

EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY

HINGE OF GENERATIONS

1953

{ } = *word or expression can't be understood*

{word} = *hard to understand, might be this*

I

1

... and that's not a means. That's an end.

2

Now, you will agree with me perhaps later on when you look around yourself. You may not know it at this time, but nobody wants to talk about this to you, that this country is sick with means.

3

You cannot have 40 million cars and trucks without, you see, being drowned -- drunk by means. These are means, the cars, the trucks, the transportation, the -- the radio, the -- the movie, the television. Two billion dollars spent in this country for television last year. Two billion dollars -- that's more than the state budget of France.

We use up year -- annually, this country, 42 percent of the gross product of the world, and we constitute 7 percent of the population.

4

Can you see what this means? That we have six times as much as would be normal, and we have, of course, because we eat up the 42 percent, we have actually not six times as much, but 12 times too much, compared to all the other people in the -- on the globe.

And you see the whole Marxian prediction today is somewhat ironically turned against { }.

II

1

Marx says the rich will be richer and the poor will be poorer, and therefore there will be war between poor and rich.

Now he thought that would happen in one country. But with us, it has -- it's happening under our noses so -- in such a way that the Americans constitute the rich, and the rest of the world the poor.

And that's a very bitter constellation.

2

And the only comfort we have is that the Russians try to make up for this. And they are the only people who try to break the class war between the United States and the rest of the world.

The French do not produce, you see, and their standard of living is -- are going down, and they seem to be our allies. But Mr. Malenkov is the only hero we have in this country and patriot, you see, because he tries to make the Russians finally equally rich with us. And that will make for peace.

Funny.

You see, if you have -- otherwise you fall under Marx' prediction.

3

The funny thing is that the Russians are the only ones who at this moment have some prospects of becoming richer, in -- in Prozen- -- percentages, you see, than they are at this moment. You will not say that the -- that the English have any prospects, and you will not say the Germans have. Perhaps the Germans have a little bit, but they are such a poor country. I mean, such a small country; it's just Rhode Island and plantations, you see. It's just nothing there. Germany is so small, and Switzerland is, too.

4

But I'm quite serious, because we have idolized means.

III

1

In this country, when you say "standard of living," it is just as opening a cathedral and kneeling down. After the -- in 1945, we had a meeting here convened by a very religious person, Dr. Ambrose Vernon. He is well remembered on this -- in -- on

this -- campus by the few who still care to -- care for continuity at all. He founded the department of biography. And this man was very interested to do something about the future after the catastrophe in '45.

2

And he asked me what I thought, being European by birth, and I said,

"Well, the whole question is the distribution of population. If the United States remain the most thinly pop- -- populated area on the globe, all the others must band together against us and -- and take our riches, because it is impossible that 140 million people" -- it was at that time only - you see -- "could hold 50 percent of the world's wealth." But if we make room for 100 more millions in this country, then the -- it wouldn't be only the 100 million people, but the prospect of anybody that at one time, he or his cousin might come to this country would alleviate the pressure, because you don't -- you have to take the pressure completely off from a steam kettle. If there is only some steam, you see, getting -- going out, that's enough if you only allow the rest of the world still to believe that this country will absorb some million people a year, you have peace for another 50 years, because there is hope.

3

And hope doesn't require immediate fulfillment. It isn't necessary that I may -- am able to say at home at Austria that I can leave. It is enough that I feel that somebody can leave to make me pa- -- more patient, because even those who stay at home, you see, are relieved of their pressures to a certain extent when their next of kin can get a visa and come to this country.

So if you allow 240,000 people in all -- or Europe to leave, that takes the pressure off from 10 million people, of course, and not just from the 240,000. And the 10 million then -- gain some understanding of the worth of peace between the United States and Europe.

4

But what did I get as an answer, in 1945, to my great dismay?

These -- the economist of this college, allegedly a Christian, pious man, everything you want -- they're all pious nowadays -- he said,

"Nothing doing. Standard of living. You can only do this if you stan- -- lower the standard of living in the United States which I do not believe for a minute, but it was just --you see, he thought -- what I'm trying to say is this: he thought that by

mentioning the standard of living, he could shut my mouth forever.

IV

1

That I mean by the temple, you see, and by the dogma, by the idol. If I can use an argument without further discussion, not in its relative value, but at the absolute answer, then you know that you have met an idol. And the standard of living in this country is an idol, because you cannot even mention it as relative, you see, as not meaning much. It is so absolute that all votes, all elections, everything is based on the assumption that the only point of agreement between Americans is the standard of living.

2

And it is, because we all differ in this country as to the aims and ends of life, the goal of life. And so the only way in which politics are kept going is that we can agree on the means of life.

And that's the standard of living. The means.

3

As you know, we are overeating at the rate of eating three times as much as the ordinary man in other parts of the world: 3,400 -- calories. Now the doctors say 1800 is enough, and most people get by for -- with 900 and 1200. But you eat 3,400 as an average.

Only to show you that the standard of living has become an end in itself.

4

To come back to my story of Copenhagen. I haven't finished yet.

It's a Danish story, and it's quite important. This man has been appointed. And since I brought him to this happiness -- first sending him to Denmark and then making the -- this foolish move that he should be appointed American representative of the NATO council, I got of course a payoff by a letter of thanks on his part. He was very enthusiastic, and he was appointed the secretary for preparing a cultural center for NATO.

V

1

A cultural center -- there you have again this on both your houses: culture. And cultural center.

And I read the prospectus and he hand- -- sent it to me for criticism. There's not one word of the purpose, not word -- one word of the difficulties, but there's only:

"This is the place in which we shall all unite," this cultural center, "and in which all the good endeavors of the world will come to prosperity."

2

There nev--- will never be nothing ever, because he has just this frame of reference -- cultural center -- and he has not even begun to dream of -- of some violet or some forget-me-not which he could plant there.

3

Now, all things in life, you see, do not begin with cultural centers. Sond- -- they begin with one musician writing one tune, or one poet writing one poem -- but a complete poem, a poem on somebody distinct from others.

You can't write poetry in general on the universe. It's no poetry.

4

And so the -- he's liv- -- just living in this soap bubble, and of course it will remain a soap bubble -- all the NATO people in New York, and he in Copenhagen will shake hands and say what wonderful fellows they are, both. They are, if you abstract from the ugliness of their brain.

VI

1

This cultural center idea is just ugly, because it is not an embrace of anything real. It's an abstract idea. It's perfectly futile. I'm ashamed of myself. I had to laugh, because the man in New York, whom I had influenced enough upon to prevail that he could send the other man is not -- equal -- equal -ly definitely a fool. And so I

brought two fools together and they feel very good about it.

2

If you think of my poor friend in Paris, or near Paris -- in the country there -- and this well-placed individual in Copenhagen, if you think of the potential of being in the center of things, so to speak, in the know of the NATO organization and being able to pull off this stunt with a paper, a tremendous plan on paper of a cultural center -- when the man cannot even -- has never even known what culture is, just a big word -- and when I see how this other man has really gotten immersed into the spirit of some great souls of 19th- and 20th-century France, and is feeling that they are the spread, the condiment, the spice, which this country in its anemia needs, then I -- you -- I see what it means really to {face} the future, gentlemen, you see, and to have the proper sequence of ends means, or have the wrong one.

3

Cultural center is just a means, obviously, you see, if you know what it -- what you can put into it.

Now, this -- I know both people so well that I can say this not with conviction only, but knowledge. The poor boy, {Phillip}, in -- in Copenhagen doesn't know anything of what he could put into the center. He could put in leather bindings, you see, with gold imprint.

Would look good, you see. But he wouldn't know what he should put in to -- between the two covers of this book, let alone what he should put in between 8 and 9, when he has a cultural lecture, you see, in the cultural center going, about the culture of the world in the West, and in the East, and in the North, and in the South, and with the {Wales}. It is just ridiculous.

4

And most of the things you read about in the paper are just as ridiculous as the Ford Foundation. Money, money, money, money, you see.

VII

1

I told you the story of genius in Germany, did I? When they came to me and said what -- some rich Americans with many millions behind them came to me in -- in -- 25 years ago, and said,

"We have heard that you have such a fine group of boys working with you, would you tell us what we can do to cultivate genius? In our country, in America, we seem to -- to kill off all genius. We are all so standardized."

2

Means always are standardized, you see. Mass production.

"So we feel the obligation to save genius in the world at large. And we want to help you. Please tell us how to save genius in Germany, because it seems to be the only original country left."

And they were very nice people, but they had this same starry-eyed look, you see, gazing into the future in general, just in general.

3

It was -- would be just the same as if you would try to procreate the human race in general. You can only procreate it in particular.

4

Well, you know, what -- it was very simple for me to tell them what they should do. I said,

"Gentlemen, if you want to help genius in Germany, you would oblige me greatly if you would take a ticket and depart. It's the only way in which we can save genius, by saving it from the contamination with your money."

Later on, when this genius has established its -- its ends -- his ends, you can help these people, you see. But you can never begin by digging out the roots of this genius, by shaking his -- his peace of mind and his quiet growth by giving him money, you see. He -- after he has been -- become sure of his end and already, you see, suffered from the ignominy of the resistance of the world, then some understanding, sympathetic, rich foundation can very well come to the rescue of such a person and try to break down the resistance. But before he isn't attacked, before he isn't growing, before he isn't trying to explode out of the darkness of his brain and grow through the wall of stone which indifference heaps up -- over every soul that wants to see the light, you can't do it.

If you go down into the coffin and take this -- this soul that is trying to burst up -- open, you see, the soil, you just uproot it. You just uproot it. There's nothing you can do.

VIII

1

Well, what -- why did I say this? I wanted to show you that {Lawrence} book is one of the most important books with regard to our problem, because it is an historical book, because in history we will -- to learn -- have to learn that prophecy and vision always precede realization. Nothing can become historical that remains accident.

In accidental events, the means come before the ends. In historical events, the ends constitute the means.

2

You believe that opportunity given, you can do anything. No ripeness is all, or readiness is all, Hamlet says, doesn't he? Does Hamlet say, "Readiness all"? or -- there is -- two sayings -- in Shakespeare, equally important.

One is "Readiness is all," and another is "Ripeness is all."

You cannot, because we are creatures of God, you see, overturn the sequence of creating your ends, and then carrying out these ends by all means.

All means, you see, come after the ends.

3

Therefore, gentlemen, the people who are in a hurry, the careerists, men, the so-called success-story boys, are men who carry out ends that are already constituted by others. If to be rich is in itself an end, then you inherit this idea from others, 150 years ago, and you carry out, then your success story is only, you see, that you find the means of carrying out a goal that everybody seems to believe in, as important, as good.

4

If you however find that you should have a new end to be created into people, as the monks did, or the saints did, or the seers did, or the poets did, or the nuclear physicists -- that there should be physicists, which in the 16th century were burned as witches, you see, which you couldn't be without endangering your life, after you have constituted the new aim of being a physicist, you see, then others can come and become physicists and building laboratories.

But the first hundred years, man had first to be quite sure that it was a good end of becoming a physicist.

IX

1

This is not so far afield as you think. You think all the ends are found, and you only have now to find the means. That's not true.

A famous -- who is -- has studied a little chemistry? Who has taken courses in chemistry? Only that many? All the others buy perfume? No, chemistry may be -- smell badly, but it's a very interesting study.

2

The most famous chemist of the -- of the 19th century has been Kekule von Stradonitz, because he made the distinction between organic and anorganic chemistry on which your own course of studies is based. He found out that or- - in organic chemistry, there is this hexagon, you see, between carbon and what is the other? What?

(Oxygen.)

Oxygen, yes. C6, you see, and O6. Wie?

(Oxygen, hydrogen, { }.)

Well, {with alcohol}, it's always CH.

{ }.

CH. Hydrogen and carbon. Well.

3

He was not allowed to become a chemist in his youth, gentlemen. His father said there is no such thing as chemist- -- was at that moment thought of like a -- a -- you think of a barber. No profession for a decent boy. His father was a learned man. And he said,

"You can become an architect. Of this I'll -- that's a vocation. You cannot become a chemist. That's just ridiculous. That's like becoming a cook. I don't want you to do this."

So the -- he was first an architect, and then he finally went to Belgium out of Germany, and in Belgium he managed to become a chemist just the same, against his father's will.

4

And his great discovery was made because, in his vision of the future of chemistry, he saw -- had suddenly an architectural vision. The two years of his architectural studies served him right, because he suddenly saw flapping doors, opening and shutting, as it is with CO₆, if you think of the {ring}.

Did it come out right? One, two, three, four. I need -- oh, pardon me. This -- this -- this is wrong. So. I am not a chemist. This is meant to be a hexagon.

X

1

Now if you -- he saw that this would be like flapping doors, he thought that every one of these sides could open and receive another element in chemistry, you see, instead of having the C attach next to the H, you see, and O, of a -- an S could take their place; and you get all the variety in organic chemistry, you see, by what he had as a vision, it is not necessary now to use it, you and me.

Flapping doors opening up between these -- this -- in this hexagon and allowing something else to enter and to substitute one of the corners of this strange, architectural temple.

2

What I'm driving at is, that he found from the old means, he had still learned the architectural means, you see, his way to his destination, becoming a chemist.

There you can see how an old scaffold of old forms, you see, has to be made subservient to a new end, and then can bear fruit, you see.

But it was a very painful process, because he had to break from his father. He had to leave his own country, you see, and -- and so on and so forth.

3

But still, by having this deeper vision, you see, of a new future, he took with him, so to speak, the equipment as to means, you see, and translated these means into a new realm of vision, and everybody in organic chemistry to this day learns about the hexagon in the way Kekule von Stradonitz has taught it.

4

I -- you want me to make a break now?

(No. { }.)

XI

1

And so back then to {Lawrence}, and you see immediately that this quite a bit to do with our main topic. Mr. {Lawrence} also is not a means to an end. He's an example.

Mr. {Lawrence} you must read, not just because -- for what he says about America. But because of this historical event, you may say that he is the first European who came to this country and remained a European.

He is not traveling for six weeks and then writing a book on America. And he is not immigrating, as I have tried to do, trying to become an American. But {Lawrence} is - - has tried to stitch together America and Europe and to find a place for both of them, you see, by embracing America very seriously, most seriously { }.

2

So he is himself in history and though we make the acquaintance through {Lawrence} with that which means history, gentlemen, history means always the change of boundaries. America and Europe are not the same after {British} has written this book on classical American literature, you see. There is a new tie between the two parts of the globe.

Well, we'll see this later.

3

Now, back to our distribution.

Who is interested in -- in the first two centuries?

[tape interruption]

XII

1

... philosophy and religion. The Church has always tried to organize its thinking around the death of people. It begins with the Crucifixion, after all. And therefore the death of people is meaningful to them. They speak of last judgment, and they speak of the other world, and of the Heaven and such things -- only another expression of saying that death, the way you die, or the way you have completed your life is more important, you see, than what you have thought during.

2

Then the philosophers, however, are sold on the opinions of people, what they think.

3

A friend of mine gave a course in biography, and he wanted to know what the men thought about {woman}, and what he thought about {God}. But you never find a great man this way, because we think very many foolish during our lives. If you think that this makes a man what { } taught.

Well, he was so hyped on philosophy that he thought a man's principles, a man's theory, a man's system of thought was indication, you see, of the man's value. That's the other way of looking at things.

4

So we have so far divided history into the -- history of opinions of people -- philosophers, poets, you see, thinkers on one-hand side, or about their saintliness, their -- their counting in -- in Heaven, like -- like St. Francis, or the Apostles, or the evangelists, or Mother -- what's the new -- American saint?

(Mother {Blour}.)

Mother --?

({Blour}. Cabrini.)

That's not her name.

(Cabrini?)

(The American saint.)

Wie?

(Cabrini?)

Cabrini. Yes, you said Cabrini? {Bain}, you said Cabrini?

(No, I was -- I was joking, I guess. Mother {Blour}; she was -- was something entirely different.)

Well, you could have said "Alice in Wonderland."

XIII

1

And what I tried to show you is that we need a new method which integrates these two ways, the secular and the religious.

At this moment, I said I was interested to look into the dovetail, where a man changes his mind, or where a nation changes its mind, and therefore it has to keep this freedom to go from one ment- -- state of mind to another state of mind. And that is, to a certain extent, dying and -- rising again. You die to your one mentality and come into another.

2

And we -- I wanted to shell you -- show you, that in a case of the Jameses, there has been lived something that really is new, unutilized, unknown, unobserved.

The poor people, William and Henry James, have been still treated as though they were thinkers: one a theologian, and the other a philosopher; one a religious man, and the other a scientific man. And have been treated as though they were two entities by themselves.

And you -- what I -- shall try to do is to show you that they represent a unity, because they didn't think {alike}.

3

Now that is a new method, to say that people belong to each other, because they have nothing to do with each other, so to speak, on the surface of things.

I want to give you an example of the problem.

When Bernard Shaw met the two Jameses, William and Henry the novelist, the son of the old -- the senior -- in England, he always tried to give -- put people ill at ease and {put them out}, and he said to them,

"Oh, you people think that you are important people -- in philosophy, and one in literature. I tell you. I know better. The only redeeming fellow in the family is your father. He is an important man."

And the two sons unanimously said,

"But you are absolutely right. Our father is much more a genius than we are."

And he was completely put out, because he thought he had, so to speak, you see, he could make them blush and embarrass them. They were the great worshipers of their father. And they said,

"He is much more important than we. Yes, of course, he is the genius in the family."

4

You must take down these sentences as they come now to me in this narrative, because before systematizing them, I think it is worthwhile to see these glimpses of life that other people have had of the true relation within the Adams -- the James family.

XIV

1

The second such thing I may say is that William James said,

"My father has been a religious genius if ever there was one."

That's a very strong statement: "My father has been a religious genius if ever there was one."

2

And the same James son -- James, Jr., William James -- has given a definition of religion which proves that he has no idea what religion even is. He knew what religion -- by what religion is only from a respect for his father.

And I assure you, we'll go into this perhaps at the end of the course. I don't wish to go into the material side of his teachings at all at this moment.

Not to confuse you.

3

He had no idea what religion was. And it's all childish what you read in William James about religion. And his father knew it. And in his letter, which I recommended to your attention, he says that much, you see: "You just don't know what it is".

Now, even though you have not understood the letter verbatim, we'll come to that later again, you see, { } that the father says, "My dear son," you see, "you have never stood in this situation, and therefore you -- you just don't understand what I'm talking about."

4

You -- remember the letter? Who has read the letter in the meantime?

That's still too few. Gentlemen, I demand from every one of you that he has read this letter on -- in Volume 2, Page 707 of the Ralph Barton Perry.

(The library { }.)

Well, that's your fault. I gave it to you, didn't I?

(What?)

Why did you give it back? You -- you should have kept it on and to have it circulated. That's why I took it out. The naive egotism of your reading the letter and then giving the book back. You did it -- gave it to one else, who -- to who --?

No, I've { } the volume, Sir.)

(I didn't do it.)

Well then, how can you manage to have them so long?

(They have --)

Volume 2.

(I've read it once, and I still can't understand it.)

But you have no right to keep the volume. You must make it accessible to your fellow -- fellow students.

(I guess I { } turned it in, but { }.)

Well, that's just ridiculous. That's not why I gave this man this book, so that you can sit on it.

(Oh, I { } book, I { }. { } two of them.)

But still we are 16 people here, and they all have to read it.

(Well, he said that he passed it around there and then turned it back in.

That's what he said last week, I thought. { })

But he hasn't passed it on to you?

(No. No, Sir. I have another one { }.)

From the library card.

(Yes, Sir.)

But from the reserve desk.

(No, Sir. See, I went into the stack.)

Well, I would ask --

({ }. They don't have it on reserve.)

No.

XV

1

At this moment, I will -- we will not go into it. I thought about this. We will not at this juncture go into the literary interpretation of the letter by word. But I only want

to state that the father felt that William James didn't know anything about religion, and I'm -- you may also take it from me that William James thought that his father knew nothing of philosophy or of science.

(William James or Henry James?)

It's always Henry James, Sr., the father, you see, the -- it's very important for you to understand the pedigree of his family. We are dealing with the spiritual side of families.

2

Gentlemen, at this moment, in the world of ours, there is nothing as carrier and bearer of spiritual truth left but the family. The family, however, has been reduced to something material and physical. Who thinks that the Holy Ghost is {vested} only now in house parties? According to your fraternity life, it isn't. The -- that is to say, Church, and state, and factories, and offices, and diplomacies, and armies have grown too big that there can be no spirit in them, you see. They are too gigantic.

3

So we are -- why do I offer you the problem of Henry James, Sr., and his family? Because he -- we will see in a minute -- has made of the family the organism, the form which in former days, cities, communities, factories -- houses of economic production, households, could ha- -- or churches could have, or monasteries -- we have nothing left in this country as a white hope except the spiritual relations between members of one family.

4

Now you understand right. You can be a man's sister, brother, and parent or son without blood relations, if you see what this relation would have to be in a spiritual sense. You can adopt a child, for example, can you not? And then you have spiritual family without the blood ties.

XVI

1

Now in this country, and all over the world at this moment in the West, there is a complete decline of vital spiritual forms of fellowship, liv- -- people living together. If I go to my church, there is no fellowship. There is a semblance of a fellowship. The only thing they would not say is the truth in the church, because you can say

the truth in the abstract sense, that we should help the Chinese, or we -- the Chinese should help the Russians. Should all be charitable.

But if it comes to neighbors, the only thing you can do in a church is to be silent, because otherwise you give offense. We cannot speak the truth about our inner, real life and our problems in marriage and in the family in any church of the United States today. It's too dangerous, too explosive.

But you still can between friends.

2

And I shall call at this moment the situation of father and son in the James family an example of spiritual life, because where -- you -- can have life only between people of the spirit. "Spirit" means the common breath of people. Spiritual life therefore -- for -- can never exist in one man.

Oh, no. It cannot.

3

That is the -- therefore completely in eclipse in your textbooks. They don't know what spirit is. They deny it even, and then they describe in sociology the family as a bundle of people who don't fit together, which is perfectly true, because without a spiritual life, and without common religion, and common worship, and common aims, such a family is bound to be ridiculous, and to get on each other's nerves.

"My family always cramps my style," a young girl said to me, you see. "My family always cramps my style. I'm much better off alone, because then I -- I'm not a Cinderella, but I -- I -- coming out in full force. And I can represent the world family when they are absent."

That's one condition. They must be away. And families on the surface of things, if they are only { }, are absolutely funny. And they are impenetrable to others, too, I mean, just as a nation is.

4

I mean, you come into America, or come to France, it is as a great man has said, "All nations in themselves are abominations," because for the foreigner they do not offer a spiritual experience, you see. They -- just as they are. And that's not good enough for people, you see.

Flowers and stones can be as they are. You and I have always to be willing to be different from what we have been. We have to be changeable, you see, because a man is a man as long as he can change his mind. Before -- otherwise he is just an animal.

XVII

1

Now unfortunately the nations of this earth are all just -- can be described in very simple terms. Because they are just what they are, they only want to be what they are. So they are so boring, and so the only way of bringing them together is the hydrogen bomb.

We will do from fear what we don't do from inspiration.

2

Spirit, gentlemen, is breathing together of different people. That is what spirit is. And if a man is inspired, that -- the meaning of "inspiration" is that it -- he's -- he's able to impart to others a new spirit.

But it must go out, or he's choked. There have been people whose inspiration has been throttled, and they died in the process, you see. You can -- spirit means the founding of groups.

3

Now, the question of -- is today is there any inspiring group left in this country, or in the world -- or the Western world, despite industry, despite the stock exchange, despite the press, despite the radio, or it is all just commentators? Is it all just -- just fiction? Is it all just veneer?

You cannot believe any man who appears on television. He smiles because he's paid for it. He'll smile at any circumstance, whether you are a rat or not.

4

Now, I want to make -- see myself treated with distinction. That is, I want to know whether this man smiles at me, or whether he smiles because he was paid for it. I'm not interested in paid smiles. Well, we have male whores in this country by the millions, people who are really able to smile, because they are paid for it. All the radio people are this way. All the actors are, you see.

XVIII

1

You know the story of the clown who comes to the psychiatrist and says, "I'm -- in such a depressed mood, and I'm just -- I want to weep inside of me all the time, and I feel that I have a breakdown. What can I do? Can you cure me doctor?"

"Oh," he said, "Yes. Tonight, you just go to the -- to the - this show. It's funny, you see. You laugh your head off."

He said, "I'm the man who makes the other people laugh."

That's, by and large, the state of affairs in this country, that you cannot distinguish when a spirit is genuine, and when it's just put on. Most of it, you can -- you pay a man a thousand dollars, he'll stand on his head. Instead of paying a man a thousand dollars because he stands from mere exuberance on his head, you see.

So he has no exuberance anymore. He has just a thousand dollars.

And what do I care for a man standing on his head without exuberance?

But if a man is so enthusiastic he stands on his head, I do anything to see him, you see. I might even be willing to pay him a thousand dollars in gratitude. But he first must produce spontaneously, and not because he's paid.

2

Can you see again the confusion between ends and means? Can you see this, that the whole country sick, because everything can be paid for, and then you have it?

But you don't have it. You don't have it. Nothing you can pay for you can ever have. You can only consume it. That's a con- -- on the consumption side, you see. But the good things of life, you see, are inconsumptible, because they cannot be bought.

3

They are always there. They are there forever. We call this "eternity," or "everlasting."

Now this is the problem of the family, gentlemen. If the family is spiritual, then it is everlasting. Then it doesn't depend on -- on physical -- procreation. Then it must -- then it is the cell in which life of the -- is restored between the members of the human race.

4

And the Jameses, gentlemen, did not understand very much of what the other fellow was talking about, and yet they inspired each other. It's a very strange story.

XIX

1

So I gave you some anecdotes. I said Shaw was put out because the sons said, "The father is important. We are not." The father says, "My son doesn't even know what religion is." The son says, "My father is a religious genius if ever there was one," but as you also know, he wrote a book, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, and he put his father down as an oddity. He's just one religious genius.

And there are many other types. And that again, means that William James canceled out, so to speak, the real achievement of his father.

2

We go on from there and we say that William James, son, writes a letter to his wife when his father is dead and said, "The rest of my life I must devote to save the remnants of my father's spirit. I feel that it has come to me as I cannot rest the case with his death. I must go on."

And he published then in fact the literary remains of Henry James in 1884, two years after the father's death, and far from being satisfied with this achievement, it has been on his mind for the rest of his life.

3

There's more to it, gentlemen.

William James had two brothers who went to the Civil War. And both were ruined morally, and physically, and financially in this experience, as veterans. They didn't -- were not killed, but as you know, it might be much worse not to be killed in a war, but to come back with a frozen heart or a frozen foot, and to be a cripple. And it has always weighed very heavily on William James' mind, and I -- you will take this down.

4

The two brother Jameses were always present in William James' thinking, and he always tried to represent their problems as war veterans in his own thinking. And he did this by finally writing "The Moral Equivalent of War."

And this amounts to a declaration, so to speak, of with his brothers. He says,

"Since my brothers ..." he doesn't say it in so many words, but I feel this out of his behavior, "... since my brothers were ruined by the Civil War, I must be willing to suffer in peacetime as much as they did in wartime, or I'm not their brother. The brotherhood of man consists in my being willing to suffer voluntarily what others have been compelled to suffer without being asked," so to speak.

XX

1

Gentlemen, that's -- is the decisive problem of your philosophy. If you begin from what you want, what you desire, what kind of world you would like to love -- live in, you start on your own as a foot of yourself. If you look around and see what people have done for you, you stand on the other foot and try to find your own place in life by measuring up to their sacrifices, you see.

It's an absolutely different problem which you put, you see, because you do not begin with what you want, you see, but with what other people have done so that you are. And from there you get a completely different yardstick.

2

And I assure you you never end up with the standard of living, which you must have, because all the people whom we owe our existence, just had no standard of living, you see. They were all starved, and destitute, moving from Egypt to the desert and into the promised land, without honey and milk for a long time to come. And yet, we owe them our liberty and our existence.

3

And if you begin this way to looking at things, you know that your only problems are ends, and not means. It's utterly ridiculous and indifferent to talk about means, except when you are a careerist and want to be elected governor of New Hampshire, or of the United States by the way.

4

What time is it?

(10 of. 10 of 3:00.)

Well, I have not finished my task -- by a long shot about the Jameses { }.

{ } = *word or expression can't be understood*

{word} = *hard to understand, might be this*

(*Philosophy 53, October 8, 1953. Testing one, two, three. One, two, three.*)

I

1

... solution, so that we feel that we have some firm ground under our feet and are not just drifting.

2

This has a special reason, gentlemen. It is my experience that most courses introducing you to civilization or history, you see, wrongly begin somewhere in the past and then lead nowhere. So from somewhere to nowhere, I don't wish to lead you. I wish to begin with a goal, and then show the way towards it, and the reasons why this goal is really the goal, because there is no other way out.

3

You -- this method of the course has something to do, gentlemen, with the good life.

The good life is not a life that doesn't know its direction. It is groping for the means, but it is quite sure of its destiny, of its end.

You live -- try to live a life that's just the other way around. You begin somewhere, and don't want to know where it should lead you to.

4

If you lea- -- read any literary critic in this country on great art, you will find that most people today are under the con- -- impression that art must always hold a surprise, that the happy ending, you see, must come in the last minute and send you home with the feeling as a detective story: why didn't we know this all the time, that this would be the solution?

That is, gentlemen, the secular mind, the ordinary mind of yours, the animal mind goes along and is finally surprised by the solution. Any such literary production that -- like a detective story -- cannot be read twice, because you know the solution, and the secret is out; and therefore the reviewers of -- you know, of detective stories have agreed that they must not give the secret, because otherwise the poor publisher wouldn't sell one copy, because even if the review only would divulge the solution of the mystery story, it would no longer sell.

II

1

That is, the good fortune of the book depends on your not knowing end.

This is an imitation of the animal life in your own life, that you do not know the end of your own life, and you -- try to keep it hidden.

Perhaps you may not have to die. Although Johnny and -- and -- and Billy have died, perhaps you can escape it. That's, so to speak, the fervent hope of the animal in us.

2

We don't want to know. We don't want to know. You take the hero -- you take Christ's life -- who knew not only that He had to die one day, but He even was --

had resolved that He should invest His death as a capital of mankind in a new bank for the unity of the human race.

Here is a man who faces the future, who knows perfectly well that we all have to die. And his question is only: how to invest His living powers best.

But the direction, the consumption, their death -- His death is always with Him, all the time.

You try to forget it.

3

Now the animal in us, gentlemen, is therefore always reflected in the so-called fiction. You call literature "fiction." And it is fiction.

And the early Christians have taught me a lesson. I come more and more, the older I grow, to have a direct disgust with fiction. I do not see why I should waste my time with books.

4

There's a new novel written now by a 23-year-old Harvard man, classmate of this gentlemen here. Well, I'm not going to read such a book. All the reviews tell me that it's just fabricated. I don't care.

Why should I listen to the fabrications of a 23-year-old guy? I'm -- I'm not interested. I don't want to have fiction. I want to have truth.

III

1

Now, gentlemen, all great art gives you to know the end of the story before you start.

Homer -- you open *The Iliad*, and you know it all in the verses. You read *The Odyssey*, you know it all when you open the book. There's no plot to take you by surprise. What you read is the "how," not the "that." What you read is how it comes about, because that's where we are distinguishable. How we live.

2

We all have to die. And a great poet takes this for granted

The small -- the -- the fictionist, the imitator of literature, what you call the "American literature" is just all -- salesworthy, you see. It's commercialized. They want to keep your attention by the plot, by the surprise, by the detective {thing}. You don't know what's ahead of you.

But take Wolfe. There's no -- nothing to surprise you about the end. He's a real { }. Or you take Melville. There's nothing in the story that is really at the end different from -- the beginning. First page and the last page, you are exactly in the same climate. Any great -- or the same with Hawthorne, even, although he is certainly not a -- an overpow- overpowering poet, you see.

3

But a genuine poet, gentlemen, doesn't have his contact with you through his keeping you just in suspense, but making you feel that you are living in one climate all the time, and -- he can very well give away his secret, his so-called secret, I mean, the solution beforehand, because he keeps you in suspense by retardation, by showing how difficult it was to bring it about.

4

As Virgil said, "much work it was to found the Roman race." But he begins immediately, "{Si den}," you see, "*Arma virumque cano.*" Of arms and man I sing -- of -- of Aeneas and Anchises, how they found Rome finally, you see.

But then there is this great sentence, you see, *{tanta} moles erat Romanam condore gentem.* Such a trouble it was to come down to brass tacks and found the city of Rome. The moles, the -- the difficulty.

The same is true of Tolstoy, *War and Peace*, one of the greatest books ever written, you see. There's no surprise in this story, but there is a melody, and just as much as any - - great musician gives you the theme in the first beats, and then enlarges on it, and doesn't hide it, you see, under the bushel, but once you take the Fifth Symphony, you see --

[opening notes of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, then a shift to theme]

Well, it will never be better, that's all -- all there is to it. These two themes, these two - - have you heard it? Well, that's the story.

And that's great music. No surprise. No detective story.

IV

1

But you are so mistaught that you always think that is not -- that the -- the whole gist is as in a short story, you see. When does -- the moment come when she proposes to her man, you see.

You know the degradation of American literature now goes so far that they even have -- make always the girl propose to the man. And the trick is only, you see, to do it in some way you have never read before. This is -- has nothing to do with literature. Just -- it's is saleable.

2

I had once a jung -- young friend. I saved her from committing suicide, so she was always very grateful to me. She went to Radcliffe -- alias Harvard, and she wrote her autobiography. And of course, since she had an exciting past, as I -- you can understand from the -- this experience with I -- which I had with her, that she had something to write about. So she got back this paper, with the, with the remark by her English professor, "Saleable". Not an "A," you see, not "Excellent," but "Saleable."

That's the ultimate degradation, you see, of the human pen. That was the criterion this -- this asinine man had, you see, by which he -- that's then called "education."

3

In Radcliffe. It was not Tuck School. It was not a commercial school. It was not a school -- then -- and I mean -- I just felt that -- well, the -- the bottom fell out of -- so to speak, on -- from my faith in -- in education in this country, if an English teacher can tell a student who gives away her most personal life experience, you see, in an eloquent manner, "Saleable."

Is this the goal?

3

If this is the goal, then you understand why it's -- has to be tricks. If it is saleable, you see, it is just imitation of other literature. Anything which you write for sale already has a standard set by others, because you want to judge -- if people will sell it, you can only judge it by other books.

Any great book is not sale, because it creates a new market. It -- is a new product, if it is an original writing. You don't know if there's anything { } so to speak. You

will know that even the -- all the American publishers in New York -- as they are concentrated there and going bankrupt every day -- they never know of a success of time, you see. They are always surprised.

4

When Mrs. -- one of the great successes was *The Good Earth*. Well, the publisher had no idea that it would be great success, you see you remember *The Good Earth* by -- by Pearl Buck. Well, that's -- that comes to mind.

It's an old story, an old experience, that a real bestseller cannot be known beforehand by the publisher. He has no idea. They always try -- I mean, they have a kind of -- of - - of course, the sorcerers of Egyp- -- pharaoh-of-Egypt service. I mean, they have prognostications, and astrologers, and just as the people at the stock exchange. They always want to know ahead of time when they are going to lose their money. But they always lose it and they don't know ahead of time.

V

1

But you are the -- living in a -- in a -- absolutely debased and falsified climate. And so I have to cry you awake, gentlemen.

Homer is not a great because you are kept waiting for the outcome. It is a great poem because although you know the outcome from the very beginning, you cannot help reading it.

2

Just think of the Bible. The whole outcome of the Bible is known, you see, that Christianity would be a complete failure. And you read it just the same, if you -- if you have at all the -- the nerve. It's not saleable. The Bible is -- I mean, no publisher in New York would take a book of the contents of the Bible today and publish it. It is -- can be no success. The whole story is known beforehand.

The fall of man in the first chapter. It's all there. Man is just so depraved as he is today. And he is so this way from the beginning.

3

So you -- you have, you see, lost even the organs of this dis- -- decrimination. And therefore, gentlemen, I have to try to -- to impose on you the method by which I

say the American story is vital to you, because the outcome can already be known, and not although the outcome can already be known.

Do -- can you see the difference?

And all the people try to -- to lull you into this insecurity as though the outcome couldn't be known. It is very well known today what could be the contribution of America to -- to the world at large, and what cannot be.

4

We can already say that the denominational tradition of the churches in Europe cannot be the American contribution, because we have 287 denominations, you see. So that's out, you see.

But we can also say, gentlemen, that the independence of America from the rest of the world cannot be America's contribution to the world, because the world is sick with independent parts, you see, and must have a planetary organ- -- order. Therefore we already know that's out, you see. The question is, then, what is not out?

VI

1

And I do think that the James family stands out there as something to be considered very seriously. But it ha- -- they have already lived.

I come back to my first statement in the first meeting, that your problem is to understand that something can have existed in the flesh and yet not reached you in its spirit. If you do not believe this, you cannot believe that Buddha, or Lao-Tse, or Christ, or the Bible have anything to tell you, because that's long ago.

2

I never understand these people in this country who on the the one-hand side pay lip service to the Church, or to religion, or go even with their family to a service and on the other hand say that history is bunk. Well but -- I told -- we talked about it, you see.

Jesus, after all, died 1900 years ago. So in between there has alwa- -- only been bunk? I don't believe that He can claim for Himself that He has more historical rights to talk to us than any -- all the things that have gone on -- in between. This is to me too artificial. If there hasn't been -- a stream of spiritual life reaching out from Him

to us, to this day, then I shall not have the power to say why American denominationalism is -- is not the blessing we have to impart to the world, and why American nationalism, or independence, or isolationism cannot be the gift we have to impart to Iraq, and Iran, and Germany, and Poland, and Norway at this moment.

3

But you know this, as well as I. We only have -- I have to cry you awake to the fact that you know much more about America's contribution to the future of humanity than at this time you have the -- the likelihood to -- to admit.

What have the James family done?

Well, gentlemen, Mr. Henry James, Sr., was a heretic. That is, he did not believe in organized Christianity. His church was his family conversation. That is, he had tenets that coincided I think with orthodox Christianity, and he found it sufficient all through his life, to his death in 1882, to expound this vigorously within a tremendous conversation in family.

4

And his eloquence resounds in the diary of his daughter Alice, in the novels of his son Henry, in the heroism of his son Robertson, and in the philosophy of William James.

That is, he found a tremendously rich, colorful, and you may say "prismatic" response, an echo in what his children did with the words they had heard from his mouth. He expounded the Gospel at his family table as a father.

And back comes to him

one tongue, philosophy;

one tongue, that's Alice's, the invalid, most eloquent woman that ever lived in this country dia- -- in her diaries, they were -- have been privately printed by the family, but you can -- I think we have it here -- anybody interested?

Then the epistolary of the -- of William James as published by Ralph Barton Perry,

and the novels of his -- Henry.

VII

1

Now, spiritually and -- so to speak, as a problem of the mind, we -- you see then that here is a strange situation.

A man who day and night only preaches the law of the Lord, as in the first Psalm says, he is like a tree planted at the rivers of water who bears his fruit day and night by speaking of the law of the Lord, you see, day and night, and his -- the answer is in various -- idioms and dialects from his children, and they are -- these idioms are secular.

2

So gentlemen, you may say one equals infinity in the religious tongue; there is only one way of speech; that in the secular, you can respond from the periphery in many tongues.

So if you -- think this man stands in the middle, you can also say this is the center, and this is the periphery, and gentlemen, the echo of a good teacher, or of a poet, in the hearts of his audience, or of his spectators is many-fold, and can never be in the same idiom.

3

Not the man who repeats the words of the master is his disciple, you see.

But St. Paul is the master, the best disciple, and you know that St. Paul never quotes the Lord. He always speaks in the {live} moment, as Mr. Richards, I'm told, has asked you to speak.

4

Did you go to his lecture? Who did? Well, you see.

VIII

1

The -- the Paul, the Apostle, never quotes Jesus. If you read his letters, it's all fresh. It's all expressed, you see, without any quotation from the Gospels.

No Sermon on the Mount quoted, as the pious people do today.

If you want to be -- lead a good life, gentlemen, don't quote the Sermon of the Mount, because Christianity has nothing to do with quotations. The apostolic life is to speak with the same power, and without glibness, and not saying, "so on and so forth," or "at some way," or "anyway," or "I think you understand," and "if you know what I mean," you see, and all these terrible words. They are all agnostic words.

2

If a man says to me, "You know what I mean?" I can only always answer, "No, I don't know what you mean. Please tell me."

Well, gentlemen, we are in the midst of a tremendous problem and you don't see it, and that's why I -- invite you to wake up to the fact that the relation of such an eloquent father who, outside the Church -- without a pulpit, without being a bishop, without being a saint, without being an apostle -- is able to -- to fertilize, to incite in four members of his family such a tremendous intellectual life, you see, is a very serious power behind the throne, so to speak.

3

And we have to look into this very definitely. You -- we may say, gentlemen, that in America, the Gospel has been unchurched in the person of Henry James. It has become unchurched.

You still find the Mormons having to write a second book, a second gospel, The Book of the Mormons, you see. They -- that's in the middle of the -- you see, Young and Brigham, you see, in the -- in the middle of the 19th century.

Here however is a man who definitely forgoes all reliance on either scripture, sacred text, or -- or church, but who feels in his family still provoked, challenged, {and} compelled to speak day and night of the Gospel, and to translate it in such a way that these children suddenly feel a Niagara of eloquence avail -- awakening them.

4

And any one of -- I told you the story of Bernard Shaw and the two sons, when they said, "Of course, our father was {a genius}. We agree, you don't -- can't tease with saying that we who have the literary fame in the world are bigger men than he."

Now you have this strange situation, gentlemen, that Henry James draws the sum of the religious past of American history in a strange manner, you see. It is through him the religion still reaches this secular generation, you see, of scientific and literary

attitudes, beginning perhaps in 1870 or after the Civil -- 1865 you see.

IX

1

So you have him as the last religious generation in this country, and why I made the break in 1865, you remember what we did. And you have purely secular in these people -- people. Philosophy, diary, novels -- I should have perhaps said "the epistolary," is something specific. This -- these three forms you know, but we'll have to build on this as something not yet fully evaluated and treasured.

2

Now Mr. William James, to oppose him right away to his father, tried to be a scientist. He went to Brazil with an expedition in geology and in zoology. And the special sciences, however, were too much for him. That is, his attempt to forget his father's imposition of unity and comprehensiveness, which always -- gives, you see, in religion unity, universality -- one god means "unity of all -- for all," you see.

3

If you take this point of the thought of his father at the breakfast table, God, and you take the sciences -- zoology, medicine -- this was the great temptation of William James, to be sure, for a while in the '60s. And he tried very hard to forget that he had any relation to his father. And he tried to build up his own personality under the -- in the studying at Harvard, and then going, as I said -- told you, on expeditions. And it didn't work. He fell sick.

4

He had a melancholia, and he could not stay in this so-called -- well, how should we call them? -- in this plura- -- pluralism, in this plural. Here we have oneness in the father, but heresy with regard to the Church. Oneness with regard to faith, heresy with regard to Church.

X

1

Now here you have an attempt of plura- -- pluralism in the very beginning. Oh, I study zoology. I study anatomy. I study {this}. I study psychology. I study this and that. This -- this -- this- or that-ness, which you all suffer from. Many things.

2

The "many-ness" is perhaps better than "pluralism." How would we call this in -- in Latin?

Well, we should have a word instead of "*hoi-polloi*." Not "*hoi-polloi*." That's a mass, you see. But we should have *{ta pola}*, the many things, you see, the many-fold, the Encyclopaedia Britannica facts, so to speak. I don't know what -- how to call this many-ness.

How would -- you have any word for this? The multitude. We always think of people when we speak of multitude. But of what I want to insinuate is, you see, the multitude, the ocean of -- of knowledgeable fields of -- you see, of scientific endeavor. How would you call such a many-ness?

(Multiplicity?)

Ja. I think that's -- that's not perfect, but I think it's quite good.

3

Now, gentlemen, will you take this down -- on faith for the time being?

All secular things are multiple. People today even believe in multiple inspiration. You go to Hollywood, and you have five people sitting in -- in adjacent studios and they have common inspiration. They call it -- I mean it's multiple inspiration. The -- they -- the most incredible story, you see, because unfortunately God created men and -- and fe- -- fe- -- male and female, but He didn't create multiple inspiration. But in Hollywood, they believe it.

These glued and -- and -- and -- and tailored and -- and pasted comedies, you see. One writes the beginning, the other writes the end, and the third writes the middle. And that they call then "art." And you believe them, too. I mean, you can sell in this country anything because you believe that art has something to do with selling.

As long as you believe this, you must believe in multiplicity.

4

Now, the important thing is that in 1865, gentlemen, William James and Henry James are farthest apart.

If you look at your own life, I think that's about you, too, that at this moment you are farthest away from your father. At least you must be. You should be. At this moment, you must let as many elements that are foreign to your father's tradition

and life enter your own bloodstream, in order to become somebody in your own right. You must try out how far you can go away from him.

That is your duty at this moment.

XI

1

The interesting thing is, gentlemen, that in -- at a certain moment in life, you are farthest away from your father, and that is also from the spirit of your father's tradition, and his -- his -- his position in life. And that, believe it or not, as time goes on, you can then build bridges between that which has entered your life as novelty and a new thought, you see, and his position. And I think that at 60, normally any man can have -- can affirm both positions -- his father's and his own, you see, without much trouble.

But now you have all the trouble in the world, I suppose -- or I hope -- to assert -- -firm your -- assert your position first, because it isn't yet in existence. Can you understand my point?

2

So gentlemen, in William James, you can study the fact that in 1865, he is more distanced from his father than ever after.

Now I think that's -- already is miraculous, because it -- also shows you that time is not what you think it is -- going this way, from A to B, gentlemen, because we learn here, here is the life of the father lived. And the life of William James begins at the farthest point and then returns.

In order to find its relation to this previous life, it has to come near enough so that you can build an ellipse, with two foci, so that there is some electric spark going over, you see.

3

Now, you have an elec- -- a machine for electricity, you know if you remove them -- the two poles too far apart, no spark, you see. If you bring them together completely, no current, either, you see. But you have to find the polarity under which there will be light, there will be electricity.

4

Now, I propose to you to look at this James family problem as a discovery in -- in your own historical situation, because your idea is that in 18- -- 1980, you will be more away from your father, or your father's generation -- that is, me, you see, and what I stand for -- than you will today. I assure you, this is not true.

The -- the main point is that a man of 45 at this moment -- I'm already older. I'm already -- so to speak, could be your grandfather.

But a man of 45 and a boy of 20 are more antagonistic, you see, than these same people are at the age one is 80 and the other is 50 or 55.

And that's very interesting, and I think exciting.

XII

1

But you have to apply to the universal history of the human race.

History does not go in a marching procession, as all the scientific analogies or diagrams try to show you. History is not going from A to B. Christ is farer from the Old Testament church of course, than the people in 300, when they already prayed the Psalms again in the Church.

Jesus had first to tell people that they could worship God without the Psalms, too. But there was no harm done in 300 to bringing in the -- Psalms again, and have the whole liturgy, you see, and the whole caboodle {prayed again}, as they do today, you see, where -- where you have all the hundred-fifty Psalms preached in every Protestant and every Catholic church every Sunday.

But if the Apostles and the -- Jesus had only done this, there would have been no Christianity. Can you see this?

2

So gentlemen, history is a mysterious process of bringing up B another -- a new position, and then relating B to A. That is the real process of life between people who know of each other and are not in nature, but in history.

People who love each other, gentlemen, cannot spare each other suffering, because B has to come into being.

A mother must give life to her child under great pain and suffering, under travail. If she doesn't separate the body of this child into an independent entity, both die, you see. The child has to get away from the mother, but it has to come back, to her -- by her smile, and her tenderness, and her -- you see, her nursing, and so on. But first it has to go out.

3

Now gentlemen, between father and son, this is true in the spirit.

What is true about the body of a mother and her baby is true, and you can study it fortunately on -- in a story lived in this country better than in any European country, any Roman, or Greek, or Palestine country.

The great story about William James and Henry James is that here birth was given to a new type of man, the secular American, the scientific American, the American who wouldn't take anything for granted, the man who said, "I don't know what the soul is, and I don't know what God is. I live without them for the time being," you see.

4

And it was given birth by a churched -- unchurched Christian who was so full of the Gospel that although the son evaded all denominational, all church affiliations, you see, did not forget the sound of these words in his ears. And although he struggled hard to get out of it, and ran to ends of the earth, to Brazil, for -- on his zoological expedition, is still under the spell or -- and has to echo it, and has to re-translate it into, gentlemen, what?

A secular unity. A secular unity. A secular comprehensiveness, which doesn't remain mere multiplicity.

What time is it? Oh, dear. Let's have a break.

[tape interruption]

XIII

1

...me retard my statement by telling you my own experience.

The of single-aged and multi-aged, or pluri-aged thinking in politics has moved me all my life.

And if you think of the idea of a renaissance, a coming-back of classic civilization -- as they believed in the 16th century, or in the 18th century, the restoration of anything that has gone by us -- the English people believed in the restoration of the old freedoms -- you have always the same problem that the fullness of life can only be experienced if more than one generation is after it and endeavors to fulfill it, because all these restorations try to do better, to do the same thing, but now -- an a -- on a higher level so that it would be more tenable than before.

2

If you restore Athen- -- Athenian painting in Raphael and Michelangelo, you feel that you are doing more than just having the Athenian arts, you see. You are now fulfilling the real destiny of man to repeat, to reproduce highest forms, in a conscious effort. And therefore you already have the problem of bringing more than one generation to a common fruition, to a common exploit.

Long ago, somebody does something -- Plato, or Aristotle, or Jesus -- and we today try to do it consciously and therefore connect ourselves with such a bygone generation.

3

The renaissance topic therefore, for example, already in -- suggested to -- it is my oldest topic in my own thinking -- the problem of: what have generations to do with each other?

If you found 48 states in this country, then of course, the 48th still has to bear some semblance to the -- Massachusetts, or to Virginia, or to Vermont. And therefore, you still carry within yourself, you see, the loyalty to the people in the other states, although you are out in Arizona, and get statehood in 1908.

And that is a renaissance problem. And it means that although you seem to be acting independently, your independence is really limited by your affection, and reverence, and interest in another generation's doings.

4

And what is this? How are you free and dependent at the same time?

The relationship of this, you see, has intrigued me.

XIV

1

But I want to be more down to earth by telling you that in 1900 -- in the '20s of the 19th -- 20th century, there was in Europe, as you may know, a pronounced youth movement, a rebellion of the younger in the machine age against the drabness and the -- the philistines among their parents. And there was a kind of strike of the young, out of which finally then the Hitler movement -- was {formed} by a multiplicity really of elements.

2

But in the -- since 1905, in Europe there has been this so-called youth movement, a radical re-interpretation of life of parents and children. Very much like progressive education. The child owes nothing to the parents; the teachers are facilities; it is the child that must decide for himself what to choose -- the elective system in every way of human endeavor. And if you can get the nursery school child already to make decisions on its food, all the better.

Concentrate, condense all decisions of life into the individual's lifespan; then you have emancipated this child.

3

Well, the youth movement is the German aspect of this complete severance of relations between parents and children as a spiritual problem, as a problem of common understanding, and you may say that it is the -- the radical outcome of the liberal century.

Liberalism meant that the parents were demanded to make every sacrifice for the education of their children, but they had to make no -- make no demands on the work -- the labor of their children -- think of child labor, which has been abolished at the end of this period, and no on their creed, their faith, their loyalty, or what-not.

4

It's a very strange paradox that liberalism at the one-hand side demanded the utmost in sacrifice on the part of the parents, and on the other hand, demanded no sacrifice on the part of the children.

And you can even say, the more sacrifices the parents make to send their boys to college, the less the children are demanded to make any sacrifices for their parents. That is the awkward situation, so to speak, down to the two world wars, that the word "sacrifice" is ridiculed just as much "adolescent" is ridiculed, or "virgin."

There are no virgins in this country. There are no adolescents in this country. And you must never mention the word "sacrifice."

XV

1

I once tried to publish an article on this -- a series of articles on this on campus here, in *The Dartmouth* in 1940, and -- as a vocabulary of education. And I finally got it in and I had to say,

"I know that the word will not go over, but the thing remains, there is no historical life possible without sacrifice. And you won't hear it, and therefore there will become -- come a terrible catastrophe" -- it was just before we entered the war -- "because when you don't believe in sacrifice, then you will be demanded to make it by violence, by force,"

which has always happened.

I mean, that's the way in which God corrects man's ways, when don't believe a part of the truth, the truth comes upon you, from your back. It just says universal military service.

2

Which is sacrifice. But you don't want to know it in front of you, in your own philosophy. So it comes through the back door.

And that's why still we have this trouble of having just universal military training established, you see. You want to do it half-heartedly, and so you get all the injustices that boys are sent to Korea, after they have participated Second World War, just because you are -- cannot be made to understand that you have to sacrifice.

3

Well, this unpopular word "sacrifice," as I said, has been written large into the hearts of all the parents of the 19th century.

If you think of Dartmouth College, what the alumni do for you, it's just unbelievable. Why they do it, nobody knows, you see. God only knows how long they are going to do it for us, you see, but they do it.

But you, I mean, you may have to fight your own way through college by serving at tables, and so, but that's still enlightened self-interest, I mean. That's within your own, you see, within your own sphere.

4

And -- so gentlemen, liberalism consists of stressing the sacrifices of the parents, and of stressing the non-sacrificial situation of the young.

You may say that down to 1800 the reverse was true. We stressed the sacrifices by piety and loyalty to be made by the children, you see, and the authority of the parents was stressed more than their sacrifices.

But today the child is the authority, and that's youth movement.

XVI

1

So these youth groups in Germany were led by very energetic, so-called leaders. The whole leader principle originated, gentlemen, in these cells, in these youth groups, where 15, 20, or 10 or 8 even would cluster around a leader and go out into the woods, or go out into Italy, or Yugoslavia, or some other part of Europe, just with tents and hiking, and -- on very little means, and -- and quite daring, and would follow the -- the leader.

2

And I was thrown into very contact with these people. I tried to persuade the youth groups after the -- between the wars to serve and to go to the workers and farmers, and run what is now known as work camps, and -- a thing which we invented in the '20s for the first time. And I have succeeded in part to make these youth groups, which consisted of young, middle-class boys, I mean, students, and high school boys, and scout -- what we would find in the scout movement, you see -- with people who -- were young Communists or young Marxians, and people who

were young -- well, how would you call it? -- young Texans, I mean, rodeo people, and such -- I mean, people who had no time for scouts, because they were out in the wilds, anyway. And -- farmers' sons.

And so we wanted to bring together three quite different ways of life:

the old countryside way of life, with its old customs and folklore;

the Marxian way of life of the citified workman, enlightened and individualistic in one way, and politically mad in the other, and -- mass man, you may say;

and the student, as a -- individualistic type, with his own self-determination very much stressed.

3

In this battle, this wasn't easy to gain access to these youth groups. They were very suspicious. And they said the leader has the say. And the -- the allegiance was between the -- such a boy of 20 or 21, and his 14-, 15-, 16-, 17-, 18-year-old gang or however you may call it, I mean. Soldiers, privates.

And so I was faced with this very problem in a -- in a -- experimental way of the place for a man who thinks in terms of more than one generation, facing a group that is loyal, and is alive, and is very powerful, and very vigorous, because of its immense loyalty to the guiding spirit, to the leader. And I had a public discussion of -- with some of the more dogmatic leaders who didn't want me to intrude into their work, and didn't want -- open their youth movement to these mixed camps, in which of course, farmers and workers having no such ideas of group allegiance to leaders, you see, would have fallen in such different germs of disintegration, perhaps.

4

This public discussion already was go- -- going on at a time when I knew very little about the James family, certainly. I knew a little bit of William James. I knew nothing of his father. I lived in Germany, and yet I wrote an article which is called -- which I found the other day, "The Polychronic -- Polychrony of a Nation," of a people.

"Polychrony" means many times, you see, the -- the plurality of times, of ages to -- repre- -- present all the time in a people. And I said, all real problems of history are polychronic. There is -- or pleiochronic, you see. They're pleiochron- -- there is more than one time.

Pleio means "more than one," you see.

You have heard of Pleistocene, perhaps in -- in geology, you see, which also means when there was the most of it, the most of -- of -- of -- of something.

XVII

1

Well, whether you call it "polychronic" or "pleiochronic," it is the same problem of the pluri-aged, which has faced this country, as I told you, since 1685, and I think it is -- gives me a kind of -- of clear title to my special interest. I haven't learned this when I came to America, but I have learned it only here in a specific American application.

It is the universal problem of mankind, and it is the specific problem of our own time, gentlemen.

2

Everything in our own time appears to be of this time itself, only. The only group of people that has to take a beating in this country, by poor treatment, by terrible salaries, are the teachers. The teachers are clearly located between the generations, because they have to hand over to one generation what the other generations have achieved. And they have to enable them to get into their own -- into their own shape, with the help of the achievements of others.

That is, of course, belittled here, because Mr. Dewey has tried to tell you, and all his teachers' colleges in the country that the chi- -- it is the child who makes himself, and the teachers are just standing by and -- and taking out the handkerchief and dry-cleaning your noses, blowing your noses.

3

But idea of a female schoolteacher I think doesn't hold water here in -- in any college situation. You will admit that what I tell you is not of your own doing. It just comes to you. You may reject it. You may not listen to it, you may laugh at it. But it comes to you from another age, you see.

And its there-ness can only serve you if you admit that there is something outside your own age which is necessary to your own existence. Otherwise my whole offering here makes no sense, because I cannot share the experiences of your own generation. And you cannot share directly the experience of my generation, you see.

4

But we have to agree on something, you see, that goes on through the generations. I have to divest myself of the two special types of my time, you see, but you will have to do the same about your own specialty, or we can't get together.

XVIII

1

And I mention these articles. They appeared in a -- in a magazine of which I am still very proud. I wasn't the founder of it, but I was one of the -- the machinists, so to speak. I brought the people together who did edit it.

It was edited by one Roman Catholic, by one Protestant, and by one Jew. And the three together called the magazine, "*The Creature*," *Kreatur*, *creatura*. And they said that the creature of man was that he was a temporal being.

2

And so my article, you see, was one of the programmatic articles, because I said man only begins to be man if he is aware of his -- you see, his problem that the temporalities of your and my must -- must be dovetailed in some form. How, that - - we may look into this. That may be open to question.

But man begins only if he is not only of his own age, because he has to be spoken to, and he has to be spoken into a life, you see, of the race.

3

And therefore, life begins not at 40, gentlemen, but life begins when you meet your grandchildren and your grandparents, spiritually. And never -- it doesn't believe - - before. Life doesn't believe -- begin at 40. It doesn't begin at 18. It doesn't begin at your birth. You're quite mistaken.

That what we call human life, and not animal life, begins when one tone -- your name, "John," "Bill" -- enters you as coming from far away, and when you begin to believe and hope that there will be somebody who listens to you, and your grievances and your complaints to carry them on and to redeem you in the future, whatever you have to complain of.

4

Once you enter, you see, this relation between the ages that have gone before, and begin after -- with you, you see, then you be -- come to life, to what is deserved to be called life. Everything else before is just existence, vegetation, animal nature. It is certainly subconscious, unconscious. It is this side of good and evil. It isn't life. It is just the lower life.

XIX

1

So my suggestion is, gentlemen, that in the James family, already in 1865, that which is facing every family today in the whole Western world has been lived out with great clearness and precision, as a problem of the age: how does a child spiritually come into its independent existence, and yet not sacrifice, or lose, you see, or gainsay that which his fathers have spiritually, you see, created.

2

That is a paradox, and you can't get out of it, by forgetting it.

And it is before us at this moment. And that's the whole crisis in America.

That's Mr. McCarthy. That's everything we are talking about today, you see.

3

What is the relation of your freedom, you see, and of tradition? But as you -- say "freedom and tradition," it's a very murky -- I mean, a moldy thing. I'm not -- the words have been talked -- overtalked too much. But if you understand that it is the question of how one age is embedded between the other ages which we have to affirm as being ages, too, in their own right and with full glory, you see, then you see that it is not a question of some abstract noun, "freedom and tradition," for which I cannot wax warm, you see.

But it is the question of the full stature of man in his own generation as soon as he accepts "generation" by definition as something that has to be followed by generations to come, and that has been preceded by generations that have gone on before, so that generation is always only inside a sequence.

4

Now I think we have already for today made one big, successful assumption that in any generation, the experience of other-ness, of particularity, of being specific, of differing from the past comes first. Every one generation should wake up with the feeling: we are different. And it's the second discovery that they discover that in the very feeling that we are different, we are identical with all other generations, because all generations recognize themselves only by this feeling of distinction.

And that isn't the whole problem.

XX

1

The problem is: how this distinction, you see, can be reconciled to our identity. But we have already reversed, gentlemen, the naturalistic, evolutionistic conception of a straight line in history. History is not a straight line. It is a jump, and then a bridge -- bridging-back of the gulf.

2

I always compare it to this, because you see, if a man goes into the mountains, for example, and is confronted with a torrent -- I had to solve this problem once -- how does he build a bridge? Not by standing this side of the torrent and then beginning to build the bridge. One man has to get to the other side, and then you can begin to build the bridge, you see, by ropes, and by beams that you throw over. You cannot build a bridge from one side, only. You have to get across by a jump, or by fording, or by -- on horse- -- or horse swimming through.

What -- however you do it, or you have to go upstream where it is more lenient, you see, and not so wild, and then come back down again to the point where you feel the bridgehead should be made. But whatever it is, a bridge has to be built from both sides, or you can't build it.

3

So the idea of ours has been so mechanical that you think time is just a patching-on one year after another. This is not the case, because years are abstractions. They are mechanical. They are a clockwork. Life never is -- happens in this way.

There must be a new entity that lives a little bit longer than the father and the grandfather.

4

This entity has to be first assured of its independence, of its own character, of its quality of belonging to its own age, and then after it has received the security and reassurance that it is somebody in his -- its own right, you see, then it will also harken to the burden that it has to carry on, the sound that had to be -- has to be spoken through the ages.

XXI

1

I think that this is such an important discovery that I should stress this; although on the other hand, if you really look on it, is very trivial, because you know this from your own family experience. But unfortunately, gentlemen, science has made such inroad on the soundness on your brain, that you don't know it, you really believe in the mechanism of time and mechanical time that A and B are connected automatically.

They are not.

2

You, as a brute animal, would kill your father. You would forget him after a year, as all -- animals do. If you go to ani- -- into the animal world, the son does mate with his mother, because after a year, the -- the filly or the -- the calf has forgotten who the mother was, although the mother nurses them, you see. No memory.

There is therefore, gentlemen -- old age is only horror to the young in the animal world. It holds no promise.

3

And this is a summary of this, gentlemen, for today: the fact that we remember the past means that memory is a promise for our own future.

There comes in again this regeneration term, this renaissance term. You see, we kept only an interest in remembering the past, because it must still mean something in our own future. As mere memory, we should forget our parents, or grandparents. There's no reason why you should remember sentimentally something that is just bygone, you see.

Let the dead bury the dead, the New Testament says.

4

The only question is, "What is dead?" you see. But the dead must bury the dead, and you go on to new things. But are your parents dead? Well, physically, they may -- have to die before you, you see. But spiritually, that's the question, you see.

What is dead?

XXII

1

This we have to decide in every generation, by a decision, and not by an autom- -- automatic evolution.

Evolution is utter nonsense for human beings. It is perfectly useless, because either it's too much to carry if it is just going on, you see, or there's nothing to carry.

The whole question is: how much of tradition do we have to carry, and how much do we have to reject? The amount of freedom, gentlemen, and the amount of tradition, the amount of sonhood, and the amount of independence have to be re-determined. And you can only do it by saying independence is first, and interdependence is second.

2

And as you know, that's the great lesson now preached to the Americans in general in history, you see. Independence in 1776 and interdependence by the famous law, Number 1776.

You know which law this was, which bill in Congress, which had the number, the fateful number 1776? And I think you should remember it.

3

It is -- I'm sorry it is forgotten now.

That was the famous lend-lease proposition by which we entered the war on the side of the Allies, that had the number 1776. And it meant that in 1941, when this bill was passed, it was -- I never forget it -- it was March -- it was very fateful in my own life, this date -- I was in Washington at that day and something was decided in my own life, too -- that was the -- when this -- the -- this bill was passed in Congress.

4

It meant that we have gone back on our Declaration of Interde- -- Independence, you see, and had entered a period of interdependence. America had come of age. The young American had to assert, you see, their being an age by themselves.

And since 1940 it is, so to speak, common knowledge, that this isn't the whole story.

Can you see this?

So let's stop here.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Testing 1, 2, 3, 4; 1, 2, 3, 4. Testing. Philosophy 57, October 13th, 1953.)

I

1

... don't know how much more important the half is, compared to the whole.

So I had half of you assembled downstairs, and we had a wonderful time. At least, I had. And so that's why the other people have to wait.

2

As to the report of today, I have only -- Mr. {Bain}, would you be good enough to read it?

[tape interruption]

3

... which has already occurred in America in the James family.

I think it isn't easy for you to see what I'm driving at. I'm trying to put your eye on a s- -- turn your eye toward the spot which usually is not seen, a spot at which, from the tree of life, a new generation springs.

We look -- if we look into the newspaper -- into the spirit of the times; and therefore the title of the newspaper is the "Times," the New York Times. And then we go onto another time and say, "It is another time."

4

The issue today for the whole of the human race is: is there a community of the times into which every one time has to be planted and rooted? As you remember, the upshot of the la- -- whole -- all I have tried to say in the last lecture has been that we discovered the strange rhythm of history, that independence comes before interdependence. And it is contrary to the scheme, which thinks that we first keep what we have, and then add.

II

1

Now, in real human history, we forget what we have, and we turn to it after we have become assured of our own individuality, and our own full life. Every generation is a secret society, gentlemen. Every generation is a secret society, with its own idiom, its own slang, its own habits, and it's quite impenetrable to any other generation.

You wouldn't be understood by Em- -- Ralph Waldo Emerson if he entered this room today. Your mores, the way you make love, et cetera -- that's your private, temporary secret, as it -- the habits of his time would look funny to you. And you have to affirm this.

Every generation must first live its own life.

2

The thing becomes tragic, gentlemen, if this, your own life, is not only the starting point for the full life. The life of your own time is not the full life to be led.

Most of you believe this, however. That would be the purely secular mind, because the secular mind says that the life in your generation is all you have to live. But the mys- -- mystery, of course, of a good conscience, and of a directed life, and of a successful life is to be succeeded into.

3

You can only be loved by a posterity if you have something to be loved for. And what is it, what people are loved for?

The sacrifice of their own will. People are loved who have been able -- to go beyond their own temporary will.

The -- Beau Brummell -- you who that was, Beau Brummell? Who knows who Beau Brummell was? Would you tell them, please?

(Well, {just very briefly}, he was a -- an actual, historical figure who was known for his good looks and his charming ways {and the} way he dressed, so on. He became to symbolize -- or came to symbolize, that is, that {elderly} man which always pretends to be what Beau Brummell actually was. { } historical figure.)

How do we call this in America, this type?

{I'm not really certain}.)

4

Well, we have a play -- we have a play that represents the modern type of Beau Brummell very well. *The Man Who Came to Dinner*, don't you think? Man about town. That's what it amounts to, only more refined, as in England, it would be more refined.

I mean, the dress is more perfect, and everything is more, even -- transparent. When you see the man, it's all in -- within 24 hours, so to speak, his excellency, and his distinction.

Now such a man can be remembered as a caricature or as an oddity, but he cannot be succeeded into, or cannot be loved.

He can be imitated.

III

1

Gentlemen, the question then before the house is:

in our days how an independent generation, without loss of character and individuality can enter the interdependence of generations, the interaction of generations, and therefore succeed and be succeeded.

Let me today formulate this in two other ways.

2

I ran into the report or reminiscences of an -- sculptor's wife, a Mrs. French, who has written a very charming book on her reminiscences, and she mentions Robertson James, the brother of William James, and Henry James the novelist, and the son of old Henry James, and she says that in her estimation, Robertson James, who never wrote a book, was by far the most brilliant of all the children of William -- of Henry James, Sr., which I think is very much im- -- of some importance to us, you see, in this connection, you see, of looking at this point where the tree of James family splits into father and sons.

3

Now we had already said that the unique character of the James family rests on the fact that Mr. James brings into his home the universal church, day and night, that he preaches the Gospel, that he is his own church and minister at home. And therefore, gentlemen, what I'm saying to you is not a solution of a carnal nature in your own family, or in my family, because ordinary men do not bring the whole church universal to their luncheon table, or their dinner or breakfast table.

What I'm telling you is: the spirit of one time as connected with the spirit of another time. It is not the flesh of one family generation, as the flesh in a -- and the flesh in another family generation. The unique character of the James family is in this:

that Mr. James, Sr., when he spoke, was absolutely nothing but the mouthpiece, you see, of the pulpit, of the Church, of the sacraments, of the Gospel in his living room.

4

You will admit, that we all, who have work to do outside the house, you see, cannot afford this luxury.

IV

1

So please do not confuse the question of a purely physical descent in -- from one generation into the next -- from the eternal question: how the spirit in one generation can be transmitted into the, you see, the hearts and ears of another generation.

2

You must, to- -- therefore, so to speak, in the James family see a unique constellation.

Solutions in history gentlemen, which then can be followed and -- and redeemed, and respected, and quoted, as I tried to do this solution -- bring into your life as a real solution, have of course a kind of perfection and -- which makes them apt to be examples, but which also in this sense cannot be repeated.

3

Your relation to teachers, to your parents, to ministers, to religion, to history books, to biographies, to people you come to know in life, you see, altogether may be able to match this -- what in this one case was allowed to happen between one father only

and all his children, because here was one man who, in the middle of the 19th century, was still in the absolute intimacy of the tradition of the Church, as nobody today really has it, outside the Bible Belt, and on the other hand, he had already the heresy of saying that the Church had to come down to earth in every life, and wasn't dependent on a Sunday service, you see, or on a liturgy, or on any denominational tie-up.

4

So you see, what I'm trying now to warn you against is not to see why the James family has this special quality. A hundred years ago, every family in the world had still strict religious authority in one way or the other. There was prayer, you went to the services, and neither Jew nor Christian were emancipated.

But the -- the -- the -- you had to belong to an organized religion. If you say today "organized religion," it is always second-best. It isn't -- filling everything.

V

1

Even if you have Catholic tennis grounds, the tennis ground is -- wins out against the label as being a "Catholic" tennis ground or "Catholic" swimming pool. Nobody seriously believes that the water is more Catholic than the water in which you can swim.

And this whole problem today of the Church is to run after all our secular activities and then to -- to make them into de- -- something denominational just doesn't work. I mean, because everybody feels that we live in a universal society, and a -- a greater universe. And no denomination can cover it totally. It's just impossible.

2

The -- the Anglicans, for example, have struggled very hard to keep their -- their tradition here as -- Episcopalians in this country. But when you read the constitution of the Episcopal Church -- who is an Episcopalian, anybody? Well, if you read your constitution, the mainstay is this purely democratic constitution, which is an imitation of the American Constitution, the way they vote, you see, the -- how the bishops and the house of the -- of the lower clergy and the laity, because it's irresistible here that you do everything in the parliamentary way.

Whereas in the -- in -- in England, you see, they never have, as you know, gotten rid of the authority of Parliament to rule them. You can't have a Book of Common

Prayer changed in England to this day without Parliament, you see, allowing it. And so the Anglican Church to this day in England is different indeed.

Here it has just become a part of the democratic way of life in this country.

3

So the faith in democracy is stronger than the -- in the ways, you see, the historical ways of the Church.

Well, you find this in -- everywhere, I mean. You find it in Catholicism, and Protestantism. Don't believe for a minute that the -- the ways of this country haven't had the power to submerge, so to speak, everything that is purely divisive, and purely denominational.

4

Without going into this, I still say once more: the James family, at a moment which was the last moment in American history, in 1865, when -- and before the country went absolutely secular, as the basis of its education, the basis of its press, the basis of its politics, the basis of its scientific search, there is still this one man, Henry James, Sr. And he sent into the world this group of youngsters. And as I told you, this man Robertson, who never wrote a line, yet is highly representative of his children, they all had a silver tongue. They all feared and beloved for their incredible eloquence.

VI

1

What makes a man eloquent is therefore one of the questions we'll have to answer in the -- this story.

Nobody can be eloquent by himself. Eloquence is a response. You can only be eloquent if you have -- we are allowed to respond to the stream of speech, of eloquence, of garrulity that is around you.

Eloquence is response. Nobody is eloquent who is not in some reciprocity.

2

Now the family table of the Jameses therefore to this day -- you can, so to speak, realize it in their books, in their letters, in their collected letters -- outshines the

eloquence of the pulpit and the sermons of the clergymen in Mr. Henry James, Sr.'s generation.

3

So you have the strange thing, which is an historical -- great historical law, gentlemen, that the most heretical form of an institution can, at the decisive moment, outlast the more orthodox, because it already has, so to speak, made contact with the future -- by {laicalizing}, by all the liturgy, the sermons, the chorales, the hymns, the thoughts, the prayer, of the Psalms, of the Church into dinner talk, into breakfast talk, into the witty and cordial exchange, and the affectionate speech between parents and children.

Mr. James represents heresy. He is a heretic with regard to official religion. No doubt about it. He wants to be one. He's a heretic.

4

That is, he proclaims a way which in some way does away with the organized church. He denies the Church.

That -- we can't go into this in greater detail, but perhaps at the end of the course, we may be able to read some of his texts.

He says this in the paper, you remember the -- have you read my paper on this, at this time? Well, I'm quoting his -- his words on Jesus, when he speaks, you see, that it was an unspeakable sully of Jesus, that the Church got hold of Him, you see, and deified Him, you remember?

So he's a heretic -- no -- no -- we shouldn't mince any words and not try to save his soul in any orthodox way. But a heretic may, at a moment when the whole institution dies, bear fruit outside.

VII

1

When the Roman Senate -- to give you another example -- when Roman patricians had kept the law under cover for a long time, the {plebeians} rebelled, as they would have riot- -- they did riot, and they seceded to the sacred mountain. And Rome wouldn't have been Rome without making peace between the old patrician tradition and the new {plebeian} tradition.

2

You have heard of the patricians in Rome, and the plebs. These two words, perhaps, may have struck you and that's very important, the way, again -- can an older group can be reconciled to the younger group, and the tradition go on fruitfully, you see, or must the next generation just break away -- the plebs, you see.

And they w- -- have nothing to do with the patricians.

3

Now it so happened that Cneius Flavius, a -- a man of rank, had taken pity and sympathy with the plebs before the riots started, and had taken the law out of the sanctuary of the patricians and had written it on publi- -- had published, so to speak, these laws, the texts of which had been kept as the sacred reserve of the peers, so to speak, of the realm.

It would be as tho- -- though the House of Lords only knew the common law England, you see, and the House of Commons had not been allowed to read the text, the old decisions, you see.

And he broke this taboo, Cneius Flavius did, and so Roman law was allowed to go on in traditional ways, because his publication of the law, his acting as a heretic in the old order, you see, had come just about in time to make the {plebeians}, after they had read it, to say, "Well it isn't as bad as we feared it would be, but as long as it was kept a secret," you see. "Now we see, that we can very well continue this -- in this line, you see, because these laws make sense."

4

You will find everywhere, gentlemen, that timely reform, although considered heresy at its own time, can save the peace between one generation and the next.

VIII

1

For example, there is one, beautiful monastery in Germany, the {Komburg}, near -- in {Württemberg}, one of the most beautiful Romanesque churches you can find there, where 30 years before the Reformation, the canons declared they would break the law of -- of celibacy and allowed each other to mar- -- get married.

Now, that happened in 1483, when in 1517 the Reformation started, the people on the {Komburg} were -- remained unmolested by the new Protestants, because they

said, "Well, they have gone halfway already voluntarily, and we won't interfere with their possessions. We won't destroy the pictures and the statues in this monastery, because these canons have already admitted that marriage is a normal state."

And so this monastery was allowed to continue 300 more years peacefully. And it's still standing undestroyed, and one of the very few places in Europe where neither the Reformation nor the French revolution have, so to speak, cut off the noses of the statues, which they have, as you know, in France, in the most devastating manner, during the French revolution, because in France they had not reformed for even 300 more years.

They haven't even to this day.

2

So the mob went out and finding no heretical courage inside the Catholic Church did it wholesale and they broke away.

And you have today this curse in France that they only have left and right, and they have not sons and fathers. They have not the two-generation problem, but they have just one world and the other world in constant opposition. That's why the Ameri- -- the French mind is just very logical and very witty, but so absolutely sterile.

3

Because the heretic -- if you see now what I mean -- in the case of -- Henry James, you see, can now represent to you a form of Church and Christianity, and Scripture and Biblical authority, you see, which you may not grant to the pope, or to the Presbyterians -- Church, or to the Episcopalian Church, you see, or to any organized religion, because you say, "My higher life cannot be dictated to by organized religion."

But as an example of the good life, Mr. James has divested himself of any such authority, and he just asks you, "Don't you want that? Can you live without me?" so to speak, you see.

4

So the heretic at this moment represents the Church as a lovable institution, without authority.

And that is the great aspect of this one side of the James family.

The older generation, by having become heretical, cannot claim any authority. It can only be accepted by you because you love it, because you have to love it, because it makes itself lovable.

IX

1

Now to be lovable, you see, is not a question of authority, of right, of law, you see, and order, but is a question of your surrendering your heart to it, and not your brain.

You see the difference?

2

So my appeal is then made to you in the same manner as Henry James did to his sons, because why am I entitled to say all these things?

Because religion, Christianity, the faith, the Scriptures, prayer, the presence of God did not come to the children of Henry James in the form of any authority. They only came as the outpouring of the free spirit of his father -- their father. And that is -- something magnificent.

3

The father dared -- the father risked his own -- whole existence on the basis of free love.

And here the word "free love" is in order.

Free love for married people is ridiculous, when it is opposed to -- to marriage, because any real love wants to lead to -- to marriage, or to -- eternal union. And however, to be loved for your relation to your maker -- that can only be done if you forfeit all claims to authority.

The father did not claim that his sons had to believe because he believed. He did not claim that he -- he should join any church, because he had no -- found no fault with Christianity, you see. But he let them completely free, but there was this testimonial, you see, his witnessing.

4

And so now you see that the -- the family really represents something very special. You read any text that comes out of this family, and you will find that these people were flooded, the children, with this constant flow of eloquence from their father's mouth in the family. It's a family pulpit. It's a family's gospel, so to speak. The -- the Gospel preached in the family.

That's unique.

X

1

You may get Mrs. Beecher Stowe, or you may get a great minister doing this at home, but he still has his other pulpit. He still does his best for his congregation, you see, or with -- inside the church. Not here. This man had no other outlet. The occasions in which he could give a lecture or a speech outside the family were very few. And then he was a mainstay, where his own friends, you see, members -- assistant members, so to speak, of his family.

2

And now, also let me underline this.

Such a family as the James family, of course, does not consist of the people born into this by right of blood ties. But it contains the friends just as much, and the correspondents. A family, as the James family has happened to be, is of course a spiritual organ, an organ of spiritual life.

It is a spiritual institution. It is not an apartment story. It is not a story of two parents and two children squeezed into 45 square feet of room, with a kitchen and a refrigerator, what you call a "family apartment." That's all a total misunderstanding of modern architecture. Any family today is -- is needed, because we need house parties. And we need house parties, because the Holy Spirit today cannot be hoped to exist at Cap- -- on Capitol Hill, or in John's -- St. John's Cathedral.

3

They are too big, gentlemen. If you have no longer commu- -- rural churches, and you have centralized schools -- no district schools -- and everything, if we have 3,000 schools in Dartmouth instead of 400 in normal times down to 1918, for the 170 years, what do you expect? Do you think you can have the Holy Spirit in any of the groupings of such size?

It's impossible. You have mob rule.

4

So the family today is nothing but the normal bearer of the good tidings of the spiritual life. And you have to make it into this.

You can't make your wife happy if you have no guests. And you can't have guests if you only regard them with television. There has to be something to be talked about. You have to make peace in your family. You have to give your guests something that strengthens them when they go out again. And you must give them cause to come to you to receive this fortification, in their distress, and in their doubts.

And you are -- this television business is just one more attempt of the manufacturers of the spirit of the times to settle once for all that there shall be no Holy Spirit in which the academics -- crowd, of course, heartily joins, because the academic spirit today in this country is a secular spirit, is the spirit that wants to destroy the communion with our forefathers and says, "They were superstitious. They were just dated. They were antiquated." And so they write books about the last Puritan.

XI

1

In the -- in the -- I have to stress this, gentlemen, because I -- I didn't when I began talking about these things, because to me it is normal that you and I, when we meet, speak to each other, comfort each other, and therefore are meeting in one spirit, either of despondency or of courage, or what it is, but certainly what brings us together is not just our physical needs.

But when I hear you talk, you really think of the family just as satisfying material needs: sex, and hunger and prestige, and security.

2

Well, gentlemen, the James family knew nothing, because in this man's decision not to become a minister -- Henry James, Sr., you see -- there was involved this strange vow, probably never articulated, that he certainly wouldn't go back, behind the ministry in an organized church, but he would prove that the real spirit could be inherited better outside the organized church. So I give you Henry James as an example of a superminister of the spirit, who consecrated his home, not because he couldn't become a minister for believing less, but he couldn't become a minister for believing more than you have to believe in an organized ministry, when you only sermonize or say Mass mor- -- in the morning from 8 to 9.

3

And he said, "But I have to witness to this totally, with my whole life."

There is no distinction between weekday and Holy Day, and that you may sum up as his main heresy, that Mr. Henry James, Sr., said there is no such division between a sacred place called "the church," and a desecrated place called "the private home." Religion is neither private nor public. It is openly confessed.

4

And gentlemen, in this point, I want you to see -- we come now to a description in -- of the solution problem in the James situation, in the James creation.

You are killed and murdered by your simply dividing private and life. The best of you, you think, is private. And the -- that which you will stand for is called "public." But gentlemen, God hasn't created a private world and a public world. And he hasn't created private law and public law. That's all nonsense.

He has created us openly, in His image.

And whether you live in the family, or whether you live in the -- under government orders, or you live in the -- on the planet -- in the desert Sahara, you are -- lie open to Him, absolutely open. And He knows nothing of this division of private and public.

And religion, of course, is killed in this country, because it is said to be man's private affair.

XII

1

Then there is no religion.

As soon as religion is -- if you know ahead of time that religion is private, it has been abolished. Because if religion is one thing, it is the permeating force, you see, that -- under which public and private life has to be brought. And by saying that religion is private, you have denied that you have any.

Then it is just -- well, it's uninteresting. It is not only belittled, but is in fact abolished.

2

Now Mr. James is so important. He is a heretic. He challenges the whole organized church from pope to moderator of a Baptist meeting, because he says,

"Twenty-four hours a day I breathe, I try to breathe in the -- in the atmosphere of the Holy Spirit."

It is this pervading force that makes him a unique fellow in your eyes, because you can think of a man who leaves the Church and still believes, but then you always imagine that he treats his { } as private utterances, to be kept private.

3

Now gentlemen, may I say then that Henry James has not, in 1865, taken the decisive step into the secular era, because he has not allowed his home to be degraded into a private affair. It wasn't his private home. And he has made his children into public agents of the spirit, by transmitting him this task of translating his gospel into the spirit of his -- their own time and this language and the eloquence of secular speech.

4

To write a novel, to write a letter, to write a book, to make -- crack a wit for the children of Henry -- of -- the Henry James father, has always meant to be -- to speak openly, and not privately. That is, to speak with the whole man.

And may the chips fall as they may, as we say today, when we are willing to take the consequences, you see, of what we say. When you speak openly, you forget whether this is a private room or a public room, and only such words of you will bear fruit.

XIII

1

The power of the spiritual life depends just as the power of creation in -- of children on your willingness to take the consequences.

That we mean by "open." It doesn't mean shameless, you see. It doesn't mean exhibitionist, it doesn't mean naked, but it means open so that you do not regulate the truth, and the consequences. You are willing to let it affect others as far as the spirit may move others. That is open, you see.

2

Whereas "private" means I know that nobody will take it out of the walls of this room. And then you have scuttled it, and you are imprisoned -- have imprisoned the spirit into the walls of a -- padded walls of a telephone booth, where you don't want the sound to get beyond the padded walls.

This is the curse of your idea of privacy, gentlemen. It's the same as -- as birth control.

3

The children are born only when the parents are willing to take the consequences. That doesn't mean that anybody is shameless enough to invite other people to look at their making love. They are just as discreet and private as the others.

But when the walls are broken and the child is born, they are willing to take the consequences. That's the difference between private marriage and open marriage, you see. If you are openly married, the fruits of your intercourse are legitimate, you see. In your private love affair, there can -- may be -- must be no fruits, because it is only privately -- private as long as nobody knows that you have lived together as {husband and wife}.

4

Can you see this?

XIV

1

Gentlemen, this is something quite far-reaching.

I want you to understand that the institution of the home of the James family in some ways is more important for you to understand that the relation -- than the relations of Church and state today, because you don't know what Church is and what state is, today, because you make the division of open and private. You are so sure that a man can take his own life privately, and are so sure that he can -- that he can control and check his offspring by birth control, that you do not see that the problem we are asked in the full life is:

to know ourselves as the link in all life.

2

When it is a link in all life, then anything we do, from shitting, to having sexual intercourse -- a loving intercourse with a woman, to thinking, to speaking out, is a part of a process in which we do not sit at the switch, and we -- cannot control the effects.

And that's why the Bible says two things:

by their fruits, ye shall know them;

and judge not, lest ye be judged.

Because any one of us knows that many times he -- his utterances and his deeds should not have -- take effect. He's afraid, of course, you see, that he be judged, because once you know that you are living in the open, and there are no secrets, because there is only one life, one territory completely containing us and working through us, then we are all deficient in grade.

Many of our acts, you see, we condemn -- would condemn ourselves, so we shall not judge anybody else, because we know that for one successful act, there are 99 unsuccessful and deficient acts in our own life.

3

Now you have to balance these two utterances.

Judge not, lest ye be judged;

and the other: *that only by their fruits we shall know them.*

In order to see the problem of a man like Henry James, who is satisfied of handing over the best he is possessed by, to his children and to leave it with them to bear fruit, without saying, "You have to be members of my church," without saying, "You have to share my convictions," you see, without trying to convert them, you see, but only trying to divert them, so to speak. Trying to entertain them.

Trying to enter into a conversation with them, and make the -- his side of the conversation so overpowerful that the echo, the response, the answer in some way must come up to this {strength}.

4

It is the vigor of the father's appeal that is the only investment and the only certainty that he has that the echo must be equally important, and appealing, and fruitful.

XV

1

Can you see the difference between a transmission of content and a sowing openly into the ground and saying { } must die, the { } can be reborn.

That's the ultimate in faith.

Can you see this? It isn't the same word that he wanted to hear from his children repeated, but he wanted to have the vigor of his word, you see, repeated, re- -- reborn.

2

So, the faith, gentlemen, in the Henry James generation, is of such an ultimate, extreme character, that he doesn't want to have his word of faith come back to him, but a new word of the same degree of faith, isn't it?

3

Now gentlemen, here you have something of a perpetual character, which the Christian Church has never lived before, neither have the Jews, neither have Mohammed and Islam, nor have the Chinese. It's an incredible appeal to the interaction of generations, that the older man has said,

"My inspiration is true, and I will believe in the truth and my inspiration, and I will feel rewarded if my sons -- sons say something quite different, but say it with the same enthusiasm and the same vigor."

4

Will you kindly note this, gentlemen?

That is something you have never read about and never heard, and it is still -- far in the future.

XVI

1

The problem of Henry James, the heretic, was not to find affirmation of his tenets in the -- by the younger generation, but his -- his task was much more faithful, and

much more inspired, and much more daring. He wanted to have the same vigor, the same devotion, the same lack of lackadaisical degeneracy which he represented, and he -- this was his reward and the echo: that he did give birth to Henry and -- and William James, who are the most eloquent English writers of their generation.

2

That isn't the whole story, but I'm only trying to develop it at this moment from his heretical situation, from his -- not his -- so much his point of view but his -- his point of action, because it wasn't his point of view. He became aware of what he had done only late in life.

He made a decision not to become a minister.

3

His negative decision was consciously done, you see, in his youth. Then as a man of independent means, he had the fabulous courage to concentrate on creating this family conversation. And it is, you see, with your damned idea of privacy, very difficult for me to give you the respect for this man's creation as though it was more important than the crea- -- creating {Socony} Vacuum, or the Empire State Building.

4

In my mind, the lifelong action of Mr. Henry James, Sr., is much more important than the founding of any corporation in the United States, be it bathtubs, or soap, or what-not. You can give me Procter and -- Gangster, and who -- not, I mean. It doesn't make -- it doesn't make any difference. All these corporations also had to be founded, and people had to give faith and trust to them and -- for generations. This -- this -- they are producing our soap. All right.

XVII

1

But Henry James invested in something quite new, incorporating faith, pure and simple. It's also incorporation, in the spirit of a family, and daring his children to forget every word that he has said -- had said, but not forgetting his spirit.

Forgetting every word that he had said. That he had to do, because he was a heretic.

2

You ca- -- no heretic, you see, can ask from anybody else to be orthodox, because if -- since he defied the Church and the Church fathers, here was this father of fleshly children who had defied the fathers of the Church. And therefore, he had to pay the penalty.

3

Now the penalty is, however, much more complicated than you think it is, you see. The penalty was that he couldn't ask for allegiance and adherence to his faith, to his formulated, articulated faith.

If I reject St. Augustine, and the pope, and Luther, you see, and everybody else, then of course I would be ridiculous if I said, "From now on, you all have to believe in me, Henry James," you see, because anybody -- can only ask for what he does himself, and therefore, after Christianity -- no heretic can found a church. A heretic cannot found the Church because he has himself desecrated the Church and cried it down and said, "It is -- there is no church for me, well, then there can be no church for others."

4

But this isn't a simple solution, gentlemen.

The reward of the loving heretic, of the faithful heretic, of the inspired heretic is that he may sow the seed in another man's heart to love as much as he, to be inspired as much as he, and to hope as much as he, and in this sense, you see the strange purification of faith in such a life, you see.

Not what I say is what I have the right and the privilege to hand over to the next generation, you see, but the fact that I believe, and that I speak with full conviction, and that I put it in the open, and cast the bread on the water and let it reach, you see, a -- work and be effective as far as I can make it effective, you see, something very different from selling a commodity, you see, in a described -- -- fashion, you see, of a dogmatic statement.

Can you see the distinction? It i- -- no?

XVIII

1

Then please ask the question. It is not right for you to sit there and --

(I can't formulate it, but -- I've been trying { }, I think. I can't formulate the question { }.)

But you do see that it is a problem?

(No. I don't see that there is a problem.)

Well, do you come -- if I may ask this question -- from any background where Church has played a part, or a denomination?

(No.)

It hasn't.

2

Well, still you would understand that a chemist wants to teach you chemistry, you see. And he thinks certain things in chemistry are in accordance with the state of the science at this moment. And he wants you not to believe anything that is dated and antiquated. So wouldn't he be very anxious to make you reach the standards of chemistry, 1953, and would he not be down on you if you -- if you believed something that was thought to be true in 1889?

Don't you think that would be true? That he would be very anxious to make you see that we had progressed and that in 1953, in chemistry, you had to think such-and-such things to be true? And you must not relapse into some prejudices which people still had in -- in the 19th century in chemistry?

Would you agree to that?

(Yes, but {since have been proven false there}).

3

Well, I haven't. That's what I have assumed. Sure. But there have -- there have many things been proven false. So -- so you have no trouble understanding this.

You understand this ...

(Yes --)

...that a chemist wants you to teach chemistry as of 1953. That's all. So you believe in the duty of a man to teach content, a certain content of tenets that must now be thought to be true, so that this chemist can go on and perhaps progress again and so that 30 years from now you may be the leading chemist. But in order to become the leading chemist in 30 years, he would have -- first have learn from this man what he should know at this moment.

Is that right? Any trouble in -- in seeing this?

(No.)

4

Now Henry James' situation is the opposite, the very opposite.

He's not a chemist, but he wants to assure his children of the presence of a revelation, of a -- of a spirit that guides their steps in every one moment, and tells them to give up chemistry, for example, or to study chemistry.

XIX

1

The decision of becoming a chemist, you see, must also underlie some sanction.

That cannot be the chemist's sanction, because you may have to choose becoming -- between becoming a politician and a chemist, or perhaps emigrate and go -- become a Japanese. As long as these higher decisions, you see, are at stake, the chemist can't help you, because he only knows what can be known.

2

When we make decisions in life, if you want to find out whom you have to marry, you see, there is no -- there is no science about this, because you cr- -- re-create the world at this moment. And here we enter this -- this sanctuary of which the letter of Willi- -- Henry James' father tries to speak to his son.

He says if you believed in creation, you would know that you must be at that moment in the sequence of how to create. The first chemist could not be told by chemists what chemistry was. But he had to cry out, and say,

"There shall be chemistry. And I'll prove it to you."

And nobody believed him and they burned him at stake as a -- as a wizard, as a sorcerer. And he said, "Just the same, there will be another chemist. We'll -- we'll look this -- see this through."

The first chemists actually were burned, I mean, as witches, because they -- you see, alchemy and -- and witchcraft were -- were contaminating each other, of course, and were thrown together in the 16th century.

XX

1

Now gentlemen, there is then, where something is not known to exist, a -- quite a different jurisdiction, and that we call the "realm of creation."

The realm of nature contains all the things you know already to exist.

2

The realm of creation contains the things which you feel must be proven to exist -- like love, or sacrifice, or patriotism, or -- or beauty -- but which you cannot prove to anybody, except by your own deed. It's absolutely -- you can't look it up in an encyclopedia. You can't look it up in a textbook of chemistry. You don't believe this, of course, because it is beyond your experience.

3

You -- in any distressing decision of your life, you will however be exposed to justice. You always have to ask yourself, "Shall I take vengeance on an injustice done in the world, or shall I go beyond and create another -- a new standard of { }, which includes even the -- the doer of the evil?" you see. "So that I take him with me into the new order of things."

"Love your enemy" is always a creative act, you see. It can never be proven, you see, by chemical rules, that it will work. He may bite your hand and he -- he may stab you in the foot.

4

We have a -- I have a dear friend on this campus whose brother was killed in the war in the Pacific, because the brother was a very -- a Christian gentleman, really, and -- and pardoned a Japanese, and had him come out of his -- of his hedgerow there, his-

- how do you call it, this cave and -- no, what's the word?

Trench wel- -- wie?

(Foxhole? A trench?)

Ja - foxhole, and made him prisoner, and then the man murdered him, this Japanese, for this act of forgiveness.

XXI

1

Now when you try to love your enemy, you're always exposed to this danger. Nobody can guarantee that thine enemy knows already that you are going to love him, you see, and before you know it, you may be murdered, as Jesus was betrayed by the people He -- He tried to redeem.

2

That's the secret of the Redemption, that He had to go to the Cross, because He loved His enemies, the people who -- and His enemies were the very people who crucified Him. So He could only show his love by accepting the verdict and going through the ordeal, and -- so that their eyes may be opened after the event.

And you are a Christian when you can say to yourself, "I would have crucified Him, too, but I mustn't," because then you are the -- His enemy who would become His friend.

3

This is very simple, but so simple that you have forgotten it, gentlemen, that to love thine enemy, any act of love is risk -- can always be betrayed. The viper can always wound you mortally in the process.

It isn't true that "love thy enemy" is without risk. It isn't true that thy enemy wants to be loved by you. This is all sentimental sugar-bread which you receive in this country. To love thine enemy is the most dangerous sacrifice of your own life. It is not done by good will, but by great courage. And you can't do it always.

4

It's only when the appointed hour has come that the world wouldn't, so to speak, be able to survive if at this moment not one man would love his enemy, you see. It's always a creative act which is added to the nature of things.

XXII

1

You cannot ask all Americans to love the Russians. You cannot ask all the Russians to love the Americans. But I'm quite sure that it is very decisive that one American at this moment goes and loves one Russian. It's very important, but you can't promise him any emoluments.

2

You can't promise him a position in the state department after that. It's -- the -- the easiest prediction is that he'll be slandered and defamed in his own country, and that the Russians will throw him into jail and prison and that he'll die from famine or -- or -- or -- or an infectious disease. But that doesn't mean that he hasn't to create the future.

3

Ten thousand have to -- try to create it, and one will be -- may succeed. That's how risky real life is, gentlemen.

4

You hate to hear this, although you see in -- in -- when you deal with chemicals, and you deal with bacteria, and you deal with anything -- plant life, or animal life -- that there is always the seed of a thousand, and one of them grows.

So it is as risky to live.

(Sir, can we have a break here?)

Of course. I want one very much. Open the window, too.

[Tape interruption]

XXIII

1

...but people only have peace if it has allowed age to come and be reconciled with this spirit, and there is a strange utterance of William James in which this secular mind says he will not have rest before he hasn't made the voice of his father heard.

2

He writes to his wife. Has -- somebody found this letter, by accident in his -- in this volume there?

It's a very wonderful letter by which William James asserts this very faith, that it is not enough to be William James, but that he's only, you see, in peace with the ages that have gone before, if he has made his father's voice heard, too.

So that in addition to age, you see, to be -- being his own -- himself, he has also to give -- make room for this age, towering over his age.

3

You all know an -- an utterance which still can be repeated with some acceptance in this country. When Lincoln died in the -- in the morning, as you know, after the assassination, the secretary of war said -- Stanton, what did he say?

(Now you belong to the ages.)

To the ages.

We belong to the ages when we have become understandable to the next and the previous generation, as well as our own. And as long as we only believe -- belong to our own age, we just haven't done that. We belong to the ages, and otherwise you only belong to your own age.

4

It's all the difference. That is what is im- -- implied in Mr. Stanton's word, and he was truer than he could know at that time. Lincoln belongs to the ages, you see, and we are very different -- indifferent to the poor digestion, and the -- his marital troubles which he had in his own age.

XXIV

1

So we shall call this level, gentlemen, where the ages are connected, a level of universal history.

You belong to the ages when you have entered something, you see, that can penetrate the fog of your -- any one's own time.

Can you see this?

It's stratospheric, so to speak. The fog and the -- the clouds, and the atmosphere of your terrestrial existence is not blinding you to this fact that in the stratosphere, the spirit of Lincoln is still there.

2

Now that was Henry James' father's problem.

And I have been asked a very pertinent question in this connection which you now kindly will repeat. Ja.

(Not I.)

(It was me.)

Oh, it was you. Pardon me. I'm sorry. I'm -- get up and speak. Get up and speak. They can't hear you otherwise.

(My point, Sir, is that a -- that a heretic can't exist as a -- a heretic can't exist first of all in a family. There is no such thing as a heretic when it's the part of a father, that a heretic can only break away from a previous authority. The definition of a heretic is one who -- who places, or substitutes an authority of his own, so that -- of a pre-existing authority, whether it be personal or ideological, and that -- in the case -- although I don't know about William James, but in the case of all other heretics that I have ever studied, it's a man who places his new authority in his own beliefs, and his own private beliefs and breaks away from pre-existing authority.

And take, for instance, music. You can take any of the -- any of the -- the -- the heretics of music like Mozart, or Beethoven, who superimposed their own ideas on a new generation. Now these things are not accepted, as you said, Sir, emotionally or through the spirit -- or through the heart. They're accepted intellectually, and that a heretic cannot transmit his content or his attitudes intel- -- anything except intellectually. Otherwise he's not a heretic. He's a sentimentalist. And he cannot be a {

} theologian.)

3

Well, it's so wonderful, you have learned all these things.

Now, I like you to consider your own situation in real life. And you will find it's much more complicated.

Jesus was a heretic, and He was very orthodox. The -- the ideal is, of course, to be authority and heretic, and free, both. There life only begins. You're only moving on this lower level there, you see. Either-or. That's not your real life. And I prove it to you.

4

I have published an essay, which perhaps I should recommend to your attention: "*Youth and Authority*." "*Youth and Authority*" was published by the Harvard University Press in 1940. And I put the simple question -- we have 287 denominations in America. And all these denominations have created at a certain time by heretics. Or most of them. Just started in this country. And yet they have all asked their children to belong to the same denomination. That's why you have a Society of Friends, and -- you have Quakers to this day, although the children, you see, were left without authority officially. And the Quakers do not claim any authority. But they are -- you have hereditary Quakers, and you have hereditary Baptists, and you have a whole group of people where you know they have been Baptists for 200 years, which is a contradiction in terms.

But there life begins only, Sir, you see. It's too simple, your logic. Your logic is in- -- in- -- unassailable, you see. Either-or. Your own authority or not. It isn't true. The heretics have all had a meri- -- a relative -- a relation to authority. They only attack the authority as established, but they try to purify it, and purified it from their own authority, too.

(But that's exactly what I said. I said { }, that's what I mean by "superimposing their own authority.")

XXV

1

Not superimposing, but only using their authority for pulling down wrong authority, but not standing in the way of righteous authority.

You only see the destructive thing. "Superimposing their own authority," the -- or they have real heresy.

2

Luther did not say that God hadn't spoken through Moses and the Prophets. He didn't say that Christ wasn't in authority. He only said you had to recognize once more Christ's authority.

That isn't superimposing my authority in a positive way, but it is making room for the positive authority which speaks in your heart, my dear man. And that even the pope has to admit that Jean -- Jeanne d'Arc was right against the priests of her time, and that she was an authority, and the priests who burned her was -- were not. And that's good Catholic doctrine.

3

You just -- you don't know the -- even the ABC of Christianity of faith.

It's all here in this country -- it's talked down. What do you think, read, or any orthodox statement about faith, your conscience is still higher, according to Roman Catholic doctrine, than anything the pope says. If your conscience forbids you, you can't do it. It's always super- -- if you call this "superimposed authority" then you don't believe in God.

If God cannot speak in every human heart, then the whole story of Christianity and Judaism is just a fake and a hoax -- if it's only a question of one man's authority against another man's authority.

4

It's a question of divine authority and the sources of divine authority in you and me and every other mortal being.

XXVI

1

And that is a real question, my dear man, and it cannot be decided by your nice and neat logic.

Any mother and any father has to show proof in the education of their children that they are not punishing them wantonly and arbitrarily by superimposed own

authority, but because it is necessary that -- that arbitrarily the child must be spanked. It is necessary. Anyone would have to act in this place, and then you are right parents. If you make it clear to the -- to your child, and I hope you will, that he isn't spanked because the father is just a fool, or moody, but because any man who wants to raise children has a responsibility from God to raise children. And he cannot raise children in any spiritual sense if he doesn't punish them.

They want to be punished. They wait for it. This ridiculous situation in this country at this moment, where the parents -- don't even know this, because they speak of "superimposed authority."

Is it superimposed when a grown-up person has to bring up a little one, with all the means and the might in his power? He has to.

(That's exactly what I'm saying. Henry James was therefore not a heretic to his family.)

2

Oh, you want to limit the use of the word "heretic." Yes, but this is very important to see that he accept, you see -- we are all heretics.

(No father can be a heretic to his son. A son may be a heretic to his father. But once -- he can -- he can change the authority. He can try and alter an authority. He can try and substitute himself.)

You are not seeing what I'm trying to say. Let me -- perhaps I have to be too much down-to-earth with the James family.

3

Gentlemen, so long we have tried to find the divine will in a universal history, or in a universal revelation. Down to 1865, there was a church and you could appeal to it and its -- there was the ...

[Tape interruption]

XXVII

1

...seems very modest to you, and not interesting and you -- most people in this country prefer Mr. Strike with Union Now, or they prefer some tremendous scheme of a World Court or of a United Nations.

But God is very much a concrete creator of direct and special situations. And I assure you, if you look into the problem of the authority of Henry James and William James, you will see that he solved and answered your remark in a very different way, because he didn't treat his children spiritually, as permanent children.

He told them that they would be equals in the realm of the spirit in their own generation. He could not superimpose his authority in his family. And he didn't. He said, "I am a heretic and I want you to be heretics, but you must have still the religious conviction that you stand for creation, for the whole, and not for department of science, and not for department of a school, or of -- teaching, or -- education department, or the department of chemistry.

You haven't understood that he already anticipated your remark and said, "I'm more radical."

2

What's your name?

({Rafelson}.)

Well, then Mr. {Rafelson}. I'm not satisfied with this eternal drawback that parents, after they have been free thinkers for themselves, then have suddenly to impose -- superimpose their authority on their children. That's too much of a -- of a -- of a contradiction, you see.

3

Here is a man, a Dartmouth student. He has cut all the classes and then he goes to his child and says he has to be on -- on time at the dinner table. So the child says, "I cut the dinner table. You cut classes." And I think the child's utterly right, you see.

So Henry James comes about -- Henry James, Sr. -- and says, "My son, I'm perfectly happy as long as he cuts the dinner table out of your schedule for the same good reason for which I have cut out of the Church. But it must be an equally good reason. It mustn't be indifference, it mustn't be misunderstanding, it mustn't be laziness of heart, but if you have such a overpowering reason as have to remain a free man, God bless you."

4

Jesus saw a man working on the Sabbath. That's -- is outside the official Biblical reading. But in the best manuscript in the Gospel, Luke, 5th chapter. You probably

don't know the story, because it's not in our official text, although nobody doubts that it is authentic.

And he saw -- looked at the man and he said to him, "Man, if you do not know what you are doing, you are cursed. But if you know what you are doing, you are blessed."

XXVIII

1

Now here you have the three levels of behavior.

A man who breaks the Sabbath from indifference, laziness, not knowing what he's doing, is cursed, because gentlemen, compared to your childishness, your indifference, your laziness, the law is better. The Sabbath is better than the man who's not on terms with the Sabbath.

For example, that's what this story is about.

But if you have an outstanding, overpowering reason that you say, "The Sabbath is good, but what I'm doing is better," to -- to come to the rescue of a -- of a poor man, at this moment, you see, and thereby leaving the church, the services alone, then you are blessed.

2

So gentlemen, the question of the -- of the heresy or authority is only soluble if you admit three levels of performance:

the individualistic performance, which is haphazardous, from your own mood;

the lawful, traditional performance, which is of long-standing authority;

and the creation of a next performance, which does not deny that it is good to keep the law,

to come at -- to dinner at -- in due time, you see, to attend classes, but which is allowed to enter the scene because you have fully realized the goodness of coming to my class, the necessity of being on time for the luncheon or the dinner at home, but the experience that something bigger is at stake at this moment in the life of the world for which it is good to sacrifice the schedule of the dinner table, or the schedule of this class.

Can you -- can't you see this? This is the human problem, gentlemen.

3

The human problem is never an either-or. It is the problem of the -- the tremendous law, the law of history, that the good is the enemy of the better.

The good is the enemy of the better.

It is never a question of good and evil. Who -- who wants to do evil? I haven't found people who want to do evil; they all just dress it up as good.

4

But I have found innumerable so-called "good" people who prevent the creative life of -- of ever breaking in because they are satisfied with the good.

The good is the enemy of the better.

XXIX

1

Now, the -- the preaching of Henry James, Sr., is -- may be summed up in one sentence: the good is the enemy of the better.

The good is the enemy of the better.

He says, "I {have}, of course, to act as your father. I have to support you. I have to -- you have to sit at my table. But woe to you if you think what I have to say at this table is the best. It isn't. It is all I now can give, but the hour will strike out in which you will have to decide what is the best."

That isn't superimposed authority. That isn't making the heretic into a patriarch in the family.

2

But it is solidly the issue of the ages, gentlemen, how the better can come to pass without denying that good is good.

Can you see the difference?

It's -- you all will have to grow up certain -- grow out -- outgrow certain things which you think are the ultimate in life.

Don't deny them. But say there is something more important and better to be done, you see. Then you will be free. As long as it is a struggle of "this is evil," and you will do good, you will never be able to the very best you can do.

The world as created is good, gentlemen, but it isn't good enough.

3

Therefore, the whole, real battle of history is between good and better. And it is not between evil and good. I mean -- I understand that a man doesn't murder and doesn't kidnap. You have in this -- country, of course, only the constant relapse into full barbarism, I mean, kidnapping this -- this child there, and things. Well, I think that isn't worthy of a debate.

Let this man be executed.

Let this woman be executed.

I won't shed any tear. I have no pity with the Rosenbergs.

4

I do- -- never understood it was a Russian -- a Communist issue, of course, to -- to make the president of this country to make him weaken his position and ask him to show mercy to these people.

What is below good, I mean, is of no concern to me. But life, gentlemen, is suffocated if the better is not allowed to come to -- into being, compared to the good. That is the real battle. That's worth your -- your interest.

XXX

1

As long as you think it is -- I mean, it is very easy to agree that murderers must be - - must be put away. And to -- we have forever -- however liberalism, you see, having this wrong idea of only fighting good -- evil, you see, and -- and -- and believing that the good is already there, have -- have shed all the tears about the criminals. So they are pardoned too early, and then they commit their next crime.

This country, after all, sees the worst crimes committed by the people who have been pardoned, you see, from a false sense of pity. Why? Because good people's interest has always been directed into this direction, that it is a most important thing to care

for the -- for the criminals.

2

I mean, we have a funny situation today. The -- for the criminal, it is cared for, but I have a grandchild that has -- is a genius, really, in talent and gift, and she has to sit in a class of 50 at the age of 8 and she's bored stiff.

Now that's criminal, you see. They think they have a good school there, but they -- should have a better. And my real interest is only how I can rescue this child from this relatively good school to teach her {as an angel}? But what can she do with -- with 50 children in one class? And that is a scandal.

But whether this man there who has kidnapped this -- this little boy is immediately electrocuted or hanged is not -- no interest to me. Behead him, poison him, I don't care. Put him in a bag and drown him, I mean.

3

But all the interest in the United States has gone into the fight between good and evil, because the march of history has been excluded here. The march of history says that good things are good and we know already that evil has to be penalized, but we have still to go one better. And we cannot just put a child under the law of public education, you see, and sanitize it. We have to rescue this child from the good of -- of compulsory education.

You -- you understand? That's today the issue.

4

I know a child in this town that has been ruined by the superstition of his parents that he should -- has -- must go to public school because that's the best they can do for him. And I told them, this child has to live better than these ridiculous schools in which people are made happy.

This one probably wants to go. It's a long story, and I -- I'm afraid Mr. Keep has heard this story already twice, have you not?

And so this boy, what did he become? I mean, since they didn't allow him expectations and promises, and a great school, he grew backward. He netted -- wetted his bed again, and he began to stammer, and he became two years old, because a living being that is not allowed to go forward will always go backward, and they thought they could just, you see, do no harm by sending him to this allegedly good Hanover High School.

But they -- I have never seen a case where the good was the enemy of that these parents owed their child, the very best. The creative thing, they had to invent the -
- a way out.

I offered them to send him to England. Anything would have been better but this so-called "good" school. And that's what is important, because here is a good boy. And he was not a -- what do I care for the -- for the non-good boy? But I do care that the good boy gets the very best, and that has to be created for him against the good.

XXXI

1

So there are always three levels, gentlemen, three levels. You can have a playboy, who isn't even himself.

Here, the {joiner}. {That's on the} lowest possible level. That's the mass man. I mean, that's the fraternity brother, the man who is always everything to everybody and nothing to himself. And he never reaches even the -- the adulthood of -- of -- of self. He always nods -- what everybody else said, he says, too.

Well, I'm not talking of this infantile level. I'm talking of the level of personality, of character, of individualism. And I say this is good, but it isn't good enough.

2

Lincoln wouldn't be interesting if he had just been as ambitious as his secretary of state, Mr. Seward, who then later became judge-- -- Chief Justice and was paid off, so to speak, like Earl Warren, for his ambitions of becoming president.

That's not important.

So neither Mr. Warren nor Mr. Seward belong to the ages. You can be sure that Mr. Warren doesn't. That's a political deal. And that's all right. No harm done, but he doesn't belong to the ages. He cannot. He has only tried to establish himself, and that isn't enough in history. The people are not interesting who are success stories. They are -- it isn't even important. I mean, it's neither here nor there. It's good.

3

But isn't the best. The best is only a man, gentlemen, who can rise about -- above the {talk} of his own time and make people in his own time become aware of the fullness of time, of the fulfillment of destiny of ma- -- the human race through and in his own generation.

4

And I assure you that a father, like Henry James, and I hope myself -- and you, too when you are a father -- has this tremendous tri{ }.

He first has -- must pray that he has a normal child, and not an imbecile.

Then he must pray that this child goes independent, you see.

And then he must pry- -- pray that this child comes back to him, and not to him as a person himself, you see, but to that which he has tried to represent while he was his father.

And that -- are three things to be done, not two.

Thank you.

{ } = *word or expression can't be understood*

{word} = *hard to understand, might be this*

I

1

Well, I don't care what you do with him. Of course, you have to get him out of the way, because he might do something again. I -- what I'm arguing against is all the sentimentality to -- to judge these things around this insane man.

Society is not interested in this -- in these freaks, and these feeble-minded, and in these idiots, and so on, you see. That's one story that has been overdone in this country.

It is interested in the heredity of its order that can go down through the ages.

That's the first thing.

2

The second comes from a surplus, if we are very well established, if the society is defended, and armed, and vigorous, and well-educated, and so on and so forth, then you can bend over and say that the weak elements have to be treated nicely and decently.

But as you know, for the last 50 years, before the two world wars, the ladies of -- in this -- of this America who run after all the show, the churches, and the -- the whole education, and the arts, and all the -- and the women teachers, they thought that the interest in the criminal was the most important thing. The interest in the freak, you see.

This is the wrong emphasis, because there is no historical group whose heredity, whose fecundity does not take first seat before its existence at this moment.

3

You see it.

I mean, your generation has given the wonderful answer to all the statisticians who have said that America would be over-aged and se- -- senile in 1960. Here are 6 million young children born in this country. That is the real answer of your generation to all this stuff of -- that a sterile, over-aged society is of equal reality as a society whose renascence, whose constant rebirth, whose constant regeneration is

first ascertained. We live fortunately in such -- at such a turning point where it is -- obviously is the greater concern of people to have children, you see, than to have the idiots built up to a higher IQ.

Now I have nothing -- against idiots being educated, you see. But obviously, the first concern of a society is that there are no idiots. Isn't that very simple?

4

The interest in the murder is something sicklish in this country, the interest in the -- in the criminal.

I mean, the Hauptmann case will always stand out, not as a terrible case with regard to the kidnapping of the child only, but with the courtroom procedures, and the newspapers.

The -- the -- the criminal cases don't belong on the -- on the title page of your papers. As long as you allow this, you are -- have to be ashamed of yourselves. And you are -- don't know -- even know that this is criminal, the -- what these newspapers' editors -- do. They haunt you every day with another crime. What have you to do with this?

Go your way, and have all the great problems of injecting into your children some vigor. That's more important than all these crimes which you {-- fed}. What do we have to know about all these crimes?

No concern of a decent man.

II

1

You know nothing but this. You only hear in politics and everything, the crime. {Addiction}.

And Mr. Hearst has invented this. You read the London Times. They -- why are the English people such a sturdy race? Why ca- -- don't they -- depend on this standard of -- high standard of living? Why have they this tremendous character? And they'll outlast the -- all the Americans, I can tell you this.

2

You think the Americans are -- are on top, and dominate the world now -- and the English are finished. I can sh- -- only say you one thing -- to -- to say one thing to you: the hydrogen bomb will not be thrown over England, but it will be thrown over

this country. There is no country in the world that is in greater danger than the United States.

Europe is absolutely safe, because Russia wants to have Europe. It doesn't want to destroy it. But it does want to destroy this country, because we are rich. The poor today are safe. The rich are in danger. It's all nonsense what you say, "Europe is done." We are done, if we go on like that. Europe is absolutely safe. Nobody's going to destroy it.

3

And why? Because nobody in England cares for anything but heredity. And in this country, everybody cares for crime.

You just compare the title page of the New York Times and the London Times, and you see what I mean. There is no title page in the New York -- in the London Times, because people live quietly.

4

And your generation has to revolt against all this. You have to live without newspapers for three or four years, a band of you, a group of you. And that group is then entitled to govern the United States. And you have to live three or four years without radio, and without gramophones, and all this television business. Then you can come back and use these mass media for the -- governing other people.

But only the group that is absolutely superior to these mass media will be allowed to govern, because government means to be ascetic about the means of life.

And just as the Methodists have ruled this country for the last 150 years because they didn't smoke and they didn't drink, so the next Methodist group in this country will be the people who do not read the title page of the American newspapers, who just won't read them.

III

1

And you will not look at boxing and wrestling matches, or -- football matches, or baseball matches, or -- on television. And you have to look at them; you think you must. Therefore you are absolutely unimportant in life. People who have to depend on some such things are no longer important in history, because you can't make a new start. You depend on something utterly meaningless.

And what the Methodists did to this country was to make people, in a cold, unheated civilization with no central heating, no electric light, they made them independent of the unpleasantness of their environment. And the non-smoking, and not-drinking of these Methodist people showed them to be rising above environment.

2

Now today this isn't your problem. Smoking and drinking today are not important vices, gentlemen; and girls are not important questions. The mass media are the important perversions of -- of thinking, and of the human mind.

So you have to protest against these mass media.

3

But I don't see any American boy or girl who knows what his next religion should be. You don't want to have a religion. You don't want to band together for any rebellion, or for any doing anything creative. You have given up every hope that you are important.

And yet the whole world is yearning for a group of Americans who laugh off Hollywood, who laugh off television, who say, "What? This country is spending \$2 billion annually for television. It's a shame! It's a scandal!" And it is a scandal at a time when we complain that we cannot pay \$2 billion for foreign aid, for hungry people. Then we buy television sets for \$2 billion a year here.

If this isn't shameful, I don't know what is shameful. It's all done for prosperity.

4

Well, you haven't even heard, you -- that something is expected from you. And you haven't heard -- for the last 15 years on this campus, I have tried to shout myself hoarse, that every generation has to found a new religion. Not a sect, not a church, but a religion in the sense that you are obliged to inject something unheard, t- -- untold, never lived before in to the life of the race.

And this abstemiousness of the mass media, that's what you are expected to perform.

And you can be sure, the group that does this is the next government of the United States or of the world at large.

{ } = *word or expression can't be understood*

{word} = *hard to understand, might be this*

I

1

...elect what parts of you shall remain.

I have ceased to be a German. I am an American. I have dropped a part of my nature. As far as it goes, I have tried to excise it. I've rejected it.

You all can -- and must reject a part of your heri- -- heritage in order to insist on other parts that to you seem valid and valuable. Nobody can -- I said before -- can go without some selection.

2

In this very moment, the word enters your nature. Your heresy, you see, the chemists' heresy, Mr. Einstein's heresy is that they think the universe exists without the word.

It doesn't.

You do not understand me. You think I'm just insane. I know.

3

But so have all Jews, and all Christians, and all Greeks, and all people who have ever believed in any god, or deity, or spirit been insane in your eyes, because you just think that man is an animal.

But you speak about being an animal, and no animal can say, "I'm an animal." Any man who says, "I am an animal," knows who God is, because God is the power to speak. That is the word.

That's the -- all -- of course, these fundamental texts, the ABC of human life to you have become some -- chosen books which can arbitrarily be discarded.

4

Do you think the New Testament or the Old Testament can be arbitrarily discarded as denominational bias? They cannot. They are much more fundamental than any ABC or the -- or any mathematics. They're true.

They're so simply true that you live by this.

II

1

Your whole freedom, the whole independence, all your rights of being a student at Dartmouth College, all your rights to be -- live in a democratic society depend on our conviction that you can appropriate the spirit of the institution in which you live by the power of the word.

By saying, "I am an American," we begin to trust you. That's democracy. Democracy means that any man is not just by the nature of things born into society, but he can, by rising to the spirit of society one day say, "On my word, this is my society." And in saying so, the society begins to live, to a certain amount, by -- from the spirit.

And on the basis of the spirit, you exhale, because you are now giving back to this institution some of the spirit which has been imparted to you before. And you cease to be just a child of nature, and suddenly the word, which you have freely chosen, begins to carry the institution.

2

And you are -- instead of becoming a product of your environment, you become the creator of your environment -- the re-creator of your environment, by this strange volunteering for the affirmation. People today have, of course, you see, obliterated -- they speak of "conscious life." All right, you can also do this. Conscious life is a different kind of life from unconscious life. And you human beings have to lead conscious lives.

This is just another form of saying they have to speak. Conscious life is not simply life. But that's the life into which you are destined.

3

Therefore you are not an animal, because -- Sir, my body carries me into the power of speaking to you, of connecting the times and the places. I can build railroads. I can send telegrams. I can make speeches. I can print books. That is, I use my body, certainly -- my animal body -- so that I may build up connections through time and space which no -- an animal is not interested in.

A {dog} is born; it dies to itself. You are not this way, and I am not this way.

4

We are, therefore, not animals, because anybody who says he is an animal is, in the process of saying this, divine. And so man is this strange mixture of divinity and animality. And you can't get out of this.

Anybody who speaks is in this quandary, because he speaks the truth. And the truth is valid for anybody who can -- hear to -- listen to you. Or you can cheat. Or you are a liar. So there are either gods or the devils. There is no way out for you, gentlemen.

You cannot live innocently in a refrigerator. You cannot live in {anarchy} all his life at 35 degrees of Fahrenheit. That's all -- every American boy tries to do that. He tries to stay out of trouble, by never saying anything, never sticking his neck out, always saying, "Yes, yes, yes, yes."

III

1

Somebody says -- then speaks for you. That's what I tried to put on the -- on the blackboard. I have said you are { }. You see, you may make attempts to say, "I'm just an animal." And there are pigs, and hogs, and -- and asinine people. { }.

But there is some devil who -- who takes advantage of their votes who -- I mean, who -- whose henchman there -- he is. You are the henchmen of all the people who -- whom you allow to speak for you. Because you want to have peace of mind, you allow them to make war.

2

Here, once more -- as you are lived today, at this moment, sitting here innocently, you say, "Well, if we are born animals, then we can -- don't have to go into history," you see.

By saying this, you are abusing your power of speech, which all American boys at this moment do, you see. No -- 50 years ago, your grandfather would have blushed if he -- anybody had doubted that he had a soul, and that he had to live up to his soul's requirements. But you don't feel ashamed at all. You think that's very funny. And you think it's wonderful -- it's intelligent even to call yourself an animal.

Intelligent.

3

Unfortunately, you see, you have lost your innocence because you have the power to say, "I am an animal," and you can only say this if you know what God and man is. Because otherwise your sentence, that you are an animal, makes no sense.

You fight off something by saying "I'm just an animal." "Just" gives you away. The word "just" gives you away as soon as you know of other categories of life.

4

How do you know something?

Because you are not natural. The only reason why you know this, because you know for sure that the animal does not know what man and God is.

Just look at the poor animal. It is bewitched. If you do not -- don't domesticate it, it is full of fear. It can't even sleep at night. Must stay awake. But you can have such peace that you sleep deeply at night, and are awake in the -- in the morning. The poor animals can only -- so to speak, rest daytime, when the sun is out. And all day -- night long, they must -- they must fear their -- their enemy. But they cannot make peace.

They cannot speak.

IV

1

Everybody -- you live, of course, on all these beliefs, but it is so -- you are so uninterested, you see, because you prefer to have this wonderful silky curtain drawn before your real existence, and to daydream some philosophy, which is so cheap, called -- whatever is realism, or material- -- I don't care, I mean, or psychology or something -- and just look at some ridiculous, arbitrary selection of reality in yourself.

2

But when it comes to choices, and when your children will be ungrateful to you, you'll be very much surprised what you have done to them, because you haven't brought them up in any faith.

Very much surprised.

And when your friends betray you, and when you go to a man and you ask him for a loan, or you ask him to help out, you just take it for granted that he will. Why he should, you cannot explain if you are an animal. Why he should.

3

John Quincy Adams, when the slaves, you see, petitioned for freedom, he could have answered, "They're just animals." But he said, "The right of petition," which then the Southern states, you see, wanted to gag in the Congress, "cannot be denied. It is a natural right born with man's nature -- man's nature, if he is to implore."

It's a very great saying: to implore. No animal can go down on his knees and implore. It's a wonderful saying.

4

The old ge- -- man who certainly was a very -- was a realistic, and sober, and very, very caustic man. Not a very amiable -- you must not think that John Quincy Adams had any sweetness or light in him. Not at all.

He was very drastic, and very crude, you may say. But he knew one thing, that the gift of man, of imploring his fellow man as his alter ego, as being just as much entitled to live, that this lifts man above the animal.

And there is no law and no order {in this government}, except among people who recognize this, that they are not animals together, but they are, under God, forming the lawful order, in which therefore anybody who can listen also can speak, and because anybo- -- if this -- relation exists, then I -- you, while speaking, already invite the agreement and consent of all the people who listen.

And therefore you identify yourself with the whole tree of the human race.

V

1

And that's why you know that the story of humanity started 6,000 years ago, and you have to be in agreement with the great direction of the stream of human life. And that no human -- no animal is asked to know. But you have to know who your ancestors are. You have to know whether you come -- stem from Caliban or from Prospero.

It's your choice, Sir. If you choose Caliban, we'll kill you. I will -- be the first to vote for your immediate execution.

I -- if a man wants to be an animal, let him be it. Out he goes. You don't see that you forfeit your life by saying that man is an animal. I have no reason to let you live if you say you are an animal or if you say I am an animal. In both cases, the enmity is eternal.

2

Animals have no friendship and solidarity. They cannot.

Eat -- they have to eat. And what I eat, you cannot eat. And what you eat, I cannot eat. It's mutually exclusive. Ask the Arabs, and the Israelis how they feel about each other, because they think that just a sw- -- one is a swine, the other is a son of a bitch.

3

It's very serious, Sir. The peace of the world depends on your -- on what you think of yourself. You are not allowed to think arbitrarily about your own nature. Man has no nature. Man's destiny is to be built into the temple of humanity as one brick -- living brick. And that's all. That's your -- your destination.

4

So you have no nature, because your whole body and soul has to be used up, has to be re-molded. You have to give up your nature. That's meant with the sentence,

"He who doesn't lose his soul," you see, "cannot gain it."

VI

1

Why -- why is it -- forbidden for man to look in the mirror?

Why is it forbidden for us to be vain?

Why is it forbidden for us to be -- live purposively?

Why do we have to be humble and -- and free and open-minded?

Because our destiny is always larger than the physical equipment which we have received at this moment.

2

Why is any person greater who overcomes the obstacle and the handicap in his equipment? Why is a great singer -- a greater singer or greater -- Demosthenes a greater speaker because he had -- he was a stammerer?

Because man has no nature. Your natural equipment does not determine what you are going to be.

3

But the calling which you hear, the vocation, what's needed in the world -- do you think the -- Helen Keller has by nature any right to exist? Yet she has done more for humanity, because she has overcome all her -- obstacles, because her nature was just not there. She has no nature, to speak of.

4

And when I received a letter from her the other day about the blind, I said to Mrs. Huessy, "Well, it can't be helped. It is Helen Keller who has signed this letter, and although I have not in -- no interest in the cause, I have to give something."

Because she has set an example how to overcome her nature.

VII

1

Man begins where you declare that your nature isn't good enough.

And the animal begins when you say, "That's all I have."

Anybody who acquiesces his animal nature has given up the right to be defended in court. Why should animals be defended in court? They can be slaughtered.

2

Pardon me?

(I said they could -- { } just as good as man.)

No, they cannot, because they cannot render, you see, this same altruistic loyalty. They want to eat first. You have never seen an animal -- an animal willingly share his

food with somebody else.

(Yes, I have.)

Don't do it. Wie?

I have.)

Well, the kittens -- as long as they are very young under the same mother. But not older. Impossible. Ja?

3

(Sir, I deny that you can base your entire thesis on the assumption that Christianity is an unassailable truth.)

Well um- -- I mean by -- my dear little Sir, certainly you want to -- live with the apes in 5000 B.C.

I still believe that for the last 8,000 years, we have found certain things to be true, as the Constitution -- fathers of the Declaration of Independence also believed. If you really think that we have to wait for you, till you tell us what we have done -- had to do for the last 7,000 years, I'll say, "Please, you are absolutely entitled to do this, but I'll take an axe and I'll kill you," and you can't complain.

You have no right to exist.

4

You have no right to have excluded yourself from the society in which you are entitled to tolerance, and to listening, and hearing, and to a -- an opportunity.

Opportunity is only within history. There is no opportunity in nature.

VIII

1

This is so cheap, I mean, if a 10-year-old boy begins to say this. But that a 20-year-old man of your stature should -- should really try to play backward and say, "I know nothing. I'm just ignorant."

It is very -- people at 14 formerly could -- had already to make declarations of faith, and they knew what they were saying 200 years ago.

But you just want not to know anything, so I grant you, you don't know anything. But I -- why should I respect this? Ignorance is not a title to -- to respect, because you don't want to know.

(I don't want to -- I don't want to accept anything that's the truth which I do not know.)

2

But -- while you are trying to accept the truth, your own truth, I'll give you -- you must know that you are living in the good faith and the tolerance of others. We give you these 20 years to make up your own mind. Sir, you owe -- grant human loyalty to the people who gave you these 20 years for your silliness and inanities.

If you admit that at this moment you don't know, I'm perfectly happy then to admit that it is the -- the -- the graciousness of -- of -- of the historical humanity which says, "Every apple should ripen himself, and so we give you, as the future apple, a chance. And in this time, you may say as -- what you please."

{Certainly}, you are unassailable in your stupidity, to use your expression. And you -- are unassailable, you see. Only, you live at the mercy of us. And this one sentence, "Thank you, gentlemen, that you allow me to be so stupid," you have to say it first. That is your real creed.

You believe at this moment in humanity at large, which allows one of its members to be at this moment so silly.

That is unassailable, Sir.

3

And this is enough to build a whole -- a whole theology, and a whole philosophy on this.

If it is true that you have to be allowed to make up your own mind for 25 long years -- in which nothing what you say must be held against you, in which you can be as silly, and inept, and contradictory as you please -- then this is a very wonderful society, that puts tremendous faith in you as a human, which thinks that man's spirit is so divine that after he has been allowed to wallow in the mire, like the prodigal son, he'll become a saint, and a hero, and a leader of the community.

As long as you keep all these doors open, if you understand the meaning of the freedom you enjoy at this moment, you are {utterly entitled}.

4

But you -- you cannot say that you have { } and therefore the other fact of the matter, that the -- we are under law to give you this freedom, doesn't exist.

If you admit that we are under law, duty-bound to allow you to be stupid, then we can begin talking, because then you presuppose our -- that we have to be religious, while you can be frivolous. That's all right.

As long as you see that allow you to be frivolous and ridiculous, but that we have to be terribly serious to make sure that you have something to eat, and that you have friends, and that you have schooling, and that you have service, and peace, and aren't shot dead while you are making up your mind -- if you see this, then you admit that we must have a religion, you see.

It is only -- it isn't your religion. You want to have a better religion.

IX

1

And then you -- the second point is that not only must we have a religion which secures your livelihood, your life, your existence, freedom, liberty, pursuit of happiness, that is, our -- must be our religion at this moment, but also, Sir -- now comes the -- the terrible thing -- { }

whatever you find in your own 25 years to be true must not be less than this, which now at this moment we grant you. That is, your religion may be better than my religion, but it is not allowed to be worse. You cannot backslide before -- into the society in which all the children which a father did not like could be just murdered -- you see, thrown into { } as the Spartans did.

2

You are already bound by my religion to -- to the fact, or to the task, or to the responsibility, that whatever you find to be true in the future must be better than what I have found. Under this condition, you are free.

Absolutely you free.

Certainly you can find anything better. But as soon as you say, "I'm not bound at all; I can find that man is just an animal," I say, "Sorry, out you go." Out you go, because you have broken the covenant. You have broken the covenant under which you have been granted this freedom. You have abused it.

3

This is the situation in which you are. {Granted}, I want you to be free, Sir. But the conditions of this freedom are very clear. You cannot do less than we are doing for you. The -- the society which you have to establish by your own deeds has already certain minimum requirements.

And they are unassailable, Sir.

4

Now, if you are so uneducated not to know that they are the Christian pre-requisites of life, I don't quibble about the word. You call it "American democracy."

Well, American democracy is a secular translation of "Christianity."

So I mean I -- if you are so ignorant, you see, that's a minor matter. You just don't know {it}.

X

1

But the freedom which you have not to know is based on very precise conditions and premises. If you deny these premises from which it springs that you enjoy at this moment this -- this freedom of saying, "I know, I don't know," you see, then you are -- have excommunicated yourself.

It's the Calibans in America. They run around by {the thousands}, the people who take to the hills, the people who say, "Society is not for me."

2

There is a Swedish sculptor who has written a book, Caliban. It's in the library. I recommend it to your care, you see. That is the real description.

There aren't anything like this man, but he has taken the consequences, which you, so to speak, { } talk, mention that nothing has been proved. { } He wants to -- to find out {only} by himself. So he abuses every woman and every man he meets in life. And he had even the guts to write this up. It -- it's a tremen- -- he calls it even Caliban. So he even knows what a -- that he lives, because others are not Caliban, because of course, a man can only commit all his heresies and all his crimes against humanity, you see, because the others still assume that he must act as a human being, and he never does.

The second already wouldn't get away with murder. And the third, even less. It's like the kidnaper. The first kidnapper gets away, and then you pass a kidnapping law.

3

Sir. This is the -- this is -- for a student, is not much of a performance to say that this is unassailable, as you did. There are very clear conditions under which you can say that you do not believe in the truth of Christianity.

If you analyze under which conditions it is permissible for you to say this, then you will see that you are already far advanced in history, in the historical { }.

4

They only say this in the year of the Lord 1953. And that -- 2000 B.C., you would have been burned, and tor- -- and quar- -- and -- and -- how do you say? -- quartered. Put in a bag and -- and thrown into the river.

XI

1

What time is it? Oh.

Gentlemen, this is not what I was going to say at all. Perhaps in this six -- seven minutes I have left, I may connect this problem of beginning to think from the point where two generations meet into some great story in the -- of the Bible.

2

Despite your remark, I hope you won't take issue with me on this.

3

Anything important is only important when a listener and a speaker meet, because only when at least two people become one will there be any effect in history -- in reality left. Anything that is enshrined into your thought and never leaves the of your brain obviously cannot make much effect on the { }.

In some form, it has to ooze out. And so I take as a minimum supply of energy in the universe of human history this meeting, where one listener agrees to what a speaker says.

And I took the father and a son as being the -- the most -- simplest form of such a process, you see, of some point where the electric current of -- that goes through you -- the human race, is closed, is -- the negative and the positive pole are so brought together that the current can run through.

4

And I advise you, gentlemen, this is really so simple.

If you begin instead of thi- -- speaking of cooperation in space, or between people here and there, you see, you begin always to ask yourself how a truth that has been older than you is established and which bears a fruit -- is made to bear fruit by the simple fact that you hear it. And then you begin to think how you want to influence your youngsters in a camp, or in a -- in a Sunday school class, or in -- in -- in -- your own family, a younger child -- how important it is that this child should understand and believe what you're telling him.

You will find that it is very fruitful to treat the listener and the hearer of a wor- -- word spoken and -- and heard, and -- as potential father and son, or potential ancestor and founder, and heir and successor.

They are the purer forms of hearing and listening than what we do here.

XII

1

You see, you are a little younger than I, and yet obviously in a teacher-student situation, this is a father-son situation. And I use the father-son situation, because I think it seems to be the most recurrent, and the -- in which all other situation of listening and hearing are contained.

A father of his country, you see, a Washington, you see, is in this sense the speaker, the father, in one, unified.

You see this.

2

Th- -- I'm -- I'm not meaning this in any sentimental sense -- father and son -- but I mean it in this very logical, philosophical, abstract sense, that the speaker is representing something that has already been known before, and the son is inheriting this truth -- a younger man.

I would say that if you should be teachers of a 50-year-old girl, or woman, or man in -- in some capacity of yours, you would be the older, and he would be the younger. You would be the father, and he is the son.

Whenever a man opens his mouth to convey knowledge, or convey instructions, you see, or advice, to another peop- -- person, the listener is in the position of being younger, and the speaker is in the position of being older, because both in the process of continuation, you see, of the spiritual life obviously represent first and second degree -- predecessor and successor.

3

What I'm driving at is that all these terms,

"son and father," "heir and ancestor," "student and teacher,"

they are all only amplifications and ramifications of the one great problem:

how does the truth get on?

How do the directions of life continue to be followed?

How does an historical humanity, that began to speak at 5000 years B.C., or 7000 years B.C., you see, still speak the same language -- Indo-European, or Semitic?

It's all one great language, after all, which we still carry on. You still say 1, 2, 3, 4.

4

Why do you count? Why did people find -- find -- find it useful to speak as our { }? Because we need these numbers. They have done something useful for you and me. You can't get out of speaking. You have to -- just continue to speak.

XIII

1

Therefore, the people who make you learn your language are your parents.

And we call anybody who makes us take up the direction of history our parents. And we owe them, as I said -- religious gratitude, because we believe in their religious dutifulness, of telling us that -- their best truth.

2

You believe this, too, that I'm now at this moment -- although you may not -- dislike what I say, but you still believe that I'm trying to do my darnedest, you see.

Don't shoot the pianist. He's doing his darnedest, as you know.

3

Now, gentlemen, in the Old Testament, in the end, in the 24th of the 24 books of the Old Testament, the prophet Malachi has a strange prediction. He says the earth must be cursed, and will perish, unless the parents turn their hearts to their children, and the children turn their hearts to their parents.

And you know, the New Testament is considered the fulfillment of the Old.

And if you open it, however, you find a very strange distortion of this old text, because in Luke, which is written 1900 years ago, only the one-half of the prophecy is fulfilled -- is declared to be fulfilled.

When Jesus comes, He says that the hearts of the parents now are turned towards their children. But the other half, gentlemen, that the hearts of the children must be turned toward their parents, is left to the Americans and to your generation to fulfill -- even to understand its implication.

4

What I'm trying to tell you about Henry James, and William James, goes back to the tremendous problem of the ancient people, who felt that the greatest achievement of humanity would only come when the children would grow up in complete freedom, but not in the freedom of arbitrariness. Not in the freedom of anarchy, but in the freedom that would lead them -- what I have tried to show you already in the figure of Henry and -- and -- and William James, to a certain extent, where the children would -- after having been made sure of their independence, would turn back their hearts to their parents and begin to understand what these parents were trying to solve and to do, and would identify themselves, because when your heart turns to your -- to somebody, you understand him, you support him.

"Understand" means to stand under his task, and -- and booth and don- -- not knock.

What he's trying to do then becomes a part of your own task.

XIV

1

Now, it's very strange, gentlemen, that you have in this -- on -- in -- on this soil in America, in this strange family history an anticipation of the last, unfulfilled promise of the ancient peoples, because the Old Testament there only stands for that which all the -- the natural people, the nations of the world, before they were welded in one faith, always felt.

The authority of the parents was so firmly established, because it was taken for granted that the children would run away like the animals, young animals, and forget their ancestors.

2

Now, in the long process of thousands of years, we feel so settled, and you feel so settled, that you think that you can forget your ancestors, because they are so good to you. And so you say, "Christianity is not unassailable."

You don't know what you're saying by this. You're just denying your whole background.

3

All right. We do this, but with this criterion, Sir, that you must listen to this grave promise:

after you have been -- become independent, and have denied everything, you will still have to look for the genius of the parents behind their authority.

Deny my authority, my dear man, but don't deny the genius of all the nations, and people, the generations that have been before you.

4

If you can -- as William James, you see, came -- to believe in the genius of his father, away with the father's authority, that's all right, you see. You can say the authority is not unassailable, but the genius of the people who have created the world in which you live, that is unassailable.

But we are waiting for { }.

Thank you.

CONTENTS