when I can leave it.

The sophists say, "You can always leave it. It's perfectly arbitrary."

4

This first rule of universal is, gentlemen, that the universals come by the mind after the fact. The Latin word is "post rem." They come after the facts are in; then I do as I please, and after the facts. Latin, "post rem."

That is the sophistry.

X ANTE REM

1

That would show you, that you can do as you please. You say, "Here are 65 men. That I call them human beings is just a kind compliment I pay you. I don't have to mean it. I can't prove it. You can't prove it. You can't demand that I call you humans. You have no right -- no human rights, because you are just specific."

And therefore you have absolutely no claim to be treated as a part of a common denominator.

The common denominator is the mind's arbitrary decision. And everybody can make a different decision.

2

I can call you "a New Yorker." Or I can call you "an American." I can call you "a Dartmouth student." And I can alternate at random, and you cannot derive any claim from my statement so that I should be bound by it. Because you say, "But you called me a Dartmouth student. Now you have to treat me as a Dartmouth student."

"Oh," I said. "I'll just treat you as a New Yorker. And of course, as a New Yorker, you have no claim to any decent treatment."

3

Gentlemen, Plato said this, and said, "This cannot be true. Sophistry is so terrible, so arbitrary, so unjust. The just man, after what Socrates has by his inquiries made certain, must be for the good of the city. The good of the city must be eternal, it must be lasting. Therefore, my statements about what is right and wrong, and how I should call you, if you are an Athenian citizen and a human being, must be predicated from time immemorial. The world has its eternal laws of order."

4

And therefore, the idea of Plato, gentlemen, the general, the universal, the common denominator, that man must be good in order to be a man, in the true sense of the word, that means that the idea is earlier than the facts.

First, we know what a man is. The common denominator, gentlemen, precedes the particular.

Before a child is born, the parents already know that if a child is born, he has to be treated as a citizen of the divine kingdom. And therefore, the idealist says, gentlemen, that we already know before any particular happens, how the particular should be treated. It's the very opposite from the sophists.

XI A BIFURCATION OF MY MIND'S EXPERIENCE OF REALITY

1

Now gentlemen, that's very tempting. All idealism, gentlemen, says that the facts do not alter the rules, that the common denominator is already known. Before any child is born, before any mountain is discovered, we already know what a mountain is.

And therefore, the second form is, of the universals, the Platonic form, put this down:

sophistry, or skepticism, or nihilism.

2

Sophistry: the universals are arbitrary performances of the human mind after the facts are in.

Idealism: the universals are necessary before the facts are in. The true, the good, and the beautiful are always there. And that a man must be just, we can tell him before he's even born. We can call him therefore "the just". To encourage him, to fulfill his own idea of himself.

All our name-giving is idealistic. If you call yourself "Paul" and "Peter," we hope that the vestige of Paul and Peter will appear in your own personality.

So we are all Platonists when it comes to the people we love. Because you give your sweetheart of course that name which you hope is truer than she now is. She must become "Honey" if she isn't yet honey.

3

So gentlemen, the great temptation to say that the second form of the universals is the Platonic form, which is stated simply: the universal precedes the individual, the particular. It precedes it. It is eternally there. Man is man the type -- Mr. Jung, Carl Jung -- you have probably heard of him -- heard more of psychoanalysis than of anything else in your life, and it's the only field perhaps where you have noticeable information.

And so it may help you that Mr. Jung is a Platonist because of his archetypes, he has the idea that we all run through certain archetypes in our development.

I think it's a gross exaggeration, but it is the Platonic idea, that the mold of youth, and childhood, and adolescence, that this is all there expecting us. And we simply, like liquid metal, run through these molds, and cannot help it. If we don't, we are hurt.

4

Gentlemen, Aristotle gave the third form of the universal. He said that while I recognize the city of Athens as a city, I make two experiences: one of a general, and one of a specific nature. I study inside my experience of the city of Athens something general, what a city is; and something specific, what this damn city is, which is dirty, and corrupt, et cetera.

And he says, "The general and the specific are like a fork, or like a bifurcation of my experience of reality. I carry into my experience of the city of Athens these pliers, or this fork, by which I mark off what strikes me there as the lasting and that what strikes me as the transient. Or the accidental and the necessary." Or however you call it.

XII *IN RE*

1

And therefore, the third form, gentlemen, of the universals is:

the universals are contemporary with the facts.

Our mind applies in itself in order to live at all, to get going, in this twofold manner, that it gives some attention to the particular, and some attention to the general.

That's called the universals "*in re*," in Latin.

2

If you now see the argument, there are three ways of dealing with an experience, gentlemen, with what you have to categorize in order to know that you live in any real world.

You can say that I have my universal ideas before the facts. That's "*universalia ante rem*," before the thing.

Aristotle says you have the universals while you are observing in the thing, *contemporaneous with the thing*.

And the sophist would say, or the skeptic - the modern thinker of the last 300 years have all been sophists, all the natural scientists, they say, "It's arbitrary. I call this a class. I call this a species. I call this a specimen. I call this a family."

3

And let me end with the great story which happened here in Dartmouth College some time ago.

The sophists say, "*Universalia post rem*," which means that they come after this world of individual things is around us, we go out and label as we please. It's just a label.

I have heard people say, "This which I arbitrarily call God." He even wrote it down, this man. He had unlearned to blush. And he should at least have used red ink for his sentence. And it's a great sentence written by a Dartmouth student. It really predicates the end of civilization. "Which I arbitrarily call God."

That can be written down in this college, and nothing happens. Not the earth, however, gentlemen, shakes when such a thing is said. Because he treats even the "*ens realissimum*," the one great reality of all men and all times as something that he arbitrarily calls God -- that is sophistry.

That is *universalia post rem*. "It itches me, I call it arbitrarily God."

4

And many Americans do not even know that they are counted out of the realm of living speech if they ever say such a thing in earnestness, because obviously, gentlemen, the name of God can only be used in dire necessity, if you have to.

Otherwise it's blasphemy.

XIII *ARBITRARY OR NECESSARY*

1

That's what the Second Commandment says in the Bible, that you can abuse the name of God.

Now if you say "arbitrarily God," you have not only said that you have abused the name, the serious name of God, but that the name of God - it's always an abuse to use it. "Which I arbitrarily call God" means, that "God" is always an abuse of human language, the name of God. That's really the limit.

2

The author of the Ten Commandments didn't think that this could ever happen. Otherwise he would have probably said something to that end. It is remarkable. This man is dead. He can no longer be helped. I would count out this man for any creative or any important purpose in life.

3

An atheist is a great man. He fights God. He takes him seriously. But this man who says, "What I arbitrarily call God" cannot be helped, because he hasn't learned English. He cannot speak anymore.

He has curtailed the dimension of his speech, by one whole third, by the whole third of the logos, because the logos is the power to say something unheard-of, gentlemen, to say something new, with necessity, because it is true. And if I say that the power of the logos, God, is arbitrarily introduced by me, I'm no longer bowing to the spirit that moves man to discover the truth.

4

So I only mention this to show you it is a very practical question, gentlemen.

In the year of the Lord 1956, Aristotle's problem of the universal is suddenly the foremost problem of all modern philosophy. After having been dismissed as indifferent, as insoluble, as uninteresting for the last 250 years, suddenly the problem of the universals has become the burning question of botany, of biology, of psychology, as I told you, of psychoanalysis, of Mr. Jung: Is what we live, and what we think necessary? And are the terms which we use necessary? Or are they arbitrary?

Do I have to call you a human being, gentlemen, or can I deny that you are a human being? That's by and large involved in this. Do I, by approaching you, have at the same time, in other words, gentlemen, to have religion? Can I deal with anything in the universe without obeying a higher authority which compels me to acknowledge where you belong?

XIV TO SPEAK MEANS TO MAKE A CONFESSION OF FAITH

1

If I only meet John Smith and limit myself, in never saying what I mean by "John Smith," that I mean a member of the family of mankind, that would be the modern, matter-of-fact way. John Smith? No commitment.

2

You know very well that when I speak of "John Smith," I already say that he has an Anglo-Saxon name. He probably belongs to the British commonwealth, or he is a citizen of the United States, because the name is given him within a linguistic area, in which there must be nations who give him citizenship. And of course it intimidates me, the American consul may come down on me if I slap this man in the face.

So John Smith acquires immediately with his name, status. He belongs to a common denominator either of Britain, or of America, or of white men, or of Western men, or something.

3

Therefore, gentlemen, whenever I open my mouth and predicate an individual fact, whether it's an act or whether it's a fact, it's a thing or a process, it makes no difference, John Smith or the World War, Aristotle says, "I have to apply myself," as the Bible calls it, "with my whole heart, my mind, and all my powers, to place this man in the realm of the divine order."

That is, "I cannot speak of any little fragment in the universe without giving away my conviction of the appropriate order of the whole."

4

To speak means therefore to make a confession of faith. It is always an act of faith that I say of anything in this world how I'll treat it. Because by naming it, I already treat it. I give it already this place in the universe. I cannot help it.

XV THE COMMON DENOMINATORS ARE YOUR RELIGION

1

The sophist says, "Oh no. I take this little thing, and I am absolutely noncommittal about all the rest of my convictions. You can never know what I think about anything else."

That's sophistry. That's what you would like to do.

2

You hope to get away, gentlemen, by never saying anything about your religion. That's not true, gentlemen. You open your mouth, and that's your creed. Because you cannot speak of a man without already making him -- or me, the onlooker, feel what you think of mankind in general. Where they belong.

Are they children of God? Children of the devil? Atoms of nature? You cannot help expressing this right away.

3

Therefore, the problem of the universals today, gentlemen, the Aristotelian problem, is today the problem of the peace in the world. If people must, when they speak, take down their visor and show their face, then we can speak to each other. If, however, they all live on Madison Avenue, and only think that the buyer must show his face, but the advertising man does not have to, then we live in a jungle and not in a civilized society.

4

And so the problem of universals is now returning. Aristotle gave it its final twist. He showed the three possibilities. The sophist, the Platonic, or his own. and you can't get out of this.

When you speak, gentlemen, you decide over all your common denominators. And your common denominators are your religion.

Thank you.

TWENTYFIRST LECTURE: *THE SEAT FOR PHILOSOPHY IN GREECE*

I *CONDITION FOR PAPERS AND FINALS: AT LEAST TWO DIFFERENT TOPICS*

1

I'd like to say something about these papers that has also some importance for you, because we will go on from this term paper to the finals.

I shall demand from every one of you the acquaintance with one other school of thought different from the one you have treated.

2

Someone said to me that he had dealt with Aristotle because he was interested in Thomas Aquinas.

Of course, that is not a good learning of Greek philosophy if you just stay and cook further in your own stew of scholasticism. The whole problem of the history of Greek philosophy of course is that he should then deal with an opposite man. Who is the man who told me this? Pleading a very poor choice. You learn too much Aristotle already in your Thomism.

So why don't you check on this? To understand what philosophy really is, you have to know about two different schools of thought.

3

I shall then require, gentlemen, from every one of you, and the whole examination will be based on this, that you now, for the last month, when I hope you have learned what to look for in these various systems, that you deal with one other system sufficiently so that you can write in the exam about it.

Of course the exam's question will be specific. But there will be one condition attached. You will not be allowed to draw on the term paper in the sense that you just deal -- if you have dealt with the Stoa -- with the Stoics in this term paper, you cannot repeat the performance. It will have to be somebody else. And that's valid for Plato. It's valid for Aristotle. It's valid for all these gentlemen, that there will be some other knowledge necessary.

4

Also, you will bring to your class Mrs. Freeman's book.

And again, of course, the question will not be about a system of philosophy dealt with in this book. So you must take one of the later schools of thought, later philosophers, as the term paper is also aware -- and however, we will make use of this book in the examination question.

I will only give one examination question, nothing to choose from. And you will bring this text to the exam, please, to the finals. You can also take your notes, but that's dangerous, because most of them are wrong.

II PLAGIARIZING

1

So please be it understood: somebody who has worked on Plato now better look up either Pythagoras, or Democritus, or Epicurus, or the Stoa, or Aristotle, and vice versa. I don't demand a full knowledge of all the philosophers of Greece for the exam, because I hope it's more solid if you understand two.

But one is not enough.

2

May I then say something about the way you have handled this paper? I think one-fifth has done well. And then very well. The other four-fifths I think are partly scandalous. Some of you think that for a student at Dartmouth College, the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is a source of information.

Gentlemen, the encyclopedias are written so that on topics where we have no special information, we can get the sum. But it is never the source of information for a topic in which you are expected to do some work yourself. Never. It's all nonsense. It has reached this stage -- and why do you go to college? Buy the encyclopedia.

There must be a difference between an educated man and a man who owns an *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. You aren't educated because you own the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The editors of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* may then be educated, but you are not. You're just plagiarizing.

3

There are papers handed in to me, just copying the Encyclopaedia Britannica. This is too stupid for words. You can learn from any encyclopedia where to begin with your work. That's why -- if you know nothing about some topic, have never heard of it, you go to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, they give you the first idea, but not the second, and not the third.

4

So it just shows the degradation into which all college education has fallen in this country, that you do this. This idea of condensations, and finally one sentence is left. That's not an education. When to look up the Encyclopaedia Britannica on Plato or Aristotle is really the end of the world. The whole library is stacked full with books on them, from which the encyclopedia after all has just copied.

Well, is there any doubt in any one's mind? I'm very glad to enlighten him about the place of the Encyclopaedia Britannica in educated man's mind. Or education. But is there any doubt? Do you think I have treated you unjustly? Then I will be very glad to argue the point.

III TO SEE WHOLES

1

In the case of Plato, who has been treated most frequently, there is one interesting thing to remark. And it applies of course, to other philosophers as well. But it didn't become so practical, because you just didn't read the others in their original context. You just read books about them.

2

In the case of Plato, one of you has written a very long paper on Plato's Republic, going just from book to book. This is an anti-philosophical treatment, gentlemen, of any book. You cannot render the thought of a man, like Plato in his Republic by simply narrating, like an epical storyteller, the sequence of this book -- *The Republic*, which for artistic reasons and reasons of the Greek environment had to meet a certain pattern of order, of dialogue, of dramatization and of personification.

3

The first thing a man who reads a book must do, is that he begins with the last word of the book. Make this a rule, gentlemen.

Each time a thing is intellectually treated, the order of things is reversed.

If you write a book review, the first thing you must have in mind is the end of the book. Otherwise you haven't read it.

Now to plunge your reader, me, in the position that I have to wallow, like you yourself, once more through the sequence of these books of *The Republic*, is the most unphilosophical thing you can do. It shows that you don't know what philosophy is.

4

Philosophy is an attempt to see wholes, to see totalities. And you destroy this power, this possibility.

This is an absolutely worthless paper, and I'm sorry to say this, because the man was quite industrious who wrote this report. But it never dawned on him that he was showing that he had mistaken a movie and philosophy. In a movie, the things follow, and they end then with a surprise at the moment when you see the final kiss.

IV STEREOMETRICALLY

1

But gentlemen, any thought has to be conceived, comprehended. All these words mean that you have to take them together in your hand, and hold them up before you and go around them, and see them from many angles and from many sides. And with a book you can only do this if you look at it from the end and from the beginning. And even from the middle. And that's your digestion.

And so this minimum wasn't done in this case, I'm sorry to say. The man certainly didn't fulfill the requirement at all.

If I ask in a course on philosophy the statement of a philosophy, I must ask that much philosophical acumen on your part that you know what it means to think at all.

2

But this leads to a very central point. I have just published this in my *Sociology: the place of philosophy in life, the seat in life, in Greek tradition*. One of you has quoted Charmides -- who has Charmides? I had suspected him that he hadn't read it. But he quoted it.

Come on. Who quoted Charmides? C-h-a-r-m-i-d-e-s? Oh, don't -- I'll find you.

Now this is a very exciting dialogue, gentlemen, because it is the seat in life, which philosophy there is given, the reason why there are philosophers in Greece.

3

And I'm going now to speak a little more about this, after I have dealt with the papers.

The seat of life of philosophy forces you to deal with any philosophical topic or with any philosopher in such a way that you do not simply follow the external line of his argument. But that you master the subject by looking around it, by seeing it from all sides, stereometrically, so that you can begin at the end as much as the beginning.

In modern times, gentlemen, the one man who may claim that he comes nearest to a Greek philosopher has been Schopenhauer, because he is the one and only philosopher in the 19th century who wrote a decent style, a very beautiful style, as good as Plato. And Schopenhauer said to his readers in the preface of his philosophy, that he had to ask them to read the book once, and then to read it again, after they had reached the end, because otherwise he couldn't convey his thought. They first had to know the whole story, what he was driving at. And then they had to read it critically again.

4

And he said, "I am very sorry, I'm quite sure I cannot keep up with the cheap Will Durants, et cetera, and of my" -- his time, "and therefore, nobody is going to read my book. But I must say that the simple condition of reading this book is to read it twice. Because you must have reached the end before you can understand the beginning."

And if this sounds paradox, it just means that you don't know what to think means. And they tempt you to buy a book, because they promise you, you can read it in nine minutes and 10 seconds.

V THREE KINDS OF BOOKS

1

Gentlemen, you are illiterates. You have unlearned to read a real book of any difficulty. And you even disclaim your duty to read a book that is difficult.

You say, "I don't read books that are difficult." It's just a denunciation of your own stupidity, gentlemen. Only books that are difficult are worth reading. Why should you read a book that is light? Then you can go to a burlesque show right away.

2

But all your values in reading books are distorted. The whole problem of Heraclitus or of the greatest minds of Greece is that you have to think about one of these sentences 20 times before you understand how deep they are, and how wide their application is.

And so I must say, I resent these papers on Plato. They all show very clearly that not one of you has taken the trouble of reading a dialogue of Plato twice. Perfectly meaningless.

3

No book, gentlemen, of any value is a book that deserves to be read once. If you don't read Hamlet twice, or thrice -- 10 times in your life, you are unable to understand Shakespeare. Hamlet cannot be read once. It cannot.

That's the first beginning, to get over the difficulties of what the action is, and who the players are. After you have gotten by this, then you begin to begin just to understand what Hamlet is all about.

I have read Homer's *Iliad* perhaps by now 25 times, and *The Odyssey* 26 or 27 times. And so on with everything. And I very often do not understand -- even then.

But you have no education, gentlemen, because you have not learned anything the second time.

4

There are three kinds of books, gentlemen. And this is important for philosophy in any case.

There are the books that deserve to be read once, and never again; that are the books to be eliminated. A book that only deserves to be read once could just as well have not been read. It's not important. You can read it for a pastime, or you cannot read it.

Then there are books that must be read several times. These are the so-called classics, the good books. Dickens, or Macaulay, or Carlyle, or Robert Frost.

And then there are books -- very few -- that must be read always. Like the Bible. And that's the difference of the Bible and the other books.

Not that it is a sacred book. *There is nothing sacred.* That's just an empty word, gentlemen. But it has to be read always, because most of the time, we aren't up to the occasion.

Most of the time, we do not understand the Bible, because we live in such sloth, and sinfulness, and stupidity that we don't understand it. You have to have a pure heart and a clear mind in order to understand the Bible.

Most of you don't have that. You are sleepy. And you wallow in so much sloth and frivolity that of course you cannot understand serious things.

VI SEVERAL TIMES

1

I had just lunch with a boy from another course. And he admitted - he was 19 years old - that so far, nothing ever had appeared serious to him. A remarkable performance. Nothing ever, he said.

2

These are the three types of books, gentlemen: to be read once, to be read several times, to be read often.

We read the books that we read once in order to find among them a book that deserves to be read again. It's a selective process, like a sieve. You have three establishments. And then there are, among the classics, a few that we give such a prominence, that we say, "always". And so that's why we give it, for example, our children as a birthday present, because we think that although it was of our time, we think still that *Alice in Wonderland* should be read today.

3

But the thing you are fed of course, you are very much excused, the children's books that are printed on this commercial basis, where people establish themselves as children's books' writers now every day in this country, not one of them deserves to be printed or read by any child. It makes these children only stupid. It's opium. It's a drug.

Because any difficulty is eliminated. The child can understand the whole book. A book which you can understand from the beginning, gentlemen, is not a good book. It's an uninteresting book, because that means that you already are on this level, so it cannot do anything to you.

And all these children's book which I happen to see too many because I have to do with little children quite a bit, I'm ashamed of the human race, that this is printed, and that gets the paper, and gets the money. And it's absolutely useless. If it wasn't there, it's just a pastime, it's like a babysitter.

That's what these books are for, to keep people blinded from experience, and from reality, and from anything.

4

So gentlemen, philosophy of course claims to have to be thought over several times. You can say obviously that that is not philosophy which can be understood in one sitting. It is impossible that this would be philosophy.

Now if you would and could understand this, gentlemen, this would perhaps be the greatest gain of this course.

VII TO CHANGE MATTER

1

The history of Greek philosophy is the history of a process of thought that by every generation has to be repeated. It is not over. Anyone who has written one paper on any of these men must have at least realized that this is still today a valid thought.

2

I was very angry with you.

There a man writes on the atom theory of Democritus. And instead of sinking to the ground in reverence, that this man had an idea which today is still tormenting every

physicist, of the character of the universe, he just reports -- oh, this man, because he hadn't modern mathematics, so he was, of course, poorer, a poor second with regard to the expression he could give to the atom theory, the writer of this glorious paper would then say.

Gentlemen, he hasn't understood that they are eternal thoughts, but thought for the first time by the Greeks. The atom theory is not dated at all. It's with us today. At times, we all go in this direction and look for a way out of problems in this simple manner that all matter is of the same.

At other times, we'll resent this very much, this egalitarian scheme, because we feel that dead matter and living matter are not distinguished sufficiently. And there's no hierarchy of values. There is no order. If all atoms are just atoms, then the sentence, "Let there be light," is then as good as the light itself. I think it is better.

The creative effort to create life must tower over the factual existence of life.

Anything that is new enters the world not because it is matter, but because it changes matter.

3

So the whole Greek story, gentlemen, is thought that must be repeated. These texts -- look at this book. We have these fragments, gentlemen.

I have now written a book on Heraclitus in German, gentlemen, where I have gone into much greater detail with making these quotations alive again. Well, these words have reverberated in my inner man fifty to hundred times before they have gotten their full glamour and their full glow again.

4

So I have not given you in this course any thought that is only for once. It essentially stays with us.

Only we have this great privilege that we can watch in the Greek story the emergence of these thought patterns for the first time. And we therefore go back to this source material, not because it is superseded, but because it has eternity.

VIII *TODAY WE PERISH IF WE REMAIN GREEKS*

1

Now gentlemen, you watch in Greek philosophy then a thing that is much debated today by the wrong people: the transmission of acquired faculties.

The story of the human race, gentlemen, is the transmission of acquired faculties. But the acquired faculties are today given to the Mendelians, and the biologists, and the chemists, and such people. They know nothing about these things. We should know something in the humanities.

Our whole problem of the human race is to transmit acquired faculties. That is, to transmit faculties that did not exist in the cave man, but in the process of the ages have entered the race, the bloodstream, and now have to be kept in it, because they now are eternal.

2

Gentlemen, all the eternity which you and I know of -- in marriage, in justice, in equanimity, in humanity, in equality - they are all created qualities in the process of history and then they are kept going.

And that's the story of Greek philosophy. The human mind has, in the Greek period, reached its maturity and a finality that you are very much privileged if you are allowed to work into your mind the importance or the eternity, the perpetuity, the validity of these ways of thinking. We cannot get out of it.

What I have tried to do is show them in perspective, so that perhaps you may not simply remain one-sided, and the victim of the Greek division of thought, for example, in object and subject.

3

Today we perish if we just remain Greeks. Since the birth of Christ, it is impossible just to have a Greek mind.

There was a man in this country who at the philosophers' slave market - it's always taking place between New Year and Christmas and New Year, the slave markets of all the college professions, "slave market" it is called, because the young instructors are sold there, across the counter, for the various colleges, who go there to hire men, usually in Washington, or some other of these dreary places.

And so there was a debate on philosophers.

And they said -- one said, "I'm an Aristotelian," and the other said, "I'm a Platonist."

And one man got up and said, "Well, there could only be three answers. You could only be either a materialist, an idealist, or a realist."

And so the fourth man got up and said, "Why they had a conference of philosophers if this was all they knew, from time immemorial, that there only could be three schools of thought?"

4

It shows you the reverence, or the dogmatism of the American human mind today.

You people are down on dogma, gentlemen. But when you use your brain, you're all dogmatic about either being a materialist, or an idealist, or a realist.

Now I'm neither one of the three. It has taken me a whole lifetime to break out of this Greek thought pattern.

But before you haven't thought these Greek patterns, in their temptation, in their lucidity, you will have a hard time of using your mind as a free man should, so that you know what you're doing when you think. Most of you are just materialists, without knowing that you are. For example, what you call "realism", is equally a stupid limitation.

IX *PLAY*

1

Today, gentlemen, we have to make use of any one of these Greek thought patterns. For certain issues, you have to be a realist; for certain, you have to be a materialist; for certain you have to be an idealist. We must be free using any of these philosophies whenever they can serve.

But for this, the first step is that you have to understand that the human mind has its classical period of its birth into a constant form, a constant mold in those Greek days.

2

These were the points I would like to make with regard to the papers.

And now let me turn to the seat of philosophy in life once more.

Those of you who have taken my course in Philosophy 9 -- who has been in 9? -- only a few -- know that before man thinks by himself, he plays with other people, and reflects in play on his life situation.

When you play football, you play war. When you play chess, you play war. That is, whenever we play, we repeat mentally and ideally a serious situation in life which we otherwise would have to experience itself. We can play war, we can play chase, we can play hunt.

And we do.

3

So the first philosophy of the human race has been the social games and plays. When we play -- when we have sports, we imitate, and become aware then of the forms in which we really live.

Children -- girls will play christening, and they'll play wedding, and they'll play funeral, and thereby already practice the serious business of life without being serious.

4

Now gentlemen, the Greeks of course were great players. And Homer -- we started with Homer -- played on his lyre with the memories of the great unifying past of all the Greek cities.

And I gave you also the date of the Olympic Games in 776, when all Greeks from Asia, from the mainland of Greece and Italy and Sicily began to meet every four years to play together, as they do in Melbourne now, as modern Greeks.

So playing together has been antecedent, has been preceding Greek philosophy. And the Greek philosophers represent a strange second adventure of playing with ideas. But that's play, too.

And in order to give you the way very precisely, how this came about, I say now something about the dialogues of Plato in this respect.

X *THE INTERMISSION BETWEEN THE ATHLETIC CONTESTS*

1

Many of the dialogues of Plato are centering around the dressing room of the athletes in a gymnasium in Athens. There the young men sit down, and rest, and joke, and

wash up, and take a shower, and refresh themselves. And there's this old man Socrates, this critic. And he takes advantage of their leisure between the games to talk it all over with them. He is the critic of these athletes, and takes them there to task.

2

Now *Charmides* is a very good example of this kind of dialogue. But there are others, of course. *The Ion* is a case, which is in your book. And *The Euthyphron* is one, and -- oh, there are at least five or six of the same type. And they also were imitated in some pseudo-Platonic dialogues which have taken advantage of this very tempting situation.

Here is a beautiful boy. All the old men are eager to meet him because they are in love with him. Going to make love in the pederastic, in the obscene sense of the Greek homosexual passion. And Socrates surpasses them all, because he doesn't want anything from this boy except the beauty of his soul. He doesn't want to sleep with him.

And therefore, Socrates is shown to surpass these other men, who enter there, this gymnasium, because he wants only to have this man outgrow his physical beauty and go on to the beauty of wisdom, to the desire for wisdom.

3

And this is so simple that you may say *the seat of philosophy in Greece is the intermission of an athletic contest*. That's the seat in life, as it is called today with the expression.

When today the Swedes introduced this idea, as the Swedish school in theology, who ask about any psalm in the Bible, "Which is its seat in life?" When was it sung? Was it sung at a festival? Was it sung in mourning? Was it sung after a victory? It's called the "seat in life" question for any biblical writing.

4

Well, we may ask the same question about the philosophers. The seat in life for the Greek Platonic dialogue is in the intermission between the athletic contests. That is the point, the sociological situation out of which the whole effort of Greek of the Platonic system seems to have grown.

He may of course have overdone it in his literary form. And I know very well that there have been other occasions, in which people might talk and discuss things.

XI LIKE BREATHING AND EATING

1

But the Greeks themselves seem to have felt that if you increase an order of things, you have already war, you have legislation. You have the jury. You have the life of the political marketplace. And you have games.

Then where do you put, where do you localize, where do you make room for thinking?

Well, you go to the people who will be so tired of their physical exercises that they now like to play with their mind instead. And so the localization of this mental, communal effort to philosophize in Greece is the arena, or the benches around the arena, where you sit down, and let all these things pass in review which you have seen, and draw your own conclusions about their meaning and about their best performance.

2

I think it is quite important that we ask ourselves, "Where is room for philosophy?"

If you go to Dartmouth, there is no room for philosophy.

We tried to start a philosophical club here two years ago for the students who were majoring in philosophy. And we gave them a very nice room in the library. And I was asked to assist the first meeting. And we discussed it, and I said, "There is a very interesting article here in an American paper. Let's discuss this as a good starting point."

Well, we were, I think, 15 men. And I came, and I was the only person who had read the article. So I went home again.

Because there is no room for philosophy on this campus. You will do requirements, gentlemen. You will take finals. You do assignments. That's not philosophy.

3

The study of philosophy -- as what you think is only imitating philosophy, I mean. If I make you work artificially by assigning you this reading, if you do not sit down and read yourself, that's not philosophy, yet.

Philosophy must have some natural place in your own natural life. Before, it isn't. It hasn't taken hold of you. It hasn't, I'm afraid. The papers bear me out on this. You

don't believe that to philosophize is an activity just like breathing. It is, gentlemen. I assure you. It's like eating.

4

Most of you, by the way, do a little bit of constant rationalization.

You go across the campus, you do something wrong. Immediately your mind begins to work, and to justify yourself. Why didn't you talk to this guy? Or why were you too nice to him? Or why were you not nice enough to him? I think you all philosophize in a small way all the time.

And why didn't they ask you to join the fraternity? I mean, every one of you has these problems.

That is philosophy already, because it is afterthought. It is an attempt to justify the life that goes on in this campus in the mirror of your own mind.

But you are not very well equipped to it, and you drop it again, and you say, "Let's forget it." That's the only philosophy you have today.

XII THE ATTEMPT OF THE OLD TO MAKE THE YOUNG MAN SERIOUS

1

That's really more than realism, and more than materialism, and more than idealism; the Dartmouth philosophy is the philosophy of forgetfulness.

You must find a good Greek term for it, and then we have a wonderful new theory, a new system of philosophy, the philosophy that tries to crush reflection.

Wonderful idea. You can sell it.

2

(Philosophy is more than rationalization, though?)

I hope it is more. That's the beginning, however. Usually something that is called a problem - the Greek word "problem" means something that lies in front of your foot, and you stumble. It's a stumbling block. That's a problem.

Now I think most reasons why we think are stumbling blocks in our behavior, in our own conduct. That is, we blush, we are embarrassed, we are self-conscious. And then

we build around it a whole theory, that we are right, and the rest of the world is wrong. And that's called a philosophy usually.

3

The seat in life, gentlemen, then, of communal philosophy in Greek is not your own self-consciousness. That's usually the starting point in modern man's philosophizing. In his loneliness, he begins to rationalize his problem, his stumbling block, and get around it, and build some whole theory -- because he doesn't want to face the fact that he is a failure.

But in Greece, the problem is the intermission, the relaxation of the young man and the attempt of the old to make them serious.

That's the whole Socratic method.

4

And I have tried to tell you the story of Parmenides. That this was actually the way in which Parmenides tried to convince these boys that he could sell them permanent truth, whereas all the life that went on as they lived there, playing, or in the army, was just appearance, phenomenon -- that wasn't true. But what he said, that was the truth.

XIII *BEATEN DOWN BY 40 GENERATIONS OF STUDENTS*

1

So we have the seat in life, gentlemen, it is in the playroom of the young, by the presence of the old.

So there is a double situation: teacher and student, old and young; and an attempt of the old to identify himself with beauty, and the attempt of the young to identify themselves with wisdom.

And that is why, in the Greek philosophy, this relation of beauty and wisdom is constantly stressed, is the constant thing.

2

Now, the young man, gentlemen, is always the physis representative in this situation. He represents the beauty of nature. And therefore we take now a step that

leads us a little bit beyond the physis, ethos and logos distinction which we've made so far.

When we come to the seat in life of Greek philosophy, and I think of modern teaching, too: here you can only study because you have some respect for what I know. And I can only teach you, gentlemen, because I take pity on the beauty of your form, and the shoddiness of your conduct. You are empty, and I am ugly. And that has to come together.

I have shape, I have form, I have profile. And you are still shapeless. But you are much more in tune with nature's promise of the next spring. Spring is beautiful, gentlemen. Winter isn't.

3

Therefore, gentlemen, physis and ethos in Greek philosophy are represented by old and young, or "young and old" is proper. I have never mentioned this before. I wanted you to understand physis, ethos, and logos as inherent in any man's contemplation of reality outside of him.

But the group that does philosophize is in a strange manner arranged. One group, the young, gentlemen, have an immediate access to the problem of beauty. Think of all the girls you love. And you have only a very delayed and dilatory and difficult approach to wisdom, because that takes many years of experience and criticism. And you haven't gone through this, really, just because the time has been lacking. And you haven't been disappointed sufficiently enough.

A man like myself who has been beaten down by 40 generations of students, gentlemen, has no illusions about the human race.

4

My problem, obviously, gentlemen, is to like you just the same. And your problem is the opposite, not to fall in love with everybody, which is hard to contain oneself, the girls are so beautiful.

So old age, gentlemen, is skeptical, by nature. Young people -- I hope you are not skeptical. If you are, it would be artificial. You must be enthusiastic.

XIV REKINDLING THE FLAME IN ANOTHER GENERATION

1

Therefore, the line -- if I may now show you -- when we come to the seat in life of logos, ethos, and physis:

*physis reaches into the reality of the human society in the form of youth.
And logos reaches into the form of the physical realm in the form of old age.*

Now philosophy, to make bold -- to use the metaphor -- is this realm in which the two shall meet and overlap. The physical eros of youth, for beauty, and the experienced wisdom of the old have this common ground where they can meet.

2

Therefore, physis and ethos are not just questions of objective contemplation outside of you and me -- that I say, here are the ethics with my neighbors; and here is physis in the botanic garden, in the arboretum, or in the Rocky Mountains -- but in the fact that young and old speak to each other, and try to experience the same truth, there is a already ethical and physical experience in the very fact of philosophizing, because the group that philosophizes, represents to each other an element of perfect physis, and of perfect ethos.

3

On the part of the philosophers' group themselves, on the part of the subject, who tries to get a picture, a system, an order into the tempestuous three realities of God, man and universe -- society and universe, there is already an experienced battleground, an area in which the three things interpenetrate.

Because the young men who would throng around Socrates, do represent in his eyes, at least, physical perfection which isn't good enough for him and he says, "Where is your mind? Where are your ethics? You are just physically perfect, yes, you are. But what of it?"

And on the other hand, he can't do anything if he cannot implant his truth into these perfect bodies and make them carrier of this truth. His truth would remain sterile, would remain weightless. He would take it into his grave.

4

The whole problem of the Greek immortality in *The Phaedon* is in this problem. Neither Socrates nor Plato see -- sometimes they see it, and sometimes not -- that

what they call "immortality" is the power of the old to beget in the bodies of the young wisdom again. It is much more in this rekindling of the flame in another generation than in their own not-dying. They die very much, after all.

XV YOU HAVE TO BE THROUGH WITH THE WHOLE THING

1

So I would dismiss even this whole discussion of immortality in the Greek philosophical context as very fruitless. We all do die, gentlemen. I have never understood why people could doubt that we die. Christ had to die in order to rise again from the dead. His crucifixion would just be a joke, if He hadn't died, really.

So we are not immortal. We have to die very real. Then we may come to life again, but that's a different story.

2

The Greeks dealt with the problem of immortality, because they had a deep yearning, gentlemen, for the eternity of the logos in young bodies. This unity of teacher and student, this unity of two generations in philosophy is the dogma of Greek thought.

Not one man thinks, but one man yearns so much for beauty that what he thinks must enter this opposite number. And so all they think -- it's the simplest way of thinking of Greek philosophy as a sport replacing the physical sport. It is really the metaphysical sport. And it is really the play of a man's mind while the body is at rest.

3

This has a great consequence, gentlemen. Once you understand that the intermission of the athletic contest is the seat for philosophy in Greece.

If you get a critic in a theater in the intermission, and you ask him what he thinks of the play, he can only at the first performance say, "I haven't seen the play, yet". He has to suspend judgment, if he is a wise man. If he is a very good critic, he will come for the second time, what I tried to tell you before. After he has seen the play once, and he has seen it whole, he may then come and argue the individual roles because only then does he know: has the actress done justice to the role, after he knows what the whole role is about. Either he must have read the play, or in a Shakespeare performance, he has seen very, very many other performances. He knows already the outcome of the play. He knows what it's all about.

You can only judge any artistic or mental performance, gentlemen -- take this down -- after you have been through the whole of it.

I come back to my point, of course, made before, that the man who tried to give me the story of *The Republic* only point by point can't give me the story of *The Republic*, because he doesn't know why this point appears at that one certain chapter.

4

And a good critic, gentlemen, then, has to face the whole of a thing. He has to be through with the whole thing.

And therefore in an athletic contest the critic who sits there in intermission, takes advantage of the laziness and of these sweating young men there, and discusses things with them, takes advantage of the fact that such a contest has taken place before. They already know the outcome to a certain way. This contest may still hang fire, and not be finished. But how a football contest does end, everybody knows.

XVI UNIQUE THINGS AND CHRISTIANITY

1

And therefore you see that the seat in life of a philosophical discussion is a classified one. It is not a unique situation. We philosophize, in Greece at least, in a stereotype situation. Although this special contest may not be over with, we don't expect that this contest will deviate from all others.

2

It is the weakness, gentlemen, of Greek thinking, of all Greek thought, of your thought, of all secular thought, *that it cannot deal with the unique things*. It can only deal with repeated things.

You will find that the whole problem of Aristotle and Plato are ideas or classifications. But never the unique thing.

3

When Jesus came and wanted to avoid the pitfalls of Greek philosophy, He was not allowed to write a book. The greatest thing our Lord has done is that He didn't write. There would be no Christianity if He had written a book. Because all books are type-written, in the literal sense, that they deal with generalizations.

That's why Thomas Aquinas is not a religious founder, but just a theologian. And theology is much poorer than religion. It is just thinking about religion in general terms.

All Greek thought, gentlemen, because it comes in the intermission of something that goes on all the time -- athletic contests -- is dealing with type. It's dealing with typical things, with things that are permanent, perpetual, but never with anything unique.

4

The only unique thing in the Platonic dialogue is Plato and Socrates. These are the only unique figures in the whole story.

XVII THE STRANGE UNREALITY OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY

1

So if you really follow up restlessly and tensionally and incisively such a seat in life, you understand what philosophy can do and what it cannot do.

Philosophy cannot deal with unique situations.

2

Now, further, gentlemen, because it is a play, or in a leisure time, it can never deal with the future. The whole Greek thought is unable to think of anything but cyclical repetition.

If you think of what we read in *The Republic* about the abuse of the political forms, it is the cycle. It goes from tyranny to monarchy; from monarchy to aristocracy; from aristocracy to oligarchy; from oligarchy to democracy; from democracy to mobocracy; and from mobocracy to dictatorship.

As we are at this moment in this country.

And that's a cycle, gentlemen. Nothing new under the sun.

3

The strange unreality, gentlemen, of Greek philosophy, because it arises in a leisure moment -- leisure is unable of creating something really new. The leisure class, gentlemen, is always the decadent class in any society. And since you all want to join the leisure class, you become a heavy burden on America.

Leisure is less real than serious life.

A very great historian has said, the Greek philosophy has been unable to abolish any abuse in any city of Greece. It has reflected on them, it has criticized them. But it did never have the power to conquer the citizens.

I think I have told you that the last Platonists had to leave Athens, because a man of the same name, Demetrius, a sergeant of Macedonia, was made god in Athens in 304. Didn't I tell you the story? (*No.*)

4

Well, the third president of the Academy after Plato had the name Demetrius, and from Demeter, the great goddess -- and he was a very good man. But in the years of the Lord 304, that is only 43 years after the death of Plato, the Athenians were so desperate, that they made a staff sergeant of the Macedonian army mayor of Athens, erected a temple in his honor and worshiped at his statue, as though this staff sergeant was a god.

That was done by the intelligent people of Athens in their despair. They thought that if they bought a Macedonian, they could keep their independence, at least with regard to the other Macedonian mercenaries, who ruled the rest of the world by that time, the successors of Alexander the Great.

Well, my Platonist, Demetrius of Phaelerum, took his manuscripts and fled to Alexandria in Egypt. And ever since the great library in Alexandria contains the real philosophical writings. They had left Athens.

(Well, wasn't Demeter one of the pagan gods? Is there any historical connection?)

No. There is never a god Demetrius. That's just a human name. It means -- just the adherent, the worship of Demeter. Demeter is the mother of Persephone, and is the god of the harvest in Greece, of fertility, it means "mother earth." "De" is earth; and "meter" is mother, and that's all there is to it: Demeter is the goddess of the earth.

But Demetrius is simply a man who is devoted to Demeter. That's a human name. It's a very familiar name in Poland and Russia to this day, Demetrius. Dimitri von Mohrenschild. He has the name Demetrius, here, Mr. von Mohrenschild.

XVIII THE CONTRADICITONS OF THE AMERICAN SCENE

1

Well, in following then through this business of the seat of life, gentlemen, we come to the advantages and the limitations of the Greek experience of their mind. The reality of the Greek mind is this crossbreeding of more than one generation.

The Greek philosopher, gentlemen, is aware of the contradiction between the physical setup of the universe, in which the young seems to win, and the mental, the logos problem in which the older is the better.

2

Now you are torn, gentlemen. In your eyes, on the one-hand side, if a man is over a certain age, dismiss him, out he goes. Business is tragic. A man after 65 is just fired. Same as they do in the colleges. Then you go to the Congress, and you have Mr. Theodore Greene, the chairman of the foreign policy committee, and you wonder. He's 89.

Well, what's the story in this country? What is true? What do you believe?

You don't know what you believe. You are absolutely torn, absolutely contradictory. The war was won by a secretary of war whose name was Stimson, and he was 78; and by a secretary of state, who was 82, Mr. Hull. Great people. And obviously very useful to a country that is so crazy, and so fashioned by crazes as the United States.

The older the statesman, the better, because he has some wisdom left.

3

So you don't know what to believe. In the lower brackets, you throw out all the teachers who may have possible wisdom. It's absolutely a waste. And the other hand in politics, you cater to these people, because you know you feel that otherwise you would be lost, you will have no mores.

And the contradictions of the American scene are never more vivid than when you ask yourself, "What do you do with the third generation?" You are only in your mentality, you only think of people from 1 to 30 from 30 through 60. And after 60, they go out of your philosophy. Men over 60 have to go to Florida in your estimation, or to California, be forgotten, or Social Security or something. Out they go.

4

That isn't the true story, however, gentlemen. The country is only saved by these few people like Elihu Root, or Stimson, or Greene, and many such people.

And you just see the Senate, I mean. It is appalling. I think -- there it's overdone the other way. And the same with our judges. When the court-packing plan developed of Mr. Roosevelt, the majority of the justices of the Supreme Court were much over 70, all of them.

XIX *PHYSIS, ETHOS, LOGOS AS THE THREE AGES*

1

Now isn't that a strange contradiction? That you can't have a vice-president over 65 in a factory, but you can have the Supreme Court just manned by people who cannot move anymore. Mr. Justice Holmes was 90 when he retired.

2

Now, it goes too far. If I have a case pending in Washington, and I would think that the presiding officer is 90, I would have the feeling that I can't get through to him. I can't convey my problem to him. Wouldn't you feel this, too?

And I'm trembling over this Greene business. The chairman of the foreign policy committee in this country is 89.

But then I think that the greatest pope of the 19th century, Leo XIII., had his greatest time when he was over 90. And the commissioner to the Great Britain from Canada before the First World War, was Mr. Donald Smith. And he had his greatest time between 87 and 94 of age. He died when he was 94.

3

So you may only begin to see, gentlemen, that logos, ethos and physis may even be transplanted into the ages of man.

I would say that the first age is the physical age of yours and mine, in which we represent more or less a part of nature. From 30 to 60, we represent a part of the ethical society of the order. But from 60 to 90, if we are any good, we represent the logos, because that's the only contribution Mr. Greene can make.

If you didn't have the feeling that he is beyond his own self-interest at that age, he couldn't make his contribution. A man of 89 with two feet in the grave can have his mind on the interest of his country. If he's any good. And that much there are such people, who have this wisdom then, to forget themselves in the service of their country.

4

And therefore, what I wanted to try to do is, gentlemen, to make you see that logos, ethos and physis are rooted somewhere in our own lifetime experience, preponderantly.

A man over 60 should not care. And you have had the great benefit of a president, gentlemen, who got into this age of 60 before time, through illness.

Mr. Roosevelt became a great man through his polio. And it shows the depths of Republican depravity that they always spoke of him as a syphilitic. I've heard this myself, high judges of the Republican Party, Somerset Club members, just tried to get rid of his greatness by dismissing him as a syphilitic.

XX THE POLIO OF MR. ROOSEVELT

1

Gentlemen, the polio of Mr. Roosevelt has saved this country, because from a mere playboy and a very cheap politician, through his illness, he outgrew his self-interest. A man who has had polio and is paralyzed has nothing anymore to ask for in this world. And that's the great blessing that this country has had from the sickness of this man. He was far beyond all his opponents, gentlemen, all these cheap opponents.

2

Mr. Hoover had the depravity and the ignominy of inviting the governors of the various states before the election of '32 to Washington, and let them wait two hours standing, because he wanted that Mr. Roosevelt should falter and faint and so that he couldn't be a candidate for the presidency.

Mr. Roosevelt survived even this ordeal.

3

But what I am trying to say is that through his polio a man who certainly was before physically interested very deeply, in life, playboy -- and ethically, that is, politically interested in just cheap advantages of a politician -- he was not a very serious man -- through the polio was in early age advanced to the age of over 60.

4

It's not an accident, he was finished at 63 and died. Because he had lived, telescoped, into the last two decades of his life, into '28 to '45, from his polio onward. I think he was stricken when? '27? It's very important, gentlemen. He anticipated the third era, the third part, the third of the man's lifespan. He had already compressed into the life -- where otherwise people are active and passages and make money, and get rotund.

He had already telescoped into this logos of wisdom and indifference to this unselfish attitude.

XXI REPLACEMENT OF THE SUPERNATURAL BY NATURAL MEANS

1

So I hope I have made it plain to you, gentlemen, that we have in the Greek story a very wonderful attempt to cope with the supernatural division of God, man, and universe by natural means of mere growth.

The Greeks are the people of nature, the philosophy, gentlemen, does ignore, so to speak, revelation. There is nothing of a higher order. And the Greek mind says, "Everybody can think this."

2

But there is a condition attached. Everybody, if he is complete in his connection with the rest of the human age, and the human experience, the young, if they are in with their elders; the elders, if they are in with their young - that remakes the whole story of Greek philosophy.

It isn't the single individual, gentlemen, that can think. That's your heresy. You think that everybody can think.

Everybody cannot think. You can only think if you are identified with two other situations: the young with the old and the elders; and the elders with the old and the young; and the old with their elders and their younger.

That's a very wonderful story, gentlemen.

3

We replace then, gentlemen, by natural means the supernatural.

A priest is a man who tries to be three ages at one. And so he draws on the supernatural, today. Originally the word "priest" only means an elder. Nothing else. But he has to be a normal man.

Formerly the Church was very ambitious in this sense. You had first to marry. A bishop was a married man, and when he became a widower, they made him a bishop, because then he had experienced bachelor life, married life, and the third life of the logos, of mere wisdom, where he is alone.

In the Greek church, that's still necessary. In order to become a bishop, you first must be married. A bishop be one wife's man, the old text of the instruction of the Apostles says.

4

That's all lost on you, gentlemen, because you live in a very estranged paradise. It is always the same problem, gentlemen: how much spirit has God immersed into human nature. And He has not given to any individual human nature much spirit. But when the three natures of youth, and old age, and elder...

[tape interruption]

...and the oldest men own wisdom, of logos, from the decision between appetites, senses, and ambitions.

XXII RECREATE THIS COLLEGE FROM THE SPORTS

1

This is in a miraculous way the Greek situation, gentlemen, by which they are a nation taken out of the context. You have no other nation that was placed in the universe in this specific condition, that they were given all the data from other people's lives, and stood between them, and had to try to make a system, or a poem, or an order out of this.

2

I think this country is at this moment very much provoked to recreate its college from the sports. Before the curriculum is not revamped in the same manner as Socrates tried to revamp it among the athletes of Athens, all these humanity courses won't do you any good, because you won't see their seriousness, their importance. They just hang around you as heirlooms from the past.

3

I think that if you only had the sports at this moment here in Dartmouth, we could reform the college very easily. Because I could make you to agree, that you must grow old.

And if you once have the fear of the Lord in your bones that it is a terrible thing for an athlete to grow old, because he is so stupid, then you would find out what you

would have to know. What you must know, what you have to inquire into, and what all the plays you are intoxicated by, should lead you to.

4

I mean, this boy of 19 there, whom I tried to fathom, there was just nothing to fathom. He was just his own clothes. And under this there was absolutely nothing to be found. I inquired what courses he had taken. Not one of these courses had done him any good.

I mean, if he had taken no courses, I could have reformed this gentleman. But since he already had played with all these courses, he hadn't developed the seriousness which I can develop in an athlete who is absolutely innocent of all intellectual endeavors so far.

Let's have a break here. And then come back and distribute the papers.

TWENTYSECOND LECTURE: *YOUR CONTRIBUTION IS THAT YOU OPEN UP YOURSELF*

I *WHAT IS A SCHOOL?*

1

-- in as far as I have tried to make you see that the Greek philosopher himself represents the problem of physis, logos and ethos, by his setup as a school of philosophy. It is quite important for you to learn what a school is.

2

You have no idea what a school is. You have wrong ideas. Everything here in this country is one step down. You call an academy something like Northfield, where they train people to be soldiers.

Well, in Plato's time, the Academy was something for the people where you had to be 30 at least to enter. And you couldn't enter at 16.

3

Now most of the terms which you use, gentlemen, are anticipations of the real thing. A college, too, in the Middle Ages, was an institution in which people were, by and large, 25 years of age when they came there. So if you give the same thing to younger people, the thing of course is devalued.

The whole idea of education is always, "Give it a little earlier," and "Give it a little earlier." But the thing itself then is changed, because you can't give to a 16-year-old boy the same food as you can give to a 30-year-old man. It's just impossible.

4

So it is not easy for you to see what a Greek school of philosophy was.

You talk so much about the Stoa, or the Stoics, or the Epicureans, or the Academy, or the Peripatetic school. You also talk very big about universities. The Greek history of philosophy should be used by you to sit in judgment over the things that carry the same name in our time, but aren't the same.

II WHO IS THE LAW?

1

And I want today to make the point, gentlemen, that a Greek school of philosophy had this vitality that it contained the three generations, as the logos and the ethos, and the physis of man would represent. Youth being the physical aspect of man, logos being the wisdom aspect of man, and ethos being the aspect of the fighting generation -- but on the other hand, gentlemen, that the Greeks knew not of a university.

2

And some of you have glibly stated that the Academy of Plato was the first university. And that's the American tradition. But that's as wrong as if you say that in America everybody is a philosopher. You can also read this in books that today everybody philosophizes.

I see nothing of this. I see a total absence of philosophy even by the people who are professors of philosophy. Because to be a professor of philosophy doesn't make you into a philosopher. Don't think this. If you are teaching mathematics, you are not a mathematician.

3

I have a friend who is a mathematician here in this country. And he's one of the 150 mathematicians on whom it depends that mathematics is alive. And he says, "The terrible thing in America is there are 10,000 people who teach mathematics, and they all are held to be mathematicians. They are not the slightest thing of it. They teach my mathematics which I produce."

Mathematics is only something real as long as it is constantly created. And there are -- perhaps 150 is a large number -- all over the world, including India and China, where people produce mathematics.

You always take a professor of chemistry to be a chemist. Or a professor of history to be an historian. There's a great difference, gentlemen. A professor of history prevents new historians to teach the things that are needed. All the people who teach something are conservatives, because they have learned in their youth certain things, and they stick to them and think they are true.

4

There is always a tremendous fight between the people who represent something - - as in the New Testament. The people who taught the law, face to face with the living law of the Lord -- of course were all against Him. Now, who was the law? He or the Pharisees?

And that's the situation always, gentlemen. But you are totally blinded.

III LEISURE

1

I think I can say that in certain fields of human knowledge, I am at this moment the in the ranks of those who create this field, who do it. Even this doesn't prevent me from doing it that I have to teach here at Dartmouth.

2

That's bad enough. But obviously, gentlemen, if you have the choice to learn something with me or by a professor in the graduate school, your assumption is always that the man in the graduate school who is appointed to teach it must be the better man than I, because I have no seal on this, under this. I'm just teaching at Dartmouth.

How could a man be good who teaches at Dartmouth? That's just impossible. So you go on to the graduate school.

So here at this moment, some Senior Fellows who concentrate on the field in which I am the one authority in Europe, now, or rated as the authority. But they never think of taking a course with me, because they mistake the appointment in a school for being the man who produces the thing. And since I'm not officially appointed in a graduate school for this field, it's never dawned on them that they might be quite well to come to me, because next year this man will go to Europe. Then he will be told, "Why didn't you go to this man? He knows better."

But in America, gentlemen, there is a constant confusion between school and creation. And you think that -- what's your purpose -- coming in or going out? (*Going out.*)

I'm very glad.

3

Now the word in Greece of "school" is a different word from what you today take it. A school is to you a thing in which that what happens can be foretold. You take an exam, and you have the credentials from this school, and then you can become a barber. That's the school.

The school then for us, gentlemen, is something predictable, that creates a routine curriculum, and therefore, it is second-rate.

4

Obviously, gentlemen, in the times from 600, from Thales' days to the times of Marcus Aurelius, and even down to the days of St. Augustine, who went to school to the academics for a while - he was very much tempted by the Manichaeans, and by the Pythagoreans, and by the Academicians, by the people in the Academy, this is not true - the word in Greece of "school" -- and I would really miss my duty towards you, if I wouldn't stress this fact -- the word in Greek for "school" is "leisure."

If you entered the school -- *skhole* -- the word s- c-h has to be divided here, as we still pronounce "school." And "skhole" [scho-lay] is the Greek pronunciation -- not the hard "k," but the soft. Skhole. It means leisure. It comes at least nearest to this. A leisure, however, a skhole, given to meditation, and to the Muses, and to inspiration.

So you joined the leisure class if you became a scholar.

IV THE FREEST ENTERPRISE OF THE ANCIENT WORLD

1

And since this is totally lost today, and we think a scholar is a man who studies, in the sense that he has a special field, in which he is then finally appointed, it is well to see that the beginning of the word "skhole" means to risk one's free time at an adventure of ideas, and one didn't know where would one come out.

It is the unlimited, the oceanic character of the enterprise which attracted the best minds in Greece for this activity.

2

So throw it all out, gentlemen. A school of philosophy in antiquity is not a school. And that's why the word "academy" to this day is a kind of glorification for a school. If you say "the academic mind," you want to say a little bit more than the "scholastic" or the "school" mind. It's not a school man then you say, but it's aiming at Plato.

3

Now there is still this reminiscence that the school called the Academy of Plato, is a venture, is a free enterprise. You may even say that it is the freest enterprise of the ancient world. It's an attempt to gain influence, to make the philosophers king. And therefore, since there are no certified credentials in this business, after all, in every generation the great hope is that these boys, who have the guts to spend a few years with the master, will then do great deeds.

4

But without any certainty, without any certificates. No examination. The idea of an examination is perfectly unknown in antiquity. There are no examinations, gentlemen. Examinations make people stupid. And this is the most stupid generation of students that is possible, because you are examined every half year.

V EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S SKOLE

1

Gentlemen, I in my whole life have taken one exam, one oral exam, for my doctorate. That's why I still think I have my mind together. I never broke away from what I had learned, because there came finals, and I could forget about it. This whole thing was all the time a going process. A real *skhole*, a leisure.

From my first day in grammar school to my last day in the university, I was on my own. I wasn't ever asked what I learned. I just learned. And so it was all inside of me, and I never made this clear break, "Now the course History of Philosophy is over, so I can forget it." So I never heard it.

2

After two years, you hardly know that you took the course. That's your case, because you take finals.

Finals are the most stultifying process in American education. If you want to reform the college, the first thing you should do, is abolish all examinations, and eliminate all the students who only are learning something because of the examinations. They don't deserve to go to college anyway.

And it isn't worth learning anything for an examination. It's only worth learning something for your own sake, as a promise for your own future. For whose sake should you take an exam?

3

Now the Greek situation then is a free situation. It's a freelance situation, it's a free enterprise situation. And therefore, the only certainty the school offers in Greece is that old people, grownups, and adolescents are together.

It is not a child's play. But it is the play of grownups who make themselves like children. It's childlikeness of old people. That's an academy. Grownup people sit there on the bank.

4

Gentlemen, when I was a young student your age, I had the privilege -- I have always studied preferably with very old men, who were already emeriti. But in Europe, an emeritus is the most dignified teacher. An emeritus is not a man who isn't used more.

VI *WHERE OLD PEOPLE LEARN*

1

This list of emeriti in Dartmouth, the directory of Dartmouth College, is one big insult to humanity. There are all the dignified teachers of this college listed as emeriti, and they have nothing to say anymore at this college.

In Europe, the emeriti have no duties to perform, but they have the right to teach what they like. They don't examine anymore. They have no duties, as I said, no obligations. But they have a group of students. They have real pupils. They have real disciples.

2

And so I took preferably courses with people between 70 and 80, because they are the most brilliant and wisest men. And they had no standing anymore -- except for what they were. You didn't go to these men before, because they were appointed professors. They had outgrown their appointments.

They were people like Robert Frost, where you go because it's just Robert Frost. No title can ever do anything but belittle Robert Frost. He's always bigger than all the titles, and especially than all the degrees Dartmouth has given him. He is the man, of course. You look up to Robert Frost as bigger than any office he can hold.

3

Well, I wanted to say, the students seated with me on the benches of this seminar with these old men of 80 were themselves between 65 and 75 years of age. And that you should have seen, the ambition that still people had to outwit us young people, in reading the Greek texts and so. We read Hippocrates, for example, together.

And that's what an academy is, where old people learn.

4

So you have to reverse your whole vision of the Greek world if you think that it is only a world where the young are introduced. But it is a way where the old keep learning.

VII RESEARCH (*Soziologie in zwei Bänden 1956/1958*)

1

And that of course today has a different name. It's called "research," gentlemen. But you must understand that research is the way of keeping old people young.

Research has come into the world - and that again you do not know.

2

It's today a kind of mystery word. Usually graduate students in various schools think research is wonderful because they get stipends and fellowships and money. It's today -- first milking cow.

It is nothing of the kind.

3

Research has been introduced in Europe as a way of keeping the teachers alive -- a time where the man already has to formulate answers to the young, allows him to question.

Research is the open attitude, with your hands open to let the rain fall from the sky.

That's research.

4

Teaching is being armed to the teeth, and already imposing on you the truth. And in order to be an academician, to be a man in the real fullness of the mental ripeness,

I at my age have to stay in research. Therefore I am much younger than you, because you are satisfied with shortcut answers. You listen to the quiz kids, or something like that, \$64 dollar question. My questions are still very long-range. For a certain question I will have to answer 10 or 20 years ahead of me. And then I may know the answer.

I have now just published a book which I feel is the answer to things I wanted to know when I was your age. Now I know it. It has taken me 50 years to know it.

And that's research.

VIII *SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES*

1

So gentlemen, the school in Greece is a situation in which grownup people are prevented from being just old by keeping also the opposite attitude of still learning.

It is learning beyond age.

2

It's the opposite from the child prodigy here, who wants to go to the Horace Mann School and finish at 14 and enter Harvard at 15. That's a horror, in my estimation. It's destructive, and anybody who's too young is in a terribly dangerous position. He's old too early. But we should be kept young long enough.

But you don't keep young, gentlemen, by playing baseball too long. You keep young by doing research. Whether in your own profession or where not. Wherever a man at 50 can question his very existence, he is still young. Not by playing around. It's a much more serious business.

So that's the Academy.

3

Now at the opposite end, I want to stress the fact, gentlemen, that an academy, or a school of philosophy in antiquity is not a university. It's the opposite from a university, just as it is the opposite from a school.

So you do me a great favor if you try for the time being to believe me -- that what in America is called a "school," and what in Europe is called a "university" -- there are no universities in America -- the Academy or the Stoa are neither one. I think it helps us to make this distinction.

You grow into the real Greek situation out of which we have developed one way the university and the other way the school. The school is less than an academy, or a school of philosophy. The university is more. Our era wouldn't be a new era if it hadn't transcended the antiquity in some respect.

We have imitated antiquity by schools.

We have overcome antiquity by universities.

4

As soon as you understand this, you will begin to understand what Greek philosophy really is. It is something in between, something that does not exist today, in an organized effort. And that's not so easy to understand.

IX YOU HAVEN'T LEARNED HOW TO LEARN

1

So I want to devote attention to this sociological aspect of philosophy to these meetings, because it is terribly important that you should not believe that philosophy is the same 500 B.C. and the same today. And as long as you use all these words "school," "academy," "academic mind," and so on, "doctor degree," as though this was the thing, that existed for 2,500 years unchanged, I don't see how you can understand the history of the human spirit.

2

Aren't you too hot? With gloves on? (*Okay.*)

So we said, gentlemen, the school is today not an adventure. But it is safe. The one thing you can say of a school is that it is meant to give security, that it gives conformity in this country. That all conditions of going to successfully to school are known.

You cannot surprise anybody with all the stupid assignments we get. You can't do more than the assignments. And the assignments are certainly limiting your own growth. I mean, obviously the modern school is so stifling, most people who go to school learn too little.

They learn much less than they could learn, like this mother in Illinois Feld -- have you seen the story in the papers --, who was a teacher in Michigan, and then in Illinois she was sent to prison because she taught her own child, feeling that she could teach her child three times better than the schoolteachers.

Didn't you see the story? No revolution in this country any more for this. I mean, 100 years ago, they would have tarred and feathered the judge who sent her to prison. It is just incredible.

But you don't even resent it. You think she was condemned righteously.

That's an injustice, gentlemen, a grave injustice that was done her. She has the duty and the right to teach her child. The school is just a substitute. But you can't see it. You believe you are school militarists. This whole country is run by the school barracks system, just as Mr. Orozco has put it there on his fresco.

It's one of his most important frescoes.

3

The simple idea that I have to give up my child's education, because a stupid schoolteacher who is 19, and hasn't yet found a husband, is allowed to teach my grandchild now comic strips, and to fill all the wrong stuff. Pernicious. Chaff. Empty, so that their whole taste is ruined for life. Nothing serious. Nothing that demands an effort. For they are just for the rest of their lives, they are worth nothing, these children.

You haven't learned how to learn, so I can't teach you anything. That's the school today.

And that is today the tyranny of this country. If you want to do better with your child, you aren't allowed to. This woman had a certificate from the state of Michigan to teach. But the state rights came in and the judge said, "In Illinois, we don't recognize the certificate of the state of Michigan. Go to prison."

4

So the school, gentlemen, is a limiting concept for growth. It's known growth. That which can already be fore-ordained. And you must see his.

Woodrow Wilson always used to say that nobody could come from an American liberal arts college who would be as good as Lincoln. That's quite an indictment if one president of the United States says this, that Lincoln could not be produced in Dartmouth College. He said it here in 1909, officially, in a great speech he gave at the inauguration of President Nichols. If you want to read a serious indictment of college

education, read the speech by Woodrow Wilson given 1909 at the inauguration of President Nichols of Dartmouth College.

And he was himself president of Princeton, so he ought to know.

X THE PRINCIPLE OF A UNIVERSITY

1

It's very serious, gentlemen. A school today is the opposite from a Greek *skhole*, from a Greek school of philosophy. And as long as you do not make this radical break in your thinking, I think everything you read about antiquity is misleading.

The children didn't go to school then. But the grown-ups did. And that makes a difference.

By the way, perhaps you keep this in mind: in the days of scholasticism, gentlemen, in the days of Thomas Aquinas, the school men, as they were called, had students who were all over 30 years of age. The people who went to the University of Paris and studied with Thomas Aquinas, with Bonaventura, with Abaelard, they were all grownup people. And that made a difference.

2

You can imagine that you can discuss with grownup people everything, only very differently from what you will put up with, before life. They all had lived. They all had sinned. They all had charges already of congregations and churches, or of courts, law courts, and so any discussion in the Middle Ages between Thomas Aquinas and his students was on a different level from what it is now in Manhattan College.

I mean, I have heard these boys there talk about God and scholastic philosophy, just to vomit. Same as in Union Seminar. You can't discuss God Almighty with a man who never had a congregation, never was in charge of souls. He doesn't know how desperate people are.

3

The university in the Middle Ages, gentlemen, and today is a conglomeration of various schools. Because in a university we have not one school, but a number of schools represented, fighting each other. In a university of the real type, as in Paris in the Middle Ages, for example, in the 13th century - it doesn't exist in America. There is no university in America.

The principle of a university is that a student is exposed to teachers who teach the opposite.

Now that was not done in antiquity. In a Platonic school, you couldn't teach Aristotelianism. You had then to go to another school. You had to leave one and go to the other.

4

The limitations, gentlemen, of paganism is that the human mind remains impenetrable to each other, that one person is not a brother with the man who has the opposite opinion. Opposition is not digested into a symphonic offer in antiquity.

XI NO PROGRESS IN GREEK SCIENCE

1

It's Christianity which says that the Holy Spirit can reconcile enemies. You have to love thine enemy before you can have a university.

2

Because in a university today, you can have a pragmatist, and you can have a Platonist, and you can have an Aristotelian in the same faculty. And you, as their student, are exposed in one week to the opposite teaching of Mr. Mandelbaum and myself. There would be the beginning.

It isn't quite the same, because you can here in this college evade it. In a university you would be forced to confront, and to undergo the influence of opposite schools.

(Well, isn't the Platonic dialogue just set up for the purpose of a university?)

You see that this isn't true from Aristotle. He had to leave. He had to set up his own school. Plato tried to squeeze the lemon, to exploit the previous schools. But the result was final. That is, the way the dialogues were set up meant that you couldn't go back to Pythagoras, but he would profit from what was valid in Heraclitus or Pythagoras and then lay down the law that the Platonic school would be based on these and these conditions, like the ideals.

3

(Wasn't Socrates in the dialogues { } of { }?)

Socrates is defeating his opponent. I told you that the only real dialogue in the modern sense is *The Symposium*, because the various contributions are left standing. But they aren't left standing in the other dialogues. One is made a fool. And he's refuted.

Oh, no. That's very definite. You see then from the history of Greek philosophy, after the Academy existed, everyone who had a new principle broke away. They had to.

The Stoa as Zeno was the most peaceful citizen you could have in Athens. Aristotle - he lived in Athens,. And you had three schools instead of one. If a university had existed, the three would have remained or gone together as one. You were either one or the other.

4

That's why there is no progress in Greek science. Greek science stagnated and just ended in nothingness.

The Greeks have had every idea that a man can have in any field of human endeavor, in history, in language, in botany, in zoology, in genetics, even. You find in atomic theory, in physics, chemistry, and so on not one great principle that the Greeks have not uttered.

Eratosthenes said already that the earth was turning around the sun. That was well known in antiquity as a possibility. But it wasn't followed up. It wasn't fought out. That was an idea.

And there was another idea. And what was taught in one school, and the other was taught in the other. And when the school folded up, it was forgotten.

XII PERSEVERANCE

1

By and large, the mental stage in America, where also you have the most wonderful fireworks in every generation. You have had here the Millerites, and the Oneida Socialists, and the Putney people, and if you follow through the list of social reformers in this country, it's a complete list. And nothing has come of it. Absolutely nothing. It's the greatest wasteland there is, America, with regard to ideas.

Because every year somebody else tries a very good idea. But then they say, "Oh, that was yesterday," and that's finished it. Americans will only believe a thing of tomorrow. And if you say that the same was told yesterday, although it is perfectly true, it's not good enough to be repeated. You are too impatient.

2

So in this country you have a little bit the Greek situation in the sense that not the Greek science, gentlemen, has had all the problems, but it had not the perseverance. It did not carry the thing through.

Eratosthenes' doctrine, that the earth turned around the sun, the whole planetary system, wasn't followed up. When Christ came, the whole Greek science was a quagmire of possibilities, of potential ideas. And no system of carrying it through, of hashing it out, of perseverance.

3

The indictment against Greek philosophy is not that it was wrong, gentlemen, but it had no virtue; it had no character; it had no means of sacrificing sufficiently in time and devotion to master the thing. You can say that the Greek mind worked to perfection, but it had no seat in reality.

4

And that is the essence of the Greek school of philosophy, gentlemen.

A university is anchored in the lifeblood of the people. It brings, for example, forth clergymen, judges. The Greek Academy didn't do that. It was not a preparation for professions, but it was a leisure class, who stood up outside the polis.

And I've tried to tell you time and again that the Greek mind is predicated on the fate of the Greek polis. That it went outside the polis, but it couldn't return inward.

XIII THE OUTSIDEDNESS OF THE GREEK SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY

1

So perhaps you take this sentence simply down:

that a school and a university, whatever they are today, are part and parcel of the community.

An academy and a Greek school of philosophy remain outside the community.

Therefore they neither undergo the degradation of a school, by which it is compulsory training of known content, nor do they have the greatness of a Christian adventure where mental enemies, people who simply would like to scratch their eyes mutually out of their head stick it out together in free debate, in enmity, in real

enmity, mental enmity - but stay together, because they know that the truth is not in one side only, but it must be in the conflagration of both.

2

The Greeks remain or step outside the city, and therefore they have the advantage of giving grownup people a real battleground for their minds. But they cannot find the way back into the city. They cannot force the mayor, and the selectmen of the town, and the ministers of the cabinet and so on to have everybody who wants to become a mayor, or a priest, or a general or a judge in the town to undergo this training, as in a school.

Can you see the outsideness of the Greek school of philosophy?

3

That gives them, of course, the freelance character, the freshness, in a way, the greatness, the character of a place for adults. Because as soon as you make it a requirement, you know what happens of course to such a thing.

It is degraded into a mere school.

4

Well, we help each other out so far in the West, in the western world as the heirs of the Greeks, that we have split the schools of philosophy, of antiquity into two things: schools for the young and universities for the real battle of minds.

XIV SOCIAL PRESSURE (OBLIGATIONS, EXAMINATION SYSTEM)

1

But so far, gentlemen, in America, you are still finished when you are a controversial person. In Europe, that's a recommendation. You are courted every place because you are controversial.

2

But Mr. Oppenheimer hardly kept his job in Princeton, because he's controversial. That's a recommendation in a university. In America, which lives by the Stevensons, I mean the secretary of war from Yale, by the people who never say anything ...

You know how Mr. Stevens became secretary of war. You have heard the story? Well, he said to himself that he had managed in Yale never to express an opinion during the four years he was in college, and that he therefore became a successful man. That's America.

3

I had lunch with a boy, gentlemen, a few days ago. And the boy said to me, "Professor, it's so nice" -- he's a senior -- "it's so nice to have lunch with you. It's the first time in four years in this college that I can speak my mind."

I was very much ashamed to hear that, for the place in which I am condemned to be. Such a nest of lies, if he could say this. If even one man can say this, and if he could think that this was the behavior required from him in this place.

I don't understand it. Can you understand it? Would anybody help me, how a man could say such a thing? How can he stand it? Why didn't he go away? Do you understand it? Can anybody explain this to me?

(Social pressure, I suppose. Don't you think?)

Ja, but would you kindly? -- I'm so stupid, I hear this word often - what does it mean?

4

(Well, it means the pressure of having a so-called American respect for the parents, where the father expects his son to go through college. And if his son hates college -- whether he likes it or not, he still feels, because he's been brought up in a certain way, he feels obligated to go through with it, no matter whether he hates it or not.)

So that he already comes here with a kind of aloofness and says, "It is nothing in my life." Is that right?

Your explanation is probably valid. But I wouldn't call it "social pressure." It's a little more complicated, don't you think?

(Sir, I think "obligation" may be the important word. The attitude generally seems to be one of obligation; that is, there are a set of regulations, there are exams, and meeting places, requirements, deadlines, and so forth. These one does out of a sense of duty, responsibility, because it's imposed. But this destroys almost the real sense of love that one can have in studying. So the approach is one of obligation, rather than love.)

Well, I think our examination system is at fault. You cannot get up love if it is constantly interrupted by these deadlines, what you call "deadline." As I said, I was

very privileged in a university in Europe. You pass your final exam, your doctor's thesis, or what is, and that's only a very little of an exam. It's nothing.

You write a book that is your own, after all, your own creation.

So that's not an exam in your sense of the word, because you make your own contribution. And otherwise I haven't been examined.

And I am still alive.

XV THERE MUST BE SOMETHING VERY WRONG

1

(Where else can you go? In other words, what other alternatives are open for you?)

If you're going out to get an education, you want to go to a place that you will have the best teachers available for you -- in the overall sense, where you can ask what questions you want to ask, where it's an idea of having sacrificed something in order to further yourself in the best way that you see available. And for instance, Dartmouth, or Princeton, or Yale, or any of these universities, while they do have their limitations, they do have certain aspects that are impractical as far as really furthering your learning ultimately.

Still, you have to put up with these in order to go there and listen to your teachers.)

Ja, but this boy said he had never said an honest word about the inner workings of his mind. That has nothing to do with your mind. I side with you. That's probably the situation.

And it's a good one.

2

But for this boy, it had turned to poison, because he hadn't made use of this situation at all. Isn't that true? I'm driving further, that's the starting point, your situation.

But this boy says to me, as a senior after three and-a-half years in college, that he hadn't had a reason or an opportunity to speak his mind to anybody, and it was very refreshing to do so with me.

(But wouldn't that be saying, regardless of where he went to school? I don't think that Dartmouth in itself { }.)

No, I'm speaking of all your schools. I have no axe to grind here. This place isn't any worse than any other place.

3

(So what I'm saying --- I'm not defending the college. The college isn't the issue I'm raising here, just --)

No, but this boy's remark. Can you explain it to me? We are concentrating not on your remark, of which there is no doubt. I have no criticism of your standpoint.

But this boy had a different viewpoint, didn't he? Because how can you live through three and-a-half years? I mean, to speak your own mind is only part of life. If you want to receive opinions and convictions from somebody else, your contribution is that you open up yourself.

(But you said you felt ashamed for the school, for the environment. And it's not that so much, because I would think the boy, regardless of what environment he'd be in, would have this same problem.)

Well, but if even one man out of 3,000 -- and obviously he is not the only one, but let's take one man -- can get an impression that this is a place where you are not expected to speak your mind, there must be something very wrong.

(I think there's practically no place in the world where if you haven't got a little guts, it isn't hard to speak your mind. And so whether you're in Dartmouth College, or you're at Leipzig, doesn't really make much difference. So it's going to be hard. And this person experiencing just as much trouble as he would anywhere else.)

4

(Professor Huessy, I think there are justifications in all this. First of all, I think the first big question might be himself, as you just stated. Second of all, I think the justification for the deadlines and the exams we take -- you yourself have said that a man must learn to follow before he can lead. I think you can apply that equally as well to learning.

I don't think the average person that graduates from high school in the United States, being brought up under that philosophy is able to come to college and to study in a free system which you have described, at least not the first few years -- perhaps after that. And even at Dartmouth, they can if they want to, like getting into some of the seminar courses, and into their major work. I know I've come in contact with it.

But I don't think I would have been able to handle it personally in my first year at the school and get the benefit out of it that I should have.)

XVI KNOWLEDGE IS NOT A STAIRCASE

1

(Isn't that perhaps the problem of the speaker, that he must have a listener for everything that he has to say? And most of the listeners in Dartmouth College or any other represent a cult of mediocrity where --?)

Ja, but this boy must have felt that he has to do with the informers. I mean, much worse. I mean, why -- if I don't say my truth, it must be because I'm afraid that something happens to me.

2

(Well, perhaps this fellow you talked to had heard of the senior at Princeton, who was one of the people responsible for getting Alger Hiss, a very controversial figure, to speak at Princeton last year, and because of what he did with this Alger Hiss business, he's now on the American Legion Known Subversive List. And I believe this fellow is going to the Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs and Politics. He's probably going to try and get a job in the state department. And this would be very tough, seeing this man is not a subversive.)

Mr. White, a moment. Here were some people who wanted to say something. Please, will you raise your hands again?

Mr. Mandaville, you had talked already once, so I wait.

(Perhaps this boy hasn't found many professors who are interested in listening to what he has on his mind. I know of many that I { } going home, not much else. Perhaps education is a two-way affair, not only on the part of students, but on the part of the professor, too. And { } professor { } interested in a class in going home.)

Oh, it is my great interest that you should go home. Yes, it is.

3

Now Mandaville.

(I was just wondering -- it might be that it's very basic -- the idea of competition.

You said that the school must be in a of a leisure time. But the way people come to school in the United States and probably in most of the European schools, too, they come to the school with the idea of competition. This is only enhanced by exams, and competition to get into the school, and everything. And once you can't study leisurely, because you're so busy competing with others that you're worried about competition more than studying leisurely and spending your time at your own pace and learning { } things.)

Ja, it comes down again to this question of the exam as exhibit of your studies. I still think the curse in this country is the exam system. I think it's an absolute mistake.

(Don't you have the exam system in Europe?)

Well, I told you, I went from my fifth year to my seventh year to school -- high school, Gymnasium, then I went to the university. And then I took my doctor's degree, the law. And that was the first time that I had an oral exam.

(But today, if you go to the University of Paris, or to Rome?)

Same -- same. Oh no, Sir. Well, nobody goes to the classes anyway, there. No, they don't.

I have a friend who was called there to teach a year in Paris, in the Sorbonne. He thought it was great honor. He came back disgusted - was an American. And he said, "Out of 20,000 enrolled students in the law school in Paris, 350 attend the lectures. And 4,000 come off and on into the school." They have such a small building, that if the 20,000 all came, they couldn't possibly. He said he would never teach at the Sorbonne again. It's an absolutely corrupt place. Yes, perhaps in Lausanne, it's different, yes.

What is it?

(No, even in Paris, if you want to enter the university, you have to take exams to enter the university.)

Well, that's like College Board, yes. *(Well, it's a little harder than that.)*

4

Well. I argue the point of thinking that you can know a man through constant examining his mind and thereby stopping his growth, because any exam is after all, a little finite segment of knowledge. And it is not right. Knowledge is not a staircase.

That's the mechanical idea of learning.

But it is falling in love with a subject and expanding from a first nucleus of knowledge which you know, by constantly assimilating related things, which come into your knowledge either through textbooks, or through life, or through newspaper articles.

XVII EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S FILES

1

If I take the fields, gentlemen, of which I am keeping track -- there are quite a number of fields -- like the classics, like history, like the law, like philosophy, and like theology -- of which I am, in a certain way, to this day a specialist. And I have kept now for the last 50 years up with the development in these fields.

2

Whether I read a report in a newspaper, or in a magazine, or in a new book, or heard a lecture, I have my files, and those topics in which I am interested, will be in evidence there, wherever my experience is, whether I travel in the West and make an experience there about water supply, or moose, or something, I'm quite indifferent to my source of information.

And I'm not drawing my information from the idea that I have to render the account by examination to somebody, who can only ask what is printed in a textbook.

3

The terrible thing that happens to you through examinations is -- in my mind - that you really think that the textbook contains what you should know in this field. Obviously, that's just purely accidental, such a stupid textbook.

What you should know in this field is what this field requires to be known, which is partly human experience. A sunset, or astronomical facts you cannot learn from a textbook only. But you have to observe the stars yourself.

4

Now today, you all undergo this examination thing without ever having your classroom studies, and all the full range of your experiences in sport, in politics, in family affairs meet, because it isn't required. In an exam, the teacher has no right, to draw on the wider range of knowledge than the one compressed in this little textbook.

XVIII *CREATING THE CURRENT*

1

Now that falsifies the whole matter. It seems to you that you only know the subject matter through the textbook. And therefore, the whole subject matter gets a stilted character.

2

If you say you know only poetry from a textbook on poetics, then the paper you will write on poetics will be very stilted and very stultifying, indeed. Whereas you should have 90 percent of your impressions by reading poetry, and then get a little help, 10 percent at best, from a textbook on poetry.

3

It's the same with Shakespeare. What does it help me that you are made to read Hamlet in class, if you don't read voluntarily 35 of the 36 plays of Shakespeare yourself, or go to theaters where they are played? The course on Hamlet is silly, because it is isolated.

It's like the sulfuric element, the copper element in the sulfuric bath, without the sulfuric bath. You can't have electricity if you haven't the fluid, and the copper getting together and creating the current.

4

The textbook is at best the copper element, in the whole electrifying process of your own mind.

Why I'm so dead against exams is that they breathe the illusion that what is required knowledge is the textbook knowledge. But the textbook knowledge is only 10 percent of the knowledge. In every field, by the way. In every field.

XIX *EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY WHEN HE WAS FIFTEEN*

1

What does it help you that you take a course in history if you do not read up voluntarily an autobiography, or the letters of John Quincy Adams, or documents all yourself, because you are interested in it? And then you go to a course that integrates all this, and covers those things for which you had no occasion to study yourself.

That's how a decent person studies history. But you go to Mr. Gisely and think that's what history is all about. You are all wrong.

2

(I want to answer your question about --.)

And by the way, I was 15 when I did my studying in this manner in Europe, because you were left free. I have never thought that my history teacher could teach me history. That's impossible. I was very much ablaze with historical interest. I would get anecdotes from older people. I would read letters, and biographies, collect works, read documents; and then the teacher could just give the skeleton.

Of course, that's a great help.

3

I mean, any man who is a gadgeteer does the same in physics. Who is a good physicist? Obviously the man who steps out and has his own laboratory -- lab a little bit. Isn't that true? And so he knows certain things, whether the textbook says it or not. He just knows how the radio works.

4

And the terrible thing is that you don't cope with the same manner with the humanities as you certainly do in chemistry and physics. Americans have the know-how there. You know how a motor runs. You haven't to wait for the professor of physics to tell you this.

But why is that different in these examined courses, where you really think it's the textbook which tells you the whole story? It never does. The textbook is only a cramming device.

XX EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S GREATEST DEFEAT IN DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

1

(What about the problem in America, which I don't think they have in Europe.)

In Europe, a very few percentage of people went to college. And among the people who went to college were the people who went to college were interested in learning for itself. What do you in America, where you have this idea of mass education, and where a student who

might not be gifted in understanding on his own, Shakespeare, who would never be led by his American background to pick up Hamlet, and --)

Put them in the administration of the college. There they can't do any harm.

2

(About what you said about the exam, the deadline period is true.

But I was just wondering, is it necessarily the device of the exam that creates the trouble, or is it the attitude behind the course, and the way it's given. Couldn't it be possible to have examinations in the course with the grade depending on them necessarily, and still, with the proper attitude, along with the teaching of the course, bolster a feeling in the person taking it, that he could continue on with his education in that course, regardless of the fact that his instruction has stopped?)

My dear man. I fully agree. I think all these mechanics, they are below the belt, so to speak. One shouldn't much talk about them.

3

An exam is something, which if it is handled rightly, doesn't have to have problems. I think it has now reached proportions of importance, by which the teacher is just disabled to get beyond it.

The greatest defeat in Dartmouth College I ever have suffered is when I had a class like yours, in a different course it was; it was a smaller class. And we agreed that the fruits of this course would appear 10 years later. At best. Then they would know what it meant in their own lives. And they all wrote down their names, and they said, "In 10 years, we'll all meet."

And not one of them has shown up. They took their exam, and they left.

4

And therefore, I feel that I'm right to complain that the exam is not in the right salient -- in the right -- how would you say it? -- at the right height of your vision. It isn't something you can keep under, here down below, but it is the highest aim. And then the story ends.

XXI *LESS FORMAL AND LESS IMPORTANT*

1

I don't know what to do about this. But I think the exam is given mutually by all the people, such a tremendous expression by the administration, such a tremendous importance. It is something that can be handled in an innocuous manner.

2

That's why I'm going to repeat the question of my term paper in the final exam. And I'll let you know it ahead of time. You just have to know a little bit about another school of thought. And otherwise you'll bring the Freeman to class, and nothing more is asked, but that you have had some understanding during his course.

3

So I don't think examinations should be surprises, either. That's why everybody can use his notes, in all my courses. And because I feel I can perhaps diminish the damage done by exams, by making them less important -- less formal and less important.

4

Perhaps since we have been discussing -- perhaps you can stand my taking up the thread now without a break, is that right? Can you stand it?

XXII *OUT OF THE HEAD OF ZEUS LIKE ATHENE*

1

Will you then kindly -- as the result of this discussion still note that the word "school" in antiquity is not a name for children, and it is not yet the achievement which we have reached in modern times by following the Christian principle of making inimical minds stand the strain, the stress of being put together for one progress of thought.

2

The Greeks have not known progress -- that's now my second point -- because of their lack of a university. Plato's doctrine remains the same from 387 B.C. to 529.

If you were a Platonist, you were a Platonist. You could leave the school and go to another school.

3

But gentlemen, you must understand that the mind of Greek philosophy is miraculous, because every philosopher came out of the head of Zeus like Athene, as a finished product.

Paganism, gentlemen, does not know the interpenetration of human people. In our present day, gentlemen, we assume -- and you do it quite naively, or perhaps you don't, because we are on the way back to paganism at this moment really, a danger for it -

4

But hundred years ago, Emerson, for example, knew that a woman contained in herself also the understanding of a man. And a man contained the understanding of a woman, that our soul was polymorph, was richer than our physical layout, and therefore, a university is a very modern and Christian idea, that we can harbor many other people's minds sympathetically within ourselves, and argue with them; and let them stand, and know that the single mind is not wide enough for the wealth of creation, and the profundity of the divine wisdom.

XXIII THE RENAISSANCE OF GREECE AND ROME A CHRISTIAN ACHIEVEMENT

1

This is the condition of what you call "progress." And since you naively believe in progress, you always look into history, progress.

But gentlemen, progress has not existed before the Christian era. Progress in science is unknown in Greece. The Greeks made no progress in science, but they had any number of -- how do you call it? -- sparks of genius, of Promethean discoveries, here brilliant flash of insight.

The Greek civilization is flashy in a very positive sense, because as I said, all these flashes together are like a kaleidoscope of everything possible. But nothing was followed up.

2

The Greeks believed not in progress, gentlemen, but they believed in cycles. They believed in the eternal return, eternal recurrence. You must know this, gentlemen, because you believe that there is no difference between paganism and Christianity. And I assure you there is.

We have been able to give rebirth to the Greeks' mind. The Renaissance is a Christian idea, because there is no enemy, no cannibal who cannot come and get a revival for the best that is in him, in the Christian era.

3

You must always understand that the Renaissance of Greece and Rome is a Christian achievement, because they could not give rebirth to Persian, or to Babylonian, or to Jewish things.

Not even to their own. Homer was thrown out by Plato, as you have heard.

4

We can give rebirth to anything pre-Christian.

If you could understand the difference between the renascence -- what we call the Renaissance, and Plato himself, you would understand that the fact that we teach Plato in a Christian era, in a liberal arts college, is a Christian feat.

Because we take a pagan to heart and say, "He's still good enough for us, to look into everything that is valid in him. And we will omit slavery, we will omit homosexuality, we will omit women's degradation. We will omit all the stupidities and follies in Plato. We will still treasure him.

He'll become a Christian saint. We will make him a member of our era."

XXIV *THE FREEDOM OF NOT REPEATING THE PERFORMANCE*

1

Can you understand that this no Greek could have done in his school?

Because Plato's school had to be kept even free from Aristotle.

2

And people do not understand this. All the textbooks on Greek philosophy which you read today in this country are of this bottomless naiveté, that they think the Greeks would have had a renaissance of Greece, the Greeks spirit. It couldn't.

The Greeks cannot give free rebirth to something that is passed. We can. We can squeeze out even the juice out of Eskimos, and of primitive people today.

We have anthropology today, because we have a respect for these people. We want to find out what kept them going.

And this is our era, gentlemen, this freedom of not repeating the performance.

3

You know there are these cyclical obsessions today with us.

Mr. Spengler is such a Greek, who has written a book in modern times as though we were all Greeks again; and we had to go inevitably through the same cycles as the Greeks. He has a book, *The Decline of the West*. You have heard of it, haven't you?

The same is true of Mr. Toynbee. Toynbee and Spengler, despite Mr. Toynbee's pious exhortations to the opposite, that he is some Christian, he has not an idea what Christianity is, not the slightest idea.

4

The first thing about Christianity is that everything is free, available -- if it has been any good -- from former civilizations, that we keep going by freely grafting upon our own tree of life anything we like from others. We have this free selective power.

Mr. Toynbee -- I mean, he's much more stupid than Spengler. Spengler was a genius, a pagan who wanted to be a pagan. He had the pride of his convictions. Mr. Toynbee always goes down on his knees and says, "I pray on Sundays. Only on weekdays am I a pagan."

XXV OSWALD SPENGLER AND ARNOLD TOYNBEE

1

I hate this. This is imbecile, and it is a coward's attitude. It's mental timidity. He wants to have it both ways: be a Christian on Sundays, and a pagan on weekdays,

because his 23 civilizations are just completely chained to a cycle. Up and down, and up and down, and out it goes. Madness, even.

But Spengler, it is great.

2

I talked to Mr. Spengler, and he admitted. I said, "How can you know anything about the Greeks? According to your principles, we are all in our own cycle. The Greeks thought this way. We have our own humanities now, so we are doomed to go through our cycle. That's what you say."

"Yes," he said. "That's what I say."

And I said, "Now then, how do you know that anything you write about the Greeks is true? You only sit in your own little ivory tower as of today"-- 1918 it was-- "and therefore the Greeks are just a sealed book to you, are they not? You say that's a different civilization. How do we understand the Greeks?"

He said, "You got me there. That's a secret. It's a paradox. I don't understand it myself. But I am convinced that I understand the Greeks."

And I said, "I am, too." But that's why you misjudge your own time, because we are fortunate in understanding ourselves and another time. The Greeks didn't. And didn't have to. Didn't even try to.

3

(Sir, perhaps Mr. Spengler -- he doesn't think that the Greeks are in a different cycle from the cycle that we're in.)

Oh yes, totally different. Yes. Every thousand years. Oh, no -- Mr. Danby, Mr. Danby, oh no, my dear man. You see, he has the hellastocracy -- you haven't read this book yet, have you? Oh, better do.

Very good book.

No, the story's very simple. Roughly speaking, it's not quite from 3,000 to 300. That's our own time. That he calls this the occidental civilization. That's the oriental -- he hates Christianity, so he calls it the "arrogant civilization." Nothing of Christianity, just "arrogant." That he calls the Greek. And then he calls the salatocracies. He means the sea-faring people. He has this word from a phrase in the Egyptian monuments, where the sea peoples came and invaded Egypt, the Phoenicians, covering the whole Mediterranean and the Etruscans.

4

Well, I won't go into the detail. But the funny thing about Spengler is that it is a total revival of the spirit of the Greek Academy, of Plato. Strictly cyclical. Every thousand years, there is winter, spring, summer and autumn or fall. And then it ends. And then begins a new period elsewhere in a different - what he calls the "maternal landscape."

And so it hops from place to place. And its absolutely lawful order in these thousand years you cannot escape.

XXVI TO DIE CONSCIOUSLY

1

And he said -- I'm just in Mr. Spengler's position with saying farewell now through this whole year to Dartmouth.

Yesterday I went for the last time to bring the papers for the final examination to Choate House, you know, where they print these deviltries and now today I go for the last time to read proof on this.

I'll never do it again. It's wonderful.

2

And Mr. Spengler has this famous line - I have never forgotten it. I read his book in 1918/19 and never again. But I still know this sentence.

Well, I wrote such a wonderful review about it then that I don't have to reread it, Sir. I know everything that is in it.

3

And he said, "We shall die consciously. And we shall observe every step which leads to our death with deliberation, and consciousness."

So that's what I undergo at this moment, gentlemen. I die consciously to Dartmouth College. And he was so sure that the only thing at the end of such an era we could do -- or he could do was to die consciously.

4

And you know what killed him? It's a very interesting thing.

He was a genius. And he had projected the end of our occidental cycle of western man by and large to the year 2200 and 2300. And then, all of a sudden -- and I had, by the way, argued this point with him -- he saw that the end which he had foreseen for 2300 came with Hitler, for Europe. And he saw Hitler. And he saw, by the way, Mussolini.

And he saw what caliber of man Hitler was. He asked Mr. Spengler to see him -- from vanity, probably. And then he talked two hours, and Spengler couldn't put in one word.

And so he died broken-hearted, Spengler, feeling that the military dictatorship, of last Roman emperors, was upon us, these tyrants.

And he saw in Hitler the year 2300 being present in 1934. And when he saw this, he saw that the end of his world had come.

XXVII *YOU ARE ALREADY IN THE THIRD MILLENIUM*

1

And it's a great lesson, gentlemen, in eschatology, in ends of the world. Spengler, as an honest man, saw that he was the end of his own time, of his own world. And he died. And he died -- I think he was 50.

A man who dies in his own time commands my great respect. He is in harmony with his own mind. His mind is his life, his life is his mind.

2

Something you will never achieve, because you have no mind of your own. You have borrowed minds. Every day another.

And a man who is so ingrown into the fate of his civilization that he can even correct his projection, and because he had thought it was still a little off, suddenly seeing himself confronted with this monster from the abyss, he falls into the abyss himself and says, "It's all over. The world I have identified myself with."

3

And so you may be perfectly safe. You are already in the third millennium. You are after Spengler.

The world in which we move today, or begin to move is a beginning, gentlemen. It's not an end. It could be for you if you wanted.

4

I have always -- that was the whole point with my contemporaries, with the Thomas Manns, and all these Prousts, these philosophers of decadence. I was never interested.

I said, "You are right, so I must make a new beginning. I cannot be your contemporary. If you already foresee the end, I can anticipate the end. What's that to me? I simply assume that you are right. That will run its course. It's over with."

And that has saved me. Mr. Spengler and myself -- we have very close contact. He's the last, I'm the first. And because I was taught by him, he had done something which doesn't need to be repeated.

If the same is true of Proust -- if one man jumps into the abyss, *A la recherche du temps perdu*, I can perhaps be on the -- "*A la recherche de temps nouveau*." Why not?

XXVIII ONLY GOD CAN CREATE NEW THINGS

1

So the Greek element, gentlemen, in our civilization has been revived from 1515 -- will you kindly mark down this year? I give you my reasons for this right away -- to Mr. Spengler, to 1917, in an amazing manner. The tradition of Christianity is freedom and progress, the tradition of Greek is cycle.

At the very last moment of the renaissance of the Greek spirit, in Mr. Toynbee and Mr. Spengler, the truth has been reproclaimed of recurrence.

2

Nietzsche has said "eternal recurrence"; Spengler has said "eternal recurrence"; Toynbee has said -- no, he hasn't the same expression, but it is -- "multiplication of the same."

Now gentlemen, it is your choice: Are you Greeks or are you not?

Christianity today is threatened by an increase of Greek influence, because the primary problem of the Greek spirit has been its evasion of progress, its having to believe in cycle.

3

It's very strange why these philosophers had to -- because they started with a question of space, with matter, with the cosmos, with the physis, at the end. Physis is the same all the time. It's always -- you cannot explain, if you begin with physis, the creation of newness. You cannot.

You must begin with God. Only God can create new things. If you do not begin with logos -- and Heraclitus was the last who began with logos, really. All the others transformed logos into something physical. Even the ideas are just somewhere things in eternity.

4

So gentlemen, in 1550, Erasmus of Rotterdam -- you have heard perhaps this man's name -- is the greatest reviver of Greek. He published the New Testament in the Greek language in Europe, and made it as the condition of the ministry to know Greek.

That's the cradle of Protestantism, the knowledge of Greek and Hebrew.

This man, Erasmus of Rotterdam, made his inaugural speech at the University of Basel, when he was made a professor there. And he had an invocation. And you'll remember that I said to you, the invocation and the dedication are part of any man's philosophy just as much as the content of the book. You remember Lucretius?

XXIX *SANCTUS SOCRATES (ERASMUS VON ROTTERDAM)*

1

Now I come back to this. And I want to show you today why we no longer understand quite what a school and an academy, or a university is.

Mr. Erasmus invoked there Socrates and called him "Sanctus Socrates." Saint Socrates. He made Socrates into a Christian. And he said, "Socrates is as good a Christian as any Christian."

2

Now the Greeks, including Socrates have not believed in progress. They have not believed -- and they have not succeeded -- that, for example, the death of Socrates is the fruit of a new life, resurrection. They have practiced it, but they had never this tenet.

As you know, I told you that Socrates taught men how to die, but Jesus taught mankind the meaning of death. That's something very different: the fruitfulness of dying.

3

And the Sanctus Socrates, gentlemen, is the first word of the Greek renaissance. And with the word "Sanctus," he gave the pre-Christian Greeks a status of sanctity in the heavens of Christianity.

Now all saints are progressive. Any saint has made a contribution which has renovated, regenerated, added to life. We know from every saint a way of life which before hasn't existed. Otherwise he isn't a saint. Otherwise he's just an imitating, so to speak, of a saint.

A saint is a man who discovers one more salubrious way of life.

4

Now Mr. Erasmus has made you believe, through the Renaissance, that the Greeks can be adopted as children of our era. In the year 1917, gentlemen, when the World War led to the destruction of the whole old world, to the Balkanization of Europe, under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, when all the order of the old world was destroyed, and is out of kilter as it is to this day -- look at the Near East; well, what is the question?

We destroyed the Ottoman Empire and we put nothing in its place. That's the Near East. What is there is nothing. You call them "states."

But Mr. Mandaville will not make me believe that Saudi Arabia is a state or a nation. We talked about this. Never shall I believe it, because it isn't. It is just a bankruptcy, a mass of countries in receivership.

XXX THE RETURN OF THE ACADEMY INTO THE CITY

1

So when we destroyed this, gentlemen, we abolished the hope for progress.

We abolished the hope for progress, because the only centers for progress are places with universities. The Near East has no universities. Cairo is not a university, gentlemen. It is a world of superstition. Saudi Arabia has no university.

If you want to have a nation you must have a center of self-criticism in it.

2

You remember what we said about the Academy? That it was a center of self-criticism. Without such a center of self-criticism, you can't have progress.

3

Now you see perhaps the sudden importance of the return of the academy into the city, into the polis, into the nation, into the state. Without this return of the Greek spirit into the political order, it has no effect. It is useless.

4

And we have now any number of barbarous countries like Indochina, and Malaya, and Egypt, and Saudi Arabia, where this doesn't exist. And we cannot treat these countries like normal countries of our description, because their conditions of self-improvement are missing. No separation of Church and state. No separation of higher criticism and political power.

XXXI THE GREAT DANGER OF RELAPSING INTO ANTIQUITY

1

So gentlemen, the reason why this course in the history of Greek philosophy is necessary, is to warn you at this moment, that the reception, the renaissance of the Greek mind has run its course to such an extent that we now are endangered by its reception, because unnoticed, and uncriticized, there has slipped into your mind the idea of cyclical thinking.

2

You are poisoned by Mr. Toynbee, and by many others, by the business cycle men before, by all the cycle creatures, gentlemen, and all the prophets of doom, the Malthusians, by the way, too, and such people -- that man is simply in a rut, that he is in a vicious circle, that everything returns.

As soon as you believe in eternal recurrence, the renaissance of the Greek mind, the reception of the Greek mind, the re-adoption of the Greek mental figures of thought have reached a saturation point.

And I feel I have to show you this, that we have, from 1550 to 1917 increasingly -- how do you call those -- let down your barriers --? (*Guard.*)

Well, let down our -- well, there's a technical's term. Let down our -- our protective palisades, or however you call it -- down against the invasion of the pagan spirit of the pre-Christian era.

3

The Christian era is the first era that has said, "Man does not have to return to his starting point. He can go forward." Every other era - take China's, or take Buddha's - are convinced that everything returns. Buddha returns every 500 years. The emperor of China was the same all the time for 4,000 years.

We don't believe this. We don't believe in the return of the native. Or do we?

4

That's why you are in such great danger, gentlemen. You fall for all these new things, like Spengler, not knowing that you therefore simply relapse into antiquity, into the Greek spirit, into the Greek Academy, which didn't love their enemies.

XXXII THE CONDITION OF PROGRESS

1

You should know that America can only survive by loving Russia.

That is, by learning from Russia, by accepting all the incentives from Russia. The world is too narrow to exclude anything from influencing us and from getting us awake. You cannot shut up, and say, "I'm not interested in what's going on there," because God has put the enemy, the devil, as our spur into our flanks.

And we don't deserve to exist if we flee our fellow man. He has something, because he's part and parcel of the same family. We cannot get out of the human family.

That's the condition of progress.

2

It's very serious, gentlemen. Against everything we sin at this moment in this country.

3

And that's why the story of Greek philosophy at this moment is at a critical point. I want to announce -- we'll study this further on in the next meeting -- that the saturation point of your acceptance, of your renaissance of the Greek spirit has come, because you now absorb Greek doctrines without recognizing them as Greek.

I have to teach you Greek philosophy for the reason that you must know what is Greek and what is not Greek. If you wouldn't listen to this course, you would accept Mr. Spengler as a modern thinker, as a progressive thinker, as a last novelty, like Mr. Toynbee, or Nietzsche, or Proust.

And I tell you they are *rejetons*, I think, Mr. Baylor, can one say in French, "rejeton"? (Yes, that's right.) How would you explain this?

4

Well, perhaps you take down the word as a precious word. I don't think there is in biology or English this word, a *rejeton*. You understand what it is? (*Regeneration?*) Oh, the opposite. (*Why do you say { }.*) There is an English word. But I can't -

XXXIII TO HELL WITH DEPRESSION

1

No. You are a member of a family, it's an old family. And suddenly a boy is born, as you can find in old princely families, who looks like an ancestor of 1500. And that's a *rejeton*. That is, is a throwback. Don't you say a --? -- no, not much of a reincarnation. It's less than a reincarnation. It's a *rejeton*, Sir. A backthrow.

Can't you say "a back-throw"? A throwback? (*Throwback.*)

2

That's what it is, a *throwback*.

Watch out that you don't become throwbacks at this moment into the pagan era. As soon as you abdicate the conditions of progress, as soon as you play with the idea of mere cyclical return, in any field -- whether it's in business, with the business cycle.

3

America went pagan in 1929 in the Republican Party, and they had to do penance for 15 years, because they were pagan -- they believed that the Depression was necessary.

We no longer believe this, gentlemen. We say "to hell with the Depression".

4

Now gentlemen, that's a conversion in the field of economics to Christianity, because as long as you believe in the business cycle, you believe that a part of human endeavor is under natural fate, that it is fate, that you can't do anything about it.

It's fatalism.

XXXIV TO TRY TO WAKE UP

1

So the problem of economics today is the problem of Christianity. If you think that you can eliminate the law of the cycle, or influence it, you act as a free man. If you say that you have to kowtow to this cycle, you are Greek. But --

[tape interruption]

...of very practical importance, gentlemen, after all.

All the questions are religious questions, gentlemen. There are no other questions than religious questions. Don't believe in social questions and economic questions. All nonsense.

The Russians have also a religion. That's why they are very important. And that's why they are very dangerous.

2

But the business cycle was the American businessman's arrest of paganism. And he had to shed it in the last 30 years. He has undergone a conversion.

3

And that's why in the '20s, gentlemen, everybody believed in Spengler. Because everybody believed in some part of his anatomy in the cycle, in the business cycle. So it seemed quite possible that what a businessman believed about the Depression...

[tape interruption]

...and he would also be true with regard to the wider issues of human life.

4

Today, Mr. Spengler has a poor press, because we no longer believe in this pagan element in our era. But that is the reason, gentlemen, why you must put the history of Greek philosophy as a part of modern history.

The penetration of Greek thought, until it threatened to flood us, to overcome our resistance against its main tenet of cycles, goes in the direction that a little comes in 1515 with the exhortation that Socrates might be called a saint, like a Christian saint, was unheard-of, was blasphemy at that time.

You no longer feel that's blasphemy.

Why not, you say? Saints are cheap to you. So make Socrates a saint. And in 1957 the majority of your beliefs is already Greek, again. And that's time then to try to wake up.

That's why I wrote this book- -- this pamphlet for you,

Thank you.

TWENTYTHIRD LECTURE: *THE RIGHT FUTURE, GOD'S FUTURE, CREATED*

I *THE ERA HAS DISAPPEARED*

1

...but we say, from the first Greek Ionian philosophers to some indefinite progress, then ends abruptly, and then begins again with the glorious awakening of the spirit of antiquity of science, and now has reached its apogee and climax in you.

2

That is your naive idea. Here you are, in 1957, and of course, you are so infinitely more clever than the people in 1515, that's progress.

So this is your picture. This is one cycle. Oh, no -- it's not a cycle, it's going straight this way. But here, this is a cycle. And damn it all -- what happened in between?

3

Gentlemen, at this moment in most rebarbarized countries like America and Germany, the era has disappeared, the Christian era, and people begin to talk first of all about cycles, and then they have abolished the counting from A.D. and B.C.

Most histories which I read try to erase this.

Mr. Toynbee has erased the Christian era; Mr. Spengler, as I told you, has nearly erased it; Mr. Freyer in Germany, to give another example; Mr. Hendrik van Loon, in his popular history, which is one of the most idiotic books that exists, but has sold over a million copies in this country.

4

And so the mind is poisoned today.

II *WHY DO WE TEACH THIS COURSE?*

1

And if you look into your own selves, you are not quite sure in which era you live, gentlemen. It isn't so very simple now to admit that one does live in the Christian era. Very few people have reasons to say so.

And the official teachers of philosophy, somebody like my colleagues here in this department, would agree with the new slant that there is no reason in important fields to count the years from zero, from the coming of our Lord to today, and they say, "That's just superstition."

2

You may of course go with the Jewish calendar, where it makes no difference, where no year changes. Everything is the same here, since the creation of the world. That's one other way of expressing disgust with the Christian calendar.

But the Greek story held by most humanists to this day is, that there was every reason to believe that the Periclean Age, and down to Caesar and Cicero, was on the right track, then people lost sight of reason and fell into the abyss of religion, and so we all became superstitious again.

3

So the history of Greek philosophy is the course in which this decision has to be made by anybody who doesn't want to take a course in college, but wants to understand his own time.

The history of Greek philosophy must end in some connection with us.

Why do we teach this course?

4

This is very central. And most of you take the course for wrong reasons. And so I have to warn you, that the end of the course of Greek philosophy must lead you to the awareness: why it ended in Christianity, and why the fathers of the Church could look to the history of philosophy as a great odyssey, a tremendous odyssey in which all the gems and pearls in the ocean were found, and fished up, yes; but it was an odyssey just the same. And it ended nowhere.

It ended in mere repetition. There came the neo-Platonists; there came the neo-Pythagoreans; there came the new Stoa, and the new Epicureans, but once the odyssey over the ocean of the human mind had been done, it was mere, fruitless repetition, and mankind couldn't live on it.

III THE CIRCULAR CHARACTER OF GREEK THOUGHT

1

I began last time to reason with you already without saying so, why it had to come to an end. And I tried to tell you that the Greeks themselves believed that they were moving in a cycle.

The circular character of Greek thought is that which I want to treat today.

2

Because if I say myself that I move in a cycle, I cannot complain if the cycle is really experienced. And of course, mankind is, at any minute, gentlemen, in danger of moving in a circle, in a vicious circle.

The progress, gentlemen, is a decision, of cutting the Gordian knot by which we are entangled in a cycle. By nature, gentlemen, we are animals who remain in a cycle. But by our strange task, by our destiny, we are not allowed to stay in a cycle.

Now your belief in automatic progress has taken it for granted that we shall not fall into a rut, as you call it, which means a cycle. But by now it dawns, I think, on most people that whole nations, like Spain today -- perhaps Hungary, now, or perhaps the United States -- very well fall into a cycle.

3

If you look at a map of Europe and of the earth, you find that more territories belong to areas where man has lived in a vicious cycle than the areas covered inhabited by groups who have kept going. You look into the Near East, and any Israelite in Israeli will tell you that the Arabs are still moving in cycles, circles, and that's the real issue. They don't lead to the same age.

All your attempts to be nice with Saudi Arabia -- I've tried to tell this Mr. Mandaville -- is he here? He is carefully absent -- are idiotic. They live in the Stone Age, in Moslem age. And Mohammed was a prophet who successfully sealed the tribes from Greek and Roman citification. And he has kept his tribes in this strange circular movement for the last 1500 years.

That's the essence of Mohammedism, of Moslem.

4

Great fellow who freed these ancient tribes from magic, from superstition, and the human sacrifice; but on the other hand, forbade them to enter the life of the city, or the life of urbanization, the life of literature, the life of science, and everything else you like, of art; forbid them the arts.

And in every Arab country, and take this unfortunate country of Egypt, the only people there who have ever filled any civil service, or any office of medicine, or anything has been the Christian Copts, the 2 million people in Egypt who did not go Moslem. They are the backbone of Egypt. They are treated as badly as the Jews in America, but they are necessary.

All Moslem are incapable of entering history, because they don't want it. Mohammed has said, "I'm the only prophet. I'm the final revelation. Not one word can come after me that's of any importance." Every Moslem has to know the Koran by heart.

And that's very bad, gentlemen, to know anything by heart, because it stymies you. We don't have to know the New Testament by heart. That's why every year the New Testament can happen.

IV THE HUMANIST AND THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIANITY

1

The cycle, gentlemen. I have here a book which I recommend to you. It came out in Holland. It's written by a Mr. van Groning. And it's called *In the Grip of the Past: Essay on an Aspect of Greek Thought*.

Now it has so much to do with our problem here, that I thought I should mention this book to you, because it shows you - you can for a very cheap price, and with a very few pages, get access to the thing that's unknown in this country - that the difference between the Christian era and Greece is our relation to the future.

2

In this country, that's all wiped away. And people say, "Oh, you can be a Greek and you can be a Christian." You cannot. You have to take your choice.

In February, there will be the visit of a man who's now at Union, also a Dutchman, Henry Cremer. He'll teach here, or at least lecture here. I hope he'll stay at my house. An old friend of mine.

He was a missionary -- or not a missionary: he was a philologist, as you may say, in the Dutch East Indies. And he was the man sent by the Dutch in 1945 to the Dutch

East Indies, and came back with the report that they would be lost, and was no use fighting for them.

3

And so he is a very man of the world. But he has written just this year a very beautiful book on Christianity against humanism, in which he chides these silly people, especially in this country, who think they can reconcile humanism and Christianity.

They are irreconcilables, gentlemen, because of the relation of the humanist to the future.

The humanist believes in automatic future. And he doesn't believe that the future can only be created by giving up the past.

The doctrine of Christianity is that without death, there is no resurrection. And if you don't give up what you have, you cannot gain access to the future.

4

The humanist thinks you can have more and more, and the mind goes just on a promenade, and first looks at one tree, and then he looks at the next tree. And finally he has all the trees on his mind and in his mind.

What he has is confusion, but no life. He has a museum.

V A VERY STRANGE GREEK SENTENCE

1

If you go to New York, and go to the Metropolitan Museum, -- or the Metropolitan Opera, for that matter -- then you know what the humanist can do. He can store.

Or take the 120 most important books, the last desperate effort of humanism in this country. Nobody wants to have anything to do with these 120 Great Books anymore, because they have been made by a humanist fashion.

2

The Bible has to be read always, gentlemen. It's not a Great Book. It's something quite different. Humanists, they can only know a storehouse of knowledge. Why, gentlemen? And that brings up our relation to time. And of this, I want to say something.

3

When Aristotle speaks of Greek tragedy, he has a very strange word which explains to you the riddle of the humanist. You remember that we said there are three positions by which a man is spiritually alive. He has to weigh in these three elements.

Now when Aristotle in the Poetics, writes on tragedy -- and it's very significant that one of you has used this sentence in his treatment of Aristotle -- he says, "Greek tragedy stopped when it had fulfilled its nature." It stopped.

It's a very strange Greek sentence. I've jotted it down for you.

Has anybody taken Greek? Not one of you. So this will remain Greek to you, too.

I'll write it down, just the same. I'll put it in Latin, because it should startle you out of your wits. I don't want to put it in English first. It must be a foreign thought. It is not a Christian, it is not an American thought at all.

4

Put it this way.

"Tragoedia finita est"-- that's my own translation from the Greek --"quando habet ipsius naturam." These words are not superfluous. You see already the word "nature," "natura" must appear in its full glory. That's Greek physis, of course.

It's a very strange sentence, and it comes from the greatest thinker, the disciple of Plato and of Socrates, at the end of the great center period of Greek thinking. And he says simply,

"The tragedy stopped when it had once attained its nature."

Will you take this down, please? Poetics, fourth book, 15th paragraph, Page 1449 in the Stephen Stephanos edition. Aristotle Poetics, IV, 15.

VI FAREST AWAY FROM US

1

Now it's a sentence which not anybody in America who treats the Poetics of Aristotle ever mentions. It's too important for that. Since the idea in this country is that the Greeks must be the same as we, the point where they are farthest away from us must not be mentioned.

But this is the point where they are farthest away from us.

It says that tragedy, like anything else, is a thing of nature, which -- when it comes to itself, it stops. That is for the famous *entelekheia* of Aristotle, the idea that we are on this earth to become what we are. "*Entelos ekhein*" means -- "entelos" is the goal, a man has his destiny. And the entelechy of Aristotle says:

the highest man can do is to achieve what he is meant to achieve.

2

Gentlemen, when you think through these two words, "entelechy," to become what I am meant to become, and "*the tragedy stopped when it had once attained its nature*," you see that the Greeks use the word "logos," use their power of the spirit to carry as many things from ethos into physis, and to look at your own tragedy, that is, the highest accomplishment of the city life, of the community, the Metropolitan Opera, or whatever you take, something civic in any case, and say, "In the light of nature, what is its character?"

3

And so physis in the Greek mind always wins over ethos and as I tried to tell you that since the first days of the Ionian philosophers, the attempt is always to carry the experiences, the first impressions, the first experience of the child into the light of nature, to generalize it there, and to make it understandable in terms of physis, in terms of nature.

It is this primacy, gentlemen, of physis over logos and over ethos which leads men to grow discouraged, because if all political action if the aristocracy, gentlemen, if monarchy, if tragedy is a form of nature, then it must share the fate of all nature; then it has definable contours.

4

A wolf is a wolf, and it cannot become anything else. And a lion is a lion. And if you try to change an ass, you get at best a mule. But the mule cannot procreate, so even the mule is stopped, when you try to mate the donkey and the horse.

VII THE INSULT OF BEING CLASSIFIED

1

Nature is what it is. It can be classified, gentlemen. And the Greek mind ends in classifications.

Now, no classification, gentlemen, has any hope for the future. If you can classify the Hungarian revolution as a "revolution," it will go the way of all flesh of all revolutions. You can't forecast it.

Things that are of a class, gentlemen, have a circular development. Will you take this down?

The cycle is simply the temporary aspect of anything you classify.

2

Now your whole mind is Greek. It's feverishly active to classify away all your experiences. "This girl? Oh, she's like all other girls. Or she's not like all other girls, but like some other girls." Already that satisfies your imagination.

And so I'm "one of the teachers".

You have this infamy of telling the best man you meet, "You are one of the most interesting people I have ever met." Don't you know that this is an insult? You classify this man.

Instead of admitting that you never have met such a man. That's the only response to a person that it deserves, is his satisfaction. You have the infamy to tell a speaker, Mr. Gateskill, "You are one of the most interesting Englishmen I have ever met."

3

It's of course a lie. You have never met an interesting Englishman before. But you say so, because you want to be a Greek. You want not to be found out by something admirable, by the famous experience of which Aristotle speaks when he says that in everything in reality is something to be so admired, so as to be so astounded by that you lose your speech.

You don't want to be left speechless.

4

Gentlemen, the Greeks didn't want to be left speechless. Anybody who can classify a new event thereby denies that it is new.

The whole attempt of the Greek mind was -- as yours -- not to be taken in.

So you say to the greatest experience in your life, "It is one of the most interesting experiences of my life." In this moment, it has ceased to be any experience, gentlemen.

You don't know this. But you are riddled with this. I have still to find a Dartmouth boy who has the courage to say, "I have never experienced this before."

Before, you haven't experienced anything. Before, you haven't the courage to say this to yourself, you obliterate, you wipe away the whole enamel of the things that you allow to experience, you rascals, by comparing, by always saying, "He's a better lecturer," or "The other is a better lecturer," or "That's a better book than the other."

VIII UNIQUE AND CLASSIFIED (=INDIFFERENT)

1

Gentlemen, as long as you do not say that this book is unique, and the other book is unique, and that you decline to say which is better, you are a Greek. And you are very stupid.

You treat me as nature, and you treat my neighbor as nature, and you treat the girl as nature, and you treat your mother as nature.

2

When Mr. Bender asked this incredible question in his questionnaire, "Whom do you love more, your mother or your father?" he's a Greek. They cease to be Mother and Father in this very moment. They are just father and mother in general. But they are no longer your father and your mother. Because about your father and your mother, you know absolutely no quantitative single thing. As soon as you try to know it, they cease to be your father and your mother. And they fall on the city dump of generalizations.

3

Now gentlemen, we come nearer to the important truth, gentlemen. Anything that is my first experience, which I let stand as unique, has value. Anything that can be classified is indifferent, is indifferent.

The difference between the two realms of experience are of value, of validity, and the other of indifference. More or less indifference. And you are proud of remaining indifferent. That's all you want. That's why you tell even an earth-shaking experience still is one -- "The Gettysburg Address is just one of the finest speeches ever made."

As soon as you say this, gentlemen, you have lost all power to evaluate the Gettysburg Address. The only response to the Gettysburg Address is to burst into tears, which you cannot do, because you never cry with any great emotion. You even think it's a eulogy, it's a praise to call the Gettysburg Address "one of the greatest speeches." But don't you see that it has ceased to be a speech made for you? That as soon as you say, "One of the greatest speeches," it's in a museum, on a tin-can shelf of tomato juice, and orange juice, and other juices, instead of being a speech without which you would not be who you are.

4

Which is the truth of you, gentlemen, that the only thing that is of perhaps some value in you at this moment is that you have heard the Gettysburg Address. The rest is shit, and urine, and dirt. But this Gettysburg Address, if it has ever taken habitation in your mind, ennobles you. You are a better man because you know it.

So what's your business to classify it outside in physis, in nature? It is a part of your ethos. It's a part of the first impression out of which your own character is built up.

IX *FIRST IMPRESSION IS PRESSURE*

1

You see how important now it is to say, "Tragedy stopped when it had reached its nature." That was written in the year of the Lord 340. Alexander the Great was just entering Greece with his conquest of the world. And the life of Greece was over. And Greek tragedy no longer formed and produced Platos and Aristotles.

And if you say that tragedy has reached its nature, it is a second impression, because it stands on the tin-can shelf of your library, instead of forming you into a citizen of Athens, or of Greece, or of the world.

2

Where this tragedy happens, one is in a second group of the library, or of the college education; and the other is - as I hope you will see when you go to a play, now *Romeo and Juliet* next week is your own doing -- or it's this week, isn't it? -- I am looking forward to it, because I'm still made over by *Romeo and Juliet*.

And we made a special effort, my wife will see it in Boston on Wednesday. And I go to Professor Booth's, who's reading, and then we'll see it together on Saturday. So that's the way one should celebrate the power, which I still have, to be impressed.

3

I'm not a literary critic, fortunately. And I'm not an imitator of the literary critic, as you all are. I'm just a man who wants to be built up by Romeo and Juliet. It's first impression.

And it's very difficult to produce in me and my age again this first impression. You have to see it three times in one week to expose myself to real pressure. That's what "impression" is, pressure. You want to escape the pressure.

4

And we can say, gentlemen, the treating of anything as nature is an attempt to recede from its immediate pressure.

Nature is a second space outside of my immediate necessities.

You can see this from the laboratory today, gentlemen. What can you put in a laboratory? Only things which you do not immediately need for your own life. You cannot put into the laboratory and experiment with it the piece of bread which you must eat. That is a first experience, that you must eat. If you have enough bread, you can take away some of this bread and use it in a second realm, as a natural experiment.

Therefore, anything you use as nature, gentlemen, is not immediately part of your own existence.

X THE GREEKS CEASED TO COME INTO EXISTENCE

1

You don't know this, gentlemen. You know nothing about nature. But nature is your temptation. It is the sorceress which has bewitched you, so that you think you live in nature, and not in the city of men.

Nature is that which the community can afford to experiment with.

Will you take down this definition? Nature is that with which the community can afford to experiment with.

2

A physicist is a henchman of the government who now experiments with atomic energy. We allow him this, because we have enough to live immediately. So we

allow him to explode the earth. It's very dangerous and we feel a little hesitant now, because we entrust him so much, of this surplus of the universe that it may backfire into our own community. And one day, we may not have anything to eat then.

But first, we trusted him for centuries, because we thought we could afford it. We had enough to eat, and in addition, we allowed the physicist to experiment with that part of the universe to which we could remain indifferent.

Would you see this? If I pray, "God give me my daily bread," gentlemen, then it's of an immediate importance. If I then say, "Let us have hybrid corn," like Mr. Wallace in Iowa, that's so much gravy, as we say, that's in addition, that's a natural scientific experiment.

3

So if and when Aristotle tries to say that tragedy stopped when it reached its zenith, its nature, he said something very profound. You can also turn around and say, "Because it reached its nature, it became natural. It couldn't affect man any more. It ceased to be tragedy."

You can reverse the sentence. For the Greek, however, it ended when it's simply descriptive.

4

But after Aristotle, I'm afraid, the Greeks ceased to come into existence, because this one element of the tragedy no longer held immediate sway over them. But it was already put in this second realm in which you treat literature, something to talk about.

XI *STEPHEN SPENDER'S TESTIMONY*

1

Has anybody some memory of Mr. Spender's talk here when he came to this campus? The English poet Spender? Did nobody attend, two years ago? You probably weren't here, yet.

Well, he said exactly what I'm trying to say here about modern poetry. He said, "These English professors of English and their students murder me before I am a poet, but after all, I can produce perhaps eight poems a year."

And that's very much, gentlemen.

2

A great poet writes perhaps twentyfour immortal poems during his whole life. You of course believe that he can produce whole volumes of poetry a year because professors of English can do that. And you can, too. But they are no poetry. They only look like that. They are tin cans.

And you can write any number of essays in a college like ours, of course. There is complete contempt of writing, because you write all this stuff, it isn't worth being written.

3

But by numbers, by quantity, it is very impressive, and very suppressing. And so Mr. Spender said, "I only seem to write poetry to give nourishment to the silly college professors of English, and their students who then try to learn to write better and quick. What I produce genuinely within one year is not enough to feed them for one week."

It becomes nature. And it becomes trash.

4

And that's how the world today is construed, gentlemen, the proportion of genuine and political, and religious life, and of natural life, is of course all in favor of the natural. Man has taken over the realm of nature.

A zoologist has said, "Man is today like a cancerous growth on the surface of the earth -- there where palm trees used to grow, and oaks, and birds fly, and pigeons, and alligators, and crocodiles, and buffaloes, and moose, man is multiplying. But," he says, "he is just multiplying his nature. He's not multiplying in his creative power, in his religious power, as a liturgist, as a priest."

The proportion on the earth is, gentlemen, that you and I, we must not become natural. But since it is your idea to become natural, the only thing is now to produce 4 billion people on this globe, to wipe out all other organic life, and therefore, to destroy the equilibrium on this globe.

XII UNIFORM: A CONDITION OF WARFARE

1

Man is absolutely lost if he is not satisfied to create communities. If you want just to be natural, know your calories, your vitamins, be an individual, then you become like one of these mushrooms, like these bacteria, one-cellular beings.

2

Most Americans try to have this hope that they will end up as an individual bacterium, absolutely unconscious, absolutely innocent, absolutely equal to everybody else. And all your dreams, gentlemen, are one of the second realm of reality of nature, where you become totally indifferent, and where you might be wiped out by the bomb quite justifiably,

because there's absolutely no reason, gentlemen, for any man to live unless he's unique.

3

If I can classify you, gentlemen, head off.

You have to put a man in uniform to persuade his enemy that he can shoot at him, because when man is classified in a uniform, as one form of others, will you bring any decent fellow to treat him as his enemy. The more a man is unique, the more you will respect the man. The more you put him in a uniform, the easier you can persuade people to go to war.

It's a condition of warfare that the enemy must wear a uniform. Otherwise you can't shoot at him.

4

So to make war, gentlemen, is the attitude of treating any part of reality as nature. Nature is at war, or at the stage of war we call our environment "nature".

Because you will admit if you treat a cow as nature, you can slaughter it. You can sell it, its meat. You can use its milk and cheese. If you have your chickens in your chicken coop as your pets, you cannot treat them economically. You have to have 13,000 broilers, as my friend now has in Vershire. It's just horrid. And 13,000 animals, they're classified. No feelings left. The sooner the better.

XIII *NEVER TRY TO REACH OUR NATURE*

1

Gentlemen, nature is on the way towards death. To say, "This is natural," means that I treat it as less and less important. It's a lessening of importance when I put on anything the label "nature."

2

And this you have forgotten. Nature is unimportant. I used before the word "indifferent." The word "unimportant" is also right, because gentlemen, in nature there is no high and no low. There is no difference -- indifferent we are --because you have no right to say that anything in nature is more important than anything else. The judgment of anything that it is natural means that it is not important, because in nature nothing is more important than anything else.

You have tried to treat society of human beings in the same way: "Nobody is more important than anybody else," gentlemen. I think we have reached the end of our rope, gentlemen. You have to tell everybody quite the contrary, as Mr. Saroyan tried to write this -- you know the Armenian poet in this country, Saroyan. He wanted to write, he said, so that everybody would feel terribly important and absolutely irreplaceable.

3

But that is not natural, gentlemen. If each tragedy is unique -- if the new writer of tragedy would feel that nobody had ever written tragedy, Aristotle's sentence would not have come true, that tragedy ceased, when it had reached its nature.

4

Gentlemen, you and I must never try to reach our nature, because that reduces us to what we have been, what has already been lived before.

XIV *NATURA ET CREATURA*

1

So now I put this down in Latin, gentlemen, because I wanted to draw your attention to the very different character of these two words of "nature" and of "creature." The sound in your English ear, and your American ear, both ending in u-r-e, and you

will not make much of them, as being differently formed. "Natura," however, and "creatura" have a very important difference.

2

Neither Lucretius, nor Aristotle, nor Plato could make this distinction between "natura" and "creatura." And Greece came to an end because it couldn't make this distinction. "Natura," that which has to be born, or which is in process of being born, the syllable of "urus" always means "in process of becoming."

"Nature" - and "physis" in Greek -- are words of growth of known entities. That is, things have been born, therefore the child that is in the mother's womb will be born. And "natura" really means birth. "Nasci," the verb becomes renascence, you still have it there, rebirth. And in the present tense it has this "s" in it, which then is lost here -- it's originally "nas-tura".

3

The "creature" is something very different, gentlemen. The word "creatura" which we need today to oppose to nature, which you hear so often now mentioned when we hear "creative writing," or "creativity" which is the last refuge today of human beings who are killed by nature, by their own idol, by your belief in nature, in this cruel deity of death, and of killing, and of warfare and of the struggle for survival, and of all the qualifications which go with nature: worthlessness, indifference.

"Creatura" has this total accent in our not yet knowing what has happened.

4

We say that God created the universe, in retrospect, because we say that we are still in creation.

There is a famous hymn, which was sung for some college students in Bowdoin College first, 1906 by DeWitt Hyde,

*"Creation's Lord, we give Thee thanks
that we are in the making still."*

Who knows this hymn? "Creation's Lord." It's in every hymn book. Don't you think? Don't you know?

Well, it's an important verse, gentlemen.

Creation's Lord, we give Thee thanks

that we are in the making still.

The word "creation" is an attempt to say that we haven't yet heard what's going to happen.

XV FEAR NOBODY EXCEPT GOD

1

In Rome, gentlemen, the word "creation" was used for creating consuls every year, to give a name to the present year. The name of the two consuls was the dating of Rome. And every year had a new date. And it wasn't 1957, it was much more poetically: it was "Postubius" and "Jubius," or "Caesar," or "Julius Caesar" and his colleague "Lepidus Amelius." And so to create the consuls meant to name the new year with a unheard-of name.

Creation is that which is not yet heard, which nobody has the right to have named. That's a creature.

A creature is the not-yet named.

2

And now we come to the important comparison with the Greek mind back right away, gentlemen. Creation points to the fact that the past at one time was not yet created. Was not yet created, and therefore looked to man as still being in the future.

If you say, "God created Heaven and earth," it's an attempt to remind you that at one point, everything we know was still unknown. And therefore, we must judge the past from our own experience, how we behave towards the unknown.

And since we behave very silly to the unknown, especially fear, it is very easy to understand why the Jewish people made all stress on the right kind of fear, and said, "Fear nobody, except God."

Because you fear all wrong things. You fear the authorities. You fear the Joneses. You fear public opinion. You fear the Committee Against Communism. You fear, you fear. But it never dawns on you that you will only live right, into the future, if you only fear God and nobody else.

3

You are the most afraid generation that has ever lived for the last 2,000 years, because for 2,000 years, all people have known that right through the past to this day the future is feared, is dreaded. The right future, God's future, created.

You have been told it's all natural. So now you are all overcome with fear. You are all cowards, my dear gentlemen. I've never seen such a coward generation as the modern college: teachers, administration, and students. Despicable.

4

If I tell you my experience with cowardice, you would be surprised. Because you don't know that you are cowards, that we are all by our nature cowards, because it is our nature to dread the future.

XVI COWARDICE

1

Here was a boy, a student, killed by his fellow students, by the athletes in this college. He was hated, so they had a drunken affair and went to his room, and beat him up, and in the process he fell and died.

It was hushed up. Instead of making this a great case, everybody feared the consequence.

To this day, his parents have not forgiven Dartmouth College this cowardice. Nobody said a word in public, how bad this was. Nothing. It was all hushed up, gentlemen, because it was natural. After all, boys are boys. They got drunk. It was one o'clock at night. They intruded into his privacy, into his dormitory. So then he died. Well, who can help it? It's like a fly that is crushed. It happens.

2

Gentlemen, if this boy -- you know what *The Aegis* is. That happened in spring. The *Aegis* came out in May, or in June. His name was not in it. His picture was not in it. He was a senior. He belonged there. But then you would have had to say something about his untimely death, they dreaded the consequences. Nothing was done. His own classmates dropped him and his picture from their yearbook.

This book exists. I own it. Ever since, Dartmouth College in my eyes is contemptible.

3

And you have never redeemed it. I don't know if it will ever be redeemed. You are all guilty of the same cowardice.

4

You would do exactly the same if it happened in your generation. It would be, after all, with the public, and Lebanon, and Hanover, and White River Junction, and somebody else -- they would be all upset if this would be mentioned.

XVII THERE ARE NO FACTS WITHOUT THE FEAR OF THE LORD

1

Another story.

We had a team on which a colored boy was playing tennis, and five years ago it was, or seven years ago: we went down -- offered Mary and Williams a match. And they said they would gladly play us, but not with a colored boy on our team. So the team obviously did what they should have done. They didn't go.

The Clairemont Eagle at that time was what now *The Valley News* is, the only paper here in the region that came out daily. They declined to report it. They declined to report this good deed, because it would arouse feelings.

That's called "the press" today in this country, publicity. Omitting everything that's important.

2

You don't know anything about what we have done in the last two months in the world, gentlemen. The papers don't tell you. It's all one pious lie. You are the most miserable, evaluating people in the world, because you treat politics as nature, as facts, as you call it.

3

There are no facts without the fear of the Lord. Because they are all of the future, gentlemen. They are all coming. All these misdeeds of American politicians come home to roost. And you or your children will have to pay the penalty.

4

But you don't believe this. You don't believe in the visitation of our maker and creator. You don't call Him "creator." You call Him "nature."

Well, in nature it's all fatal. And you can't do anything anyway. If you live in nature, gentlemen, why get excited.

The only way, gentlemen, of getting out of nature is to fear God.

XVIII HE THREW HIS WORD AND HE THREW HIMSELF AFTER HIS WORD

1

Now, the Greeks -- as anybody who has read Lucretius knows this -- they were angry with their fear of the gods. That's his great attack on religion. Because if you have nature, instead of *creatura*, gentlemen, then you do not -- will you kindly sum this all up in a formula? --

when you treat everything as nature, you treat the present as an image of the past.

When you, however, have the fear of the Lord in your bones, and you say, "I'm a creature," then you treat the past as an image of your own present, and your own future.

2

That is, if I read the Bible, gentlemen, I know that the authors of the Bible drew their conclusions from their own experience of life towards the past. They said, "Since I am still in creation, obviously at one time, God must have created Heaven and earth. I am not yet. And I know what it is to be nothing, and nobody. Therefore I know that God created the earth out of nothing."

And if you ever have succeeded in becoming a new man, gentlemen, then you know

that the creation of nothing is every good man's personal experience.

Yes, you can't, because you are all nature boys and nature girls, gentlemen. You cannot become anything surprising. You can only go on the scales every morning and weigh. That's of course very physical. That's physis. That's the only thing you think that can increase your weight.

3

But a man who gets married, or a woman who gets married, know very well that they are made over by this experience. They have never existed before. They were just in a dither; they were just shadows of themselves.

Anybody who has put his foot down, and given up a declaration of his faith, he says, "Well I didn't know what life was before I have said this." Now he is luminous. He's himself. He has been born by this one word of truth to his proper character.

Don't you think that Luther became a new man when he had said in Worms, "Here I stand. I cannot say anything else, God help me. Amen"?

4

He who speaks, gentlemen, is reborn by his own words.

That's the meaning of the Gospel of St. John. "In the beginning was the Word," and the Word creates.

Jesus is only a different man from other people, because He said something different. That's the only quality you can give Him. Because what He said, He became. He threw His word, and He threw Himself after His word.

And that's all *creatura*, gentlemen. That's creation.

XIX HOW CREATION AND NATURE DATE

1

So gentlemen,

creation deduces the past from the present. Nature deduces the present from the past.

2

Now you all deduce, at least allegedly, the present from the past, and even the future. Therefore, the future is perfectly uninteresting, gentlemen, because everything that is natural is uninteresting. It's unimportant, it's indifferent, it's uniform, it's classifiable, it is predictable, and it is fearless.

3

Anything that wants to come to life dreads its coming into life. Life is dreadful, gentlemen, or it isn't life. Dead things are not dreadful. They are totally indifferent. Most of you are indifferent; if you only were dreadful.

That's the first -- if a boy is dreadful -- I mean, out of a juvenile delinquent, something can become, because he's at least sensitized to the nonsense of his society. But if a boy sleeps through all these temptations, and doesn't mind, he will remain indifferent -- also to better appeals.

You can always say that people who doesn't go insane in certain insane conditions has no brain, no sanity to lose.

4

Creation dates the path from our experience with how we enter the future. And nature dates the present and the future from what has happened allegedly before.

XX MYTHICAL AND EXTRAORDINARY

1

Now we come to the Greeks, gentlemen.

The Greeks come from a so-called mythical, religious scenery. They have a cult, everyone in his own city. They pray to the gods of the city. And they explain how this city was founded by the myth.

2

So they have two tenses. The mythical time is the time in which all the guilds and crafts, families, cults, temples, walls of the city were created, the law. Every law in the city is ascribed to some creative founder, and he is rejected into a mythical time. Zeus did this; and Hephaestus and Prometheus gave them the fire. And the mythical time therefore is divided into gods and heroes.

And here are the modern men in Greece, you and me, the students in Dartmouth College; and they look back and say, "In time before, this was the time of the founders," as we call it, with a little weaker expression, "the founding fathers, then we wrote the Declaration of Independence; now we repeat it." Then they had the 4th of July, now we hold onto the Constitution.

That is, in the mind of you boys, gentlemen, these times are the extraordinary times; you would call them "extraordinary"; the Greeks called them "mythical"; and then this is you. You live in ordinary times; you are "just a human being."

3

Now gentlemen, once you make this decision, which you all do -- that for some unbelievable reason there were, at one time, the Apostles and Christ; and another time, there were George Washington and Jefferson; and now we have mediocrity and politicians - once you make this division, your own time is incapable of ever producing anything new, because the new and the extraordinary go together.

Mythical times have produced fire, and architecture, and priesthood, and astronomy, and writing, and reading.

My own time is ordinary; is reasonable time. We are reasonable people. We are practical people. We ask, "What do we earn?" How do we sell our cars? But Mr. Benz, and the man who invented Mercedes, and Zeppelin, and so, they invented the motor without any money. They lost money on it.

This you cannot be asked. That's unreasonable.

4

So your own time rational, reasonable, practical, economical -- everybody pays his own way, and everybody does only things as you are recommended, which do not conflict with the presuppositions of the existing order.

XXI THE IMPLICATIONS OF TURNING LOGOS TO LOGIC

1

You won't be called a subversive? Terrible, you see! You will not hide behind the 5th Amendment; therefore you will never do anything interesting or important. You will remain absolutely indifferent to all questions of politics. You will be as natural as can be. You will be an ordinary man. And all the things that you use are, strangely enough, come from a mythical time.

2

That's by and large, your own picture, gentlemen, from a mythical time in which somebody like George Fox, the Quaker, had a hearing. Today, we would just arrest

him and put him into a mental asylum in New York. He's just a fanatic, mentally sick. We would analyze him, give him two concubines, and everything would go.

3

Well, that's by and large your view of the world, gentlemen.

You all live like Greeks. The past is the creative time when extraordinary things happened for the first time. But now we are much cleverer. We have given over our life to Madison Avenue. They tell us beforehand how many things will sell. And we will only produce those things which will sell. And we won't do anything that we cannot be paid for immediately. That would be impractical.

And we are reasonable people. And we know the laws of nature. And the first law of nature is that where nothing is, nothing comes. And therefore creation out of nothing is impossible, so we won't create anything, because it can't be done. We can only follow, conclude.

If I have \$10,000, I can get 3 and-a-half percent interest. That's logical, isn't it?

4

So gentlemen, the Greek mind uses logos to increase the amount of physis around it. And that is the path from logos to logic. I tried to tell you this before. Perhaps now you understand the implications.

If you say that logos is nothing but logic -- which my colleague, Mr. Mandelbaum would heartily agree with, that logos should be treated as nothing but the laws of the ordinary mind, and not the inspiration of the extraordinary mind -- if logos is only the bridge from the first impressions and the first experiences to classificatory experiences and statements, then logos is logic, is treated as a mere nothing but the structure of the ordinary, indifferent, natural universe.

And the Greeks have turned logos into logic.

XXII THE REASON OF THE BRAIN HAS NO DIRECTION

1

But you have done even better. Gentlemen, one boy wrote a paper on the Stoics. And I think it's an historical, an epochal event.

The Stoics came from Cyprus. Zeno, the first Stoic, was free of the Greek idolatry of logic. And therefore, he said, "By what means do we recognize what is the spirit

with which we divide ethic, community, human life, future life, and natural life, and recurrent order?"

And he said, "First the five senses. Then our generative power, our power to love." He knew that love makes us speak fanciful things. "*The poet's eye in holy frenzy rolling,*"

you have to be in love to speak great truth.

Then he said, "Language itself is a great inspirer of my mind. It fills me with all kind of powers, associations."

And then he went on and said, "But the leading, the directing force in man's power of knowing, of recognizing, is the heart. And the whole logos comes from the heart."

2

Whereupon my Dartmouth student went and translated "heart" with "reason." And destroyed the whole idea of the Stoa. Who is the gentleman, if he's good enough. You must have found it in your paper. Who is it? Will he not confess?

It's a remarkable forgery, gentlemen. A remarkable forgery of a modern American mind, who cannot understand that this man Zeno already belonged to the 20th century.

3

In Europe, people know this again. In this country, you still believe in reason. That is in something up here, and omitting the directing power of the heart.

The reason, gentlemen, of the brain, has no direction. It is merely pragmatic. You can never get from the brain anything but reasons. But not direction. A reason is the opposite from a direction. You get reasons after you have decided where you want to go. You can adduce thousands of reasons why you want to go. That's called "rationalization".

But to translate the heart with the English word "reason," - that's high treason.

4

And it was done in this paper without any rhyme or reason, because after all, in his sources, it was clearly stated that Zeno, the founder of the Stoa and all the other Stoics, knew that direction cannot come from the logic.

Logos is more than logic, because logos is the power that fills reason with the task to explain what is already present.

XXIII THOMISM IS ATHEISM WITHOUT THE EXPERIENCE OF THE HUMAN HEART TO HIS CREATOR

1

A theologian, gentlemen, is a man who has experienced God and then tries to give his reasons why he might persuade others, too. But if he hasn't experienced God, please don't let him become a theologian. It's hopeless.

2

I know now so many theologians who have no experience of God. And they think they can study God.

You can't. By no logic will it ever become plausible to you that there is a God.

I mean, I know many ministers who have the effrontery -- even Catholic priests -- I met a boy from Manhattan College who gave all the reasons of St. Thomas for the existence of God. But of course, he himself was an atheist. He had never any other connection with God except the reasons he could give for Him.

And you just felt so frozen out by his approach.

3

I was there together -- it was with this army camp in New York state, on the Bear Mountain Bridge. They had a military camp after the war. And students could live there. And it was a quite an interesting group. And there was a boy there who wanted to study for the priesthood Thomism.

4

But gentlemen, Thomism is atheism, if it isn't coupled with the first experience of the human heart to his creator. No use using your brain, giving reasons why there is a God, if you feel that the boy never knew of God, anyway.

XXIV ONE WORD IS ENOUGH TO MAKE OVER A MAN

1

And that it should have happened in this class, in one of the papers, I thought is significance enough to tremble, really. I fear for the future of this country, gentlemen, because with this sleight -- legerdemain, you are able in such a term paper even to omit the kernel.

2

And you think you have done a good job. I'm afraid I have given this man C+. I shouldn't. It was E. You omitted the gist of the matter.

An attempt in the Greek history to face about, and to stop this constant intrusion of logic and of nature upon our experiences of being created, of being not yet anything known, of having still to say what we will want to be.

3

A girl that says "yes" to the man who proposes to her is a different person. She's changed by the one word she has spoken. She becomes this man's wife. She enters history only as his wife. Nothing before matters. She's forgotten. Because she married Abraham Lincoln, she now is known. That's all. And that's what she lived for, for to speak this one word.

One word is enough to make over a man. A man who takes a bride, or a man who says "no" at this decisive moment is only the man who turned down the bride or who took it. And he is nobody else.

4

But you all take the bride, because you say it's natural. And your only hope is that you won't be found out. But you can only have the courage to turn down the bride if you have the fear of God in your system.

If you are only afraid of being found out, then of course you can take the bride, because you only have to feel then, that it isn't the perfect crime. And that's the whole attitude of most of you: "I'll do it, but I make sure that nobody will find out."

XXV AT THAT POINT THE GREEK SPIRIT BROKE DOWN

1

Which always amazes me in your interest in crime, gentlemen. The only interest you have: is he stupid enough to be found out?

2

My only interest is in the crime, that it must be punished.

I cannot understand how people can read detective stories. It's a mystery to me. It's a total perversion in my mind. Because that is all within reason. I'm interested in the man who doesn't commit the crime -- or who does commit the crime that his barrier of fear breaks down to God.

But you only fear the police. That's not a noble fear; it's not an interesting fear, even. It is a pure animal fear. Has nothing to do with humanity.

3

Nature and creation then, gentlemen, are divided in the Greek spirit in such a way that they are divided in a mythical time, and in natural time. The more nature permeates the mind of the philosopher in Greece, the more he says, "We people should live naturally." And the more the gulf is enlarged between the mythical time of creation, of which they cannot get rid, and their own time.

And the more you enlarge this abyss between the mythical time and your own time, gentlemen, the more the present becomes the ordinary time; and the mythical time the extraordinary time; and the future -- it becomes impossible. It becomes absolutely impossible.

4

At that point, the Greek spirit broke down, gentlemen.

XXVI BREAD IS NOT WHAT WE FIND IN THE FIELDS

1

What made Christianity win, is something very simple. The Christians insisted that the mythical time was just as much ahead as it was in the past. And it was just as much in the present as it was in the past.

And therefore the Bible begins with the naked couple, Adam and Eve. Not with Prometheus, and not with Heracles, and not with anybody extraordinary. But the Bible is an attempt to make the people of the past ordinary and the present-day people extraordinary, because it had to correct the Greek mind.

2

The Greek mind says, "The people in the beginning were heroic. And we are ordinary. We are reasonable. Therefore we can understand rationally what we're doing, and we can report these miraculous beings at the beginning."

But the Christian revelation says that because man tries to behave as an ordinary man, he misses out about the future. And if he is not an extraordinary man, he cannot create the future.

3

And therefore, the whole distinction is between *creatura hominis* and *natura hominis*.

The Christian church goes so far that it even appeals to the wine that is blessed in the Church, and to the bread as *creatura*, because -- gentlemen, please mark this well - because otherwise you'll never understand Holy Communion and what-not in the Christian faith.

You will think also that's a superstition, because you can only understand nature. You know very well that bread has to be taken from the spears from the field, from the grain, from the wheat, or the rye, and then it has to be put into the mill; and then it has to be ground into flour; and then it has to be mixed with water, and then you can have the leaven, the yeast, and then you can have bread.

And therefore you see that bread can only come off if, after nature has done its work, something social, something cultural, something historical, something technical is added.

Bread is not what we find in the fields.

4

But the process of creation goes on in your own treadmill, on your own oven.

And that is all against your belief. You say, "That's just a social arrangement, that's such a second-rate thing, society."

With the wine the same. There is no wine in the grapes. It has to be put in barrels. It has to ferment. It has to be bottled. It has to be then cooled or warmed. And then it is unbuttoned -- uncorked, and then it is ready for use after several years. The longer the time, the better.

XXVII TO REACH ONE'S DESTINATION

1

So the Church has expressed this enmity against the Greek spirit very well in calling bread and wine "creatura." They are still to be created beyond their process outside human society.

And so the two great blessings in the Church for bread and wine begin: *O creatura vini -- O creatura panis.*

2

Which goes to show that the Church is very radical, anti-Greek in saying that these creatures still await their final consummation. And the real wafer at the Holy Communion is not general bread or cranberry juice in general, as they now give in Methodist churches. But it is the wine that has been waiting for you and which you have been waiting for. It's your Communion wine.

If you cannot realize this, you will always be superstitious with regard to Holy Communion. If you think that's wine in general, gentlemen, you cannot be redeemed. It isn't. And most people, of course, drink to their own perdition in the Holy Communion, because they don't understand. And they think they're just taking -- they have just bought something in the general store at Macy's.

3

The drink is just as unique as you are at that moment. It unites with you because at that moment only does this wine reach his destination. And you have therefore to call it with the personal pronoun, "she" and "he." It isn't "it."

That's why the Church makes this great detour and this solemn formula, "*O creatura panis, O creatura vini.*"

And that's not said in vain, gentlemen. That's the salvation of the human race, that you and I can feel that not only we are only at this moment coming to pass. The whole creation moans and groans in order to come to pass tomorrow.

4

It's perfectly natural for me to believe, gentlemen, that God created in the beginning Heaven and earth, because for Heaven's sake, I do still hope that there will be a day in which out of your dead clay, and this dead material of your background, or however they call it, you might be created.

You aren't yet created. Don't believe that for a minute. You are, at this moment, nature, pure nature. And you wait for the word that will bring you into life. You haven't yet heard it, your word, which nobody else can say.

XXVIII *THE HOUR TO DECIDE*

1

There will be an hour in your life, it comes to every man and nation -- there comes the hour to decide.

Perhaps you have heard this hymn? Does anybody know it? Or again am I a single theologian?

"Once to every man and nation comes the hour to decide"-- which means that every one of you, gentlemen, will have his dark hour of temptation, or his great hour of illumination, or his wonderful hour of love. In which form it ever comes, it is unique.

And it has come to nobody else before.

2

And if you miss this hour, as many people do, from fear of human agencies from your terrible anxieties of being found out that you are something extraordinary, gentlemen, then you miss this hour; you cannot be created.

Most of you remain nature. You remain dust. Most people are before their birth today.

You are all before your own nativity.

3

And this is so serious now in America, that you even yourself joke, and say you are "only twelve years old." What does it mean? You are before your own nativity.

Because what is twelve years? It's the age before a man can say a word of his own discretion.

When a word can be held against you because you have said it, then you are born.

Not before -- as a man, as a person. Anything you have said before is so general, that people cannot hold it against you. You say, "Oh, I just said that. I didn't mean it. I talked through my hat."

4

Now since you all say that Americans are twelve years old, you simply say that you are not yet created. And this whole, great country gentlemen, is this side of its own creation.

XXIX BE AFRAID!

1

This is not a joke, gentlemen. I mean every word of it. I mean that in 150 years since the days of Jefferson, you have been so proud of going the way of nature, the way of all flesh, that you have gone it. Most of you, as *The Chirotekes* shows, and as all Dartmouth College shows to me daily, are very proud that you will never be heard to say a word that can be held against you.

2

Gentlemen, as long as a man cannot say a word which can be held and must be held against him, he's a coward; he's a piece of dirt. He is not a man. And he certainly is not a human being in any sense of the word that entitles him to have a name, and to say something in reality.

Numbers, cattle, which you try to be. And you are very proud of this. That's so funny. But full of fear.

And you have a whole stable full of Egyptian sorcerers who try to tranquilize your fear. They call it sleeping pills, tranquilizers, psychoanalysis, gentlemen. What else is it? They say, "Don't be afraid."

3

Gentlemen, I tell you, "Be afraid!" It is only the question -- don't you think I'm afraid? But I'm less afraid of your disapproval, gentlemen, than of some other person's

disapproval, who is a little higher up than you. That's why I do not care what you think of me, gentlemen, really not.

As long as I have the fear of the Lord, how can I treat you lordlings as important?

4

But you are only afraid: the teacher has to be pleasant. Gentlemen, why should I be pleasant? It's not my business to please you at all. If then I cannot teach you if I want to please you.

It's an unpleasant business to teach people who want to be asleep.

XXX THE POWER TO WIND UP THE CLOCK

1

This has very much to do, gentlemen, with the cyclical vision of the Greeks.

You have to be a pessimist about the future if you are Greek. Because if you really know that you discriminate between a creative period of mankind, the founders, and your attempt to make everything look ordinary, and everything look natural, then you say that you are constantly reducing the energies with which the future has to be created. It is a constant running-down of the clock.

And the physicists, as you know, have even invented this psychodynamic law, this physiodynamic law, thermo-dynamic law that the world is losing energy all the time a little bit, and it is getting colder all the time on this earth, and so on.

2

Now every one of you knows that the salmons go upstream, gentlemen. And every one of you knows that the penguins or -- who are these animals in the Pacific, who do not eat for three months when they mate? Who are they? And -- thank you.

And therefore, it is simply not true, gentlemen, that we always consume energy. It is just as true that we wind up the clock as the fact that the clock runs down.

3

All good clocks, gentlemen, are wound up by somebody -- in our household, at least we have a clock that has to be wound up. And somebody does it. If I forget it, my wife does it and vice versa.

And gentlemen, the whole problem of the Greek relation between community and nature is that they did not believe that anybody in their own lifetime could wind up the clock.

4

Now you see therefore that the problem of logic and logos is very decisive in this fact.

Logos is the power to explain how the clock runs down, and the power to wind it up again.

For the Greeks, however, and for you, logos is only logic. And that only explains why the clock runs down, why it runs from ethos, from community, from sacrifice, from creation, from genius into ordinary imitation.

XXXI A STUMBLING BLOCK FOR PROGRESS

1

You can explain why one poet, Spender, can be imitated by 10,000 American college students. You cannot explain Mr. Spender.

I'm only interested in Mr. Spender. I say, "The clock always will run down." That's natural. But it takes a tremendous ethos, and a tremendous power of the logos to convince one man of you that he should become a poet, instead of selling short stories to the Saturday Evening Post, which is the opposite from poetry, which is infamy, which you shouldn't do.

2

But you think that you can become a poet by writing short stories for the Saturday Evening Post.

Gentlemen, that's impossible. That means you want to have the name of the extraordinary, a writer, for something ordinary.

And that is the forgery of modern man, that he wants to keep these mythical expressions "creative writing." And what does he do with the course in creative writing? He prostitutes it. He wants to please the editor of The Dartmouth -- of the Saturday Evening Post. This you cannot. That's not writing, gentlemen. That's imitation. You imitate writing.

3

And that's why we colleges are today a stumbling block for progress. Because in these colleges, you imitate the creative life. You imitate mythical time.

You talk big about the Gettysburg Address.

But at the same time, you take courses which prove to you that you should never do anything unheard-of, that you should always comply with the orders, that you should never rebel, that you should not be subversive, that you should take an oath every month on the American Constitution, and so on and so forth.

4

Gentlemen, you are caught in a terrible lie, because you use these great words of poetry, of freedom, of decision, and for what do you use it? To sell your wares.

No.

Thank you.

TWENTYFOURTH LECTURE: ST. PAUL 'S DOWNFALL IN ATHENS

I ZENO BREAKS THE IDENTITY OF GOODNESS AND LOGIC

1

Gentlemen, the problem for the exit of Greek philosophy in its own time, or in its own cycle is to understand why it did not satisfy, why it didn't grip anymore.

I tried to tell you that in 300 the Stoics already said something very un-Greek. They said that the directing force was the heart, and not reason.

And I tried to show you that you misunderstood this, and that the man who wrote on the Stoics, in his flippant way, just assumed that a Greek had to say that reason was the directing force, and so forged the old issue.

It was a very poor paper for this reason, because he couldn't even read the text.

2

Now most of you assume that the Greeks were reasonable people, and that Greek philosophy means rationalism.

But that's the pitfall of rationalism, and of your idea of Greek philosophy, and perhaps of the Greeks' own idea of philosophy, that even the duchess of Windsor, who certainly is not a model lady, knows that the heart has its reasons.

3

Now it is terribly important for us today to get the chronology right, gentlemen.

This is Zeno the Stoic, who introduces as a Cypriot, from Cyprus, as a man who certainly is somehow in touch with the prophetic tradition of the people of the Semitic languages, and the Semitic tradition, knows that the heart has its reasons, and thereby breaks the identity of goodness and logic.

Plato said that that what was true was good, and that who knew the truth had to be a good man.

And that's your own faith in education.

4

I say the more a man is educated, the more imperiled is he for becoming a scoundrel. You say the more a man is educated, the better he must be.

He's much more risky, gentlemen. You run a greater risk when you get educated.

But the American dogma is the Greek dogma. From 1800 to 1950 in this country, we were all Greeks. Greek philosophy prevailed. Plato prevailed. Aristotle prevailed. The teaching of philosophy prevailed.

And the dogma of Greek philosophy in this limited sense, from 600 to 300 B.C. and from 1800 to 1950 in this country is that the good man is the true man, and the true man is a good man. That is, the true man in the sense: he who knows the truth.

The identity, gentlemen, of beauty, goodness, and truth is what makes the Platonists. And that, because we know we will act right, is the dogma of any philosophy that says it is enough for life to have philosophy.

II GYMNOSOPHISTS

1

In 300 B.C., there was a knocking at the door of Greece. Alexander had gone to India, and had met there with the fakirs, and the yogis, for example, and the Buddhists. And he brought back the knowledge of the so-called gymnosophists.

2

If you read anywhere in a Greek text the word "gymnosophist," it means influence of Hinduism. It means asceticism. "Gymnos" means naked. And a gymnosophist is a man whom we would call an ascete. That is, a man who, in order to be wise, chastises his body.

You see that there enters something of which the Greeks were perfectly unaware, that to be immersed in physis, in one's own nature can prevent oneself from knowing the truth, and that you have first to get out of your own physis before you can see the rays of hope of the true sun.

3

"Gymnosophist" is the Greek expression which of course we have to approach in connection with sophism, sophists, and philosophers, the word "soph." In Greece

the idea is to love wisdom enables you to become wise. The love of wisdom is the positive step towards wisdom.

It is this funny idea: you are already somebody, and you add an inch to your stature by becoming wise. By love, you become more than you are.

The gymnosophists, gentlemen, and any modern monk, and any modern puritan, if there are such, will tell you that in order to become better, you have to reduce something inside yourself. You have to cut out something.

4

I always tell it in this way, that the good is the enemy of the better. I think we talked about this here?

The good is the enemy of the better.

That is, you cannot become better because you are only 5 feet 8 inches tall. You cannot add to your stature one inch, neither morally, nor in knowledge, nor in ethics, nor in anything. You can only, by omitting certain advantages given you, you can grow. Because there is a certain sense of proportion in your being.

And the idea that you evolve into more and more, and larger and larger bank account, so to speak, of virtue, is a mistake. You cannot have more virtues. You are who you are.

But you can shift the economy of your inner household. You can replace one item in this household by another item.

And that's gymnosophistry. That's asceticism.

III CYPRUS

1

And therefore, not only does Zeno, the Phoenician, enter the scene in 300, from Cyprus, that's one of the reasons why the Greeks have absolutely no claim to Cyprus.

2

One of the idiocies of America is that we support the claims of the Greeks for the island of Cyprus. They have absolutely no business to get it, more than the British. It's an error of judgment. Typical, I mean.

You did everything. You gave the Czechs the poor Slovaks and Magyars in Czechoslovakia and drove out the Germans -- from America, everybody who shouts loudest always gets his view in Europe supported.

Mr. Benes had no business to get Czechoslovakia. Two-thirds of them who were not Czechs; and so the Greeks have no business to get Cyprus.

3

I offer you this in the history of philosophy as a good example, that the greatest man from Cyprus was not a Greek; 300 B.C. And Cyprus has always been peopled by non-Greeks, by Phoenicians, from the very first day.

You fall for every craze here in this country, and always wrong. Pseudo-nationalism this is. This country cannot be nationalistic, but you wish the evil of nationalism on every spot in Europe.

You support the Irish. You support the Albanese. The Albania, which is now a Soviet colony, was created in Lynn, Massachusetts, by the immigrants from Albania, who of course got a hearing here, and all the Americans said, "These nice cobblers in Lynn, Massachusetts, must get their state at home in Albania." With the result that in Albania, the submarines of Russia prepare the Third World War.

Just typical of Cyprus, by the way.

4

And that's why I lay some stress on the fact that 300 B.C., Mr. Zeno came into Greece and introduced a foreign motive of philosophy. The moral motive, gentlemen, that the heart breaks the conclusions of the mind.

IV THE PRICE OF KNOWLEDGE AND GOODNESS

1

And the gymnosophists, the Hindu influence, comes into Greek, which we now have today still in our monasteries, in our Christian monasteries. That is already the form in which wisdom was allowed to enter the Christian Church, only is a blend between Hindu and Greek, craving for wisdom.

The Hindu said, "If I want wisdom, I must pay a price." That's the price, asceticism, renunciation. And the Greeks said, "Craving, eros, love." So out of this plus and minus, gentlemen, our modern Benedictine monasteries, for example, exist. You read

Mr. Thomas Merton -- why is he a monk? -- because the wisdom which a monk in this world today represents is a combination of Hindu and Greek mentality.

Very important to know.

2

Of course the Church has fructified and has profited from any of the previous streams of life. But the Greek way of philosophy has not been allowed to enter the Christian Church unchanged, unmixed. And the price which the Greeks did not want to pay, the gymnosophists, the naked sophists paid.

3

And the combination of Buddha asceticism, and Greek philosophy -- this splendor created of the medieval monks, who represented the wisdom of the Greek and Latin tradition, copying all their manuscripts, studying Aristotle, Virgil, keeping the classics alive, under the condition that they led the ascetic life with the three vows of chastity, and obedience, and poverty, which no Greek philosopher in itself connected immediately with knowledge.

4

So the price of knowledge and goodness, gentlemen, entered the consciousness of the Greeks through Alexander the Great, through this combination of India and Greece.

And I'm very sorry to say that all your textbooks on Greek philosophy therefore make no sense, because these 300 years, from 300 to 0, are not understood as an exchange of two streams of thinking. The stream that says, "Before a man can acquire knowledge, he must purify himself, he must leave nature," and the other stream that says, "He must crave wisdom".

V *THE GREEK MIND EXPLAINS LIFE OUT OF DEATH*

1

And perhaps this sign helps you a little bit. The plus sign is Greece, the Greek mind, stretching out, longing for. Without yearning, gentlemen, without expectation, without hope, you cannot achieve anything. But without faith, that is asceticism, without forgoing immediate advantages, your hope and your yearning is in vain.

2

You are all full of hope. You are all Greeks. But you do not ask under what condition does your hope make sense. It can only make sense if you pay the excise tax.

If you cut out that which stands in the way of your hopes ever be fulfilled, and there are very many beams in your eye, whom you do not like to see. You only see, of course, the little -- what does the Bible call it? in your neighbor's eye?

(*The mote.*) The mote.

3

So gentlemen, we have, beginning in 300, the combination of the plus and minus of Greek and India. And we have in Zeno and the Jews of Alexandria the combination between Israel and the Greeks.

That all begins in the same year and goes on till the coming of Christ, to Saint Paul, because here we have the limitation, whereas for the Greeks, their mind covers the universe, gentlemen.

For Israel, the human mind is just a speck of dust. That is, well -- how should I say it? The Greeks are pantheists. And the Israelites are monotheists.

4

Now what's the difference, gentlemen, between pantheism and monotheism on the surface of things?

"*Pan*" means all. Everything is divine. Therefore nothing is bad. Nothing has to be rejected. Nothing has to die.

The Greek mind looking at the universe, cannot distinguish life and death. There's no criterion in all of Plato between life and death. The dead things are used as yardstick for explaining the living things. The stars in *Timaeus*, are used. The ideas: beautiful, good, and true -- all dead things, just dead ideas, who do not speak, who do not breathe, who do not live - they are used to explain you and me, living beings.

Incredible idea.

The Greek mind explains life out of death, which all the modern physicists do.

Silly asses - life explains death, gentlemen. But death can never explain life. Because I live, I must die, gentlemen. But not because I die I must live, or because I'm dead.

Dead things stay dead. And therefore most of you will remain dead, because you don't know that you have to fight for your life in order to escape death.

So you just remain unborn. You never even enter the danger zone of living.

VI *THE FULL LIFE*

1

Today again at lunch, somebody told me that it was impossible to hear a word of truth said between students on this campus. I don't know if this is true, but he said it at least. And that shows that he feels that the life which only comes when people speak the truth to each other is held off from you.

You never know the good life, the full life. Full life is only when we speak to each other, gentlemen. Before, you do not know who you are, and you do not know what you think. Do you think you think?

The best I can say that after I have spoken to you, I know what I think, because you do me the favor to listen to me. You love me enough to be patient with me, to believe in me; and so my truth comes to me.

2

I told him at lunch, this boy, the story of the Arabian tribe.

To this day, in the proper peninsula of Arabia, you cannot eat meat, except at a festive meal, because meat is too next to humanity, to you and me. A single individual is not entitled to eat meat. Only the group, the inspired group of people who have a good talk to each other, who can mutually allow each other to share at a meal the best of food and drink: they are allowed to eat meat.

So where you draw the line between vegetarian -- one group being vegetarian and the other group being meat-eaters, the Arabian is much more sensitive and he says, "At times, I am allowed to eat meat, because I am inspired. I live the full life, of the waked mind of the group, of my community. And at times I am limited to vegetarianism, because I am not in the spirit."

3

"I'm not inspired." If you would know this, you would be able to cure yourself, because I think a man who lives alone should know that he is on a lower plane, if he isn't creative. If he is creative, he speaks for the whole community. Then he is of course filled with the spirit of this very community for which he writes the next

great drama or the Gettysburg Address. And then he can have all the camel meat he wants.

4

Do you begin to see, gentlemen, that philosophy is a state of your own nature, of your own life?

VII *MORE ALIVE, LESS DEAD*

1

And the Greeks have this strange limitation, that they only see in the working of the mind its plus sign. They do not see the price they have to pay, that before you can know the truth, you have to forgo certain things, like homosexuality, like any perversion of your body.

And the second thing is: the Greeks say, "All which the eye sees, indifferently, since it is natural, is full of gods, is full of the logos, and is full of ethos. It's pantheistic."

The Jews say that God is the Lord of life and death. And since He is the Lord of life and death, the true God, gentlemen, is not like the Olympian god, ever to be represented in statues, in stone temples. You can't. That's not the living God, because the living God proceeds all the time against that which must die into the living of the future. He declines to be captivated in dead matter.

2

And therefore the word "monotheism" for you should acquire a new quality, gentlemen, today. You should see that when we speak of monotheism, we do not mean one god against many gods. But the Jewish prayer and the Christian prayer is: "It is the god who can save us from our death. And can open our eyes to the fact that we are dead in our sins at this moment, that we are just animals by ourselves,"

and that it takes a special act of grace meeting a brother, meeting a sister, meeting the Church, meeting a community, meeting an opportunity, meeting a task to make us into the children of God.

Monotheism means that there is a universe that can be empty of God, that the world is not simply identified by God, because part of the universe is less alive than it should be.

3

And you know who is less alive in the universe than he should be?

Man. Man is that part -- you cannot say of the sun that he is less alive than he should be. We have no judgment in the matter. It's just as hot as can be, it seems to us. We can't argue the point that the sun should shine more.

But we can argue with every one of us, you and me, with ourselves that we should be more alive, and less dead. And the whole problem, gentlemen, of Christianity, of the Resurrection, of the dying to our sins and rising with Christ, is a very simple thing.

It's the verdict that the dead Christ is still 10,000 times more alive than you as you sit here at this moment.

4

And that's simply true. We are dead. We just dream that we are alive. You don't know what it means to be alive.

VIII *SUSPENDED ANIMATION*

1

If you can speak like Nathan Hale on the scaffold, the words he said, "I wished I had more lives to give to my country," then you know that you are alive.

2

What you call "alive" is shitting, and urinating, and eating. That's not alive. That's just mechanical movement. You mistake your idea of life totally. You don't know what the good life is; have no idea. You think three meals a day, that's living.

Gentlemen, that's below, I call this anabiotic -- suspended animation. Suspended animation in this country stands for living. It's a mistake, gentlemen. It's good for the refrigerator business, but for nobody else. You live all refrigerator lives. And you want it this way. Your psychologists sell you suspended animation.

3

Now I come back to the last lecture. And it joins.

You remember that I said that the ordinary time is always the time of logic. And the extraordinary time is this time of the myth, of the creative, founding moment.

Now the time of reason in your sense of the word, of using your brain, is the time of suspended animation. In your five senses, if you remain in your five senses, and don't let the heart speak, you can never propose to a girl, because it is always foolish to do so. Always. Absolutely never any excuse for you to propose to a girl. It's foolish. It may lead, and usually does lead, to disaster.

But anyone who wants to live, has to take the plunge. He has to. It is unreasonable, but very wise. Because the heart has its reasons.

4

Yes, young lady -- it always is unwise for a young man to get going with a girl. Always. But it is very wise from a higher point, if he wants to live better. He must live more. That's the only reason why he cannot stand this state of being a bachelor.

Bachelors are clever. They're much more clever than husbands.

IX *PHILOSOPHY IS A BASTARD*

1

Gentlemen -- philosophy is always right if you reduce it to the state of today and omit it to the problem of fecundity, of bearing fruit. That's why the New Testament has conquered the whole realm of Greek philosophy with this one simple sentence, "By their fruits ye shall know you." "By your fruits" only, nothing else.

It's the difference between Christianity and religion and fruitfulness and philosophy.

2

All Greenwich Village is much cleverer, gentlemen, than the people in the other suburbs. But in the other suburbs, fortunately the children are born, and in Greenwich Village the cocktails are produced. That's fruitless, totally fruitless.

The intellect is fruitless. The intelligentsia is a bastard of life.

3

Philosophy is a bastard. If it doesn't know that it is, like Mr. Wilson says, an outsider, who wants to instigate life to become higher, by its getting outside society and illuminating it about its future greater vitality.

4

The cultural critic, who abounds in this country, is a nuisance. Good for nothing. If you would close the Saturday Review of Literature and all the Mr. Galletts, et cetera, absolutely nothing would happen. No harm done. They don't produce anything. They are unproductive, because it has no consequence what they say, gentlemen, except perhaps negative.

X ST. PAUL'S DERAILMENT

1

Well, I want to say that the difference between pantheism and monotheism enters the Greek scene from 300 to the coming of Paul. And I would like your permission today to explain to you why, from Saint Paul to Saint Augustine -- that is, from the days of Seneca, the Stoic, that's the contemporary of Paul -- to the days of the end of the Roman Empire, that's the 5th century -- Saint Augustine died in 430 of our era -- why the Greek philosophy is on the retreat.

And why at this moment in 1950 again Greek philosophy has to undergo its limitations by monotheism against pantheism, that any philosophy that says that it can replace religion, it can replace faith, is already prejudged by an historical cycle in which the Greek philosophers had the run of the place.

For 600 years they had it. And broke down the first time in 300, by the being checked by the Hindus and the Jews. And then after the coming of Christ, they were themselves suddenly faced with their own limitation.

2

The way in which I think you should be equipped, and I feel very strongly on this point for many decades, is that you should read and bring to class for the next time, but we'll read it today right away-- perhaps you'll read it at home then yourself -- the famous attempt of Paul to compromise with philosophy.

You know when he tried to compromise with philosophy? You ever heard of it?

The story of this compromise is a very important one. You can today say to yourself and to any Greek, "The way I decide on this speech of Paul, is the way I stand in this whole question of the rank and role of philosophy in life."

Therefore I think it's a personal task on yours. It's not something you can learn from the book.

3

Most books in the last decades have been written by the Greeks. The so-called theologians in this country were nothing but philosophers. They even called the Christianity a philosophy. They misunderstood the whole point.

And therefore the last three decades or four decades, as a matter of fact, this speech by Saint Paul has been praised as a tremendous academic oration, as the ideal of a philosophical argument.

Poor Paul himself has thought that it was a derailment, that it was a scandal in his life, that he failed to do his duty, and that when he went to make this speech, he was defeating his own ends, that he was deserting his Lord, and he promised that he would never do it again.

He has never done it again, as far as we can tell.

4

So the thing is very dramatic, gentlemen, because half of the commentaries which you read are written by Greeks. And they want to show that after all, Paul could philosophize if he wanted to, and that he was a very nice man who under the circumstances one might even have granted the master's degree at Dartmouth College.

And he said, "If so, then I am faithless. I betray the Lord again," as Peter did in the night before the Crucifixion. "I shall try not to betray him again. It's bad enough that I once did."

XI *THE COWARD, THE COURAGEOUS, THE TIMID*

1

Now I keep you perhaps in expectation. But all the Christian martyrs and saints, as you know, have one hour of defeat.

Jesus said on the Cross, "My Lord, why hast Thou forsaken me?" If He hadn't said that, He wouldn't have been a human being. He would just have been a phenomenon from the other world.

2

Any human mortal, gentlemen, wavers. Jesus' temptation comes when it doesn't matter. He comes after the act, when we can be weak. Any courageous man is frightened after the daring, after he has dared.

That's unknown. You people think the difference between coward and fortitude is that the one never trembles, and the other does tremble. But the real difference between a coward and a courageous man is that the coward is frightened in the moment of danger, and runs away. And the courageous man is frightened afterwards, when it doesn't matter anymore. But if he isn't frightened, he's just a bull, not a human being. He's good for nothing. He's just a big noise. There is no humanity in himself.

3

Any man who does something daring, must tremble afterwards, then he is courageous; or he trembles in the danger, then he is a coward; or he trembles before, then he is timid. Timid people can be very courageous. That is, they mean not to be cowards.

I think I am very timid. But I have learned by experience that it doesn't help me to be timid in the moment of danger. And then I am not. The coward is frightened in the act; the courageous, after the act; the timid before the act.

4

Somehow you must be frightened. If you are not frightened, you are not human.

The Lord wept when Lazarus was dead.

And the Lord cried from the Cross, "Why hast Thou forsaken me?" But He couldn't get down from the Cross anymore. It was done. So why shouldn't He be frightened? His weakness didn't interfere with His vision.

With another man, however, it does interfere with his vision. He is so frightened that he avoids the process. He runs away from him in the last minute.

XII THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE ASHCAN (GEORGE MORGAN)

1

This is quite important for Paul, gentlemen.

Every human being that deserves the quality of "human" must undergo the emotions of the heart.

And that is Mr. Zeno's and Israel's contribution to the correction of Greek philosophy, gentlemen. A philosopher who always believes that he is right, has no truth to sell, because we demand in the Christian era from the man who holds the truth, that at one time he must doubt his own truth. Otherwise we call him a fanatic.

A man who never doubts his truth is not a human being.

A man who always doubts his truth is a coward.

2

Most of the people in this country now, from the anxiety of being fanatics, are cowards. They never hold any truth. That's nothing, gentlemen. You must fight for your truth, but after you have fought, you one times wonder why you did. But it doesn't matter.

3

I always tell the story of a friend of mine who was a professor of philosophy at Duke, and wrote a very wonderful book on Nietzsche. It cost him ten years of his life. And when the war broke out, the Second World War, he volunteered, and entered as a private, although he was forty years of age, and he could have secured a colonelcy, like so many of my colleagues in this nice college have done. And he didn't. He thought that would be a coward's action. And he didn't become a colonel, but a private. And he served up, and became a captain at the end, which was quite a career for a private.

But he came home after six years. In the process he lost his family. Got a divorce. Everything was destroyed. He gave up his professorship. He's now in Tokyo with our embassy. And everything changed; everything was sacrificed.

And he came to me in '45 - oh no, '46, or '47 even - and said, many years had already been invested in this venture of serving up from the ranks - and he said, "I'm disgusted with myself. I've made a fool of myself, and a mess of things. If I had gotten a colonelcy in 1941, which I could, then I would have been a brigadier. And in the administration of the foreign countries, I would have played an outstanding role.

And with my knowledge of French and German and of the country and the mind of the people, I could have prevented many stupidities and follies of the occupation. This reeducation to democracy and all the nonsense that has been done and estranged Europe from America so totally, and why didn't I do this?"

4

And we had an argument. And many things developed from this argument. I wrote a whole book on this problem. And the gist is this, gentlemen: that he cultivated at that moment, in '47, as we all do, the "Oh God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" philosophy. I call this the "philosophy of the ashcan".

When the fire is burned out, it is obvious that we were all disgusted with the whole process. We have the hangover of the next morning. Fireplace is burned out. All the drinks are over. It has cost a lot of rum and whisky, a very expensive party. And you hardly understand, with a headache on the next morning, why you ever did it.

But that is absolutely not of any more authority, your judgment the next morning, than the judgment in the evening. You are not the wiser man, or the more entitled to judge, because the next morning you feel empty and take an aspirin.

XIII *PREPARING EACH OTHER TO THINK RIGHT*

1

The philosophy of the aspirin, of the ashcan has absolutely no more authority. Quite the contrary, gentlemen. If you consider that my friend entered the army as a private, and enthused thousands of college boys to do the same, I can say that we won the war by all like Mr. -- who made the right decision at that moment, the decision of not asking for self-aggrandizement but humbling himself to becoming a private.

And if I think of his judgment in 1947, I say it doesn't matter. It's his private opinion. It has absolutely no interest to me, because it isn't infectious. It's just private reasoning. And so, he's very important with his decision in '41; he's utterly unimportant with his opinion in '47.

2

You are so clever, and so rationalistic, and so intellectual, and you are the cream of the nation, and therefore you think that while you're sitting here on your fannies, and sitting in judgment over events and actions, that you are the people to make the right decision, and to judge critically, wisely, because you are out of luck. You are not swimming in the stream of events, and think that when you volunteer for a noble deed, that you are fools.

3

It's the other way around, gentlemen. Fools we are in this classroom. We all are, because we are less alive to our responsibilities at this moment. We have nothing to decide of importance at this moment.

If you don't use this time rightly and see yourself in proportion, as we are here, that we are far away from responsibility, we cannot really think right. You must be aware that at this moment, we play. We play with ideas.

That's very irresponsible. And I can only, by reminding you that we are in danger of being irresponsible, harness your energies of thinking at this moment, to the great moments in which my friend had to enter the army, that moment for which we here are preparing each other to think right.

4

And so forth. If thought is not in the less vital moments of your mental life harnessed to the great moments, where you are more alive, it must go wrong.

And then logos must become mere logic.

XIV JULIET AND THE NURSE (*ROMEO AND JULIET*)

1

I've tried to tell you this through the whole course, gentlemen, that the logistic, the syllogistic problem is the problem of subduing, of making subservient the working of mere logic, and mere mentality, and mere reason, to the great moments where you are fully alive, where body and soul are required to stand up and to fight.

If you do not at this moment resolve to resist a bribe, which you are offered as a judge, and you just say, as you will hear in *Romeo and Juliet*, the nurse propose to Juliet that she should marry the Count Paris, because after all, it's a very practical idea: "Just be practical, Julia -- Romeo is dead," the nurse says, and, "So please, Juliet, let's go on with the next match."

I don't know if they have cut out -- who saw it yesterday? Is it played? (*Yes.*)

Well, there comes this tremendous line in Juliet, gentlemen, by Juliet, this 14-year-old woman. But she's a real woman, great person. She says, she's resolved at that moment that there shall be a wall between her and the nurse; they will be twain, cut in twain. Not a word of confidence anymore will be exchanged between her and the nurse.

That's the greatest line in the whole play. Because here rises this young woman to her full solitude of her thinking. She knows that her thinking no longer is now promiscuous. But she, with her great privilege of loving Romeo, must put the mind no longer on the level of this plebeian boy, but has to think in terms of service to her love. And there exactly that happens to Juliet, that she suddenly sees that all her reason, all her rational powers have to be kept ready for the great moment which then comes where she is willing to drink the vial, and to go to her potential -- to her death, as it really turns out: to go to her death.

2

And the wisdom of Shakespeare is always just make you feel very low yourself, that he could put in this one line, this use of reason by a noble soul, that we think in our abstract moments, in our classroom moments, in our moments as students in preparation for the real life.

3

Never think that here we live really, gentlemen. We prepare to live, or we postpare. I report to you what life has thrown on the beach of life as its jewels, and you collect these jewels so that you are not naked when the great moment arrives. But the terrible thing of yours is that the critic today in this country is that he thinks he is more alive than the poet, the creator.

And the nurse thinks she's more alive than Juliet, who's aglow, who's in love. And this dead, damnable creature, this nurse, is nothing. Dirt. But she has more of a mind. She talks 20 lines when Juliet speaks one-half.

One of the mysteries of *Romeo and Juliet* is that Shakespeare didn't care to make Juliet loquacious. One line of hers, and twenty lines of the nurse. And one line of hers is twenty times as good as twenty lines of the nurse.

4

If you can't hear this in the play, you can't read Shakespeare. It's everywhere the same, gentlemen. And of course, Shakespeare had this great advantage over the Greek world that the women could speak in the Christian era, that Juliet can come forward, instead of Zeno from Cyprus.

The heart speaks, and the heart has its reasons. And it has much better reasons than all the philosophers of the world.

XV PAUL'S DEGRADATION AND DESERTION IN ATHENS

1

So the philosophy of the ashcan, gentlemen, is the philosophy in which philosophy is not, as they call it today, existential. That is, in which the state of aggregate, during which we philosophize, is not seen to be less vital, less filled with zest of living, than the life of love, the life of politics, the life of warfare, the life of heroism, the life of sacrifice, the life of asceticism, the life of passion.

2

The Apostle Saint Paul preferred to remain incognito all his life. Nobody knew in his days that there existed such a man in the educated classes of the Roman world. He was just negligible. Seneca was a great man. He was prime minister.

And always, ever since Seneca and Paul, people have been intrigued by the relation of Paul and Seneca. And they even forged a whole correspondence between the two in antiquity, because they couldn't imagine that two people could be contemporaries and not be in the same society, move in the same limelight.

3

And, as I said, we have now the speech of Paul in Athens, before the philosophers of Athens, in which he tries to accommodate, and to compromise. And it is the structure of this speech, gentlemen, which was his downfall in Athens.

The structure is academic.

You know where this speech is to be found? (*Acts 18.*)

Wonderful, yes, Sir. Quite. Right you are. It's the 17th chapter.

And, as I said, if you are not careful, and read one of these Greek commentators, these philosophizing commentators -- they will say it's the high point in Paul's career.

To him, it was the degradation, the desertion.

Because what happens is this:

"When Paul expected his comrades to come to Athens, he was incited by the spirit inside himself -- because he saw that the whole city was given over to idolatry. And so he first disputed with the Jews and their adherents in the market place, day after day, to anybody who was willing to hear it.

But there were also Epicureans, and Stoics, philosophers, who debated with him. And some of them said, 'What is this seminiverbius, this thrower-out of germinal thought, saying?'"

4

When a man here in this country doesn't want to have to do with any new thought, he calls me, for example, a "germinal thinker." That is, "It is before it is successful, so I don't have to care for it."

I have seen this in a very funny manner with some of the people here. They call me "a germinal thinker," they think they honor me. And that's then a good reason to say, "Well, it's too early". "Fifty years later, we'll quote him."

XVI SPERMOLOGOS (*SEMINIVERBIUS*)

1

It's a very strange word, gentlemen. It's as important as "gymnosophist," and perhaps I may even give you the word, because it is the New Testament.

It's a good word, and I assure you that at this moment, where the philosopher's isolation and paganism is again to be brought back to the fold of our Christian era, where this is a very important moment, gentlemen, in the history of the human spirit.

The cycle of the Renaissance has run its course, and we have now to encompass and comprehend and bring home Greek philosophy as only an element of reality, but no longer being sovereign, no longer being able to tell you and me that you can live by philosophy alone, ever.

2

Since this is 1957, a great year, gentlemen, in which Bolshevism and pragmatism both have to be conquered, unless there must be a Third World War, and both are philosophies, gentlemen; pragmatism is a philosophy, and Communism is a philosophy.

And both are unable to rule the life of nations.

You cannot run America by pragmatism. And the Near East crisis shows it. It is a scandal that now in all practice we will join the Baghdad Pact, but by our vanity, we are obliged to say, "No, not the Baghdad Pact, but something -- the Eisenhower Doctrine". That is, the other good nations in the Near East have done their duty two years ago. We had an election coming; therefore, we couldn't act.

So now we have to boast that we invent a new policy. Because we simply say after two years, "You have been right." The Baghdad Pact, which says exactly what the Eisenhower Doctrine says, that is, the Russians try to go into the Near East, it will be a war. But we are so vain that we cannot say, "Now finally we will subscribe to the Baghdad Pact."

We have to humiliate the English. We have to humiliate everybody else, and we have to say, "Now we invent a new doctrine." Two years too late. After all the mischief has been done.

Because we want to live by pragmatism. Solve things as they come along. The elections come first. Everything else comes later. That's pragmatic.

This country has a philosophy, gentlemen. It's a purely secular country. It goes from one sensation to the next. It's sensationalism, you can call, or sensualism. That's pragmatism. It's just another expression.

It's a satisfaction that what the eye sees is good enough for the mind to feed it.

3

Now, pardon me, what was I going to say? I wanted to tell you this strange word with which Paul is charged.

From the point of view of a Greek philosopher, gentlemen, all Christian mission, all Christian literature, the New Testament, Saint Augustine, they are *spermologoi*. It means sowers, just as the parable in the New Testament calls it, sowers." And the sower is told -- "We don't believe you. We haven't seen the seed go up". If you throw -- the sower cannot demand faith by the unbeliever; he will wait to the harvest. If I call a man "a sower," from the outside, a "spermologos," that is, "spermo" is sperm, and "logos" is a speaker of sperm, or sower of sperm.

4

The sower of which the New Testament is full, which you expect not today, which you accept in a pious mood on Sundays as a very nice parable, gentlemen, is a very serious explanation of the cultural lack of this country.

XVII YOU HAVE TO KNOW YOUR DESTINY

1

You see, if you only believe in logic, you will always come too late for all events. The whole problem of the secular mind is that it is always too late.

Bill Mitchell came in time. The country came 10 years later, after Pearl Harbor. Because no sacrifice for the secular mind. No risk. You have to stick your neck out, and you have to be persecuted if you want to be in time.

2

I may mention this, perhaps it's a small matter compared to the sacrifice of Bill Mitchell -- but I received a letter today from Germany. And there had been a conference. And the main speaker was a man who has always called me a "spermologos," a sower, and said "impractical, absolutely impractical, this man," me. And he's a man -- a very famous up in the political science. And the adviser to the Bonn government. And for seven years, I have beleaguered this man's mind.

That is, he has been felt very restive. Has visited me here and so on. And has never said anything but, "Not for me, what this man thinks. Impossible." And seven years it has had this incubation.

He is secular, and he thinks rationally, and logically. And you would all got along with him wonderfully. He never says anything important. And he's always on top of the world, because this kind of diluted rationalism is always acceptable. He's never ahead of anybody, so everybody can agree with him. And this conference had made him the central speaker.

And in the discussion, a man got up. By the way, an ex-Nazi, not my friend at all. I just got the report today in the mail. And said, "What you said was said in this place in 1950 by Mr. Rosenstock-Huessy."

Well, he was put on the spot. And he said, "Yes," he said. "It has taken seven years before I have understood it. He was right" - because I had accused then the Germans, that they were lagging in understanding of the events of the last 30 years, because they used their mind as an American will use his mind to think about things that had already happened. And always come too late, of course.

And I had a kind of scheme by which perhaps the next generation might be spared this cultural lag, by which it would take a conversion of the intellectuals, if they would not conclude logically from what the eyes see, from the facts.

3

Zeno the Stoic, and Jesus, and Paul, and the prophets have always known that to judge by the facts leads nowhere because that's all past. You cannot judge reality from the past only. You must know your destiny, your destination, the goal toward which you live to know what you have to cut out of a present condition.

Half of the past is rotten. How can you know if the past is master, if you only think because you know the past?

Now the interesting thing is, my correspondent who writes me the letter says, "Why must it take seven years before he will admit that you are right? In '50, he condemned you; in '52 he condemned you, in '56 even, when I met him last summer, he wouldn't accept a word. He would never quote you in public. Now suddenly, in January '57, he has broken through the shell, and he is willing to give you the honor of having had this right insight, and recommended a new method in political science."

4

Well, I thought I might tell you this to explain the fate of *spermologoi*.

The sower usually is condemned never to hear who heeds his word. There is no physical connection, usually, between the sowing and the reaping. And therefore, of course, much sowing isn't done, because most people say, "Why should I go to this effort? I don't see any results." No results.

Mostly no results.

XVIII TO LIVE AND TO BE LIVED

1

I mean, I would still at this moment think that I have taught for 20 years in this college absolutely nonsensically, uselessly, no fruit. You forget it all. At this moment, you may be interested, gentlemen. Tomorrow you hear something else, and you forget it. And that's the worst that can happen.

I sow on blacktop.

2

You are all blacktop in your minds. No soil. No topsoil. You have no topsoil left, because you hear too many things, and one follows the other, and you have no time for me, gentlemen.

It's not your fault, perhaps. I don't say it's anybody's fault. But as the construction of your mental life is today, you cannot bear fruit. You all want to be clever, gentlemen. You won't be astounded.

3

Gentlemen, if a man is astonished, he sinks into amazement, and we talked about this. Philosophy means to have time to be astonished. You have no time to be astonished, gentlemen. You say, "So what?" On to the next.

Gentlemen, if you cannot be astonished over one little question, one single question, so long that you stand like Socrates, after the Symposium, for 12 hours on your feet, without tiring, in the thoroughfare of Athens, and then find out that the comedian should be the tragedian, and the tragedian should be the comedian, the same person -- if you can't do this, gentlemen, you can't philosophize.

And you can't live.

4

You are lived. You are lived from one stimulus to the next. And you even say that you want to be stimulated, gentlemen. If you only would pray every evening -- "Dear God, don't stimulate me," that's the reasonable prayer of any human being of your age, gentlemen: "Don't stimulate me," don't you think?

Because you have too much to digest the stimuli which you already have. You want to be stimulated, gentlemen, so how can you bear fruit?

Do you think that a woman receives more children if she sleeps with 10 men in one night? Well, that's what you think. Your mind is, after all, a womb of chastity and fruitfulness, or it is nothing.

XIX BEGINNING WITH THE KNOWN, GOING TO THE UNKNOWN

1

Paul, of course, knew all this. And he was a sower. And he was approached by the Epicureans, and the Stoics in the 17th chapter of Acts -- as a sower. They tried not to dishonor him by calling him a philosopher.

2

The word "philosophy" occurs in the 18th verse. Some Epicureans and some Stoics, both philosophers, debated with him. And some said, "What is this sower of words here intending to perform or to achieve?" And others, however, said, "He seems to be the announcer of a new kind of polytheism, because he speaks of Jesus and of His resurrection."

So they approached him and led him to the Areopag, and said, "Are we allowed to know what is this new doctrine which is spoken by thee? You seem to bring something new to our ears. And we want to know whatever it could be, because all Athenians are hospitable towards any stranger. And they always seem to be ready to give up every other occupation, if there was something new, either to say or to hear."

I need not tell you where this happens, too.

3

And so, Paul was standing in the center of the Areopag. That is, -- you would say-- how's the place in front of the Supreme Court in Washington? -- where is the geography so to speak, of Athens. And the Areopag was the Supreme Court of Athens.

And he said,

"You have more religion, o men of Athens in every respect than anybody I know, because when I went by, and I looked over your various stiles, your various pillars for worship, I found an altar in which there was written, 'To the unknown god.'

Now that which you, without knowing it, already cultivate, I now am going to announce to you: God, who created the world and everything that is in the world, since He is the Lord of Heaven and earth, does not live in manmade temples, cannot be cultivated by human hands, because He Himself is the giver of life to all, and of our inspiration.

He made --ex uno - -out of one act of creation the whole humankind, and gave them to inhabit the whole globe.

And He defined the eras, the lapses of time," you may say, "the prescribed periods, the length of time, and the boundaries of habitation for every part of our race, and charged them to seek God, if they might attract Him, or might find Him, as indeed He is not very far from every one of us in our heart.

Because we live in Him; we are moved inside of Him; we exist within Him. And this already has known by some of your poets, we are God's kind" -

genus -- how would you say? "kind" is right? (Breed.) "Breed." Ja.

"We are God's breed.

Since we are God's breed, we must not show our esteem with gold, or silver, or stone, or the art of sculpture" -- no, pardon me. I'm wrong.

*"Since we are His breed,
we must not compare the divine as being similar to gold, silver, stone, sculpture,
or even any human thought.*

*And since God looked down on the times during which this ignorance prevailed,
and we did compare the divine to gold, silver, and human thought,
He now proclaims to all men that we all should do penance,
and has stated the day in which He is going to judge the earth in equity.*

*In a man in Him he has laid down the power to give faith to all of us,
since He suscitated him from the dead."*

4

That's the speech.

The logic of the speech is academic, gentlemen. It's un-Christian.

It begins with the known, and goes to the unknown. It begins with the narguable,
and then deduces, the arguable.

It tries to avoid the scandal of the Cross.

XX THE VOLUNTARY MINUS

1

Christianity is foolishness to the Greeks, and scandal to the Jews.

The Jews say it's a scandal to say that God could become man.
And the Greeks say it is foolish, to say that God could --

no, pardon me.

*The Jews say it's a scandal that a man can say a man can become God,
and the Greeks say that it is foolish to say that God could become man.*

The incarnation is a scandal to both.

2

When Jesus said, "I am the Messiah," the high priest rent His garment and said,
"That's blasphemy. He has to die," because he said, "He, the mortal man, was God
Almighty."

And on the other hand, for a Greek, that is no blasphemy at all. All men can claim like Caesar that they should be deified. They were. But that the immortal gods who live on the Olympus, that they could become incarnate and be satisfied to go to the Cross in their loneliness, and could be deprived of their eternity and could die voluntarily, that's impossible for a Greek to understand.

3

So the criss-cross between Judaism and Greek is a secret of the Christian message.

And the problem of the speech of Saint Paul, gentlemen, on the Areopag in Athens is that he tried to avoid the ridicule. He tried to be not ridiculous. He tried to sell his wares as a good professor of philosophy and be respected in the process.

4

Now, gentlemen, I called him a spermologos, and the Greeks called him a *spermologos*. The sower cannot be known for his seed at the moment of the sowing. He has to wait for the harvest.

Paul didn't have time at that moment. He hoped against hope that he could sell his truth in the hearts of men before it had taken root in the hearts of men, before they were willing to step down and live the life of the suffering, and incognito, themselves. They wanted to know the things of life, the facts of life as you call it so nicely.

And that's always of yesterday. The facts of life are always life minus my own willingness to be eclipsed, to give up something, to be not recognized at this moment for what I think I already have the right to demand.

You have always to add this voluntary minus to your position if you want to increase the future, because you must be extraordinary at this moment, gentlemen. And the mind can only see the ordinary.

XXI DOING ORDINARY THINGS IN AN EXTRAORDINARY MANNER

1

You remember that we had this strange situation, gentlemen. We have the mythical time, -- as an example I give you Zeus and Heracles. And you have our time, human time, which is normal, reasonable and ordinary.

This is all extraordinary.

Now, the Christian problem of Saint Paul was to say that the future cannot be reached by people who want to live the ordinary life, because they omit that their own ways of life have been created in extraordinary time.

And since as much has been created today as was created yesterday, since creation, as I tried to tell you, is a process in which you believe as still going on, as opposite to nature, since to be a *creatura* means to be that we are unfinished at this moment, and we still have to expect the outcome of our own creation tomorrow.

2

We need those extraordinary elements of the mythical time, because everything we know: fire, railroads, and radio have been created by extraordinary people, like Mr. Pasteur, or whomever we take. Or Descartes. And they have not been created by an alumnus of Dartmouth College. Therefore -- except Mr. - who seems to have been a decent guy....

Well, don't you see this point of Christianity is to say that Adam and Eve were ordinary people. That is, in the days of Zeus and Heracles, there was no Zeus and Heracles. They were just common folks. But in our days, they are extraordinary people like Heracles and Zeus.

3

It has been said by a little Quaker woman some years ago that a Christian is not a person who does anything extraordinary, but who does ordinary things in an extraordinary manner.

That's a very good definition of the problem of creating the future, gentlemen.

If you cannot do your paper to me in an extraordinary manner, although it is an ordinary paper, you cannot do your share to the restoration of life on this earth.

In every moment, you have to do the ordinary things of life in an extraordinary way. As though nobody had ever done them, you have to do them with the emphasis as though they had to be done now for the first time as a precedent.

If you cannot do the ordinary things in this extraordinary manner, the energy with which they are done may be lost. Must be lost.

4

The famous thermodynamic law of humanity: by mere repetition and routine, the vitality is lost.

You have to do everything as though it has never been done before.

That's why most marriages end in divorce, because they do not celebrate the day as their wedding day. They celebrate the wedding day 25 years behind. Dead. Out goes the marriage. No one is interested in what happened 25 years ago.

XXII ORIGINAL SIN

1

So gentlemen, this is the collision between Christianity and Paul and Seneca, the attempt to make the future the seat of the highest vitality, instead of the past. It's that this burning up of energy, which creates the solar systems, or which creates the republic of the United States of America, which creates anything, is waiting to come. It wasn't, yesterday.

Anything we know of the past is lacking in grace. That's why I do not see how any one of you can pass over the old doctrine of original sin. It is obvious that you are all guilty of it, every one of us.

Original sin means the loss of energy by inheriting something.

2

Now, all America is just crowded with these softies who have inherited too much, and get an education for nothing and have less energy than their fathers, who got no education.

And that's original sin, gentlemen. You can call it in terms of physics the loss of energy.

3

Now you know very well that in every process where energy is spent, there is this loss in volume. And why do you laugh your head off when you hear the word "original sin"? I think it is always the end of this country. When I hear this, I feel cut up, because I feel that you have become bastards of your own nation, of your own tradition.

A man who laughs at original sin doesn't know that pioneers have founded this country, and had always to face the question of the second generation, where people would not have the same energy as their forefathers. That's original sin. That is, by your having inherited something, that's original. By your finding something already, you are no longer under the full pressure of having to do it yourself for the first time.

4

So gentlemen, Paul tries to reconcile these Greek philosophers, and tries not to be a spermologist -- a sower, but a teacher of philosophy, a systematizer. So he says, "Well, everybody in Greece said it already. It's a well-known truth."

Well, if it is a well-known truth, then he is of course superfluous. He first already sterilizes himself. He says, "You know it all. I only repeat the performance."

XXIII *THE PROBLEM OF PAUL*

1

Now, I told you that's anti-Christian, because the coming of Christ is something unheard-of. He comes into the world, because He never came before. If you can't make people feel this, that this has never happened before, it will not happen now. It will not happen with the same impact, with the same originality, with the same martyr, readiness to die for it. It has never happened before.

That's the first thing a Christian must say.

Then as soon as he says this, the Jews are scandalized. They say, "We have the revelation." And the Greeks laugh and say, "Prove it."

Now, if you prove the new thing by the old, it is no longer the new thing. It's deducted from the past.

2

So you cannot reconcile the Greeks and the Jews, gentlemen, when you want to live. You cannot. The scandal is inevitable.

Bill Mitchell had just to be court-martialed. There is absolutely no other way of convincing Mr. MacArthur. You know, MacArthur was one of his judges. He has to do it.

3

And you'll see the problem of Paul -- compared to Plato and Aristotle and Socrates -- is a very simple one. That he has before him all the time this great sentence, which no other philosopher has, and Paul is as much a professor of philosophy if you like -- as any Greek one. Much learned.

Modern Greek theologians have always said he wasn't. But I mean, you just read one sentence;

he's more learned than all the Greek philosophers who were his contemporaries.

And he says this -- will you kindly take down this sentence?

4

The decisive distinction, gentlemen, between Christianity and Greek philosophy is in these three words: which you will read in the liturgy of the service of Saint Paul on June 29 in the prayer book. It's in one of the letters of Saint Paul. I've forgotten at this moment in which. And there he does repentance for his superciliousness and sophistry in this speech on the Areopag.

He says, "The Greeks have not known it. But I -- *scio cui credidi* -- I know in whom I have believed."

XXIV WE HAVE ONLY THE LOGOS

1

The basis, gentlemen, of a Christian is that he has forbears. He has an author. He has authority. The basis of Plato is that he has ideals. Ideals, I told you, have waxen noses. That is true what you think is true. That is beautiful that you think is beautiful. And that is good that you think is good.

Ideals don't talk.

2

But the Lord talks, speaks very energetically to you. And if you look at Him, gentlemen, under His searching eye from the Cross, nobody is justified, as yet. He still has to do one better, because the problem of Christ is, that He opened our eyes to our own death, which is still in front of you and me. We have not seen it, yet. In Him, it becomes known to us what it means to die.

And since we are all cowards by nature, we don't want to figure our life in the direction of our death. We think we can find ways and means by saving accounts or something else, of escaping death.

3

I can't go into this.

The three words, however, mean, gentlemen, that for the Christian, the only endowment towards the future is the vitality of the founder, that we have to be as vital as he, with complete freedom what to do.

We have no system; we have no code; we have no ethics; we have no physics; and we haven't even logic. We have only the logos.

That is, we have the power in us, which He had, to remain faithful to His cause, regardless of the consequences.

4

Can you see the difference between having the problem of vitality before you all the time, or the problem of some code of ethics, or some system of philosophy? The replacement of an ideal by a forbear, and of a code by a sacrifice by a victim, is tremendous.

Because, with the victim before our eyes, we concentrate on our power of freedom, to be totally free. Self-interest, or illusion, or what-not. And if we however have as our forbear a book, a text, a set of rules, we try spasmodically to compare what happens today with what happened yesterday, which is useless.

Nothing that happens tomorrow is in any way the same as what happened yesterday.

XXV FOR FREUD AND MARX - AGAINST THE FREUDIANS AND MARXIANS

1

That's why Christianity always boasts that it is the doctrine of total freedom, of complete freedom.

2

You can't understand this, why the spirit of Christianity is so much freer than the spirit of the Greeks. But it is, because the Greeks at best could sell you a system. The Christianity gives us the power of the creator of a system, so that you can create your own system at this moment.

The power of creating a system stands higher than the system. Most people can never, a whole life understand this. They think that a system is higher than the power to create a system.

3

I give you this example, gentlemen.

If Freud and Marx in our days had their way, then nobody after Freud and Marx could be a genius, and could preach a new doctrine, because Freud says that all doctrine comes from obsessions. All ideas, therefore - it isn't worth to believe them.

Saint Augustine has a mother complex. And Moses had a persecution mania. Or the Israelites had the persecution mania. They killed Moses. That's the origin of Israel.

And so, gentlemen, if you believe Freud, the one consequence is that no Freud cannot be born or can at least preach. Because you can't believe any man anymore. They all have ulterior motives, Mr. Freud, too.

And the second thing is, with Marx, the same. Marx was a man who left his class and went over to the proletariat. If anybody was not a proletarian, it was he. He was a prophetic Jew of a wealthy family, and he married the daughter of a nobleman, of a count.

And these two people set out and said, "We give up nobility, we give up religion, we give up philosophy, we give up bourgeoisie, we give up our country, we give up our native language, and we become the workers' champion."

If Communism is right, that's impossible. The Russians killed all people of the upper class, because they were impossible. They couldn't be converted.

4

And therefore, gentlemen, I fight for Freud and Marx against the Freudians and the Marxians, because I say it is more important that people like Freud and Marx can be born in every generation than any beautiful system Mr. Freud and Marx can erect.

I'm interested in Karl Marx; I'm not interested in Marxism. I'm interested in Freud. I hate him, but I'm interested in him. He's important. Such people must be born. In their system, they can't be born. They can't be produced. Therefore, down with the system; up with Freud.

XXVI TO CREATE THE CONSOLIDATION OF ALL THE GENIUSES

1

If you cannot understand this, you do not know the case of Christianity. That's the whole case of Christianity.

Christianity came into the world for no other purpose but to say that it is more important that people like Jesus are born than that the whole system of the law is preserved. And therefore Christianity is a sequence of Jesuses. It's a sequence of saints. It's a galaxy of stars. It's a sequence of martyrs, confessors, missionaries, and nothing else -- of geniuses.

2

It has been said of Christianity that compared to the Greek philosophy, gentlemen, in Greek philosophy, the genius was the free enterprise, private enterprise. And in the Church, gentlemen, of our era, genius is incorporated. That is, all the geniuses know of each other and can support each other.

3

I told you that in antiquity there was no university, because every head of a school had to keep alive by, in separation from the opposite school life. The first thing the Christian era had to perform is to create this consolidation of all the geniuses.

What we today believe of a human mind is that he works in collaboration with all other spirits. That's the problem of our era. That's what is called a university.

4

In every generation it relapses into paganism, sloughed off. Marxism is such a temptation. Freudianism is such a temptation, to bury the unity of the human spirit by claims of one little gang, to know it all by themselves.

XXVII THE LAG OF THE MIND

1

So we are at this moment at a very low point, gentlemen. The year zero, in which Christ came into the world and said, "Let the spirit free everybody, so that we don't have to have the war of all the systems against each other, but the fertility that all

these systems may correct each other, because I give you the spirit that shall make you free."

2

This moment, gentlemen, is amongst us. It is not yet decided whether the United States shall not go the way of Spain, because in your great fear at this moment and your great cowardice and your timidity, you may end in either confusion or indifference, like the Greeks. The Roman Empire died from the indifference of its citizens. The only survivors were the Christians. The rest, just indifference.

Retreat? "Oh, I'm just a human being." You can't do anything.

Everybody has a little private cult: Lions, or Rotarians, or what-not. And that was all.

Gentlemen, the agony of the Greek philosophy, from zero to Saint Augustine, from Paul to Saint Augustine, is something I recommend to your great attention. You are on the best way of entering this path.

3

The abyss between the people who believe, and the people who don't believe, the people who are up to date, and the people who are lagging culturally, is as deep today as it is always. But we can say today that if you believe that it is enough to have a philosophy for life, you are at this moment embarking on the venture of Mr. Hitler, Nero -- that's exactly the same period, in significance. Because you say the individual has no possibility to bring the time up to date.

The lag of the mind, gentlemen, that is the problem of our day. And that means the limitation of the operations of the mind.

4

Sum of it all: philosophy comes too late, left to its own devices.

Philosophy as a system of its own always comes too late.

And that is the crushing conflict between Christianity and philosophy. Philosophy is not wrong. But it comes too late. Because it says, "Everything -- all the facts are equally good," it remains indifferent to the disgust with half of the facts, with the power to say, "Half of the facts have to go out of existence, because they're dead."

The decision between life and death, gentlemen, is not made by philosophy.

Thank you.

TWENTYFIFTH LECTURE: AN ATTEMPT TO BRING THE MIND OF THE GREEK PHILOSOPHERS BACK UNDER THE DOMINATION OF THE SPIRIT

I I AM FREE LIKE A FIRST CAUSE

1

...unable to make their disciples into extraordinary people. The problem of philosophy is its relation to time; that the farther back you go in time, the more creative is the moment.

Aristotle will say that there is a first mover, but everything else is second-rate.

2

Now how can we stand to hear from any period in the origin of the world which is greater than our own time? What's this?

You all believe that the founding fathers were founding fathers, and that you are just brats, and kids, and boys. Well, gentlemen, as long as you say that they are founding fathers, and you are all boys, and the ladies of 70 are dressed as girls, you cannot wonder that this time is decadent, because you are just girls and boys.

But you accept this with great glee and say, "It's wonderful."

You live all in a mythical time, just as the ancient Greeks, because mythical is if you say that there was a time when things happened for the first time, but today everything happens by deduction, by logic, by reason, for causes, by motivation, for ulterior motives, and so on. Well, gentlemen, if you are all caused, you have nothing to do with the first cause.

3

But I assure you, gentlemen, that I am free, like a first cause. I am not caused.

In what I am caused, I am mortal, and I'm very indifferent. I wouldn't stand here and speak to you. But for what I say, I'm not caused, gentlemen, but I'm cause. I am a first cause.

I hope you are, too, when you do right. Anybody who does right, or who proposes love, or who does an act of charity is a first cause. Has never happened before, I hope, or you can't live.

4

You all consume life, gentlemen. Certainly in your minds. And you are very costly addition -- you are the mildew on this civilization, all the educated people in this country, because they all live by derivation. And you are even proud of this logic.

You call this "logic."

II THE INTERCHANGE BETWEEN THOUGHT AND LIFE

1

So, last time I tried to show you that there was a group of men at the end of antiquity who protested, who said that the problem was to look at the past as an ordinary time, and to look at themselves as extraordinary people. To reverse this process is mythical process, on which you all live in a myth, of this founding-father business of the prime mover, of the origin of species, and whatever you call this nonsense, because everything has happened before, and you are just derivations. Dregs, you are. Dregs, not derivations. You are dross, relics.

2

When Paul had this clash with the Epicureans and the Stoics in Athens, and for 300 years there was this wrestling match between the Christian spirit and this philosophical logic.

And I think your papers bear me out that it is nearly impossible for me to break into your vicious circle of thinking, gentlemen.

I had a talk for an hour with one of you. I couldn't get even near his mind, when I tried to show him that Plato was not simply using the ideas of Socrates, but he was existentially moved by the life and death of Socrates, and that the ideas of Plato are the fruit of the death of Socrates.

He could only write and say to me that the ideas of Socrates produced other ideas. That's this mechanism which you have in your brain, that one thought begets another thought, gentlemen.

3

My life begets my thoughts, and I hope my thoughts beget your life.

Why should I teach you otherwise?

But you can't see this. This interchange between thought and life -- you really think that everybody's ideas come from somebody else.

4

The climax was reached in a paper I had to read today, in which the gentleman said that logos, physis and ethos are ideas. I asked you to subsume the ideas of the Greek philosophers under these three realities, these three experiences which we all have when we write, when we speak.

III TO BE OVER-LORDED, TO BE LORD, TO BE BROTHER

1

They are not ideas, gentlemen. As soon as you make logos, physis and ethos into ideas, we are just Platonists. Because the word "idea" is an invention of Mr. Plato. There was no idea before. And if you are outside Plato, there are no ideas.

2

But you think you can dodge the whole issue by hiding behind one of these philosophers, Plato, who is the most fashionable in your time, and say that my reminder that you live, gentlemen, under God, with people, and above nature, above things, that you eat and shit, that you love and hate, and that you believe and obey and command, all these three things which you do daily, that these three experiences disrupt the continuity of your thinking, gentlemen.

God, men, and world, or the commands which you give as an ensign to the platoon, or whatever you do, or the orders of your doctor, which you follow, because you believe in science or medicine, or whatever you believe in, the acts of friendship which you show to your classmate or your roommate or even your teacher, to the treatment of the things which you cut down, like a tree, which you use for firewood,

they are acts which point in three absolutely disconnected directions.

*One, where you are overlorded;
one, where you are a lord,
and one, where you are a brother.*

3

These are experiences. They have nothing to do with ideas. As long as you call them "ideas," you haven't understood the whole course.

And I would venture to say that three-quarters of you, according to your papers, have not understood that logos, physis and ethos are not concepts, are not ideas, but are a stammering attempt to draw your attention to the fact that you talk to people, and listen to people, that you obey greater powers than yourself, and that you have the power to use animals, plants, and minerals, and the topsoil of this earth for your own sustenance.

What do you do when you breathe in this air here in this room? You dominate nature. You take it upon yourself to declare that your life is more important than the incumbered existence of this oxygen.

You don't give a thought to the fate of the air in this room that it will be used up. You say, "I come first."

4

That's the experience of everybody.

But in other respects, gentlemen, you don't say, "I come first." You say, "I come last." When you help a child, or when you please your mother, you say, "I come second." And if you rejoice in a good party, or propose to a girl, or go down to Smith, you say, "None comes first, and none comes last. We are together."

IV *WHERE ARE YOU IN THIS WHOLE BUSINESS?*

1

This is physis, ethos and logos as directions of our experience.

In German terms, or English -- German's my mother tongue, so it always comes back to me - in plain English then, gentlemen, logos is the lord over me. You of course are polytheists, so I must say "the lords," "the gods" which you have.

I believe in one God.

2

Yes, most of you are polytheistic, because anybody who doesn't believe in God believes in many gods. It's very simple, because everybody has to obey orders.

3

Ethos, that's man. Men. Humanity, whatever you take. Your nation. Your family, et cetera.

And nature, gentlemen, that's the realm of things.

The Anglo-Saxon word for "nature" is "world." In Greek it is the "*pan*."

So don't repeat in your finals all your own thinking, this nonsense which has sterilized most of your papers on these philosophical schools, that you think that these people use logos, physis and ethos. I tried to make you realize that you, while writing this paper, are forced in your own thoughts to act, distributing part of these men to their divine inspiration, and call them "gods," or "divine," or "true," which is the same.

When you count a man "true," we say that God is in him.

4

And that's why he's a philosopher, for example, is only interesting with regard to what is true in him.

Only one-tenth of the people who have written papers in this course have even dared to mention the question of truth. You cannot deal with a philosopher without asking whether he is true. You don't. You describe in terms from a textbook what somebody else has reported that he has said.

But I have never been able to find out, gentlemen, where you are in this whole business. And that's the only thing that would have interested me.

V WHAT IS LOST IN THE GREAT HARMONY OF NUMBERS?

1

This is perhaps a little difficult, gentlemen, but we come to this. This is an important question. How far is this, which this man dealt with, for you real? And how far is it just a picture on the wall where you read that somebody said something about something?

2

It's very difficult for any one of you, this seems to me, to break into this reality, where you say, "If I had lived in the days of Pythagoras, I would also have tried to solve

the dilemma between logos and physis, by saying it's all number. Because numbers can come from the workings of my spirit right into the things. They seem to connect them."

And Pythagoras therefore did not ask the very simple question, "What cannot be numbered?" He only saw that something could be numbered.

In as far as you and I can be numbered, we become things, however. So it's pretty dangerous to use mathematics.

One of you -- who is the future scientist who wrote on Pythagoras? Mr. *Porter*? Ja. Did you? You had this problem.

3

It is a real problem. I wanted you to ask yourself: how far do we get with numbers? It is a very awe-inspiring thing, of the Pythagoreans. Don't misunderstand me. There is something which we cannot give up, that part of your and my being is explicable by numbers. It's really awe-inspiring that anybody should ever have conceived of this great harmony in numbers.

4

But obviously something is lost.

If I call Mr. Porter Number 365, you have a right to protest. Your name is lost. The thing that cannot be numbered, is lost. What that is, is the mystery of logos, again. I mean, logos is richer than numbers.

That would be the outcome of my treatment of Pythagoras. Or it should have been yours.

Pythagoras himself cannot be reduced to a number. Otherwise there would be no Pythagoreanism, no authority.

VI THE GODS BECOMING INDIFFERENT NATURE

1

Today I want to introduce you to this last chapter in Greek philosophy in which people try to cure the constant loss of power from generation to generation, because the logos was made a part of nature. The operations of the logos were considered a province, a territory of nature.

2

Some of you have described this very clearly. One of you writes, for example, that with the Stoics, nature contains all the divine order of the universe, too.

3

Now, if nature contains the gods, then part of logos obviously has been reduced to nature. Because the gods are the powers whom we obey. Once you look at them from the outside, as nature, they can be treated indifferently. Nature is that towards which we are allowed to remain indifferent.

Perhaps you take this down, gentlemen:

logos is that for which we have to have awe.

The more you treat things as natural, the more you can remain indifferent, the more you treat them as logos, the more we have to be moved.

If you then say that the divinities -- as the Stoics did, by the way, partly at least -- is that the gods are real, but parts of nature, the more you allow man, as Lucretius, for example, wanted us very much to do, to dismiss the gods as indifferent, neutral.

4

The whole way, gentlemen, from Heraclitus, in his dispute with Parmenides, is that Heraclitus wanted to keep the paradox of the logos, that I'm overawed by it, that as a moment I say something, I still feel the force by which I'm allowed to say something is above me, is something that will speak tomorrow again, differently.

I have to wait - what he calls the way back -- but I have said something, gentlemen, to you. I have to wait until I find myself justified, and verified, or refuted by the facts.

I can teach you something. And it will only be tomorrow that I know, "Did I?" I have to wait. It isn't enough that I think right.

VII SEVERITY

1

Sometimes, as in this country, sometimes I think you have to teach nonsense in order to bear fruit in truth, because the good words, the true words have all been so abused, that as long as I speak of the good, and the true, and the beautiful, there is just sterility, and non-understanding, no reaction whatsoever.

We go to sleep.

2

Now it is sometimes better to wake people up with wrong truths, gentlemen, than to put them to sleep with right truths.

I don't know.

3

In Heraclitus, gentlemen, the relation is still very clear that the logos is above physis. And it is very clear that Heraclitus, because he has this relation of logos above physis, that he is rough, that his ethics are serious, are severe.

The result, wherever logos is above physis, gentlemen, is severity. Severity of the teacher to the student, of the prince to the subject, of the judge to the culprit, because the man who has logos above nature cannot treat himself as nature, when he speaks or when he uses logos, he knows that he is himself above the things of this world. And so he has the power to subsist in a middle ground.

4

Today, as you know, where everything is natural, no judge has authority. The president goes in shirtsleeves and is called "Ike," and on it goes. That's a very great symptom, gentlemen, of our desire to be natural, gentlemen.

Because he's natural, he doesn't want to make decisions. All the disagreeable decisions are made by Mr. Sherman Adams or some other unknown quantity, and he plays golf, because that you can understand. He's natural.

That's the state of affairs of this country, gentlemen, that you elect a president who says, "I don't want to make decisions. I hate the presidency for this reason. I want to play golf." Everybody is delighted, because you are just the same.

VIII WHAT IS NEW TO MR. CHESTERTON

1

And so you have what you want, gentlemen: you have nature. You have absolute nature, and no logos whatsoever. Pious phrases, insincerity, hypocrisy. It's the most insincere country I know of, is this country in political affairs. Not one word spoken in Congress is true. Not one word.

2

Everything -- we say that we are starved with oil, and and now we won't sell oil to the English and French to punish them. All the oil companies, in fact, for six months are itching to sell their oil to England and France, and with great glee have come see this happen that the Suez Canal is blocked. Nothing better could have happened to the American oil interests. Texas is just jubilant.

But no, they talk about the drought.

Nothing is true that you hear officially, gentlemen. Always the opposite is true. Don't believe one word that is said here in foreign policy. We always do the very opposite from what we say we do.

But to you these pious phrases, they all take you in, gentlemen, because it's part of the mind, to you is just a natural entity. It follows the smallest pressures, the electorate, the stupidity and the folly of the day. That's what you think is the mind for. The mind is a machinery. And you will put the International Business -- what are these bastards doing? (*IBM.*) Yes. They will run the country very soon.

3

Now, I'm very serious, gentlemen. You must, as long as you do not distinguish between logos and physis, you will never distinguish between natural pressures, gentlemen, and the truth. You have no criterion of what's called "pragmatism" in this country.

When Chesterton came to this country, he said, "They tell me that you can make anybody buy anything by psychology." He said, "That's new," Chesterton -- you know, the English humorist: "That's really new to me. We never would have dared to say officially that we are free to cheat everybody," because saying in psychology that I can make everybody buy everything, even if he doesn't want it, that in plain English is called cheating. You call the customers "psychology".

4

As soon as psychology becomes a means to an end, all science in this country is prostituted. You have to pay \$22,000 in Boston to the head psychoanalyst, if you want to settle for psychoanalytical practice. So you can see how many people have to be fleeced before one case can be healed.

And I have a friend, who's a poor teacher. She had \$8,000 of savings. The psychoanalyst found out about it, and he exactly treated her as long as there was one cent of these \$8,000 forthcoming. And then she suddenly was cured.

That's all going on in this country with great glee. You call it "science." The science of psychoanalysis. I call it "the robbery."

IX RHETORICS

1

But as soon as you have no distinction between physis and logos, gentlemen, what's the difference? What's the difference between nature and truth?

You can make no distinction. To you all the utterances of human beings are nothing but instinctive results of pressures on this people. The person says what it is clever to say. And what is lucrative to say.

And you assume that's so. If you want to be elected, you have to say these things. If you want to sell something, you have to say these things. And if you want to be liked and be taken into a fraternity, you have to say nothing, and on it goes. And you believe this. That's so funny. You believe that physis has swallowed up logos.

2

Now gentlemen, once physis swallows up logos, the result is -- as with the Stoa, as with the Epicureans -- logic. That is, logos can be pre-calculated, gentlemen.

The Greeks had this word "logic," and they had also the word "logistics," by the way, in many forms. And in Plato already you find the degradation of logos to logistics.

What is logic, gentlemen? Pre-calculable truth. That is, you are not saying something because you have to say it now and then verify it by your own act. You don't take an oath and say, "I'm going to be faithful to this woman," and then try to be faithful. But you precalculate, as a lawyer would in a contract.

And all logic, gentlemen, is repeatable truth, and computable truth, it is truth already known and now reformulated.

3

The result in the Stoa was that the logic produced tremendous rhetorics. Rhetorics is also saying something, for the second time. Not speaking under compulsion for the first time, as an original mind, but thinking it over, and now putting it in to such a form that it will sell.

4

As soon, gentlemen, as this Niagara, from logos to logic was set in motion by Parmenides here, when he tried to make man master of anything in the outer world, in his mind, and not allowed himself to admit that he was inspired, time and again, and to say what was necessary in this moment, but he looked at all the world as just in shambles, you get the necessity, gentlemen, of finding some way of rebuilding logos.

And so you get at the end -- in the Paulinian appearance in Athens - the clash between logos and pneuma.

You have heard of the Holy Spirit.

X ULTERIOR MOTIVES

1

Now gentlemen, as long as the Greeks believed in logos, there was no need for the special word "*pneuma*." Pneuma and logos are historical ideas.

2

You use spirit, the word "spirit." You have heard of the Holy Spirit.

Why did the Christians -- when they went into the pagan world, to the Gentiles, to the Greeks especially, and the Romans -- why did they have to burden us with the Trinity?

3

That is the problem of the Greek mind, gentlemen. In the meantime, the logos of antiquity, the power to speak, had been used by the philosophers, and the philosophical schools as an apparatus, as a mechanism, as something that was like nature. It could be particularized, and it could be itemized, and any of you who has written a paper on any of these philosophers must simply know that the logos was treated by them as a thing, as an entity like any other.

This is what the Greeks did to logos. They depersonified it, and they detemporalized it. And they said, "The logos is a machine, is a mechanism."

To give you an example of what happens in America at this moment.

We have here a group of people who try to keep the inspiration of President Tucker alive. And one of the men took me in this group to speak on President Tucker. And he got up and he began, "The mechanism of a college..."

And I interrupted and said, "The spirit of a college."

And there was great laughter, because he wanted to speak about the spirit, but the natural word for him was "the mechanism of the college". Because it's more natural for you to speak of the mechanism of the college than of the spirit of the college. We know more about the mechanism, the filing cabinets, et cetera, and the alumni fund.

So the drawback is always to speak about the mechanism, and not of the spirit. Except when you sing "*Dartmouth Undying*," because it is so definitely dead.

4

This is very serious, gentlemen. Anybody in any family, in any nation is faced with this contradiction that the spirit which we invoke usually has already been used for ulterior motives. We say it's a pep talk. And once you say it's a pep talk, the logos is already dead.

XI JESUS AND HITLER - SACRIFICE AND SUICIDE

1

Now the Christians' attempt to go out into the world from Judaism -- Israel being the only group in the ancient world which had shunned philosophy, and had not gone this way of logic, and natural science -- this way into the Greek world was beset with this decadence of logic. If logos is a part of the natural realm, then it can be looked at objectively, and it is something that I can use, as I can use anything.

And the Greeks did, by the time of the Roman Empire, use their mind.

2

So we can say, perhaps in so many words, gentlemen, when logos becomes physis, then it becomes mind. Mind is logos in the state of nature, as a part of a man's equipment, as a man's mechanical equipment. Logos in the force of our and your original experience as a child, for example, is overwhelming, an act of obedience.

When you take a child for the first time to church, there are no questions asked. But it tries to open its lips for the "Our Father" with the feeling that there is a Father in Heaven. In this country you can no longer rely on this. You are all so sophisticated.

3

It happened to me in the last class, in the last course, last year. I shall never forget it. I shall take this as an earth-quake to my grave, as a real, shattering experience, that a boy in the same class in the beginning of the class, said to me, in front of the class, publicly, that Jesus committed suicide. And by the end of the class, he had gone one better and he said, "After all, Hitler sacrificed himself for his nation."

Now I don't think you can speak to this man any more about any religious truth directly. He is absolutely ruined. Everything has gone.

The greatest act of logos, of obedience to our Father in Heaven has become suicide, the going to the Cross, the Crucifixion. And on the other hand, the most arbitrary bastard, the devil himself, the great liar, really a beast from the abyss, has "sacrificed himself for his nation".

This can be performed in New Jersey and adjacent territories. This boy came from New Jersey, from one of these Nazi communities there. Wisconsin and New Jersey, gentlemen, they have more Hitlerites than all Germany today.

(To give this fellow his due, he might have been able to say that quite logically, looking at it from Hitler's point of view, Hitler believed he was sacrificing himself for his people?)

Not in his last speech. He said, "You deserve now to perish." He didn't say that, he said, "I go out, because you haven't sacrificed yourself for me."

That was his last speech.

4

(Well, I mean, before that. A person who's crazy can say all sorts of things.)

But my dear Mandaville, if you do not shudder over the human frailty, I'm very sorry you don't know how serious the destruction of all values at this moment in this country is, if you can sell this -- and this boy was convinced that this was clever, was very smart, and if you even are convinced that it can be held, we have no means any longer of understanding each other, because the logos can only be understood in terms of sacrifice, in terms of obedience, in terms of authority, in terms of majesty, in terms of awe, in terms of submission.

Because the logos says to you, "Now you have to go and die on the battlefield."

XII HITLER'S JUST THE WORLD WAR; WORLD CONQUEST

1

Now if Hitler sacrificed himself for his nation, the whole resistance against Hitler all over Europe was criminal. All the people on whose memory your, my future rely, much more than you know, because these good people have said like the Hungarians now - it's very similar -- the consequence is that we have no good men in our country, because the best ones have all resisted this scoundrel.

So you get into terrible consequences.

The blind admiration of Nero, of power for its own sake.

2

Oh no. You don't see what the logos does. Every word you speak, my dear man, and every name you invoke organizes the whole universe. You can never isolate Jesus and Hitler. They infect all your judgments in ethos and physis.

Because after all, you despise then a man like Jesus who had not even a veterans' home, not even a Levitt House to put His head down. And Hitler, who conquered the whole world, and you still say he sacrificed himself for the nation. That's the consequence, then.

3

Why not take the Suez Canal? Why not march into Hungary? Why not, my dear man? Why not? It's the only reasonable thing to do: conquer the world.

That's the consequence when you use this word "sacrifice," my dear man, in the opposite sense in which it was meant.

You cannot isolate Mr. Hitler as a nice, interesting fact. He's just the world war, world conquest. And he said so. "I want to be this".

4

Oh no, oh no. That's why everybody in Europe feels that the United States are just a shipwreck, because they have no mind left, gentlemen, or if you say -- no logos left. There is no logos here. Anybody can sell anything and be called "smart."

This is very smart what this boy said. You also think it's smart.

Smart is logic, gentlemen, without the spirit. If he makes you buy something, it's very smart. But that he may create an inflation, and a spiral in wages, and so on, by overdoing his automobile stunt, his prosperity in automobiles, that is not logic. That's logos.

That takes a spirit to know.

XIII INFLATION - RIGHT AND WRONG

1

I gave an example, gentlemen. There is a paper -- who was in Philosophy 9? I think you will remember, I gave you this example of Mr. David Lawrence, this arch-rascal who publishes this capitalistic paper on United States News Reports, where he said that inflation was inevitable, because debtors like inflation, and there are more debtors in this country than creditors; therefore we must have inflation.

2

What's wrong about this? Very smart. He was very clever. And many people subscribe to this paper, because he is so smart, gentlemen. Can you reach the point where you find what makes him into a scoundrel, just by this one paragraph?

You see, the logic is impeccable. But of course, always, as with the spirit, it is that the spirit knows that there are not just debtors and creditors. There is still right and wrong. There are still widows who have a right to live on their pension. And there are still endowed institutions who have a right to live on their endowment. And there are any number of things that cannot be dragged down by the greed of workers and manufacturers.

3

Inflation is the way in which the working class and the industrial class live together on my and your back. Fleece us, that is, the people who at this moment are not wage earners or money makers. You live in some form on a settled income, on the tuition or whatever it is -- somebody pays. If this has to be increased, you are in danger.

That's inflation.

4

Inflation is just not right. The smart man does not know what right or wrong is, gentlemen, because right or wrong -- you should know this from your study of Plato -- is something that is not natural. It isn't even mathematical, Mr. Porter. That's the Pythagorean problem.

Plato said, "The good is also the mathematically true".

"Mathematics and the Good," Mr. Whitehead called his last lecture.

But the good is not the mathematically correct at all. It's different.

XIV CREATING PNEUMATICS

1

Ethos and physis cannot be identified; that's the power of the logos to say. As soon as you make logos into logic, you will not give in before you have explained the whole ethical realm of politics by natural commotions.

And that's what's going on in this country. That's what Mr. David Lawrence does in these news reports. He says that inflation is inevitable because there are more debtors than creditors. And debtors love inflation.

2

Can you see what happens when you treat all social relations by numbers, by quantity? That's physis. And that's acclaimed in this country.

3

So the word "*pneuma*," then is an attempt to get out of the constant loss of energy of the logos by being treated by mere logic.

So I have invoked the necessity, gentlemen, of creating pneumatics. That would be a reminder that logic is always wrong. Because logic treats the logos as nature.

But gentlemen, that I can say "no" is never nature. That's always supernature. That is always something quite different. That's a power that is primeval.

Just as God created the earth, I can create injustice by calling a thing unjust. Somebody has to call a spade a "spade" before it is a spade. You don't believe this.

You think the spade is a spade before I have called it a spade. But this is not so in society, gentlemen.

4

Before I have called Hitler a "scoundrel," he is not a scoundrel, because in the ethical world anybody who can speak is on the side of the angels before he has been found out and declared to be on the side of the devil.

The strange thing about humanity is, gentlemen, that you assume that before the man has been declared to be worth killing and worth executing, he has a right to live.

XV THE HOLY SPIRIT

1

Let me now put this whole problem, gentlemen, -- so may I sum this up?

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is an attempt to link up the Greek odyssey, the Greek migration, the Greek exodus from normal humanity into philosophy. This attempt to look at the mind as a mechanism, and to treat it as something that is under law, and whose results can be pre-calculated. That is the essence of logic, pre-calculating the results of the spiritual life of mankind.

The *pneuma* is an attempt to restore the balance, and to say, "Just as much as I can repeat old ways, I can also start a new way."

And since I can start a new way, the power with which I decide whether I repeat at this moment, or whether I start something different, this decision is not logic. And that comes from the spirit, or as the Greeks called it, from the *pneuma*.

2

Never forget, gentlemen, that the word "pneuma" and the word "spirit" is nothing but the word "breath" in Anglo-Saxon. It's nothing so very highfalutin. It is simply the breath of life.

I have published a book in German under this title, *The Breath of the Spirit*, to draw attention to the fact that something absolutely physical is meant, that I can take a deep breath and start all over again.

3

So the whole road of the ancient world, from Paul to St. Augustine, is an attempt to bring the mind of the Greek philosophers back under the domination of the spirit. Or, as I tried to tell you, to balance the overwhelming weight of past routines, of known and computable ways of the mind, by unknown, unheard-of future ways of inspiration.

4

The Holy Spirit is an attempt to tell you that the past is not better than the future; the future is not better than the past. Both has to be holy. That is, both has to delve into this total freedom, as the New Testament expresses it, that a wise man brings out of his treasures something old and something new.

You become, gentlemen, a Christian as long as the old is not better than the new in your judgment, and the new is not better than the old, by itself.

As long as you think new is better, you are apes. And as long as you think that old is better than new, you are monkeys. So take your choice.

XVI FROM THE UNLIVING TO THE LIVING

1

The problem of the spirit is that old and new are no categories for truth, or for goodness, or for value, or for importance. If you are recommended television because it is new, it's a very poor recommendation. That's not a good recommendation. But you believe that you cannot resist the new.

This country -- if you say, "This is new," you think you have to have it. And if you say, "It is old," you think you can pass it over.

2

We had a young woman who went to marry in Oregon. And she came back after twenty years. This was in '35, that she had gone out and gotten married. And she came back in '55 and entered our church and said, "This is impossible."

And we said, "What's impossible?"

"This church," she said.

And we said, "Why?"

"It's the same rug. It's the same rug." There was the same rug lying in the aisle, which had been there when she got out to Oregon. In a decent church in Oregon they change the rug every three years.

Of course, no spirit. But rugs.

3

To show you what happens when logos becomes, gentlemen, something physical, a mechanism, a logic, a rhetorics, all the things of public speaking, all the things you study.

I got here a book yesterday from the university in which I have to teach next spring. So they wanted to prepare me for the worst, I suppose. And it's called a ring lecture. That is, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 people have followed each other very like the Great Issue course. But with some more connection I suppose this is, because it's called "*From the unliving to the living*." It is a way of life from death to life.

4

That is the way, gentlemen, of the Greek mind. This is a typical Greek book. It begins with the deadest, the external, the air, the fire, the elements, the heavens, as it is still in Plato's *Timaeus*, the universe, which is dead, as far as we know. It may be heated; it may be moving. But it is dead. It has no life.

And all Greek mind, and your mind, too, thinks it can explain me and you by knowing what Mars and Jupiter are like, and what the galaxy is, and what the cell is, and what the waves is - all physicists do this.

The tendency is to go to physis to explain life. To begin from scratch. --

XVII WAVES HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO COMPULSION

1

People think that's very logical. Because if you use your logic to explain the living from that which does not live, the reasonable people say that this man is logical.

2

You give me physics. What's the next science on top of physics, what would follow, Mr. { }?

(The logos.)

Oh no, no. I mean, in the field of natural science. If you first have explained everything you can do in the realm of physics, which would be the next science -- which is already a little more complicated?

(Chemistry.)

Chemistry. Mixturing. Then would come the cell physiology, biology; and then would come plant life; and then would come animal life; and then would finally come?

(Spiritual life.)

Well -- they don't believe in the spirit, but at least human life. Social life. All right.

Finally, you would then explain God from waves, and that's what they all try to do.

3

This book is very typical for what the Greek mind has tried to do since the days of the Ionian philosophers, to explain the higher out of the lower, gentlemen.

And the spirit with which I try to explain the lower then is itself explained as the result of the lower. I use my mind to say that waves constitute the universe. But I say this.

And this in your mind is perfectly logical.

4

One day it will be explained by Mr. Einstein's theory of relativity, because what I say is the result of waves. If it is the result of waves, it cannot be true, gentlemen. Because in order to be truth, it must have a source which is not waves. Waves don't bind me.

You can laugh at this.

Anything that is just waves, gentlemen, has absolutely no compulsion.

XVIII FROM LIFE TO DEATH

1

If you look through any truth, gentlemen, as being purely psychological, purely chemical, purely physical, it loses all interest, because why should you believe in such nonsense? Something that is just produced, like an egg soufflé, like an --

how do you call it? -- these French soufflés, out of a few eggs, you make a tremendously pompous { }. How do you call it? (*Fondue?*) Fondue is quite solid, compared to a soufflé. (*Would meringue?*) Yes, a meringue is a good example. Soufflé, they call it. Don't you say soufflé, too? (*Yeah.*) All right.

(It's an omelette. Scrambled eggs.)

2

It always seems to me that it is just startling how you people all go around, waiting for the next physicist to explain your own highest prayer, or thought, and then think that you will accept his explanation.

If all explanations are nothing but vapors of the brain, gentlemen, of the brain cells, then I'm not interested. Then he has just to say what his machinery forces him to say. And he certainly cannot tell the truth, because he will only follow his self-interest; he will follow the line of least resistance.

All natural explanations explain everything by the line of least resistance, by gravity, by selfishness.

3

The response, the protest against the Greek mind was Christianity, which said that the road travels from life to death -- to dead things. That I first say "no," when I speak to you, gentlemen, I am alive. I am certainly more alive than this piece of wood. And that's why I'm entitled to stand here, and to hammer this table. It has to take it, because it serves a higher life.

And now comes the whole problem, gentlemen, which the Christians had to face -- the Jews, too -- and which you and I have to face when allot the place to philosophy.

This book is written from the dead to the living, and it always assu- --

[tape interruption]

...this book are as alive as anybody can be while they wrote the book, and you are at most alive when you read it.

4

That is, the assumption is, gentlemen, that when you write a prose book, or a book in prose, or when you read it, that this is the highest moment of vitality, the highest phase of vitality.

XIX THE INCONGRUITY OF COMPARISON

1

Now, I'm going to go to Münster, gentlemen, and to teach there. And I shall begin with this book, and I shall say, "I have to reverse the process." I have to teach a course in which I try to pursue the road from life to death, how even the best life dies in the ears of students.

Because you take examinations, which is a specific form of Hell and death. Anything that is asked in an examination is no more alive than a dead dodo. It's killed.

That's why all the great truth is constantly killed in our colleges.

2

You cannot be asked a question in an exam under duress, and still appreciate its poetical, or its scientific value. You just have to know it by rote, and you have to get by. And you swindle, and you copy, and you cheat, and what-not. So all truth in any school of the world, gentlemen, dies. The death, the undignified death of imitation and fear.

3

But there is another, much more difficult thing.

Anybody who speaks, gives a course from the logos down to physis -- as I intend to do, instead of from the physis up to logos -- must admit that in the moment while he's speaking in the classroom -- I'm speaking here to you, gentlemen -- we are less alive than we might be. In other words, the whole problem of Heraclitus, and Parmenides and the Stoics and Plato and Aristotle is the incongruity of the comparison.

If you try to explain the mind as a mechanism, gentlemen, the mechanism even of a college, the mechanism of logic, you have, through these various phases -- from physics to chemistry, to biology, to psychology -- you have the right to assume that you are on top of this ladder.

This book is written by people who think they are on top of the world. They are the finest flowers of this world of Mr. Einstein in which you deduce the higher from the lower.

If I say, gentlemen, "All lower things must be explained by the higher, the world is only because man is, man is only because God is, and I cannot possibly use the slightest star in the universe to explain me, but I must use me to explain the star," I am in this very great handicap, gentlemen. I cannot reverse the process and say, "I look down now on the feces of my body and say, that is what I've left behind, although it is literally true."

I must look up, as well as down.

4

That is, any human being who is not crazy knows that when he opens his mouth and passes judgment on things, on things of the natural world, gentlemen, is standing halfway between a greater life and the lower life. And therefore, there is no reciprocity, gentlemen, between the logician and the pneumatist - you may call him this way, the pneumatics, the spirit - the man who believes in inspiration and in his obedience to the spirit, because I have to admit that I am not the lord of the spirit.

I am under the spirit.

Whereas this other, this logician can say that he is on top of his world. He is the finest flower of the dead universe which he has construed.

XX LOVE IS NOTHING WHICH YOU CAN FIND IN DEAD MATTER

1

Can you see the difference, that this ladder leads to the point that these twelve gentlemen are sitting there on top of their own death chamber, which they have construed, and say, "We are the finest flower of the dead universe, which finally has produced life" - which is a joke to me.

Death doesn't produce life so easily.

2

You know there have been very wise men who have said that all the oxygen in the atmosphere come from life, from corpses that have given off the air, that even the oxygen that you find around us are the result of life, not the other way around. The oxygen is not the reason for our existence.

But we are the reason for the existence of oxygen in the universe.

3

A very great Frenchman, Felix Ravaisson, has always taught this. And I think he'll come into his own. It's a very profound remark, that that little life, that exists in the universe has come down into this universe which is totally dead and has not produced us. If God hadn't created us as living, and created an environment in which we would be -- these dead things wouldn't be.

I don't think that any one of you believes that cemeteries are the place in which the children are born. They are born in a cradle from the love of their parents. And love is nothing which you find in dead matter.

4

However, there is a real problem, that the man who looks down, gentlemen, has very modestly put himself between the logos above him, and the physis below him. And he knows that with all his fellow men, he is in a community of mankind in which he is not alone in handling and manipulating the logos, but he is only a member of the group which is inspired.

That's Heraclitus' doctrine, that while I say something, somebody else has to say the opposite. And that is the life of the logos.

XXI THE ROAD FROM "WE" - "HE" TO "IT"

1

So this is my problem in Münster, and it should be my problem with you, gentlemen, to make you understand the eternal temptation of the philosopher. The temptation of the philosopher is the reduction of a three-dimensional existence into a two-dimensional existence. That is, he wants to have a polarity: "I'm the subject. You are the objects." That's all you know, too.

I don't live this way, gentlemen. I know that I am entitled to call certain things objects. But I am in a certain way involved in all important questions, I'm subjected to some power that is not my object at all.

2

You can hear today even ministers say in church that God is the object of our worship. If he were the object of our worship, He would be an idol, and He couldn't be worshiped. He is not the object of your worship.

Can you see this, that this is impossible?

But that's the result of such a book, gentlemen. If you only have this ladder, from the unliving to the living up -- up -- up in one direction, man is the only subject, and all other things are objects, including God.

3

And then you have this tragedy, gentlemen, that among the things which this human mind here, these twelve wise men - they are very funny, really -- which they finally dabble with, is the objectivity of the divine. That is, they must transform the persons into neuters, into things.

Always think of the way of the Greek tragedy -- which it is, the Greek philosophy, the word from "he" to "it," the road from -- "we" -- "he" to "it." Out of Zeus, there comes the divine, or the universe.

4

The real change, gentlemen, is not a new name, but a new gender. "That"-ness, instead of "he"-ness.

That's why you cannot understand the Trinity.

XXII *THE TRUTH AND THE TRINITY*

1

The Trinity is a very simple attempt of the times from Paul to St. Augustine to combat this constant loss of personality, of your authority, of him who says something to you, by saying that if I am already allowed to think of myself as a person -- which is very bold assumption, because in fact I am after all a bundle of nerves, and a coward, and what-not -- so if I call myself, as you think you are

allowed to call yourself, a "person," or even a "personality," then obviously, God must be more than one personality.

He must be at least myself and two generations and their unity.

2

I'm only young or old. You are only now young, and one day you will be old. So God must be at least the Father and the Son. That's the minimum, in order to understand the authority which He has over me.

3

The Trinity is a very chaste attempt, gentlemen, to place you in the middle of the process between logos and physis and ethos. It has nothing to do with denomination. It has nothing to do with the pope in Rome. It has something to do with the truth, gentlemen, the Trinity.

Don't believe that because you are a Christian, you must believe in the Trinity. No. Because you have to believe in the Trinity, you must be a Christian. It is simply so that your own spiritual experience must prove to you that it is utterly ridiculous to deduce your power to declare love, or to declare war, or to make friends, that this should depend on the working of your cells.

4

That is not begging the question. That is valid that you want to make peace. And you have to stand by it, whether your cells function one way or the other. Or the next scientific fashion tells you that your cells move in a different direction.

What difference does it make to your truth? What difference does it make to your freedom? What difference does it make to your willingness to pay the penalty of your decision, or to stand by your word?

XXIII YOU CANNOT BE THE YARDSTICK OF TRUTH YOURSELF

1

As soon as you have realized this, gentlemen, you understand that the Trinity is the philosophical answer to Greek philosophy. That's what it is. It is nothing of a luxury.

It isn't the heart of the matter. Jesus didn't have to preach the Trinity for reasonable people who hadn't gotten lost in philosophy. But anybody who has studied

philosophy, even by indirection, in an American grammar school, must believe in the Trinity in order to get out of his mental cave of being a philosopher.

A philosopher is a man who has only the one-way street that he is on top of life. And everything is less alive than he. He is perfectly willing to admit that he can be deduced from the less life. That's his admission in the logical process. But otherwise, he is quite sure that he represents the highest life at this moment.

2

Anybody who knows a little bit of himself, knows that this is nonsense, that most moments we are less alive than great powers like genius, and saints, and martyrs, who have done much better, really, than we.

Any one of you knows at this moment, that when your mother gave birth to you, she did a bigger job than you have ever done in your life so far.

And you know very well that a veteran, a soldier who has died in Korea has stood his ground better than we. We mostly fail.

Anybody who has died for us, anybody who has sacrificed for us ranks higher in vitality than you and me.

3

And nobody can be talked to, who doesn't admit this from the very beginning, that there can be higher life than his own.

That's the condition, gentlemen, under which we only can transact business when we deal with the truth. You cannot be the yardstick of the truth yourself. It is impossible.

4

The philosopher doesn't see this. And that's why Greek philosophy had to be brought down.

XXIV THE CONSTANT EXCHANGE OF AUTHORITY

1

And that's why I'm interested, gentlemen, in this course to say to you, very frankly, gentlemen, that the Trinity, which these ministers themselves do no longer understand, because they have neither studied Greek, nor Latin, nor Hebrew, nor philosophy. They don't understand anything. They are the slaves of the fashionable philosophy of our day today, these poor, so-called ministers of the word.

2

But you and I, gentlemen, as laymen, as secular minds, you must know the remedy against your own mind's haughtiness and arrogance. And that is only when you see yourself standing here. We are all within the realm of the experience of neighbors. One saying one thing, and another saying something else.

Now we all know that this is held together by some higher authority. You have listened to me, your teacher. But I have to have teachers, myself.

3

In this constant exchange of authority, gentlemen, I am only on the rung of the ladder which is in the middle; and therefore there is a higher authority than myself. Anybody who has died for me, has more claim to your respect than I have, myself. He has brought into the life, and I have not.

And I pray that I may be spared, that I don't have to die in resistance against Hitler.

Some of my best students, gentlemen, who have taken every word, which I have taught them in Germany, and believed it, have acted upon it and have died from the hands of Hitler. Well, they are now higher in authority than I am. I am their teacher, all right. But they have done what I have taught them to do.

And therefore they have outgrown me, and I have to admit that they are above me. And they do.

4

By the way, this is a very practical business for me, because these people have now to be put into the right authority in Europe if Germany is going to have any life again. And we are battling -- I had just a large exchange of printed matter on this business. I had to write some open letters on this point to the people who, like Mr. Mandaville, think that Hitler was after all not so bad.

(I didn't say that!)

Well, at least he believed that he sacrificed himself for his nation. You said.

(I said that he believed he was sacrificing himself. Well, what crime would that be, Sir?)

Ja, that's all enough. That would be enough to absolve him. Anybody can't do more than have a good opinion of himself.

(I wouldn't say it otherwise, { }.)

XXV WHY SHOULD WE EAT MEAT?

1

Well, gentlemen, let's come back to the main issue.

The main issue today is that the dogma of the Christian Church has ceased to be a dogma of the Church. It's a problem of the philosophers today.

The Trinity today is the last chapter in the history of the Greek mind. It is an attempt to get out of the vicious circle, and that's why they were all great Greeks who proclaimed this dogma.

That is an attempt of the Greeks to find access into the Church and to Christianity.

2

The Jews laugh at this dogma to this day and said, "Why bother? We have never believed that man's mind was such a great thing, or that the idols of the world, the sun was a god, or the stars were gods. We never believed this nonsense in the first place. We were no astrologers, we were no chemists, we were no psychoanalysts. And therefore, we don't have to be converted."

And so a real Jew, I mean, an orthodox Jew -- not Mr. Freud or so -- but they will poke fun at the Trinity, and say it's not necessary. And you have learned this, and you all poke fun at the Trinity and say that Paul spoiled Christianity, because he had to say to the Greeks that they had to come under authority again.

Nothing else the Trinity says.

3

The Trinity places man in the middle. Here is nature. These are the things for which I can make up my mind. I must study them. Anything that is indifferent, gentlemen, is physis. Indifferent in the sense that I can use it, because I undoubtedly have the right to use all lower life.

We talked about this, about meat. With the camels and the vegetarian? Did we speak here about this?

That was the other class.

Well, you don't doubt the fact that you can eat hamburgers. A vegetarian begins to doubt it. He places himself elsewhere and he says, "I can't take life."

Now there is this whole decision to be made that there is higher life and lower life. And just as much as you have every right to kill a flea, so you have a right to eat hamburgers. It's a national passion in this country to eat hamburgers.

Which is a grave decision, gentlemen. Why should we eat meat?

4

If you are only apes and monkeys, a Darwinian cannot eat meat, because a man is just another animal. If you group men on the level of animals, then we better not eat meat.

But man is not an animal. He's animated. He's a little better than an animal, because he can condemn himself. He can condemn part of his life as lower life, and other parts of himself as higher life. And he can draw this wedge in between himself, between his transient, and temporal, and physical existence, and his representation of the power that decides where the road shall go, what the journey is.

XXVI THE LOTTERY OF MECHANICAL EXAMINATIONS

1

So gentlemen, the acknowledgement of the higher life above me places me in the position to know what is physis, what is ethos, and what is logos.

Before, I try to mix all these spheres. I try to treat logos as a machine.

Read all these logical positivists, or semanticists. They all try to say the mind is just a machine. And if you treat the machinery right, then it has infallible, but indifferent

results. There is no truth which the pure logician can bring out, that is of any importance. They are all valid, in the sense that they cannot be refuted.

2

But if you will read the famous syllogisms, and the famous logical feats of Mr. Zeno, the logician in antiquity, or today, of these modern things -- they are not interesting.

They are just as good as the \$64,000 question. The answer -- I have yet to find the answer to any of the \$64,000 question which is of any relevance. They are all indifferent.

That's very typical of our civilization, that nothing important is ever asked. The stupidity is asked, and stupidity is answered. And for this you are paid.

3

It's really very interesting, gentlemen. It's the same as with your mechanical examination questions. No important question can be asked which is tested by a machine. They are not important. It's a lottery. Your life doesn't depend on the "yes" or "no" of this answer.

4

Now, of course, unfortunately you do not know that while writing the papers for me, your own future mental life and its health depends on the answer you give. But it does. It isn't important, gentlemen, what mark you get in this course. And it isn't important what you tell me and what I think of it.

But it is terribly important that at one point, you should break through your own mind's crust and know that you are under logos and above physis and in an ethical relation to me.

XXVII *GOD, MAN, WORLD (FRANZ ROSENZWEIG)*

1

Which is very difficult for a student to grasp.

But this is the whole problem of this course, gentlemen, that logos, ethos and physis, gentlemen, can be simply called "God," "man," and "world." I use the Greek words to shout you into the awareness, gentlemen, that there is within your educated sphere, where you all use these highfalutin terms like "psychoanalysis" and

"psychology" and "advertising" and what all the terms are which you use, this goulash of English, which you call "scientific language," that I can enter this realm of nonsense, too, and sell you there logos, ethos and physis, as highfalutin terms.

2

Human beings who don't go to college speak just of God, man, and world with honesty, because they still bow their head to God. You don't. So I have to call it "logos."

And physis seemed to me better in your technological age than if I say "world," because you think the world has is not entrusted to you.

You don't believe that the creatures are moaning, and groaning, and waiting for their redemption by you. You think you can cut the redwood, or tread down the violet, or extirpate the moose, or the elk, and as long as you treat the world in this sense, I'd better say "physis," to make it possible for you to find this term within your own jargon, within your own lingo.

3

So I have only spoken Greek to you, gentlemen, all this time, because I felt that by inviting you to this jargon of the Greek philosophers, I might do two things: show you the temptation, which anybody who does something in this world has, to become master of his destiny.

The Greek philosophy is an attempt to become master of our destiny, gentlemen. Christianity has tried to set the scales in order again, and to tell us that we are not masters of our destiny, and never shall be.

This is your own decision, gentlemen.

When you are in your office, in your business, you think you are the masters. To a certain extent, you are. Where you repeat the performance, where you invest, compute -- we are to a certain extent the masters -- not of our destiny, but of our purposes.

Destiny has nothing to do with purpose.

And the important thing that happened, gentlemen, in the reconquest of the pneuma through the Trinity is this distinction between purpose and destiny.

4

The Greek mind cannot distinguish between goal and aim, between destiny and purpose. When your mind is God, and God is the mind in this sense, in philosophy, in your own business, you always think that your purpose is your destiny, and your destiny is your purpose.

Obviously, gentlemen, the destiny is only always evident after your purpose has failed.

XXVIII *GOD IS ONLY STRONG IN THE WEAK*

1

When Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt had polio, his destiny became very clear, because his purpose was destroyed. That's why many great men have been created by suffering. It takes suffering to learn the distinction between purpose and destiny.

Can you see this? Not? No?

That's difficult.

So on this we have to speak next time. You cannot see the distinction between purpose and destiny?

(No.)

2

I'm glad you say it, because that's just the same thing as you can't see the difference between logic and logos. Right you are.

Who, by the way -- would you all be honest, and tell me? Who can see the difference between purpose and destiny? Who can see it?

I think that's good. This is only a minority.

3

But that's the same issue, gentlemen. The problem of philosophy has been that knowledge is virtue. And virtue is knowledge.

Now virtue is power. A man who would have power would be the master of his destiny. Man has no power. And the more he tries to have power, gentlemen, the more powerless he becomes. God is only strong in the weak.

4

That's all paradox at this moment. But I think we have the topic for the last lecture, gentlemen.

The end of Greek philosophy is each time this recognition that purpose is not destiny and destiny is not purpose.

Today, I was satisfied to introduce you to the fact that the pneuma, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, is not a religious doctrine, and a religious experience, but the necessity of expressing the Greek experience in terms that were no longer Greek, but that led the Greeks back into the general experience of the whole human race, that the loss of spirit, the loss of logos, by mere logical instrumentalism, mechanism, cleverness, had to be rebuilt, or replaced, had to be remedied by making man again able to be inspired by a power higher than he himself.

Thank you.

TWENTYSIXTH LECTURE: A VOLUNTARY ACT OF SELF-FORGETFULNESS

(This is side 2.)

I TO PAY THE PENALTY

1

My friends, this is the last meeting.

And I have to offer you a suggestion: what good your participation in any study of Greek philosophy might have for the future of our society - if it had not some meaning, if it was just a private interest in such a serious time as we live in, it should not be sustained.

You think that you are here for your pleasure, or to have a good time, or to get something out of your studies. For a teacher that's an untenable position. I'm not here to give you a good time. I'm not here to interest you in anything.

I'm here to try to mobilize you for that which is necessary. That's the only reason why you have the right to be in a college.

2

And most of you don't accept this challenge and you think you can do as you please. I don't talk to those.

But it is a serious question, gentlemen, why Greek philosophy and philosophy are still needed and in the predictable future will be needed as an instrument for our own salvation, for keeping society going.

3

This chapter of the criticism of Greek philosophy, which was started by the Apostle Paul, when he spoke in Athens, and which ended in St. Augustine, is the chapter which has now to be written in occidental thinking, in worldwide thinking, you may say.

Philosophy itself, now, has suddenly to speak of the spirit.

The reason for this is if you remember what we said in the last meetings -- you remember, we started last time with this strange book, *From the Dead to the Living*, or from dead things to those which are alive, this lecture of twelve men given in Münster in Germany, where I am going to teach this next summer.

And I'm going to contradict the sequence, the hierarchy, the order of this book by giving a course from life to death, and not from death to life, because I do not believe that the dead things produce the living.

4

But I do believe that all life is finite and leads to death, and can only become life everlasting if one pays the penalty, and knows what has to die in order to keep the rest alive.

II *THE SPIRIT BLOWS WHERE IT LISTETH*

1

It's a very serious business, gentlemen, that today the mind has become so natural, so just a part of nature, so logical, so reasonable, so rational, so semantic or whatever you call it, that philosophers themselves have now to invoke the fact that the mind is not the story of the logos, of the reason that the word represents, or demands, or requires.

And I said to you that the man who begins with physics, and then goes on to chemistry, and goes on to psychology, and then goes on to politics, and finally ends up in theology, perhaps, that this man, who builds allegedly out of atoms his universe, can, when he stands or when he writes his book, presume that he is alive, on top of this pyramid.

2

And so these twelve gentlemen of course all pose as though they are on one end of the ladder. They are supposedly alive, and -- although they are teachers, which is a killing job -- and that the things on which they look down, have lifted them up out of the morass. They have pulled themselves up by their own bootstraps, and now they look down on their bootstraps.

3

That is the funny picture which all these modern naturalists propound. First, they say that everything came out of dead matter. And then they assume that you and I take them for living, without further proof.

And I told you that I am in a very much more absurd situation. I know that when I stand before you, that's not my highest life. I have better moments. Grave decisions had to be made. I think I was more myself in such moments.

Nobody who can go into any curriculum, into any scheduled activity--no doctor, no lawyer -- can say that while he's doing this, he is at the top of his world, of his vitality. These moments of greatest inspiration come and go, the spirit blows where it listeth, or what's the saying? And we never know ahead of time whether we are at our best.

And therefore, a man who looks down to the danger of dying and is grateful for the little life he has, has at the same time to look up to moments in time where there is more inspiration, where there is greater life. And he has to admit not that he is on one side, as dealing with his objects, as the ruling subject like these gentlemen, who come from Mr. -- physics and chemistry -- but I come from the living word which has inspired me one time, so that I chose to be a teacher -- but now condemns me to carry on the routine job of teaching you for 30 or 40 years.

4

Every day I'm half asleep, when I stand here. And I have to wake myself up against all the odds of your resistance.

And so I have to stand, gentlemen, very modestly and say that part of my mind represents more life than I pretend to have at this moment. And partly it now has become part of my nature that is dying, and mortal, and is full of gravity, and laziness, and sloth, and all the encumbrances of dead weight as we call it rightly.

What we say, "dead weight" -- any college carries a lot of dead weight, doesn't it?

III *THE LETTER KILLETH, THE SPIRIT VIVIFIES*

1

That's very serious, gentlemen. The problem which I am going to talk to you about today is then the final problem of philosophy which is now on the agenda of anybody who is serious in the western world about thinking -- the line between that which is below me and Him who is above me, runs right through my mind.

2

Part of my mind is natural, and part of my mind is divine. And the mind itself is neither natural nor divine, but is in this transitional stage from life to death, and from death to life, and we know at no one moment whether we are stupid or wise, whether we are inspired or dull, whether we repeat or create.

3

And we are at this moment here in this class also in great danger that I succumb to the temptation of siding with your sleepiness, and your silliness, and your laziness, and only sell you repeatable truths, in which I would commit a crime against the spirit, but would satisfy you very much, because everything I would then say would be of immediate use for your final examination.

And you would praise me highly, and say, "What a good teacher! Finally, we have got it all in black and white."

4

But the letter killeth, and the spirit vivifies.

And I can kill you with my letter when I satisfy your mind. The satisfaction of your mind is the crime, because your mind is a natural being, just a part of your nature, which goes by the line of least resistance, which goes always downhill, which follows pressure, and dangers, and ease, and what-not.

IV PNEUMATOLOGY

1

So gentlemen, I offer you as the problem of philosophy, and as the reason why Greek philosophy will then form an inherent introductory chapter to our own endeavor: the fact that the logos proposition today appears in this form.

2

You remember we had this division of logos, ethos and physis. And we said,

"Ethos are the rules of the game within the group.

Physis is that at which all of the members of the group look indifferently."

With indifference, because it's outside the life of the group. The ethical behavior is the condition, the city, for our having any nature to look at, to contemplate.

And therefore, we recognize that the ethical principles of fellowship, of sacrifice, of integrity, of membership come first.

The second -- what you call "physical science," is only possible if all members of this group can look at the outside world with indifference, together. And Mr. -- all these

physicists in these various places where they now make these interesting attempts to bomb us, are our servants. A physicist is my country's delegation, the society's delegate. He's my domestic servant.

Don't respect them so highly, gentlemen. They are our technicians. They look at the world of indifference after we have granted them their existence.

Now *the logos*. This was for the Greeks something that inspired the city, and inspired all the various individuals in their relation. Or it was the laws of the universe, the natural law. They had either laws of nature, or they had laws of man, laws of the city, of cities.

That's how we started out.

3

Now, to you and me, gentlemen, and to philosophers of the future, the problem appears again as it appeared to St. Paul. The logos is the law of my own spiritual life. Something third. Of my own spiritual life. I must learn to discern the spirits of sloth and of creativity within myself.

I must make this distinction, as I told you, between logic and pneuma, inspiration. If you want to have a Greek word, we shall call it "pneuma."

So we need a pneumatology to balance the logic.

What is pneumatology, gentlemen?

4

Pneumatology is the doctrine of how creative thought enters the community, and enters you.

When are you creative?

Not after you have drowned yourself in all kind of dissipation, for example. A certain amount of discipline is necessary for the man to meet his God, to be creative.

But there are many other problems, gentlemen. Fear is usually not inducive to creativity, if it isn't the fear of the Lord.

V ENTHUSIASM: GOD INSIDE

1

So gentlemen, for the first time in the history of the modern mind, the theology of the philosopher suddenly is paramount.

And lo and behold! The best book written on Greek philosophy in the last five years is written by a gentleman in Harvard, who's very famous, Mr. Werner Jaeger, on the theology of the Greek philosophers.

The reason should now be apparent to you.

2

The only interest we now have in the Greek philosophers is their own enthusiasm.

But what is enthusiasm? The inhabitation of the philosopher by God. That's enthusiasm. "Enthusiasm" means "God inside."

3

So the problem today is not the laws of the city, which came before there was philosophy, gentlemen. And it isn't the laws of nature which came after philosophy enabled men to look in spectacular success to compare notes about water, and fire, and earth, and all these things, in common to all citizens of all cities in the world.

There is a third problem today, gentlemen: the ethos of the thinker. The ethos of the thinker, because the ethos of the thinker is penetrated by a sharp sword -- as the Gospel rightly says, that he is half-dead, and half-alive.

Partly as far as he is dead, he belongs to physis. And the mechanism of his psychology is simply that he goes by the line of least resistance, that he will judge by prejudice, that he will be inhibited.

4

And in Yale Law School they had a course on the prejudices of judges. They studied the stomach ulcers and the hemorrhoids of the judges of the Supreme Court. And then they predicted how you should plead in front of these judges to win your case.

That is, that's actually true. It was an all-time low.

VI THE LINE BETWEEN LIFE AND DEATH

1

You know, you don't know this, gentlemen, but America is just at this moment coming out of a deep moral depression of 25 years, in which the scoundrels held sway in all our colleges. And they partly still hold sway in our institutions of higher learning, in which you could get away with Proust and Freud as the standards of life. And you still believe that's true.

Now you have Sartre.

2

Well, that's very simple, gentlemen. You actually were told that the judges of the Supreme Court could all be bribed if you played on their ulcers, or on their nerves, or on their prejudices, if you only knew the keyboard.

Justice? That had gone long out of the window.

3

This whole group, gentlemen, exists. They are professors of law, they call themselves,. They are professors of injustice. We live in the time of the sophists, again.

But the difference is, gentlemen: the sophists mocked the laws of the city. The modern man mocks the laws of his conscience. That is, the laws of the person, the conditions under which a man is a person is, however -- and you know it, that this is true, from your own experience, gentlemen -

that the line between death and life runs right through the middle of your own intellectual life.

4

In as far as you just have a mind, you are a drilled and trained animal. You jump at conclusions.

If I hold the meat, the sausage before you, then you draw the conclusion. You just have to say, "The man is a Democrat," and the other fellow reacts accordingly. All these things, "Jew," "Pole," "Democrat," "Bolshevik," they can be used for treating man a member of a good circus in which he jumps to conclusions just as the animal runs through the ring. And it is a spectacle, of course, in which Madison Avenue

leads. They tell you that everybody can be made to jump. And they play on the mind, gentlemen, as a part of the natural order.

VII THE ONLY VERIFICATION OF A GREAT TRUTH

1

You can see, however, the man who says that everybody can be jumped upon by prejudice and can be dragged to conclusions mechanically, thinks that this sentence is true, this one sentence. And with all this one statement, he is already in the realm of freedom. Because anybody who knows that this is so and can state this, thinks that you should accept the statement not as a consequence of his ulcers or his glands, but as true.

2

If this one sentence is true, then there is truth. If there is truth, then there is something superior to your death. Because the truth must prevail, whether you have to die in the process or not.

3

What is truth, gentlemen?

That which is valid whether I like it or not.

Whether I benefit by it or not. Whether I profit or whether I am going to hang.

The criterion, the ultimate criterion of truth is that a man represents this truth willy-nilly, even if he has to go to the cross. That's the only verification of a great truth, gentlemen, that a man is not fazed by his danger of death, as you all are.

A man who is not willing to verify what he says by his death doesn't know what truth is. He may say, "I'd better not fight. I'm not a truth-sayer. I'm not for this martyrdom." But then he should go out of the way and admit that there is truth. But he is only unable to represent it; he's impotent.

4

Most people today are impotent to testify to the truth. That's true.

But that has nothing to do with the fact that even they still think that there should be mercy for them, and that the truth contains the sentence in which is said, "The untruthful may be tolerated until they become too dangerous."

We all live, gentlemen, by the truth, and not by self-interest, because not one of you has his life in his own hands.

We are all tolerated, gentlemen.

VIII THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN MIND AND SOUL

1

The dividing line, gentlemen, goes through you and me. And today I offer you a very practical criterion of how to draw this line.

It is of course not my own invention. But it has nearly been forgotten, especially in the last 200 years.

2

It is today forgotten with one very cunning vocabulary, the identification of "mind" and "soul." Whenever today people use the two terms, "mind" and "soul," interchangeably, gentlemen, they deny that the mind is half-alive and half-dead. They think it is only a mechanism. And most of you use "mind" and "soul" indiscriminately. Most of you would say that if you have to choose, you'd better use the word "mind." "Soul" cannot be found.

And on the other hand, you may use then the word "soul" sometimes as though it didn't matter much whether you said "mind" or "soul."

3

It is very important that this battle was fought already 2,000 years ago. Paul was very much aware that the academic tradition insists of making the mind a part of nature. And then the soul disappears. Everything becomes mind.

The soul is then nothing but muscles, or physiology, or reactions of nerves, or what-not. And the lack of distinction between psyche, gentlemen -- the Greek word of "soul"--"mind," that's the Greek *nous*, and spirit is the quandary of Greek philosophy.

As far as logos was degraded to logic, the distinction between mind and soul was lost, and the spirit was extrapolated as something has to do with the city, before the

individual came about, or with the gods which were just superstitions, and became evil spirits or what-not.

4

In the Letter to the Corinthians, which I recommend to you as a part of philosophical reading, because Paul was versed in all the disputations and arguments of the Greeks. And he has very scathing terms in his various letters for the emptiness of their psychology.

They are philosophical letters, gentlemen. Just as much as what you like to forget, and what you think, they have to be religious, which puts you to sleep.

IX PSYCHIC AND PNEUMATIC

1

He says literally in the 15th chapter of the Letters to the Corinthians -- oh, the first chapter, pardon me -- that the bastards, the secular mind are *psychekoi*, are psychologists. They believe that there is nothing but the psyche with its mind, and that follows certain mechanic laws, certain predictable reactions -- all the things you have are made to believe, too -- and that the pneuma, the spirit is denied by them.

And so he makes the distinction -- I think the two words are worth your new knowledge -- between the *psychekoi*, he has no necessity of speaking of psychologists, the word "logos" is quite unnecessary. He makes it direct. The *psychesi*, in Latin -- or in English, you would call it the "*psychesi*," the psychics, and the other he calls the "*pneumatics*."

So he says, you have to take your choice, whether you believe that everything is under the understanding of a mechanism of my mind, or whether I am a pneumatic speaker. The psychic speaks according to his own interest. And the pneumatic speaks without any regard to his self-interest.

2

Obviously, gentlemen, when you go to a doctor and ask for his help, you always believe that he is acting pneumatically, and not psychically, himself; but he is in the service of divinity of his medicine, and that he is dealing the truth out to you, regardless of whether he is making money on you or not. It is no consideration for a doctor to ask himself how long he should prolong your agony, because he wants to keep you as a customer. A good doctor must send you away after the first meeting and say, "You have no need anymore for my cure". And a doctor who would keep you for 20 meetings would be a scoundrel. And a good doctor won't do this.

3

Now what's the difference then between a good doctor, gentlemen, and a scoundrel? That he is pneumatic. One of the seven spirits of the Holy Spirit, the spirit of healing, has taken possession of him, and he is willing to forget his self-interest. And you all believe this.

The same is with any professional man to whom you go. You assume that the spirit of his profession keeps his mind so alert that he forgets the carnality of his flesh, and the interest of his self.

4

And you couldn't live for one day if the people around you were not much better than you yourself, according to your own materialistic philosophy.

X INSPIRED AND EXPIRING

1

But I find today Americans are prone to condemn themselves to the bottomless pit of what they call "materialism," but all assume all the people around them are wonderful guys, and in the service of the spirit of God.

Very strange. It is a complete reversal of the times, I think, of the past.

2

Today the individual American is quite abject in admitting his own materialism. He says, "I'm not an idealist. Oh no, I can't. It would be stupid". "I'm selfish," and he's quite relieved if he admits it to himself, and feels he's a great man.

But then he always relies on the community that some people in the community are not this way. He can turn to them for help, for example, and he feels that they won't cheat him. He goes, for example, to psychoanalyst, and he thinks the psychoanalyst will love him, help him, cure him, and send him home after he has no more money.

3

So gentlemen, the original new situation of today is that the line between physis and logos does not run through the city, the community, but runs through you.

A philosopher is a city in the nutshell. We are all today so highly individualized that you can say of all of us that we are Greeks in the sense that we are, every one of us, a philosopher. And since we are, we must now distinguish in ourselves the part which is original and alive and the part in us which is purely mental mechanism.

The line of division between logos and physis, in other words, today runs inside the biography of the individual. And for your own salvation, gentlemen, you must inquire when you are inspired, and when you are expiring.

4

I would call all the expirational processes of humanity, the mechanic processes, the "mental processes." They are necessary. Anything we repeat. Anything we learn by rote. Anything we just follow by convention.

That's not bad. As much as I have to inhale, I have to exhale. As much I have to eat, I have to shit.

XI ONE TWENTY-FOURTH OF YOUR TIME

1

So gentlemen, don't mistake me. The mental processes do not stand condemned. A part of our life is death. They are intertwined.

The real problem is only to see the inherent necessity, gentlemen, that as much as we can logically conclude from precedent and cause, as much we be ourselves a first course.

2

So in a very logical and a very simple manner, once you admit that the line between logos and physis is not now inside the community -

the United States, which has a territory, which is *physical, rivers, mountains, climate, resources, geographical situation, economic situation,*

and then the education of the people, and schools, and philosophers, and churches the other way -

but if you see that inside you, part of your mind is deadening, is routine, is inherited, is nothing but result,

and that for this very reason, it will poison the community, unless you also are the sower of new truth, and the beginner of a new chain, that you can misjudge your own situation within the community.

And since we have vulgarized philosophy to such an extent that you and I and we all can claim to have a little bit of the habit of a philosopher, forming our own judgments, then it is terribly important, gentlemen, to discover the difference between Plato and the Platonists, between Aristotle and the Aristotelians, between Parmenides and the Eleatic School, between Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans, between the men who thought something for the first time, and the people who repeat what they have thought for the first time for years to come, that, gentlemen, the cleavage in the future today will be the cleavage between the men, the group of men, the kind of man who are geniuses, and those who follow geniuses.

3

Now every one of us is in the same boat, gentlemen. In a certain field of your own endeavor, gentlemen, where you are in love, where you are courageous, where you are inspired, you begin something. And in other ways of life, you learn, and you repeat. And every one of us, gentlemen, is half genius, half inspired, and half routine.

Twenty-three hours a day, I would say, we live by conventions, and one hour -- it's of course an arbitrary figure ---you are setting precedent for others. Not more.

I mean, that's already quite a big order. One twenty-fourth of your time would be spent in the leading where you have no precedent, where you first climb the mountain.

4

But in some little way, every one of us has to know that he has to strive for this balance between inspiration and expiration, between mind and spirit, between psyche and pneuma.

XII VITALITY

1

And that is what St. Paul invoked constantly in his letters. He has a very typical way of putting it. And I like to dictate to you this sentence, because I have never found it commented on.

2

He writes in the -- perhaps you take this down - first Letter to the Corinthians, 5th chapter, 45th verse. Now that's straight philosophy:

"The first man"-- will you take it down? -

*"The first man, Adam, became a living soul.
The last Adam became a life-giving spirit."*

This is expressed historically.

If we now in philosophy, gentlemen, after 2,000 years are allowed to use these same terms systematically.

The first man in you and me, the man of the city, the child of man, the man of the world is a living soul.

But the man who wants to render to his community, to his life on earth, in his historical place what he has gotten, who wants to give back what he has received, must become a life-giving spirit.

3

All the terms are here of which I am talking. It's a wonderful verse, because it's just one verse, two half-sentences. And you have the fact that man is two things.

As a member of his community, he is a living soul, just psychic. Can be treated psychologically. He's alive, yes. But soul and life in the New Testament, by the way, "psyche" and "se" are interchangeable.

Some people translate the word "psyche" from the Greek into the word "life" in English, and others translate it into the word "soul." It is perhaps better to just translate it as "life." It's vitality. That's what it is, psyche.

4

So man was made into a living being within his community. When he wakes up, gentlemen, and turns around, and becomes the acorn that falls down from the oak tree, and must found the next community, his family, his profession, the next city, he becomes the first president of Czechoslovakia, or whatever he does; that is, after all, sets out to start a new avalanche of acts rolling: he must be a life-giving spirit.

XIII *PREJUDICES*

1

That is, gentlemen, beyond life there is the power that gives life, as we all know physically. And the laws of procreation are more important than the laws of living.

Procreation comes first.

That's as you know why the great animals forgo food when they court. For three months these sea lions don't have to eat. And they go up into the island on the Pacific.

2

You have seen these movies, probably. You remember? What was it? "Sea Lions"? Or what was it?

A great story, that they forgo self-interest, because the survival of the species is much more important than their own life.

3

So perhaps I have made my point clear, gentlemen, that you and I are two people.

In as far as we inherit an order of our city, we are living souls. And our mind then is working in a mechanical way, because it has been impregnated by an order for which we have not received ourselves the first impetus. We were not responsible for our behavior. We sit down at table.

In Turkey they sit on their fannies and not on chairs. You will admit, that's convention. And although a child may think it is a great crime not to sit down, but to kneel when eating, you would laugh and feel that you are superior to this child, because you know it doesn't matter.

But of course in innumerable ways, you and I are western people, and of course we have, our mechanism, and our defense mechanism, and our hatreds, and our animosities, and our prejudices.

A man like myself was brought up -- to give you a rather innocent prejudice -- with such a prejudice against the Jesuits, that it has taken me all my life and friendship with real, specific Jesuits before I could drive out this terror, which I had received into my blood that Jesuits were just all very wicked people.

4

And so the mechanism of our psyche, gentlemen, is a reality.

XIV PEOPLE WHO CANNOT BE FORESEEN

1

It is also a reality, gentlemen, that for the love of the future, we are able to divest ourselves of this mechanism. That's the right word, I think, "divest." D-i-v-e-s-t.

2

And this power of divestiture, you might call it, of divesting yourself, of yourself and of your impregnation of your mold, that is the condition for doing our part of the regenerative processes of the human race.

Just as these penguins or sea lions are not allowed to eat for three months -- that is, give up their daily habit for this greater purpose -- so all of you, gentlemen, when you make a real decision -- for example, for whom to vote in the next election, you cannot vote by self-interest. That's not a good reason. Or you are not citizens.

3

As if a country, gentlemen, has all the voters only voting for self-interest, it must go bankrupt. The importance in any country is that little group that swings the balance which is not swayed by self-interest.

Don't count these votes of 45 millions, and so on. I'm not impressed.

The margin, the people who can be swayed by deeper considerations, they are the ones for whom the whole system of democracy alone is feasible and through which it is upheld.

4

That you do not see, gentlemen. You think democracy works by majority vote. I assure you it only works by the people who cannot be foreseen.

XV GRENVILLE CLARK

1

This country has been saved in wartime by a man like Secretary of State Simpson or Stimson, or Hull who were Republicans who served the Democratic administration. And America has always been saved by such people.

2

We have an honorary doctor of this college, Grenville Clark, who has saved the country twice. Nobody knows of it much. He lives here in New Hampshire, so we gave him an honorary degree. He deserves more than an honorary degree of Dartmouth. I don't think that's such a great honor for the man.

3

Because we are honored that he accepted it - he created the *Reserve Officer Training* in Plattsburgh ahead of time, so that the United States were ready in 1917 to enter the war with at least a certain group of trained officers. We did this with General Leonard Wood. And he has created the draft board system, which has certainly debureaucratized the draft to a certain extent. And he has many other merits, but these are his two outstanding ones.

That is a voluntary action of total self-forgetfulness, as it comes out in the fact that his name isn't even known for these great actions.

You read a history of the First World War, and Mr. Grenville Clark isn't even mentioned. But only on his existence does the democracy of the United States, gentlemen, rely.

4

As long as you can find this unknown group of patriots, the democracy system can function. The supposition, gentlemen, of everything that's in the Constitution is, that there are people who are not influenced by selfinterest. As long as you don't have this third group, the whole mechanism must break down.

You must have civil war between all the interests.

You always assume there's an arbitrator. If your mind is a mechanism, how can you, if your mind is a mechanism, assume that there is any disinterested person?

Impossible.

XVI WILL YOU PLEASE CAREFULLY ASSAY THIS GREAT TRANSFORMATION

1

Now there is no disinterested person, gentlemen. But there are people who are more interested in the survival of the race than in their own survival.

2

Take it very massively. Jesus was very much interested -- He wasn't unselfish and Paul wasn't -- in the sense that He didn't want a certain future to come about. But He was ready to pay the price of His own existence for this future, which any man in love has to do, like the sea lions. They perish in the process, like the drones in the beehive.

3

This is the mental proposition today of the philosopher, gentlemen. And the strange re-arrangement of forces in the next hundred years in which philosophy will have to be taught, and Greek philosophy will have to be taught, is this: Will you please carefully assay this great transformation?

Fifty years ago, the philosophers stood for the indifferent things, for nature. All philosophers were philosophers of nature, and the theologians tried to defend inspiration. Today the process is totally reversed. The theologians are so well versed in biblical criticism, that to them the whole Bible has become natural. And they are the pagans today.

If you want to hear a real pagan, then go to a theologian. They don't even know what it means to believe in God. They only know of God. They discuss Him. They argue.

Just as the Stoics and Epicureans discussed the gods in the Areopagus.

4

The philosopher today, however -- take Nietzsche, even take Sartre with his existentialism, who speaks that man is thrown into the future -- have more faith than any of these ministers.

I receive a magazine, Christian Economics. Such a lack of faith I've never seen.

XVII HOPE AGAINST HOPE

1

The terms, gentlemen, in which we are going to speak rationally about inspiration, or have a pneumatology, will look different from the ancients.

2

To give you an example which may clarify the way in which this eternal problem between the life-giving spirit, and the life-consuming spirit, between expiration and inspiration, between mechanism, and -- what's the opposite to mechanism?

(*Vitalism.*)

No. That would be still psychism. But it's very interesting.

Perhaps it shouldn't be -- you find the word. I am going to say it later.

3

This dualism inside the life of the philosopher I may perhaps explain by a remark of Aristotle.

Aristotle was asked what hope was.

Now the word "hope" is the American ground word. If nothing is to be hoped for, there is still hope. *Hoping against hope*, that's a very famous term in this country.

And one of my best American friends told me when I came to this country, he said, "There's no faith in America. But there is much hope."

That's very true, gentlemen. And if you want to understand, gentlemen, the difference between inspiration and expiration, between psychology and sociology, on the one-hand side, and the doctrine of the pneuma, pneumatology on the other, I would say that all what you receive today as the science of the mind is based on hope. One day we will know. One day everything can be explained.

4

It's all wishful thinking. It's all very hopeful. And one day we'll know everything.

XVIII *WHO'S WHO AND SO-WHATS*

1

And so I then say, "So what?" I mean, if we know everything, we will have no reason to live anymore. I don't want to know everything, because I want to live.

2

The idea that by knowing everything, you could still have life on this earth is nonsense. Once you know everything, life is extinguished, because then everything has become a mechanism, predictable. If you would know everything, then God would have become a thing, and life would be neutralized.

3

We talked about this "who" and "what" business. I can also say, "Where I am inspired, I am listening to someone."

"Inspiring" always means to believe in who's who. That is, in persons. And to expire, to function mechanically believes in so-whats, in whats, in things. Down below, for the natural man, there are only the world of things; and above, for a living child, for a creative mind, for a poet, even the flowers and the stones are personalities are she and he, because everything is alive.

4

So you can also distinguish the inspiring faith which goes through your mind, where you have the power to personify, and this other, this sterilizing power of neutralization. Where you neutralize.

As soon as you say, "God gave this to me," you are inspired. As soon you say, "Somehow it was given to me," you are a coward, you are expiring, you don't want to commit yourself.

XIX *A DREAM BY DAY*

1

You see, the unbelievers call God "somehow".

Whenever a man says "somehow," you know that he suppresses a religious phrase. You don't know this individually. But it is just the way in which you still leave open

the fact that there is an inexplicable thing. But you can't anymore make up your mind to call it "God," so you say "somehow" or "anyway".

"I did it anyway," usually by an inspiration of the devil.

2

So "anyway" is just as "somehow," very significant for the modern man's philosophical mind who only wants to look down to some mechanical thing. And since he doesn't know the cause, he puts in "somehow" and "anyway," so that he can say, "I didn't say that was a devil, or a god, or an angel. I neutralized it. Of course, I have no idea what did it. But it was certainly a what, not a who."

I mean, when a married man says so, you always know that his wife asked him to do it.

3

Now. We today would then have to say, gentlemen: The mind, who has these endless chains of causation, of logic, of deduction sees how long the road would be to progress. But he says, "Somehow, anyway, one day we shall arrive there."

That's hope, is it not? Hopeful thinking. You all live by these hopes. You even think that's good.

4

Well, Aristotle was asked, "What is hope?" And he answered a very important thing. He said, "It's a dream by day."

XX INTELLIGENCE BY NIGHT

1

And I thought about this, and I said, "Couldn't I find a definition of faith which could correspond to Aristotle's say?"

And I think faith to you can become valid if I say, "It's intelligence by night," in sleep.

Aristotle said, by the way -- the correct definition is, "A waking man's dream." That's hope: a waking man's dream. And I would say

that faith is a sleeping man's wisdom.

2

A general who has laid all his plans, like Eisenhower for the invasion of Europe, and he cannot go to bed and sleep, is not a general. That he has the faith to sleep, to go to bed, that's the wisdom that must take him through the night. He's more intelligent by going to sleep than by going on thinking.

3

This is, I think a very useful help to show you the hinges in which our real personal life hinges, hangs, is suspended. You have to sleep and you have to be awake.

Hope is the waking man's dream. And a little bit of dreaming probably in daytime is in order. Without these daydreams, without hope, they would be too hard.

4

Modern psychologists are too much interested in night dreams. I think they should be more interested in the hopes that men nourish at day, where they cannot quite wake up to reality.

So I think Aristotle's definition is very useful and very important.

XXI SLEEP

1

Now the creative mind, gentlemen, is the one who can sleep so deeply that his faith can produce. And when he wakes up, the solution is there. All the best things come while you are asleep. We grow in our sleep. All inspiration takes place in the early morning hours, when you wake up and it has come to you, like the egg of Columbus.

So I think faith and hope are very much related, like day and night.

Now all mental philosophies, gentlemen, of the Greeks have tried to frown on sleep, to praise light, to praise enlightenment, to praise clarity, clarification, and so on.

Gentlemen, the balance between night and day, the balance between darkness and consciousness, between extinguishing and illumination is the real problem of your and my life, and of the life of all of mankind.

There must be as much darkness as there is light. And the idea that there can always be more light leads to the extinction of the stars in your consciousness.

2

And if I had to say something, we would have less night illumination than we have in this country, in favor of the Edison Power Company.

It's very serious, gentlemen, that you live in a fools' paradise, because you think you can abolish darkness. And you do not ask yourself why there shouldn't be darkness as much as light, so that light can impress yourself as light.

Unless there is darkness, light loses its meaning.

3

This goes very far.

A zoologist has now come out with the very eloquent declamation that we ourselves, gentlemen, have so abolished the contradictions, the paradoxes as between darkness and light -- death and life, that the human population now increases by leaps and bounds and uproots all lower life. And he says, "If you would ask the moose, or you ask the nightingale what they think of population increases in mankind, they would say, 'That's a cancerous growth.' It's a cancerous growth that these men-bacteria represent, because as with cancerous growth, it outstrips all leaps and bounds. The proportion is changed.

And since man has lost all sense of proportion in his mental thinking, since he has said that mechanization, clarification, statistics, knowing more and more by system, is the only solution of everything, it's no wonder that he himself lives in this cancerous way on the surface of the globe and ruins the soil by chemicals and water pollution and what-not, and so undermines the balance between the less-vital and his own vitality.

4

It's very serious, gentlemen. Wherever you look, you will feel that the true wisdom today is to acknowledge that unless you have darkness there can be no light.

XXII *TIME CONCEPTS*

1

That's why we'll say farewell to the child prodigy, where light came too early without any darkness. It's terrible to be a child prodigy, because too early everything is clarified. The child has not been allowed to sleep, and to daydream, and to

slumber, and therefore down with the child prodigy, I would say, because it means that philosophy has lost any sense that before there can be expiration, mechanization, organization, clarification, enlightenment, there has to be inspiration and creation and originality and spontaneity.

2

So you see perhaps at this moment that my line to draw the difference between mechanism and creativity within the human character of the philosopher, of the thinker himself, within human thought processes is really today critically needed. We can no longer today ask so outwardly what is mechanical in a community and what is political here.

That will depend on your and my awareness of how much dead wood you represent, and how much life you represent. How far are you a life-giving spirit? How far are you just a living soul that is lived by mechanisms, by psychic formations?

3

My answer then is, gentlemen, that our solutions probably will all have to do with time concepts, like night and day, waking and sleeping. That's a rhythm in which things follow each other.

And instead of saying, "mechanic," I will say "day thought". And instead of saying, "incarnation," I will say, "night thought," "growing thought," "sown thought."

You remember the sower. And that, where you want to sow a seed in a student, gentlemen -- think of my situation.

When I came to this country, there was still a great respect for vacations. We are now nibbling off this very wonderful gift to your mind, in which your mind is allowed to lay fallow for four months. These four months in summer were the heart of the matter. You have such a mechanized mind, that you do not understand that the four months in summer are much more important than anything that happens in winter. Because your mind lies fallow, it's a night of your consciousness. And therefore, when you return to college, you can have grown. You might have grown. Some of you do, as you all must have experienced.

4

But nobody has respect for these vacations. The people think you have a rest, or that's laziness, or that's for making money, or going out West, or taking a trip to Europe.

XXIII *OVERIMPRESSED*

1

Who is interested in this damned trip to Europe? What we need is incubation. For incubation, there has to be a quiet time.

2

Now what you do in summer is absolutely indifferent to me. But it's terribly important that you do not learn actively in these four months.

So that the action of your mind, which is always mechanic, can be balanced by a creative respiration of your inner man, in which certain things can protrude, and grow up without your knowing it, without your doing anything about it, just showing their head, and coming to the fore as important.

3

Today, the women in this country, the men, the students, they are all unimpressionable. I can't make an impression on you, because you are impressed 365 days a year, day and night. And you are overimpressed. Too much stimulated, because we have denied any difference between the active, mechanically working mind of the psychologist and the creative mind of the future citizen.

And so teaching has become a very sterile business, and the expressions are these mechanical examinations with "yes" and "no." They are all for the active mind.

4

Gentlemen, this whole course, what do I care that you know anything about the fact that I can ask an examination? As long as a man writes such nonsense that logos, physis and ethos are ideas and are not his own experience and his own immersion into reality, I haven't made an impression.

XXIV *EMBODIMENT*

1

And to make an impression on you is much more important then, gentlemen, than to make you know something which I can inquire for in an exam.

2

Where in your anatomy the thought, "What is Greek philosophy?" is harbored, is my problem. Can I put it into your liver? Can I put it into your spleen? Can I put it only into your brain?

If I have only unloaded my whole course into your brain, if it doesn't preoccupy you during the summer, and if you forget it after the finals, I have not operated right. Is it not clear? Here, it goes in, here it goes out. It evaporates.

That's the right word, gentlemen, evaporates. And that's why you think of the mind as something vaporous, as something airy. You say, "Ideas are airy. They are not solid."

3

Gentlemen, when a thing of the mind gets hold of you, it begins to be embodied by you. And this is called "incarnation," or "embodiment."

4

And that is the problem of philosophy, gentlemen. The problem of philosophy is the question: Can spirit be embodied on this earth?

XXV *WE ARE ALL ON BOTH SIDES*

1

Now you see perhaps why Plato and Aristotle are more important than the Platonists and the Aristotelians. If you say, "I'm an Aristotelian," I'm not interested, because that part in your anatomy which is Aristotelian is just here, a little thing, placed up here. For the rest, I look at you, and I say that you would make a good football player.

But you are not Aristotle. But Aristotle is not a good football player. He's Aristotle, right through. He embodies Aristotelianism.

2

That's your question today, gentlemen. That's why I tried to tell you that the line today has to be drawn between the man who thinks something for the first time, and something who repeats it.

That's the problem of problems today.

3

Plato against the Platonists; Aristotle against the Aristotelians; Paul against the Paulinians, and so on.

Christ against the Church.

Everywhere the problem today is: We all are on both sides. We are all 23 hours repetitive. And we are one hour original. Put it in a perfectly arbitrary proportion. But we have to say both sides in our thinking. You cannot think because you are 23 hours mechanic, that you can be cheated, and that you must always take the line of least resistance.

And you cannot, because you write a creative poem, or you create a new profession, or you start a new firm, or what-not, or marry a Chinese girl, for this reason, you cannot say that you are always creative.

4

The whole problem is in the in-between, the decision that you have to answer for both orders of the world, the world of the law, and the world of freedom; the world of the spirit, and the world of the mind, in other words.

XXVI *WHERE IS YOUR NAME LODGED?*

1

It runs right through you, this whole problem, with every generation of philosophers. But the new form is that you and I, treated as philosophers, are all at the same time Plato, a founder, founding spirit, and a Platonist, a mere college boy who learns what Plato thought.

2

As far as you think something for the first time, gentlemen, it must be thought by you with your whole heart, and your whole mind, and all your understanding, and all your powers.

In as far as you learn something by rote, it can be lodged up here. The place of thought in your existence then becomes the vital distinction for the reality of what you think.

Where is it lodged in your anatomy?

3

You know, Romeo asks this wonderful question, "In which part of my anatomy is my name lodged?" You have heard it? Who? It's wonderful.

The poets, of course, have this wisdom long before the prosers have it. He knew it 400 years ago, that for Romeo and Aristotle, their name was lodged in their whole being. They were the embodiment of this.

4

For you it's a passing flirtation, what Romeo went through. And what Aristotle went through in 63 years for you is one course here in this class-room, and then you dismiss it.

XXVII *DESCARTES*

1

Now gentlemen, you must learn that Aristotle and you are not akin, even though you think he's true. The mere fact that you say with the mind that "probably Aristotle is right," does not allow you to tap Aristotle on the shoulder and say, "We are comrades in arms."

2

There is a field of endeavor, I'm sure, in your own life, where you are the equal of Aristotle, but not in philosophy.

And this is the damned curse which hangs over in this country, that you will not make this distinction, gentlemen, between the first and the repeater, the customer. The customer here of any motor car ranks with the man who construed the motor car.

3

To give you another example, gentlemen, of this great commiseration today is the story of Descartes.

Descartes is, as you know, the modern, great leading spirit in philosophy. And by my saying "leading spirit," I already put him on the side of creativity. And we have to say "leading spirit" if we want to do him justice. But the theory of his philosophy was that the mind was all that existed. Descartes has no room for the spirit.

And he's a very useful example, because Descartes was a genius who deprecated the existence of genius, who said "There's just reason." "Everybody can think as I, Descartes, can think."

And nobody asked him the silly question, the simple question, "But why didn't anybody ever think before you came?"

4

I have today to defend the genius of Descartes against the system of Descartes.

The same with Plato. I have to say, "It is terribly important that people like Plato should be born, but they must have the right to write their own ticket. And therefore, they cannot be Platonists. It is more important that people like Plato are born and Aristotle and Descartes.

So I must defend genius against the consequences of genius."

XXVIII EXCUSE

1

This is what I mean when I say that any philosopher today, who does not make room for the miracle of the philosopher, for this freedom of the philosopher to say something new, is a poor philosopher, because he does not learn from Christendom in its victory over Greek philosophy, what had Paul taught the heathens, that he had to bring to the heathens first the doctrine of the Lord, of the genius, of the free man, before he could make any dent.

As long as he wanted to draw the conclusions, from their premises, without preaching the crucified Lord, he left out the miracle, which we represent in this universe of natural law.

2

The miracle is that you and I, at the high points in our life, make a break, are the first cause. That's our divinity. If Aristotle says, "God is a first cause," what of it? Every one of you, in a certain way -- if he helps an Hungarian orphan to come to this country, or whatever he does -- he sets a new beginning.

And so, that's our divinity, gentlemen, that we are a first cause in a small way, somewhere. And nobody, gentlemen, who has experienced that he is a first cause, knows who God is.

Before he just talks like a blind of the colors.

3

Most of you do this. But you are much better in your own life I think than you think you are. You are without rancor. You forgive somebody who has sinned against you.

Anybody who can excuse another man, gentlemen, who can forgive him, is a first cause.

4

What is excuse, gentlemen? Can you interpret this word? What does it mean to excuse somebody? What is it?

It's "causa," Latin, causation. To "excuse" means to do away with the cause which would lead to certain logical, mental, mechanical consequences.

If you excuse somebody, or excuse yourself, you say that this cause shall have no effect.

XXIX MAN IS INCALCULABLE

1

Now every one of you, gentlemen, knows that this is possible. You make constantly excuses. And you always ask to be excused. And you always assume that I may excuse you.

But I will be a damned fool if I ever let you know beforehand whether, in this case, I am going to excuse you or not.

2

I'm not going to do this, because I must keep my freedom too. I cannot be a mechanism. You cannot say in advance, "He always excuses me."

That's why a Christian is not the man who always turns the other cheek. But sometimes. But nobody can know in advance whether a Christian will turn the other

cheek. If he would become a mechanism who always turns the other cheek, gentlemen, you can buy him for a dime from Wurlitzer.

We are no mechanisms. You must never know. Man is incalculable.

3

And this is the problem then of your own mind, gentlemen. Your own mind must be able to follow precedent, and must be able not to follow precedent.

The same mind in a certain number of cases will say, "Yes, I'll just acquiesce. It has been done this way always; I'll do it again". But not always. Sometimes. And nobody must ever know -- yourself must never know.

So when the president in the United States said, "We will never use force in the Middle East," I shuddered. How can a president say this? It's impossible. He has no right to say this. It's a free country. He's not a free man anymore if he says in advance what he's ever going to do. He cannot know.

When Wilson said "I kept the country out of war," he was at war four weeks later.

That's the law of real life, gentlemen.

4

As soon as you try to turn life into psychology and mechanisms, gentlemen, you will be overwhelmed by surprises, because everybody will begin to act the other way.

The self-assertion, gentlemen, of the new beginning of the miracle of freedom, is just as with the Hungarian revolt. If you had predicted this, everybody would have logically proven to you that it couldn't be done, that no Molotov cocktail could blow up a Russian tank.

XXX NOT THE SYSTEM BUT THE EXISTENCE OF THE PHILOSOPHER

1

So the whole program, gentlemen, of modern philosophy is to take over the role of the fathers of the Church. If you want to have universal truth, you cannot rely today on denominations, and you cannot rely on these petty frogs of the theological schools, who are riveted in their cleavages.

It has to be the free, universal truth by which this great truth has today to be defended or rediscovered or stated, that in all of us there is this combination of freedom and routine.

And that our mind is the battlefield of the spirit and the mind.

2

And therefore, gentlemen, today we do not care for the Greek systems of philosophy, but we care terribly much for the philosophers. The Greek philosophers are the great argument in our fight for the truth of our own freedom and our own faith and our own creativity.

Every one of these men broke away from one system, which he inherited, and began his own. And in as far as genius today has to be placed, recognized, saved, spared in an order of Communism and of pragmatism, which abolishes all genius, which denies all freedom, which precalculates crises, et cetera, in such a predictable universe, we need every free spirit today to defend the incalculable in humanity.

And it is today not the system of the Greek philosopher, gentlemen, but his own existence, by which we know that the spirit can be incarnated.

3

And therefore, the word against mechanism, gentlemen, is a little bit complicated.

It is embodiment.

If you call the mind "a mechanism," it is his repetitive part, his expirational part, his dead-end street. But if you call the same man "an embodiment of the spirit," then you see all the shortcomings of the mortal who speaks to you or whom you read, or from whom you learn.

But you know that what I say may be much truer than the man who speaks here, that through me, the spirit has found a place of efficiency in this material world.

4

So the end of the story, gentlemen, is quite an overwhelming one in this sense.

All the tenets of Greek philosophers, the division into idealism and materialism, I think can have been blown into smithereens. Don't use these terms any more after this course, gentlemen. They say nothing to you and me, in truth. Nobody can be an idealist. Nobody can be a materialist. I certainly don't see how anybody can.

XXXI *PHILOSOPHY AND INSPIRED POETRY*

1

But there is a third party in the history of Greek philosophy. That's the Greek philosopher who created these schools, who said, "You have to be a materialist," and "You have to be an idealist. Follow me."

Well, at one time, he didn't follow, he created. He heard something which he had to pass on. And this is today the eminence of the Greek tradition, gentlemen.

2

Can you still bear with me for ten minutes? I'm sorry. It is the last time. It's my only opportunity.

3

Because I want to cement a little bit this historical, tremendous transformation of the importance of Greek philosophy for you and me.

I told you already that Mr. Jaeger wrote this book, *The Theology of the Greek Philosophers*. There is one deep reason, gentlemen -- the deepest reason, I think -- why at this moment it is so important that you see the genius in the Greek philosopher and save, therefore, your own faith in inspiration, in pneuma, in spirit, in life-giving spirit, as the Bible calls it so very poignantly, which is undermined in your environment.

4

The reason for this secret is this, gentlemen: from the times of Thales to the times of the Stoics, and from the times of Thomas Aquinas and Descartes to our own days, to the world wars, the abject mechanization of the mind by philosophy was always balanced by poetic faculties, by Dante, by the Greek tragedy, by poetry of all arts, and by the arts. And we all, even the worst rationalist, said that philosophy, if he put it on the side of the mechanism, could be balanced by inspired poetry.

XXXII *WE NEED A METALOGIC*

1

We no longer can rely on this balance, gentlemen.

After the experience of the last fifty years, poetry has given up the spirit and has become itself *anti-poetic, rational, logical, analytical*. And therefore, because poetry is no longer checking philosophy, and science, we have to become poetical.

That is, we have to defend the powers represented by poetry.

2

You have now to think not of what Mr. Sartre writes about putrefaction of the human mind, but who he is. Who is Mr. Sartre that he can say a new word? Give us a *frisson nouveau*.

Who is Proust? I do not care for his book. But I do very much care that such men like Proust still exist who say something different.

3

That is, philosophers, gentlemen, at this moment must defend poetry, because poetry today has become philosophical. That is, it is so rationalized, it only sees the mechanism of life.

As long as you have such poetry, and in as far as poetry has given up its spirit and has become preaching the gospel of mechanization and of nature, of physis, obviously philosophy now has to preach the gospel of *pneuma*.

Because the poets are the pneumatics. They are the inspired people.

And therefore it is now up to the philosophers to defend poetry, because it has now become the strange role of the poets to defend the *cloaca maxima* of indigestion, or whatever they deal with, the itching of your vagus, and sympaticus, and your glands, and so on.

4

They are no longer poets.

Never be betrayed by names, gentlemen. The functions of the human spirit constantly are transformed. If the poets cease to be poets, then the philosophers have to cease to be rationalists, or logicians. And therefore we need a metalogic -- as it has been called -- "metalogic" or "pneumatology" which balances the mechanics and the embodiment processes which permeate your and my strange being, gentlemen.

XXXIII NO PEOPLE LEFT

1

Partly, gentlemen, your mind is the product of your environment. And partly you embody the spirit. That is, a creative thought which has to come through you into this world.

2

The history of Greek philosophy has at all times served as the great admonitor, that without genius life comes to a standstill.

3

The question is not between one law and the other law, between system and another system, gentlemen. The problem is always that between unforeseen and foreseen, between laity and professional -- there can be no people of God on this earth, gentlemen, and no real people if everybody is an expert.

4

This country is going to hell because there are no people left. There are only now people who have a job, jobholders.

The women. They were formerly the people.

Now we have class distinctions; the president can have a Cadillac. And I don't know what the vice-president can have. And the worker can have a Ford. In this country there are suddenly divisions in the last twenty years - they had never existed, when we came.

Very strange.

XXXIV A NEW CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF THE RENAISSANCE OF THE GREEK SPIRIT

1

In this very moment, gentlemen, where everything becomes mechanized, the freedom of the laity, of the people in any one moment to break in with a surprise, with something that is not predictable, has to be defended by thought.

2

And therefore, I think that with this course, I should have liked to initiate you into the great secret that at this moment there starts all over the world among serious people a new chapter in the history of the renaissance of the Greek spirit.

Thank you.