

EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY

HISTORIOGRAPHY

*BIBLE AND HISTORY,
THE STUDY OF HISTORY USING THE BIBLE*

*University of California at Santa Cruz
February 24 -May 26, 1959*

FIRST LECTURE: THREEFOLD INTRODUCTION

FIRST PART: WHAT HISTORY IS TO YOU

CHAPTER ONE: THE RECORD OF A DEATH

I

1

So we had the two meetings.

And I wish you would write down a report of two pages on these two first meetings, every one of you, so that I get a little bit of your own handwriting.

Who hasn't taken part in the first? So may you just go in for the last one.

And with this break in continuity, that we ask you today to write something that is a week before ..., you see how difficult it is to know anything about history. And I think you will find this already an imposition that you should know what went on a fortnight ago.

Now you can imagine what we are in for with history that pretends to know something about a hundred years ago, or ten years ago.

2

And what did we do last time? Does anybody recall?

Never has any generation and any place been so forgetful as the people yet in Los Angeles at this moment. You have no memory. But -- please.

(Well, one thing you said was that Los Angeles was a horizontal city, which might suggest in this city as representative of the whole American thinking, that our view is horizontal, rather than having a historical perspective of viewing things in relation to one another, rather than all flat and blended in.

And you related this to other historical themes, throughout the period.)

Then what did we intend to do today?

(Discuss Samuel?)

Quite.

The Book of Samuel. First real historical book of the world's whole literature.

3

But I have found a very strange quotation which may show you the very anti-historical bias of this country.

You know who Mr. Kettering was, the inventor, who died recently -- a few months ago? And since one of his relations lives in our little village in Vermont, so I became very interested in the man. He was a very great inventor.

What did he invent, by the way?

(The combustion engine, I think it was.)

(The starter engine. The automatic starter, the solenoid starter. The thing that starts the engine.)

Ignition. Well, he has of course made a number of inventions.

But I do think he delivered us from the crank, so many accidents have been eliminated by him. And he became very rich.

THE STORY OF KETTERING'S DIPLOMA

Now he's a man who graduated with him tells the story that when Kettering graduated from Ohio State in engineering, he received his sheepskin diploma, and threw it in the wastepaper basket, and said, "This is not what I have toiled for, for four years, at starvation level."

4

Now I think that no European, no Asiatic, no African will ever understand -- the Australians and the North Americans are in line with this strange separation from the act and its formal declaration. That is, obviously, the four years in Ohio State were very important for Mr. Kettering. It made him.

But the expressions, the declaration, the document on which this is written he throws in the wastepaper basket. He's annoyed by the certificate. And by the way, his roommate tried to rescue it from the wastepaper basket, and fished it out, and gave it back to him, and then he threw it in a second time. So it was not a rash movement, but his considered opinion.

II

1

I can give you a strange parallel to this.

THE STORY OF THE FATHER OF WILLIAM AND HENRY JAMES

The father of William and Henry James - you know who Henry James was, the novelist, and William James, the philosopher. Now they had a father who was greater than the two of them, Henry James, Sr. And when the two sons came to England, Bernard Shaw teased them on this, and said, "You know, you are nothing. Your father is everything."

And they surprised Bernard Shaw, who was a terribly ironical and sardonical mind, and said, "Well, we know that."

So they were convinced that their father was a greater man.

I think he was.

And this man, when he went to die, in 1882, was asked by his daughter what they should do at his funeral. "Oh," he said, "I'll tell you. You just come forward with one sentence, to be read by the oldest son.

*'Here lies a man who has always thought
that the ritual connected with birth and funeral is just hokum.'*"

2

Now here you have the two typical situations which are certainly anti-historical, because they go against the documentation of history, against the form in which history is recorded. Because after all, what is a funeral?

The record of a death. And a death in a family is a very important event. And a birth is, too. In a birth, the new name is given. In a death, you are entitled from now on to treat this person as no longer to be reckoned with. And therefore, obviously, this has to be declared.

3

But in this country, which is strictly naturalistic -- you can call this "naturalistic"-- the declaration of the event is brushed aside as unnecessary. The fact of the birth and the death stand for themselves.

And thereby history is destroyed, because history is the weaving together of natural events in such a way that they -- although they occur in one or the other person -- they make sense to each other.

A birth is nothing unless the father says, "This is my child, and he's now called William Smith, Jr.". And a death is nothing unless the widow now is called a widow from this day on. That's what we call a funeral.

4

So between the event and the declaration of the event, there is a minute, or a day, or three days of lapse. And the American mind cannot deal with this amount of time. It destroys it and says, "We don't respect it."

THE STORY OF THE WIDOW

In former days, at a funeral, the widow had to stay put in her house with the belongings of her husband for thirty days. She shouldn't make up her mind before, what to do.

III

1

THE STORY OF A JUDGE IN NEW YORK CITY

Now I have known a judge in New York City, and his wife. Very good people, and very happily married. And when the man, came to die, the woman -- this poor widow -- sold her belongings the day after the death, before the funeral. And four weeks later, she was in a sanitarium, because she hadn't given the necessary time to her own soul to digest the event.

2

So it is what no American -- pardon me for saying this boldly -- seems to be able to digest that an event, before it reaches the outside world, takes time, before it is digested, because it becomes a part of history.

THE STORY OF LINCOLN'S CELEBRATIONS

That if Lincoln is murdered in the evening, and he expires in the morning, and then Stanton, the secretary of war, says, "Now he belongs to the ages," then this is still no reason why he shouldn't be buried in all the cities through which the coffin passed. There were celebrations.

And this is part of his death.

You can't eliminate the waves that an event, the stone that falls into the water mobilizes in a pond.

3

But this is what the American mind tries to do. When the stone falls into the water, the idea of a wave theory by which these waves have to be accepted as part of the event is absolutely undigested, but it seems for *Reader's Digest*. And *Reader's Digest* is the stomach of America.

THE STORY OF READER'S DIGEST

We are all digested by Reader's Digest.

Or pre-chewed, you can also say.

4

And this is your point where you have to start your historical thinking -- at this moment; here, in this place especially. Is there really, between a purely natural event -- that is physical, in nature, like a death of a person, and its becoming an historical event, a necessary lapse of time during which this event must get the chance to work itself into the fabric of a nation's, a city's, a family's consciousness, isn't this as much real as the so-called physical event?

And all of you are inclined to deny this, and give this movement of waves around the stone that falls in the water no reality. Say, "Well, that's not real, that's just "-- how would you call it? -- "mental, or psychological," and how all these strange words are.

IV

1

And you live in this era -- psychoanalysis is a case in point -- where the physical is divorced from its meaning.

The death of a person has a very different meaning in the hearts of man, whether this person has been murdered, or whether he dies a heroic death on the battlefield, or whether he dies in a sick-bed in a hospital, and unconsciously doped, and kept alive for ten years too long, as they do now.

Such a death leaves quite a different imprint.

One death on the battlefield is so sudden, and so unexpected, because the lieutenant is only twenty years of age, and it is not his natural way of dying that you have to celebrate him for fifty years to come, by Fourth of July celebrations, or Battle of Gettysburg celebrations in order to do justice to this shortening of his life, by his bravery.

2

When a man, however -- I have such a dear friend.

THE STORY OF A DEAR FRIEND

She wanted to die. She was eighty-four, was a beautiful woman, and a widow of a great painter. And she knew that she would have to die. And we all loved her. And if she had died at that moment, we all would have honored her memory. And she would still be with us in spirit. But the doctors came and said she had cancer, and so she had to be operated upon. She protested. They said, "You have to do this for the students' sake, so that the student can learn something," which is really bestial. And they were treating her just as a piece of flesh, to be studied.

Well, at this age, with all the doctors agreeing, she went to the hospital. She was a living corpse for another two and-a-half years, and when she died, nobody remembered her. Every interest in her had been spent in the sympathy, given to her sufferings for these two and-a-half years. She had known this.

And so she was destroyed in the hearts of men, by this ridiculous state of medicine which we have today.

3

And this has to do with the naturalism of the age, because if medicine can separate the person from the body to such an extent, that the body is kept alive even when the personality is gone, then obviously, this is just the anti-historical bias of our age, which says, "The only thing that I consider valid is the body."

4

Now history is not made out of bodies, gentlemen. But strange as it may show, it is made up of spirits, or of laws.

You cannot explain the death of any person unless you relate it to what happens after his death.

Does he bequeath his fortune to somebody?

THE STORY OF MR. DULLES

Has Mr. Dulles to be replaced if he should die now, by his successor in a state department? Is he indispensable? Is he irreplaceable?

This is all discussed today in the papers. And a physical world, as ours, in Mr. Dulles' case is desperate. There is no succession for the presidency; there is no succession for the secretary of state at this moment, because we have not learned that all life is based on spiritual succession, and not on physical succession.

CHAPTER TWO: THE FOUR EVENTS THAT MAKE HISTORY

I

1

Formerly, this was very different. Any son would inherit his father's business.

A son at Harvard, I told you, I think last time that he would rank in the -- how do you call it?-- in the syllabus of Harvard, in the album of Harvard, the almanac of Harvard, in rank with his father, because it was quite natural that the son did participate in the standing of the father in the community.

In such a case, death is an historical event. You can see immediately that it means the position of a man in the community that has to be replaced. If the father is governor of Massachusetts, at his death, everybody knows that death means succession.

2

Now you and I have separated the retirement and the physical death. And what formerly, in a monarchy or in an aristocracy has to happen at the day of death -- succession that somebody succeeds them -- today is separated in two events. Retirement, on one hand, or election; and physical death on the other.

And for this reason, Mr. Henry James, Sr., could say, thinking in these terms of a complete division of the physical life and his office in life, his position, that funerals were formless events, that it was all crazy.

3

But gentlemen, I would invite you to look at this.

The cornerstone of history are four events. And there are no others. These are the bricks out of which history is made.

*There would be no history if people wouldn't die;
there would no history if people would not be born;
there would be no history if people didn't have to marry;
and there would be no history if they didn't have to have an office.*

What I call a "calling"; you can call it a "profession"; you can call it "an employment," today. An activity, a station in which you would do something.

4

So we come into this world passively, and we go out, and we do actively, we act -- "calling" is the most general term for it, but you can also in modern terms call it "employment." I hate it, because it is not self-chosen. It is foreign-directed, "employment." And I wish you all that you never will feel employed, but always feel active.

That is, you cannot live unless you feel called to do what you are employed to do. If a man is only employed, he hasn't yet appropriated his station in life. And then you have to give notice and go elsewhere.

And marriage, which is the founding of the next generation.

II

1

All these four events today are broken up into separate events. If you take marriage -- as long as a man can only marry once, and specially a woman, there is one event in life, one incisive event between birth and death, in your physical nature.

Today, when you have four divorces and five marriages, and you have obviously the same event broken up into five -- it is the same with death. If you have retirement, and if you have dismissal, and if you have unemployment, you get this with death, you get it broken up into two events, at least: retirement and physical death.

2

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY COMING TO THIS COUNTRY

Now in my case, I came to this country in the middle of my life, in forty-five, and started a completely new life. Did nothing again what I did at home, and did everything different from what I never had been able to do at home; so I think I have died very completely in the middle of my life, because I could not take with me anything, which I had achieved, or owned in Europe.

Now most Americans have in their families such an artificial death in some of their ancestors, who in the same manner had to give up a full existence, a full life, were retired in Europe. You never assess sufficiently the historical break that this creates in most genealogies of American families.

3

With employment today similarly -- formerly, a man had one calling. He was a doctor -- and it's very significant: a man who had a calling down to 1900, never went on vacation.

THE STORY OF VACATIONS

The vacation is an invention of the time of mere employment. Today people need a vacation, and for the worker today, the struggle for the vacation is the struggle for a continuous life, for a meaningful life. It's I think the greatest social problem today: to give the employed people vacations, and also to make them realize what they should make out of it, and not just bus rides and tourist enterprises.

And it hasn't been solved, yet.

4

THE STORY OF DONALD MEYER

Here, my friend, Donald Meyer, my colleague whom I here now replace at this moment with you, has a very good idea. He feels that we shouldn't have a forty-hour day, or a thirty-hour day -- but it would be more important that any employed person could have a whole year off every four or five years to study, that this would be much more meaningful for his existence. And though he would waste all his time at juke boxes, and in Greyhound buses at weekends. And I think the organized pleasure of weekends is an indication that people are completely ruined by their ways -- they are short-lived employed. They are all shortcuts to happiness.

III

1

What Mr. Meyer suggests has very much future.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S ADDRESS IN THE PAULSKICHE

I've just come from an address I had to deliver in Germany on January 30th for a large audience in the so-called Paulskirche, in Frankfurt, which is the largest hall in the city of Frankfurt, where the German parliament of 1848 convened. So it's a very solemn place.

And I invoked there that industry of the industrialized spheres of the world couldn't go on unless every member of industry served the colonial and underdeveloped countries one or two years in a service capacity, that the mere showering of industrial products on these countries would lead them to a tremendous upheaval, as you already see it at this

moment. And so it was my point, too, that the modern industrialized humanity doesn't need weekends, but it needs whole years of breaks in their existence.

2

By which I only mean to say that here again, the new thing which you now must realize is that down to sixty years ago, a man did not have a vacation, if he was a professional man. And a farmer didn't have a vacation. He had holidays, sure. He had a sabbath. But to go on vacation was simply unknown except for the luxuriously rich.

I mean, for the bored people.

THE STORY OF THE RICH PEOPLE

And you know what God thinks of the rich people. You know it?

Well, you just look at them, how He made them. So, they aren't the best.

3

So here again this difficulty for you to understand history is that the brick out of which history is built -- *people's lives, birth, deaths, marriage, and calling* -- are broken up.

Here, by divorces, so that a man has four wives and more, if one woman has four husbands.

And death, you have it broken up by retirement, and by emigration.

Employment you have broken up by many employments, by change of employment, so that your constant being in a station where you represent a function like a brick mason, or a jeweler, or a doctor, or a lawyer today disappears behind the fact that you are just in business, that you are just doing something, you have a job.

4

The very word "job" has replaced the word "calling." And with birth, the physical, the medical aspect of this has overwhelmed people.

THE STORY OF THE HISTORICAL EVENT OF A BIRTH

The father is totally excluded. That he gives a name to the brat is today a matter of minor consideration. People do not realize that the historical event of a birth is that this child is recognized by the father.

IV

1

You know, in former days, in former centuries, and I think they were very reasonable, a child did not exist in society before the father hadn't taken it up and recognized it as his child. So the historical event for society was the recognition by the father; the physical event in nature, was the birth by the mother. The two had to go together.

2

This had very great advantages, gentlemen, because an idiot and a mongrel, simply these children were not accepted into society.

And we haven't solved this problem by a long shot, who must live. Where is the limit?

As you know, we keep people alive where it's very doubtful that we should. And you know how many families -- not how many, but that families are destroyed, because suddenly they are for the rest of their life beset by this problem of having their mongrel to live with.

And no softness of heart can bring you over this problem, over this hurdle. Must every semblance of life be preserved?

And it's again with this keeping alive of the dying person: you can overdo it.

3

THE STORY OF THE DOCTOR IN A HOSPITAL

I know a hospital, fortunately, where in such a case, the doctor simply says to the nurse, "You know what you have to do."

And it's a bad society in which such virtuous doctor runs the penalty of death, or of deprivation of his office, because he just does right. And the whole community is such a coward, and so timid that they don't dare to face the necessity that not every life deserves to be lived. And everybody -- you tremble.

But at the same time, when you have forty thousand people killed in auto accidents.

A very strange society. The forty thousand in auto accidents deserve to live, because they are not idiots, supposedly. But not one idiot can be killed, but all the people on the highway can.

Very strange society. Life is very cheap for the people in the middle of life. And it is very precious for the newborn and the dying.

I think it should be the other way around.

4

Well, here I come to the fact that the mother and the child in your imagination are the only people concerned with birth. And this wasn't quite a new thing.

THE STORY OF THE CHILDBED

In former days a father had even to go to bed with the woman in order to make him feel that it was his child, too, and that he acquired a tremendous responsibility for this child. And the break between the illegitimate child and the legitimate child is just in this one thing: that a child had a father in one place, and the other it hadn't.

CHAPTER THREE: HOW TO BE BORN

I

1

Now today, there are no fathers. There are just second-rate mothers. The fathers play the role of the vice-mother, and vicarious mother, and push the perambulator.

And since a father doesn't educate his children, and isn't their moral sustenance, doesn't give them their religion, the meaning of the whole relation of birth to history is darkened.

2

THE STORY OF QUAKERS AND BAPTISTS

But if you look at the Quakers, or the Baptists, even, "Theoretically," these people said, "nobody can inherit Christianity." And yet you know very well that there are Quakers stocks now for three hundred years, and Baptists for two hundred fifty. In other words, even in the religious denominations which say that nobody can inherit religion, the heredity of religion has made itself felt.

Down to 1800, you couldn't escape it. A father would donate to his child, his relation to the universe. His spiritual heritage was very real.

3

I think nobody in this country ever mentions this riddle, how all these denominations become hereditary. But down to the Mormons, they are. It is only nowadays that most religious sects have given up this heredity status.

The Jehovah's Witnesses, as far as I can see, are not able to go on into the next generation. And all the crackpots in the secular sects in Los Angeles, they don't.

But from all this religious heritage, and especially from the heritage of the Republican Party, from the membership in the party - in the Middle West, you just are a Republican or you are a Democrat by birth. And that is decisive for the parties. They couldn't exist without this.

4

Don't laugh, Sir. But you have quite --.

(I'm not laughing at you. I'm agreeing with you.)

Good.

(Don't fight me.)

II

1

So I want to give you the brick of history here.

Now the bricks out of which history is built is the experience of human beings, that they are born into this world, into a heritage of law and order, which they are subjected to, because they have a father. And that they are allowed to choose a calling, a profession, an employment, whatever it is, a station in life, to which they contribute actively, which they represent, where they hold office -- you can call it today with a cheaper word, "function."

But I do think that the word "office" is in order. Everyone has an office.

2

THE STORY OF CHRISTINA OF SWEDEN

When Greta Garbo plays Christina of Sweden -- have you seen this movie, still? Or is she forgotten? She played the queen of Sweden, and there was a shoemaker. And he visited her in her palace in Stockholm. And the queen then had to put him right. He wanted to rebel. And she said, "You go home". "My office is to be queen, and your office is to be shoemaker."

Now that's a good Lutheran doctrine: that every man has his calling. And the lowest as much as the highest has an office to fulfill in life. We all hold office from a commission from our maker.

3

Today, however, it is very difficult to believe this, because if you have 52 jobs within twenty years -

THE STORY OF 52 JOBS

I had a friend who achieved this record. I published his life for this reason; I published the biography of this man, because I felt that in order to understand modern industry, you had to face the fact that this man had had this number of jobs, and therefore was deprived of his relation to what he did. He couldn't treat it as an office.

My comfort has been: I also had many offices. I don't think I ever called it a "job" inside myself.

But your own life is your office, the whole of life. And all these various employments are little notes in the symphony of your office.

4

If you see that in your consciousness the fact that you do inherit *tradition, politics, religion, climate, language, mores* to an extent that is outranking anything you can contribute during your whole lifetime, you would suddenly see that the entrance into the world of history is much more of a weight, and deserves much more to be balanced with a physical birth than at this moment seems to you valid.

Even you can say that in your consciousness, the acquisition of the English language, of the American slang, of your local traditions here in Southern California, of your school days, of your vaccination -- of all the things that society does to you -- of your learning, being toilet broken, anything -- wearing dress, knowing what dress to wear when -- it's very important, to know where you are. In a swimming pool, you are differently dressed when you are in church. That's a tremendous education.

All these things which you think nothing of it, are your birth.

III

1

Now the baptism, or circumcision, or taking into the community -- any ceremony that marks off this event, that you now are growing into the traditions of the community, they are formerly treated as more important historically than the physical birth.

THE STORY OF THE CHURCH REGISTERS

Our church registers for this reason, registered down to 1870 the baptism only, and not the birth. Because baptism meant the name around which now all the forms of historical life could crystallize.

You as the bearer of historical *manners, mores, convictions, laws, attitudes, dresses, customs*, became the historically important person, or were made the historically important person.

2

So our church registers did register the baptism.

And very often, we don't know the day of birth. With Martin Luther, we are not quite sure whether he was born on November 10th, but we do know that he was baptized on that day. So sometimes people would take the child right away to the fount, and sometimes they didn't.

3

In other words, may I make myself understood?

Birth, as an historical event also consists of quite a number of events -- and I would say it begins with the diapers, with the swaddling clothes, and it ends up with the walk to school.

Now this is a long story, and it goes down to UCLA, that for twenty years you are born into society, into history. Because what does it mean to be born?

4

You are not held responsible. Every mistake you make is more or less forgiven you. It's still an unreal, a playlike existence.

To be born means that somebody else is still responsible for you.

IV

1

Now take mistakes made here in this section of you. Can be forgiven. It's given to the wind. It doesn't stay with you.

Whereas later on in life, it's very different. On the highway, the mistake you make is held against you. It goes on record.

2

So it is overlooked by you that you still rely on this historical birth. But it is also fragmentarized today, broken up into these little events in life, and so not one of them looks very important.

So just as much as you have fifty employments, and just as much as you have five marriages today coming to you, *the kindergartens, and the school, and the high school, and the college, and the various psychological phases of a child's growth*, today to you are just separate entities.

But for history they all mean that you are still prehistorical beings.

Birth means the entrance of a child into a preparatory stage, and I call this intentionally to shake you into consciousness -- you are prehistoric.

3

We are prehistoric as long as anything we do is not held against us, or in as far as it isn't held against us. Where things can be obliterated, where the parents simply can say to the child, "Well, we forget about it," where you have this obliteration, you have fatherhood.

And since God forgives -- this meaning of God's fatherhood that to the end of days we still are His children, and He obliterated, He forgets what we have done. And we can start afresh.

But not in society. Society has to pin down some responsibility on somebody. And so we have a criminal whom God can forgive, but the law cannot.

You see the difference? Quite surprising, really.

4

But all these doctrines from the realm of the religious tradition today I have to conjure up as your own experience, because modern society has managed by multiplying these stimuli -- by speaking of "stimuli," instead of "events" to take you out of history, to make you unconscious of your real historical position between the generations.

You are in history only if you can form a generation consciously between the laws of the past and the promises, or programs, or prophecies of the future.

CHAPTER FOUR: TO BE SHOT INTO HISTORY

I

1

You are only in history if you can say, "This one thing is over, this order of society, and I'm going to start a new one."

And for this you have to look backward, how you were born into society by these acts of *training, education, breeding*, what-not, and if you can also know that it takes a lifetime to leave any dent, that to your dying day you are clothed with one office that is total.

2

That the measure of your life is not of our own making, but that God -- or the creative process, or however you call this; I don't care; I call it "God" -- that God has invested in men His way of continuing creation.

You and I do the creating.

That's our business. And therefore He has made men to live seventy, or eighty or ninety years. And He has also allowed us to concentrate, to give away our life for a great cause, earlier.

THE STORY OF A LIEUTENANT WHO DIES ON THE BATTLEFIELD

So I would say when a lieutenant dies on the battlefield at twenty, he invests fifty years of his life expectation into this event. And therefore it is much more effective than the day in a sickbed, after seventy years of life. He does something with his whole life. He compounds it, and it explodes; and therefore leaves a greater mark. If you invest fifty years of un-lived life into such an act, you leave a mark.

3

All this to you, it seems to me, has gone out of existence, because you are spellbound by the animal kingdom, by Darwin. You really believe that we live like animals.

That is, our physical existence is the whole story.

Obviously, my dear children, since man is in history, this isn't true. The same human stock, the same way of coming into this world has existed now for -- let's say - ten thousand years, fifteen thousand years. Yet every generation has changed the picture of the globe.

And if you look here, at Los Angeles, you will admit that from the desert to the water tower, and to the aircraft factory, and to Hollywood, it is quite a march of events.

And every generation has done something to change the human character; that is, the human activity, and that is history.

4

And therefore, the physical death, the physical birth, gentlemen, the physical act of mating, and the physical, playlike activity of running around in a desert is not what makes man into an historical being and is the condition of history, but only

*that we are heirs, as I might call it,
that we are founders,
that we form a group,
and that we fill a whole office.*

II

1

Now what's the difference?

Formerly, when a person married, he also held office. You moved into a homestead, and you began to farm, for example. And before, you were part of your father's household.

So marriage, and office, and employment formerly were very close together. Usually the day of a man ceasing to be an apprentice, or a fellow becoming a master also meant that now he was ready to have a house.

I invite you -- marriage is forming a household.

2

All this today is destroyed. Most people try, when they marry, not to form a household, but to live with the kitchen and go out for lunch. And so again, this is destroyed. Marriage today does not mean housekeeping necessarily. And especially when the wife also goes to work.

Housekeeping and office-holding I want you to see as the direction of a man's position in life towards the outer world, and towards the inner world. Marriage means to create an inward order, an interior. You go to an interior decorator if you want to furnish your home.

This word is very significant. You want to have intimacy. Inside you want to be of something, by which you brick yourself off against the outer world.

Marriage is the forming of one cell out of two bodies. And the word "house" or "home" is the expression for this direction inward.

3

And the office-holding -- if you elect a president of the United States, why is he holding office, gentlemen? What is the simplest criterion for any office-holder?

Compared to a woman who enters the house of her husband and disappears behind the doors, and doesn't want to be seen like the widow of Tyrone Power, I read yesterday, said -- she stated very bluntly: she would have nothing to do with the public.

Any officeholder faces the public. That is, private and public, outer and inner are the antagonisms, for the act of *marriage*, of *intimacy*, of *intimation*, and any office is extrovert.

4

I can prove this to you by the simple fact: anybody who holds office represents to the outer world the community in which he holds this office.

If you are doctor and you go abroad, they say, "It's an American physician." And you can't help it. America comes under scrutiny, because you are an American physician. You represent America in medicine, as soon as you go abroad.

The same is true of an American student who goes to Heidelberg. "The American students behave like that."

So all office-holding, all function is representative of the whole group inside which you function.

III

1

Again, I recommend this to you as a kind of rediscovery of the historical bottom principle. We all in our public functions are representing the community in which we function.

If a governor of California goes to Mr. Khrushchev, or the senator of Minnesota, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Khrushchev doesn't speak to Mr. Humphrey *per se*, but he receives him because he's the senator from Minnesota, obviously.

And wastes his time on him.

2

Why do I say this?

Do we have another blackboard? No?

We should have.

The historical brick, which you and every one of us is asked to represent the element out of which - you can also say, the "molecule," this block of humanity which you and I are -- in the case of marriage creates *an interior, a house, a home*. In the case of a calling, it becomes representative to the outside world.

Perhaps I should make this sign more clearly.

3

Obviously the most pronounced representative of the United States is the president. But he has only the highest office. Everyone of us to a minor degree is also representative of the group inside which he has this function.

Now a thinker, a philosopher tries to have a function for the whole of the thinking universe. So not everyone represents America. You can be a member of the senate in California, then you would represent California through this office, and not the whole of America.

4

But any office, whether you are a blacksmith, or whether you are president of the United States, is representative of the group within which you function. No blacksmith can function if he has no horses to shoe. So that he is a blacksmith inside the agriculture or industrial society only makes him into a blacksmith.

Nobody holdsoffice, nobody can be employed, except as a representative of an order in which society cooperates.

We all, in our division of labor, have offices which together form the whole of this historical pattern.

IV

1

So the disagreeable thing for the American mind at this moment is that his representative function he will negate. He says, "I'm independent. I don't approve."

THE STORY OF DECEMBER 7TH, 1941

This happened to me Pearl Harbor Day, on December 7th, 1941, I had a class - the 8th. This was Sunday evening. And Monday at noon -- as a matter of fact, at 1:30, I had a class, and I was very excited, and I said, "Now we have war." Up went a student in the true, anti-historical spirit of a good boy and said, "No, we haven't. We still can refuse to go to war." And I said, "Pardon. But there are two people engaged. The Japanese want war. And if they want war, you can be forced into it." And he said, "No. We simply decline to accept Pearl Harbor."

2

There you have the idea of staying outside history. If you do not agree, history doesn't take place.

This is carrying it very far, you would agree. But I think it's the American first reaction: "Let's not be taken in. I want first to examine this". "I am not representative, as an American citizen, of an event that has befallen the nation. If I'm not in it, I'm not in it."

3

And this is quite interesting, because it restrains you from accepting history, as a process within which we are already found, whether we like it or not.

Now the same is then true of the other thing.

THE STORY OF CHRISTMAS

We are shot into history by this process that from the stable in Bethlehem, and where the donkey and the ox connive to accept the little baby -- Jesus is shot into history year after year. And the scene in the temple at twelve, where He teaches, is an attempt to show this upward movement on the historical scene.

4

To you, a child that is born is already on the historical level. I decline. The physical baby that is born in the cradle, it has to be lifted up on this level in which it can become a person through marriage and a person through office. And if this isn't done to him, you get juvenile delinquents, for example. That is, they tire on the way into history.

This is the real fate today of the juvenile delinquent, that he is fatigued. On this march, he suddenly is at the age of twelve deserted. He has his hands no longer lifted.

One reason is that there are no demands on him, of a real imposition on his character. And people from whom nothing is demanded are the unhappiest creatures in the world. They can't grow.

SECOND PART: CONDITIONS FOR THE HISTORICAL PERSONALITY

CHAPTER ONE: PLAYBOY AND MAN – WOMAN AND LAUGHING GIRL

I

1

Just as you have to tie a vine to the tree so that it can grow up, so a child has to be tied to the demands of the elders in order to become itself able to stand on its own feet. And our school system is one of making you forget that life is hard instead of showing you that it isn't.

And our own society is so anti-historical -- Los Angeles is a case in point -- that most children no longer reach the level of history. They mate, but they don't marry. They confuse sex and marriage, which are two absolutely different things. And so they remain brute animals.

2

And put it this way:

*here you have the baby;
here you have the child;
here you have puberty;
here you have capacity to love;
and here you have marriage.*

Now these are every seven years quite distinct phases. And in order to be able to found a home, this takes maturity.

You have to be able to distinguish between your passion of love, and your sobriety in love. You have to distinguish in love again between sex urge, and what is love, which is connected with your willingness to sacrifice for the person you love.

There is no love without the balance between lust and sacrifice.

But sex is mere happening, sex is before issue. You can do nothing about it. The way out of sex is selection, where you will sacrifice.

3

THE STORY OF MANY A BOY

I've seen many a boy saved on a Saturday evening, because he was on the way to do anything to throw away his physical strength. And then a good woman just on the street says to him, "Come and have a cup of coffee with me." And the whole sex urge boils down, quiets down, and this day is passed off erotically, by affection, but not with an act of sexual helplessness.

4

Now the importance of the historical fact of birth -- that is, of baptism, of the relation of father and child -- is that it did invite the parents to consider this road from birth to the child's marriage, and the child's employment by the wider society as their responsibility. You understand, that the mores of the country, the customs, the laws -- they couldn't be devolved on a school.

The Parent-Teacher Association hadn't been invented, where the teachers tell the parents what to do. It's a very funny association. Do you ever go to a PTA? You know this, how difficult it is, for the parents to have a real voice in the matter.

Or, how do you find it?

(I don't think it's uniform. I think that in many cases, the teachers are so much abdicating their own position, that then the parents tell the teachers. They have to tell them -- something has to be said. And in other situations, I think that where the teachers have a strong organization, that then they tell the parents. So I do think it changes. I don't know what it is here, in Los Angeles.)

II

1

Anybody any experience with this?

(I know of an experience of entire corruption of someone using their power for money, trying to make a teacher lose his job because he flunked his student, and went to the PTA, and the board of education. And this teacher received calls from board of education, asking him to reconsider. And the case was really clear-cut, that the kid was cheating. And it's just sickening to see what could happen, especially when you think of education.)

Well, Mr. Sherwood Adams, a trustee of Dartmouth College, and Mr. Goldfein's son went to Dartmouth College.

(He was my classmate.)

He was your classmate.

(I know him well.)

And Gary Earl tutored him.

2

You remember Gary Earl?

And I am still in close touch with Gary Earl.

THE STORY OF MR. SHERWOOD ADAMS

When the story about Sherwood Adams broke in the papers as a private secretary to the president or assistant president, I was reminded by Gary Earl of the fact that exactly what you say happened: Mr. Goldfein's son was found cheating in the finals. And the faculty voted that he had to be severed from college. And the vote was taken, and was unanimous for dismissal. Then the president suddenly stood up and said, "Mr. Sherwood Adams, trustee of Dartmouth College, wants you to reconsider the case." And the votes were taken a second time, and Mr. Goldfein stayed in.

(This is better, because in this instance that I cited, at the very beginning they said, "You know, don't do it." The principal of the high school told the teacher not to do this, here.)

3

Perhaps you begin to understand that since we have no historical relation now to birth and death, but a purely physical, that many people remain outside history.

This is the staggering event. And I think if you go and see this humanity here, your first impression that they do not know where they are living, when they are living. It's just purely accidental. They live from day to day. They live very well, as a matter of fact. And that's just the reason why they have absolutely no notion.

THE STORY OF THE SECRETARIES OF LABOR UNIONS

I was asked the other day by a group of very serious secretaries of labor unions what they should do to educate the young women before the age of twenty. Could they send them to Bible classes, or lift their sights in some way, that they wouldn't throw away all money and everything for lipstick. And I had to answer them, that if they couldn't interest these girls in the next five years of their lives, there was nothing that deserved to be put into their lives, by reading or so.

I said, "You can read the Bible in the life of 24 hours, as a stimulus, as an interesting story about Susanna and her bath, and then it ranks with Esquire. Or you can make a child aware of the fact that she has a long life to live, and that the tensions which carry a person along, over ten or fifteen years should rule the powers that rule the day.

Just as in the relation between marriage and sex, this is absolutely necessary, that sex is overruled by love, and love is overruled by marriage. And if a woman is sick, that doesn't allow a man simply to go haywire and to say he's no longer married. And if his wife grows ugly, there's no excuse for him to run after beautiful woman. So all the urges are simply to be overruled by a higher law."

4

And I said, "If you cannot inject into these poor girls' existence something of this long-range sentiment, or expectation or fear, don't abuse all the good things -- neither Shakespeare nor the Bible -- because they will all fall flat. And they will be never available, even later not. The terrible thing with the classics and the Bible is that if they come to you at an age where you live from day to day, their power is destroyed. And you will say later, "Never again will I touch these books," because you have this memory that you abused them for a momentary flicker of interest, in which they could never compare to the comic strip.

And I would in this country abolish the reading of the Bible, of all serious literature, before twenty-five or thirty.

If you have to read the comics, then read them. But then don't read anything else.

III

1

This is very serious, gentlemen. It all has to do with the idea that the whole process of growing up is a process of your own action that you are all self-made, that you pick and choose. At the age of twelve, you tell your child, "don't you go to the movie," then you go. Or you say, "I want to see television," then they have to allow it. If the child is not born by the father's spiritual, historical act of procreation, if this is not an act of the parents, then it is thought of as being an act of the children.

2

And this today is the rule in this community that the child is already considered as somebody who selects for himself.

THE STORY OF CHILDREN IN A RESTAURANT

I have seen children of four being asked to select on the menu in a restaurant what they want to eat.

Well, that's madness. But everybody does it in this country. It's absolute madness.

THE STORY OF A FAMILY VERY MUSICAL

I have also known a family where the child was destroyed, because it was asked to distinguish composers and conductors -- it was very musical. It was a kind of musical genius. The parents were so proud that they inquired from this child at the age of two who had composed this -- Beethoven, and Haydn. At four, my son who is a psychiatrist, got this case; and the child was destroyed. Nothing could help him. It had been overstimulated; it had been overtaxed.

And here was a genius destroyed by this idea that a child, after it's born, it's all under its own steam. It's in his own boat.

3

Gentlemen, you are not in your own boat as long as something is not held against you. As people understand that what you say is not serious, because a person is in history when his word can be held against him. This is the break in your social situation.

Wherever, the thing I say makes me, because I'm quoted on this, and people say, "That's the man who said this," I'm in history. Before, I'm not.

4

This is the only decisive difference between a playboy and a real man. Or a woman and a little, laughing, ignorant girl. As long as you giggle, well, people say, "It isn't serious." But as soon as she can cry and say, "Here I love this man, and I'll elope with him," she becomes Juliet at the ripe age of fourteen.

IV

1

And the limiting concept of history therefore is always this simple fact: in every one of us there comes the hour where you have to stand upright and say, "You may take my life, but this I cannot do."

You cannot commit adultery; you cannot commit incest with your sister, even if the people say, "If you don't, I will kill you."

THE STORY OF THE GERMANS IN POLAND

The Germans have tried this with the Jews in Poland. For their pleasure, they tried to break down the morality of the Jews. Just for their entertainment. Say, "We'll kill you, but in our" -- in their presence, perform.

2

There you see how serious this whole question of historical existence is. There are limits to any man's endurance. And there are things you cannot do, even though they kill you.

And this may be a limiting concept, but it is evaded in this country, although this is the most bloodthirsty country in the history of the world. There have been more people killed in the settlement of America than in any other country.

If you read the story of the Indians in this country, here in California, it is just awful. But it is denied today that people can live in history without ever having to decide the question: "You will have to die for this cause."

Yet no war is possible, no public law can be upheld if there is not a policeman who is willing to take a chance to be shot down by the robbers. It would break down your system of order.

3

And as long as you must every one of you - this is a very personal decision - should begin to scrutinize: your whole upbringing is against every word I say.

I am perfectly aware of this. But you have bought it at the price that you are outside history. You are all living, preferably, outside the historical -- you are statistically important.

But in history are only the people who are statistically unimportant because the statistically unimportant at one point resist the trend. And if a crime is committed by everybody -- everybody lynches Negroes -- one person has to stand up and say, "No."

That's how it begins.

4

My greatest historical story in this respect is the story of a McCarthy anecdote.

THE STORY OF McCARTHY

McCarthy had his Mr. Caspar and other similar individuals going down South. Now I don't know if it was Caspar or somebody else, but it happened in 1948 in a city in the South, a small city, perhaps ten thousand people, in South Carolina. And this rabble-rouser came to town, and everybody went, because it was the McCarthy days.

You haven't lived through them, probably, but there was real excitement in the country. And it was like the Sedition Act of 1795, the whole nation thought they were betrayed. And I think still there was some cause for this excitement.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY IN THE PURGE OF McCARTHY

So you mustn't think that I have something to say in favor of the purge of McCarthy; because when I came to this country, I've been persecuted - because I was not a Communist -- by the educated people. So I know there was this "fellow traveler" business to a tremendous extent. I was a reactionary, and I was denied all promotion here, and all acceptance, because I was a reactionary. And a very wise man at that time said, "Why don't you join the Communist Party?" And I said, "But I can't." And he said, "Well, but then your future in this country would be assured."

This was in '33.

So I only want to say, I'm not partisan in this story, you must understand. I'm only descriptive of what happened. Because he was a louse, he was cheap, and didn't deserve any personal credit.

And this rabble-rouser came to this town in South Carolina, and set everybody against everybody. There were thousand people in this gathering. It was very great excitement. And you felt that one match could start a conflagration. And so everybody was on edge, what would happen. And after he had ended his harangue, an old man -- and they always have been the saviors of the historical continuity in this country, the men over seventy or eighty -- like Stimson, and such people, the secretary of war under Roosevelt -- and he said simply, "My friends, I have grown up in this town, with Protestants, and Catholics, and Jews, and Negroes. And we have always got along very well. I think the speaker has not understood this. So I propose that we all now get together and accompany him to the railroad station." And so it was done.

CHAPTER TWO: THE OVERFLOW OF FREE AMERICAN AGENTS

I

1

And I think there you learn how history is made.

History is made when an automatic trend suddenly is interrupted by a personal act for which this man takes the responsibility and allows himself to be quoted.

It's very simple.

2

But now after this has happened, I go around -- into this seminary group here of yours, and say, "This is representative of America, of the American small town". Because he simply created a function, which is nowhere written in the Constitution of the United States. But I assure you, the Constitution of the United States cannot function one day without such an event happening. If not one man comes forward, and says, "This is not right," there will be no Constitution of the United States.

3

Take you another case.

THE STORY OF TRAVELERS OF GOOD WILL

Down to 1939, the good will of the whole earth was enlisted on the American side by the missionaries that went all over the globe from America, travelers of good will. They were journalists, they were real missionaries, they were doctors, they were dentists, but people all over the globe.

And I have met with them.

And when I was a boy of ten, I was approached by an American in Switzerland. And I have never forgotten it. He tried to proselytize me, and I was deeply impressed that a man with a great top hat, that was still the way he traveled. A giant of a man. Now, I was a very small boy. And here he was, bending over me, and saying where I came from; I came from Berlin, Germany. "Oh, that's a very dangerous city," he said. "It's so secular."

And so I never heard these expressions before. He talked German.

Well, I only meant to say, this man traveled around the globe and everywhere represented America; and they were fully aware that their life was their office.

A good American has this feeling, that his whole life is invested in this one adventure of getting God's commission. And I have met these people -- and I know of many others -- what an effect the existence of these free travelers from America had all over the globe.

4

THE STORY OF PASSPORTS

In 1939, it was discovered by the department of state of this country that there was nothing in the Constitution saying anything about passports. From this, they gathered that since it wasn't mentioned, it was not the birthright of an American to get a traveling passport abroad. And they usurped, as you well know, by now the power to say where you can travel. By this they controverted, they inverted the whole Constitution of the United States, because the United States had been founded as an open part of an open world.

And obviously, if you give to an institution of the government the right to decide where you can travel, you reverse the whole situation. And from the open frontier, which is a passport problem, we simply are now a closed shop. And we are not any better than Russia.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S LETTERS CENSORED

My letters are censored when I write to Russia. They are censored not in Moscow, but they are censored in Washington.

And nobody cries. Because you are so statistically minded, that you say, "But nobody says anything. Why should I?"

II

1

One man went to court, you know. And the Supreme Court now -- it hasn't been quite settled, the question -- but I assure you that your whole future and the whole future of humanity is at stake at this decision whether the state department can retain your passports, or whether you have a right to go to Holland whenever you want to go. That's very important for your own life. And you don't care. You say, "Oh, I can't do anything."

2

The one person who cares makes this passport case into a stepping-stone in history. If there is not such a man who says, "I sacrifice my fortune, my time for it, my lifetime, to go through with this, through all the different courts of appeal," nothing will happen.

3

I here, I do nothing. I arouse your interest in this matter, but am I really engaged in this?

No, I'm quite aware that I'm only mentioning this to you. I'm not yet in history. I'm playing with the idea, that some one of us should make the sacrifice and stay put until this is solved.

And you may see that a teacher of history is still only fooling around with the story. I'm not making history here in this seminar by telling you this. I'm quite aware of my very secondary role.

But I think it's a beginning, at least. I have to tell you at least that it is an issue.

4

And if you begin to see this, certainly, you will make an office -- a man becomes representative in history if he makes one issue his issue through his whole life, whatever that may mean. And the test of this is: is he willing to perish?

Not that he should seek death, you understand. It's not a suicidal thing. But that he should be willing to pay the penalty. I go now to the Supreme Court and say, "The state department has withheld my passport to China."

As you know, they do this.

THE STORY OF BILL HINTON

I have a friend, Bill Hinton, who went to China just the same. Now this had tremendous consequences. His mother was the principal of the famous Putney School in Vermont. And many of the parents were good, old-fashioned, wealthy people; and they were frightened to death. My son went to school in the same class with Bill Hinton at this school. So I know the story very well. Well, Bill Hinton said, "Come," -- water? or how do you say? high water or?

(Hell or high water.)

"hell and high water, I go through with it." He went back to China. He testified before the foreign committee of the Senate.

Well, he is still an old-fashioned American who knows what it takes to enter history. He said, "You can break me, but you cannot take away from me the decision that I have the right to find out what is going on in China myself."

III

1

Now the whole period of American history from 1776 to 1945 I assure you is at this moment jettisoned by your generation, because you don't give a damn for this issue. It is the one issue, because it makes America into a different nation. It makes them into a nationalistic nation, if the center office in Washington can decide where you move to. The whole legislation has been in this direction.

2

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY A NATURALIZED CITIZEN

I cannot live in Europe now without losing my citizenship, because I'm a naturalized citizen. The people of the United States are so fed up with immigrants that you have made me into a second-rate citizen. I am now a citizen since 1940, and just the same, for twenty years now -- after nineteen years I'm a citizen. I came to this country innocently in '33 and came on a visitor's visa, because I didn't understand this whole rigmarole. So I could have become a citizen much earlier. However that may be, that's my own mistake.

But still, the law says now, that a person who is in the opinion of the state department absent from this country too long in the first 25 years of his citizen rights, can simply be deprived of his citizenship without due course of law, without any proceedings. Simply his American passport is taken away from him. No answer given. No reasons given.

I live under an absolutely arbitrary regime. It's just as bad as taxation without representation. Or even worse, because I even am not a citizen. And I have no appeal.

The courts in this land have nothing to say in the matter. We are absolutely treated as second-degree people. Who cares?

THE STORY OF MR. EISENHOWER

This law was picked over under the steamroller of the Republicanism of Mr. Eisenhower's jubilant entrée into the good old folk ways of 1750. And he became a Presbyterian, and that was all that was needed to set the country right.

3

The intent not to have to do with historical problems is overwhelming. And it is therefore quite exceptional that history can take its course. It is against the will of the majority of humanity, to take upon themselves the burden of the question that has to be solved at any one moment.

Now, look at the passport question. It has to be solved now. If you forfeit this privilege, within the next five years, never will America be again an open country.

I don't say a "free" country, but the condition of freedom is openness.

4

Now immigration has stopped. But the corollary to emigration, which is never mentioned in your textbooks, is not immigration. But how would you call it, this free roaming?

The right to roam over the globe is essential to the whole American story.

Where would we be in South America?

Where would we be in Panama?

Where would we be in Mexico?

If you read any American's reminiscences and memoirs, how many people have gone to all of these countries, and made for good will?

IV

1

THE STORY OF DOUGLAS STIER

Douglas Stier, at this moment, the Quaker, is in South Africa. It's very important for the rest of the world, because here is a man of the Quaker faith in this African turmoil, terribly important. Now should he be made dependent on the wisdom of some official in the state department who says, "It's good to go to Africa," or "not good to go to Africa"?

What difference it makes for your and my right to enter history. A whole field of action is either left open to my decision, or I'm just -- how would you call it? -- an instrument then of a deliberate policy of the central government.

2

And I feel very strongly on this.

Now that I depend for my passport on a decision of the state department, nothing that I do is completely free. So an amount of dignity is taken away from my action, because everybody in the foreign world will say, "Oh, he got a passport from the United States government. Then they must like what he's doing. He's a propagandist."

You understand that I'm now tainted with propaganda?

3

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY GOING TO YUGOSLAVIA

I went to Yugoslavia, this last fall, which is a very important corner of the globe, as you can see. It's betwixt and between. Well, I went at my own expense, but I did go as a delegate of the United States government, because otherwise I wouldn't have gotten a passport. And I felt denigrated, I felt belittled, made small.

Can you see the difference? Because the people said, "Well, obviously the United States have an interest that this man go. This is not a disinterested party to this. They gave him the passport. They even allowed him to speak in their name."

4

So today, the horror of the world is that any American who goes abroad no longer is acting as a free human -- a Christian agent, but he's acting as a representative of the United States government.

And I think the poison comes from this.

We would have had peace long ago if there was still this overflow of free American agents.

CHAPTER THREE: STATISTICALLY UNIMPORTANT

I

1

(The thing is that you are saying, we still are representative of our own country, whether they label us officially "Americans" --.)

Oh, pardon me. I said explicitly, you can be representative for Vermont. You can be a representative for the United States. But any function has its own area of meaning.

A doctor is not only an American physician. He can also stand for medicine. And a physicist can stand for physics.

THE STORY OF MR. OPPENHEIMER

You know, Mr. Oppenheimer died for this. He was deprived of his position here with atomic energy, for what reason? You know the story?

Because he said, "I can communicate with all physicists of the world," and so he talked to a Communist physicist in Paris. And this was the only reason why this man -- who's now the head of the foundation at Princeton, of the Institute of Advanced Studies - was not allowed to stay in the American, Atomic Commission, and why we have this fool Teller now, instead.

2

So it is very bad. You always represent. I stick to that.

But you can represent Christianity.

This man who talked to me in Switzerland, with his big top hat, this great top hat, he didn't speak as an American to me, but I saw that Americans still cared for the rest of the world. This is enlarging this.

But now I don't think that Americans would say this, "They care for the rest of the world." I would say they carry their American interests everywhere.

That is, it's *America first*.

Can you see the difference? The slight overturn, the twist in this?

Then I believe that Americans will go to great lengths to help the Armenian children.

Now I saw it's in the interests of the American government that some Americans should go and help the Armenian children. That's quite a change.

3

THE STORY OF PROPAGANDA

And I can only tell you that propaganda is an invention of the last forty years. Lord Northcliffe, the English journalist, invented this. He himself died from persecution mania, and from syphilis, and this is not unimportant, because propaganda is a similar fever pitch. It's something from which we all suffer. And propaganda I think makes world peace highly improbable.

As long as you have propaganda, everything is distorted. You can only hope that everybody will distort everything so that nothing will work any more.

That's the only hope we have, that all propaganda will be counteracted by counter-propaganda.

4

But this has never happened in the history of the world.

The word "propaganda" was invented in the year of the Lord 1916.

I think this is very important for you to know this. The secular word "propaganda" is a word of very recent standing. And I think it has made man's historical role in society highly difficult, because anything we do now is treated under this aspect of propaganda. And it is stay-collared. And Heaven knows how you will implement any acts of yours to make sure that they do not rate you as just a spy, or just an agent of Mr. Ford, or of the government, or of some corporation.

It is not propaganda only in politics. It's commercial agents, even more so.

II

1

I can give you a nice case.

THE STORY OF AMERICAN DRIVING MORES

The chief of press of the Lufthansa, which is the German airline now -- corresponding to Pan American; it's the only airline they have -- wrote a very sensible letter to the paper,

which I happened to read, about car driving. And he's a driver himself of a man of fifty. And he has driven many different cars. And he complains that American discipline on the road is so much better than European discipline. Anybody who has been to Europe -- who has been to Europe? Well, you know this, how true it is.

And he tried to introduce American mores. And so he said, "Cut down on your speed limit. You cannot go at hundred miles an hour on our narrow roads. In America they only go fifty and sixty miles. Why don't you do this, too?"

Thereupon a shower of letters came to this paper. I read them. And it's just incredible. The climax was reached when the editor of an automobile paper for motorists, said, "Well, why do you listen to this man at all? After all, he's with Lufthansa. Of course, he wants to slow down the driving of the cars. He's just making propaganda for flying."

And it's only to show you: here was a man simply soberly discussing the problem of the road, and immediately he was considered a propagandist for his bread-and-butter employer. It was quite interesting, because then the paper itself got very mad indeed and upheld the right of this man from Lufthansa to say what he thought about car-driving on a road.

But we live in this kind of world today, that nobody is believed for anything.

2

And since this is so, gentlemen, you will see that witness to the truth is the historical role of man.

In order to get yourself in a position where people believe that you mean what you say, you have to strip yourself from certain securities, from certain niceties of existence. They want to see this risk.

This man of Lufthansa could only prove his point if he would still persist with his policy about cars on the highway -- Lufthansa or no Lufthansa. Before, it could never be proven that he is not a propagandist.

3

Now you haven't to take a man seriously who has ulterior motives, obviously. And history in the last fifty years in this country has developed a tremendous search for ulterior motives.

And this is why the whole story I think had to be brought home to you. The ulterior motives have abolished the whole American history.

Mr. Charles Beard has said that Jefferson and Washington had ulterior motives in writing the Declaration of Independence. And this idea of ulterior motives has been made an

attempt to make history into a science. And to penetrate behind what people stood for -- or said they stood for, into their being really instruments of propaganda for ulterior motives that there is something you do not say.

4

And "ulterior motives" therefore is just another word for treating everybody as a propagandist. And so this school of historians -- this is what I wanted to say today in the first place -- this school of historians which surround today you in your textbook and so, has tried to find ulterior motives, in order to get rid of this entrance into history by personal conviction.

There are no personal convictions. Everybody says something but means something else.

III

1

In this moment the whole history is depersonalized because then the man who fights for the passport against the state department before the Supreme Court, is again acting for something else. You never know what people mean when they say something.

2

And I think that's how you are treated. Everything is just allowed to fool around with the words he said, with the laws he writes, with the letters, with the speeches he makes.

We have a situation, where the president doesn't make his own speeches. And so we are totally poisoned. Nobody believes anything what is said. So why should a man believe when the girls propose to him, as they do today?

Everything is perverted.

3

Did you see the squib in the paper, yesterday? "Sure, I married her," somebody is overheard here on the beach. "Sure, I married her. She wanted me more to marry her than I didn't want her to marry me."

That is, it's all minus. It's all negative.

4

So my first word is: if you rediscover man as a brick in history, and would admit that to be born is not a physical act for the society, but that somebody undertakes -- parents, guardians, you may even say in a very meaningless way, "society" -- you take the responsibility of building up a baby's prehistorical situation into an historical situation.

If you could bring yourself to see that to be born is the deed of the community to you, that you are prehistorical, that to be born is not something you do to yourself, you would have to destroy this notion of the self-made man.

IV

1

You have to decide: is man self-made, or is he born?

But birth is nothing physical. Birth is something that takes place over twenty years. Man is born into society, because he's only man if he can understand under what conditions he can become a full-fledged member of this society.

Before, he is not in history.

2

If you could replace this, you would get rid of the two agonizing things of America which are self-contradictory.

One is: man is self-made.

The other: man is just under trends and can be statistically be gotten. That is, he's not self-made.

The new child is said to, "Oh, you do it yourself. You select your menu when you are three."

And the grownup person is told, "Oh, you are just a product of your environment." "We have statistics that will tell us how many refrigerators can be bought; you have nothing to say about it."

3

THE STORY OF BEING IMPORTANT

I once had a discussion with a man of Madison Avenue, one of these tycoons. And I said, "But I don't care for a television. I won't have one." And finally we discussed these things, and he was so annoyed. Finally he said, "Well, you are statistically unimportant." And that

finished me in his eyes. But I began to look up, perk, and think I was a great fellow. I am statistically unimportant. Then I am important in history.

4

The condition for anybody to be an historical individual is that he is statistically unimportant.

CHAPTER FOUR: TWO MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE CONCEPTS

I

1

So we have the choice.

Your tradition is -- and it is for 150 years the official reading of man's existence on this globe -- that we are self-made as children, and as young men. And then we enter society, and there environment, propaganda, ulterior motives are everything. Because if a man is after all the product here, you get all these technical terms:

trend, environment, propaganda, ulterior motives.

2

Hypocrisy, by the way, is the most general common denominator for all this. It's the hypocrisy of the made man, but the self-made man is able to break through all this at the ripe age of six. How he does it, is a mystery.

These are two mutually exclusive concepts. I will say that a man of sixty may begin to be self-made, gentlemen. But how a boy under the pressures of modern society at the ripe age of fifteen should be self-made, I do not understand.

That's against the official creed of this country.

Yet it is believed.

3

THE STORY OF THE MINK COAT

You have the story of the boy who from rags to riches on the one-hand side, that he can make good. You know, like the blond girl who came back with a mink coat from New York to her father and he said, "Well, have you been a good girl? A mink coat?" And she said, "Oh, Papa, you don't know how good you have to be in New York in order to get a mink coat."

So let's have a break here.

THIRD PART: THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE BIBLE

CHAPTER ONE: THOUSANDS OF YEARS?

I

1

Or you want to dance?

What did I ask you to bring to class?

The Book of Samuel.

2

Anybody who is interested in this so-called scientific approach to history may do well. I don't want to make it prescribed reading.

The History of History, by Mr. Shotwell, who was the great gun at Columbia University, and president of the inspirer of the Carnegie Foundation for Peace, and a leading mind at the turn -- down to ten years ago, Shotwell, *History of History*.

There is a rather astonishing misunderstanding of the Bible to be found. He called this book *The History of History*. And as I said, I have respect for the man. He has achieved many things, and certainly has done a lot to introduce the problem of a world history to this country.

3

But then he has a strange chapter on "*The Old Testament as History*," page 107 to 142.

Now this is in the seminar room here. It's one of the few books on the ancient history which we have, "Gift by Genevieve L. Morris," God bless her, "to the library of the department of history, the University of California." And I'll take it back there, and every one of you perhaps can read the few pages till next time on "*The Old Testament as History*." Pages 107, following.

It's the most radical or the most fashionable version that only in the last ten years is beginning to break down, in Albright's book, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, there is a very recent attempt to digest this anti-historical view of the Bible by Mr. Shotwell.

(You're recommending Albright's book?)

I think it's an important book. It's not the end of the story by a long shot. Well, I have many things to say myself because I'm working in the same field, but I think it's a great step in the right direction.

(Was a Johns Hopkins professor.)

Ja. Who knows the book, by the way? You have you read it?

(Just part of it.)

4

The problem before us, gentlemen, before the house is:

*what's the contribution of the Greeks to history,
and what's the contribution of the Jews to history?*

There is only history in the Christian era, in the full sense of the word.

All three theses you will not believe at once, but I think it is true. And we are on our way out of history at this moment, if we do not recollect the contributions made by Israel to history, by the Greeks to history, and the unification of the two strands in the historical tradition of Christianity.

II

1

The first thing that all pre-Jewish, and pre-Christian, and pre-Greek history has done is to add to the length of the historical process, arbitrarily, thousands or more than thousands of years.

2

Now that's a fact you can test very easily. The Japanese history allegedly begins in 661 B.C., but in fact it only begins in 300 A.D. That's a typical attempt to add one millennium.

I have found it true in several such chronologies, that the mythical addition is by and large one thousand years. Must be something in the human imagination which works in such a way.

If you get to Egyptian chronology of the pharaohs, you have a hundred thousands of years added.

The Great Year of the Persians, that's an imitation of the Egyptian year again. Three hundred twenty-three thousand is the era of Zoroaster -- not Zoroaster himself, but the Persian tradition which was then later built on this.

The chronologies before the Christian era are all attempts to exaggerate the length of time with which they deal.

"Mythical" means longer.

3

Now the boldness of the Jewish history is its brevity, briefness.

And this now is very important, gentlemen. I ask you the question: which kind of history makes man more responsible, and which dispenses more with his own action: the longer or the shorter? What would you say?

(I'd say the shorter.)

What does the shorter?

(Makes man -- what was the question again? Were responsible?)

Makes you less responsible or more responsible.

(I think the shorter makes you more responsible.)

4

Quite.

THE STORY OF CALGARY, ALBERTA

I went to Calgary, Alberta. I had to spend there a whole week, and was very tired. So I didn't know what to do there. I had to wait for my money. So it's a very abstruse situation. So the only thing you can do in Calgary, Alberta, except to go to the Swedish church, is to go -- and that's closed on weekdays -- you can go to the geological and zoological park there. And there are tremendous monuments to these primeval animals. And they are all there in clay, in natural size. And there the counting reads, "600 million years," "700 million years," "800 million years."

And the more you read these figures, the more you vanish, yourself.

III

1

And I'm very convinced that the anti-historical bias of this country is embodied in this gloating over these alleged astronomical figures of the animal kingdom. And man before one hundred thousand years.

We know nothing of any of these things.

The history of man is very short. It consists of perhaps fifty generations.

That's long enough to be interesting. And long enough to hold you responsible for it. All the rest is bunk. Not "history is bunk," but the elongation of history into these mythological depths is bunk.

2

Now I can't give you all my reasons for this, but I want to bring out the fact that Greek and Jewish history have one merit: they have shortened the history that matters.

That is never mentioned. It's very important, because they have pinned down man to a range of time within which your own lifetime matters. And with 600 million years, you'd better give up right away. We'll just settle it.

3

I have always laughed at this statement, "*Since Copernicus, we know that man is a grain of dust, of sand in the universe,*" because the vanity of this statement consists in that we are terribly proud that we know that we are a grain of sand on the universe.

The contradiction is just as much as with the self-made man and the environment. It's exactly the same contradiction.

THE STORY OF US NOBODIES

On the one-hand side, it took man five thousand years until Copernicus found out that we were just a grain of sand on the surface of the globe, that was within a system of stars, and that was again within a system of stars. So we're absolutely nobodies, but the whole history of man is concerned with finding out that we are nobodies.

4

It's exactly the same relation between, we are able to find out that we are just products of our environment. For the individual, it's exactly the same story as that it took the humanity down to the year 1543, until Mr. Copernicus -- or later Mr. Galilei -- did find out that we were absolutely nobodies on an earth that is nothing -- the sun that is nothing, compared to 400 million light years in the universe.

What do I conclude from that?

I think it's all nonsense. It doesn't help me at all. I'm not the wiser for it. I'm just paralyzed.

IV

1

But this is the American story. I can't open one American dictionary or book on Copernicus - or Galilei, for that matter -- without this stock phrase, "*Since him, we know that man is just a grain of sand in the universe.*"

You have seen this phrase, too, yes, but the vanity consists in this: that now we know that we are a grain of sand.

2

So, on the one hand, they give; and the other, they take. They have to leave something. It is the adoration of the human mind.

He is nonsense in reality, in the flesh, and his mind is gigantic. It has found out about this.

3

Now I prefer to be somebody in my carnality, in the flesh -- real, now -- and to hell with my mind. What do I give for that? That's just vanity.

THE STORY OF THE MIRROR

Shall I stand before the mirror and say, "I know that I'm nobody"? I have no interest in the matter. It gives me absolutely no measurement for my own behavior. Quite the contrary. It elates me on the one hand, immeasurably as a mind; and it dismisses me as a real person immeasurably on the abyss of nothingness.

4

And you all are brought up with this absolute overrating of your mind, gentlemen.

Your mind is a scoundrel. Your mind can prove anything. And if you want to abolish responsibility, it will prove to you that you live a thousand million years on earth, and therefore, you are not responsible for being inane, and a scoundrel, and a paranoiac, and so. It's your privilege, because who are you, after all?

A nobody.

But if you are a somebody in a "body" -- then you better correct your mind with all its lame statements.

CHAPTER TWO: THE BIBLE IS WRITTEN AGAINST MYTH

I

1

It is the relation between body and mind that is at stake in this whole naturalistic approach. If man is a carrier of historical life on this earth, his mind has to be put to service.

As you well know, the mind itself is indifferent: to good and bad, to future and past. The mind can prove anything.

2

To tell you the truth, if the ladies allow the mind is known to be a whore. And just as a woman is only somebody if she can be faithful, the mind has to be ruled by the heart. And otherwise, if your heart is wicked, your mind will always prove anything to your heart's pleasure.

Anything. You can prove anything.

3

There is no crime -- slavery in the South has been proved by the most beautiful minds of South Carolina, that the institution was wonderful.

THE STORY OF MR. WILBERFORCE

I just read Mr. Wilberforce's speech for the abolition of slave trade in the English House of Commons the other day, and where he fights a Mr. Norris who said, "How beautiful for these Negroes to come to America, and to come to the colonies, and to work there, and to sing," and so on. And he says fifty percent of them were killed on the boat.

Well, he rejoiced, Mr. Norris had said, because the mind can prove the slave trade very well.

4

So despise the mind. A mind that is not ruled by the whole human person and his character is absolutely worth nothing. It's a whore, a harlot. It's available. It's like a juke box. You put in ten cents, and it plays.

II

1

But we come from an era -- and this is Mr. Shotwell's era -- where the mind was thought to be free. And so the bodies become despised now: all pagan chronology shares this, by making history longer than it really is. And mythical history, gentlemen, is always diminishing my own responsibility.

Because if the world has gone on for thousands of years in one way, you'd better acquiesce. The myth is basking us in a rocking chair. I think you hear still in the word "myth" this quality of unhistorical, repeated movement. It's always there. You can't get out of it. It's just there.

2

If you say long enough that Los Angeles is a myth -- which it is -- your responsibility is all in the space, in Los Angeles. You can't do anything about it. "People in Los Angeles just behave like that". So the pattern is set, and it's from time immemorial: the climate, the climate, the climate.

And it's very similar with the mythical attitude to history. "*From time immemorial.*" Whenever you say, "*From time immemorial,*" you are adding to the burden of established forms of life.

3

THE STORY OF THE DICTATUS PAPAE

When the Pope Gregory VII broke away from the abuses of the feudal era, in his famous struggle of investiture against the interference of the secular power, the royalists, the imperialists, the adherents of the king of France, of the king of England, of the German emperor, said to him, "But you can't do this. For six hundred years the Church has been ruled by the emperors and by the kings. And -what are you going to do? How can you break away from this?"

He said boldly, "What? Does this make any difference? The devil, as you know, has ruled the humanity for five thousand years before Christ came. Did this make any difference for the Lord? Just for this reason did He finally have to come."

4

Now you see the boldness of the man's emergence against myths, against the immemorial.

THE STORY OF THE FALL OF MAN

That is, by the way, the true reason why the Bible and the theologians have upheld the theory of the fall of man. If man has been *rotten, criminal, environmental*, the product of his society, always as a creature, then history cannot take place, in our own day. The fall of man means that we can do something about it, because at first there is no prescription for any abuse.

III

1

The importance of the story of the fall in the Bible has nothing to do with history, but it creates a condition of history.

THE STORY OF THE JEWISH PROPHETS

This is why the ancients Jews were so terribly being in history and knowing that the future should be different from the past -- that's what they stand for, the prophets - they had to say, "Don't believe that anything that was, because it is there, is good."

2

And in this sense, I think you all must believe in the fall of man, the story of Adam and Eve, because it means that man has an act of freedom, even in the very first moment.

There's nothing immemorial. You can never say, "Because it always has been, it must remain this way." I do not see how any naturalistic historian can get out of this, if he is the burden of proof is on the changer, then. Once you say, "It has been there for six hundred million years."

3

So the length of history has been abolished by the Greek and the Jewish tradition.

Now I think when we come to Thucydides, you will find that it is overdone. This history is just his own generation. He knows actually nothing about anything that is going on before.

Have you Thucydides already there? Well, it's just contemporary history. There is no other history for him.

4

And the Jews have been very careful -- we'll see later in Genesis how they have gone about it -- to emphasize the relative shortness of history without pretending that the present moment is lost of all continuity, is deprived of all meaning of previous stages or future stages. But it's a very complex situation.

IV

1

In the Book of Samuel, we have the first book that is contemporary -- and it's the first contemporary history, of which we can say that it was written.

All the other books preceding Samuel are written later than they were recorded. That is, they were oral traditions, it seems, to a large extent. There were inscriptions, probably stone inscriptions; there were documents. But that the book, the historical book was written contemporaneous with the event is not to be believed. In the desert, they didn't write the books of Moses. Although the record is very precise, and much more genuine than people have cared to admit.

But Samuel is written more or less in the way Thucydides is written. And that's why I think it is quite important for us to look what is interesting -- the Israelites in history.

2

That I would say: from the first the Jews are interested in the anti-mythical element.

The Jews are the enemies of myth.

This is so simple that it is really hard to deal with people who now call the Bible itself a story full of myth. The whole Bible is written against myth. That's the tendency. You may say it's a very tendential book. And a partisan book.

It certainly is absolutely biased against myth. That's why it was written. And that's the whole raison of the Jews. To this day, they stand against all mythology.

They say, "Virgin birth? Myth. See? So we can't become Christians."

3

Now from my point of view, still I think the virgin birth has meaning -- this goes too far. But the Jews simply decline to accept any mythical story. And that's their quality to this day.

4

So to call the Old Testament "a myth" is really an incredible aberration of the human mind.

CHAPTER THREE: THE GREATNESS OF THE JEWISH STORY

I

1

If you look at Samuel, he has to find out the problem. Yes. Why is this an anti-mythical book?

Because it should show in these books, the two books of Samuel, and the two books of Kings must have been written under David and Solomon. And the reason why they could afford to have a library of books, and needed it, was -- do you know when David was king of Israel? Does anybody know?

(Around 1000?)

Ja. He must have lived -- we know it, not to the year, I would say, but 1030 B.C. to 960. And that's an important date, because it is much before Thucydides and Herodotus lived. And it's just a hundred years after the alleged date of the Trojan War.

The Trojan War supposedly took place in 1187 B.C., and David has governed from 1030 to 960.

2

According to my own insight into the prehistory of this, I may tell you that I believe that Moses left Egypt around 1300 -- 1280. That's the usual time now, by the way, given for the last hundred years, many hundred years to this event, because it was under Ramses that he left.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S BOOK DIE VOLLZAHL DER ZEITEN

I have recently published a book on the relation of Egyptian history to Mosaic history, and so I feel a little competent to cope with it.

3

This is not unimportant, because the Jewish prehistory, then at the year of the Lord 1000, or 960, when David dies, and when we can place Samuel perhaps, around this time, is not so very long. The Israelites only had as the people of the exodus of leaving Egypt - only a history in the eyes of their grandchildren, of how many years? 1280 to 960 -- how much is this?

(Three hundred.)

Three hundred fifty years. So by and large, like the American people at this moment.

From 1620 to 1960 brings you up, and just as you feel free to deal with the Pilgrim fathers and have Thanksgiving, so Easter in days of David corresponds by and large, to the celebration of Thanksgiving in this country with regard to historical continuity.

4

And I think that's quite useful for you to realize that the story of the existence of Israel, at the moment when they begin to write books, is brief, is not mythical at all. It's not as in Japanese history, dated back a thousand years more, but in the full light of history in the countries around.

The Egyptians at that time had a history of three thousand years.

II

1

There's no attempt among the Israelites to lengthen their story artificially. Quite the contrary. It's very short.

Because the Jews even admitted that Shem was a common ancestor, that they were only a branch of the Semite family, that the Israelitic history is inside, inside, inside any boxes of more complex histories.

2

And no pretense made. The modesty of the Jews is that they have never claimed to exist from the beginning of the world. The impudence of all other nations is that they call themselves "earth-born". The Greeks, for example, "They were in Greece all the time." That's how Thucydides begins his story, and Herodotus: the Athenians said, "Never has there been anybody but Athenians in Attica."

The Jews know that this is all bunk.

3

The greatness of the Jewish story is that it begins with Cain; and all other nations, except the Jews, have insisted that their own story begins the story of mankind.

4

Now the truth of the matter, as you have here -- how many tribes you have in California? Do you know how many tribal languages there have been spoken here in Southern California? Any idea?

*(What's a tribal language?)
(Indian.)*

Oh, you know what a tribe is.

(No, I thought you maybe had some other --.)

Well, like Hebrew, a language by itself.

Well, 138 languages have existed when the Spaniards came to this country here. Hundred thirty-eight in Southern California alone. Only as the tribes were only one, two thousand heads strong. And every one of these tribes has a mythology by which it is derived...

SECOND LECTURE: WHERE WE ARE MEANT

FIRST PART: THE BIBLE FOUNDS HISTORY

CHAPTER ONE: WHY? - HOW? - WHO?

I

1

...the heart of the whole problem of the historical character of religion. The Jewish people are infinitesimal small.

In the Cambridge History of the Orient, they cover one page. And in relation to page 26 -- I just looked it up in the most modern volume, not the Cambridge one, the German one --and it's quite significant that these people feel that they have already done remarkably well by giving page 26 and-a-half to these little tiny specks on the map, called Palestine.

2

And in any sense of space and time, the Jewish history is minute. So it remains a riddle.

There are two great riddles connected with the Bible in history.

One: how this little, tiny, and insignificant group was able to reach us, and to impress on us its own vision of history.

But *the second* -- equally interesting -- is: how it was possible for the last seventy years to distort the Bible, and, bound by the scientific outlook, to judge the Bible and the history of Israel as simply a story of one other country, or one other tribe.

3

This book by Mr. Shotwell is a shining example. Who has looked into this book?

I'm very sorry that the rest didn't. All right, so it is an assignment for next time. You'll have to read it.

I think it's a very good summary of these follies of modern history as a science. He has absolutely not the slightest understanding of what the Bible tries to achieve. And that's quite remarkable from a very intelligent man.

And so I want you therefore to read, because it's a good -- Mr. Shotwell being the great authority in this country on historiography and historians -- it is very interesting that he didn't even try to understand what the people tried to do when writing the book.

There are these two problems.

The Jewish Bible obviously is of an importance that has nothing to do with the quantity, the power of this little, tiny speck on the map. Point 1.

Point 2: this importance, however, has been denied, and it has been made the attempt over the last seventy to eighty years, to reduce the Bible to a local story.

4

We must make an attempt at least to find out why the Bible has this authority, this importance for us to this day; what their contribution to our experience of time has been.

II

1

We began to read the first chapter of Samuel. We shall go on with it, but before plunging into this, I should draw your attention to a simple fact. It seems to me that perhaps otherwise we might get lost.

You have in your own mind three ways of dealing with the reality.

One is: asking the question "Why?" -- ask for cause and effect. That's -- you have learned in school -- is the only reasonable way to do something. That's reasonable.

Then there is another question: that's "How?" And that's the question of techniques, as you know today -- government is a question of Madison Avenue techniques. That is, the know-how. So you don't know how, then you know how, and then you are happy.

2

Now the question, neither the question "Why?" nor the question "How?" is of any interest to the Bible. And therefore the scientist and the technician miss the boat. Since the Bible doesn't ask the question of cause and effect, and doesn't ask the question, know-how, and is perfectly unworldly, these two people who think this is the only reasonable way of dealing with the world, and the only technical way of survival, do not understand then there is quite a different way of approaching reality, which everybody, by the way, uses for all his own important situation.

THE STORY OF A LADY

I met a lady -- "lady" is perhaps the wrong word -- I have to be quite frank about it. She was the daughter of a college president here on the West Coast. And she was married to a very rich Easterner who, as a matter of fact, owned the last primeval forest in Connecticut. So blue-blood and intellectual, high-bred class she was.

And this woman, she had obviously married the man for his wealth and position -- he was a diplomat - and was one of these unsatisfied, voracious, aggressive women. And she always asked the question, "Why?" "Why?" And once she invited me to her house. I had to spend several days there. I left it like hell. And she played with everything in the world -- lesbianism, and every other vice you could imagine, as she frankly told me -- because she was so bored, that the only interest she had in life was to find out why. And she told me -- she shouted at me, in half an hour after I had entered her house, if people only could answer the question "Why?" then the world would come right.

Well, she was just a witch; should have been burned at stake; and because she answered the question "Why?" which you and I are not allowed to ask.

You cannot ask yourself why we love your mother. Once you ask this question you are in hell. That's not a question to put. And "Why don't you commit suicide?"

3

These are not questions that are permissible, because there is the real region of historical existence, gentlemen, why do you keep the laws of this country? You just keep them. As soon as you begin "Why?" you are already on the way out.

Better leave the country and go to Russia.

Most of you act quite plausibly on this quite completely different level which the Bible poses. And the question of the Bible is, looked at from the angle of the technician and the angle of the philosopher, at best, if I want to state it in worldly terms, I would throw the "What is the Bible import?" "What is the story?" Because these poor people like this bitch -- or witch, or however you call this lady -- the only thing you might find in the Bible is: "What funny story?"

Creation of the world, and conquered kings, and crimes, and banalities, and so on.

4

Now you and I, however, have quite a different question for our own existence, and our family, and our political future. That's "Who?" As you consult the *Who is Who*, it's also very important whom you meet. If you think of the importance of being introduced to the right people, of social contacts, and so, the question is not at all "Why?" and "How?" but the question is "Whom? As whom do you people treat me?"

*You want to be treated as their comrades.
 You want to be treated perhaps even as their superior.
 You want to be a star in Hollywood.
 You want to be treated as the future successor of your teacher, or of your father;
 or to inherit the earth.
 You all want to be somebody.*

This is quite a different question, and expressed in the terms of the Bible itself, it is never even only "What am I going to be?" but "Who am I going to be?"

III

1

So the only approach in which you, in a secular sense, can get in a reading room of a modern library, a view of yourself is *Who is Who*. Because that's an honest question. The books, the *Who is Who*, where there is given a list. Because if you ask yourself, it's quite important

*who smiles at you,
 and who scolds you,
 and who is down on you,
 and who encourages you.*

These are the real questions. "Whom do I meet?", and "Who am I in their eyes?"

2

And so the Bible asks this tremendous question: "Who am I?"

*In the eyes of the world I'm often despised;
 I'm often neglected.
 Is there nobody who looks at me and restores my countenance to serve security?*

And the divine face that man can only become a man when other people set eyes on us, is summed up in the case of God shining upon us.

Man is a reflection of the divine countenance.

3

And everybody who has been in distress knows very well that he goes crazy if everybody despises him, that it keeps him upright, that he knows that these eyes are not the final view of his own self. If you think of a man quashed, and poked fun at, because he's

*disliked in the crowd,
or is sent to prison,
or is sent to the scaffold,*

what holds him up that the passing views to which he is exposed are not decisive as to who he is. They do not finally determine who he is.

Everybody knows this, and therefore, there is nobody who's an atheist. I've never seen one. Everybody expects that someone looks at him understandingly. At least he puts himself before a mirror, and then he's his own god.

4

So the question, "*Who looks at me?*" and "*At whom do I look?*" is the possessing in every life of humanity. People -- the Russians, the Americans, the whole American nation -- is for this reason one nation, because they all ask the same question, "How are we liked in the world?"

We want to be liked.

All Americans want to be liked. And they aren't. And they ask "Why?" "How?" "Who am I, that they don't like me?" And "Who is liked?"

IV

1

So the question, "Who?" gentlemen, never enters the whole discussion of a scientist, although in science, too, the *Who Is Who* is very important. Mr. Einstein, and Mr. Teller, and Mr. Oppenheimer -- they all have a religion.

The religion of the scientist is to be liked by your colleagues, and to be taken up on your word, and to be believed as a reliable scientist.

They all say, "Who am I?" They usually are satisfied that this little clan of scientists is affectionate about them, and treats them well.

2

So if you look at the ambitions of a scientist, all these books now written on science -- begin with *Arrowsmith* by whom? Who has read *Arrowsmith*?

(*Sinclair Lewis.*)

Yes. Who has read it?

Oh, well, only three people. *Arrowsmith*. Never read Sinclair Lewis?

Well, what did you read by Sinclair Lewis?

(*Main Street*.)

Ja, but *Arrowsmith* is very important. He wrote it together with Mr. de Kruif, the microbe hunter, de Kruif. And they were possessed with the idea of giving the scientist his place in American society. There is in *Arrowsmith* -- Martin -- yes, it is *Arrowsmith*, the hero is Martin, isn't he? It is the scientists' novel.

3

Well, then when the problem of the scientist is not in his laboratory, but is with his wife and his colleagues.

And I just received from the Book-of-the-Month Club a rather stupid volume, called *Scientist*. It's a kind of detective story. Have you seen it?

And I had to take it, because I wanted to have the Yale Shakespeare. But now I'm licked and we are in for this torment of the Book-of-the-Month Club selection. And I hope I can get out again.

But so I got this very cheap novel.

Novels about scientists abound today. It's a trick in this country, because people believe in science, so they think that books on scientists should be interesting. But they aren't, because the scientist has a starvation diet in all human relations, and is the last man of any interest in the sense of "Who?"

THE STORY OF MATHEMATICIANS

He's boring, mathematicians, the greatest bore in humanity. Sometimes they are musicians, then you can fiddle with them. But why should they be interesting? They are good mathematicians. And for the rest, they are a semantic blank. So they get under the domination of presidents, and generals, and produce bombs.

4

Because the scientist asks the question "Why?"

The technician asks the question "How?"

And that's the difference between the scientist, by the way, and a technician, which in this country is constantly transgressed. Most people don't know that scientists do not ask

"How?" but "Why?" And after they have found out why, then they hand it over to a plumber; and you call the plumber in this country a scientist.

A technician is not a scientist. He's a plumber. That is, he applies, when you have learned the cause and effect, then he says he knows the way then of putting things together. Just as Thomas Alva Edison who invented the electric bulb when all the physicists' work had been done in Europe, and he applied it.

CHAPTER TWO: THE BIBLE COMES INTO THE MIDDLE OF GLOBAL CONFUSION

I

1

Tinkering is the answer to the problem of "How?"

So I think this is at least important for you. Most of you -- it's not your fault -- live normally in these two relations. Everybody cares very much whom who is his friend, and who is maligning him, and who is hating him. We all are directed constantly by this.

But you don't admit it.

You think that you are really interested in science, or in techniques of social behavior. Don't help you at all. If you don't meet the right people -

THE STORY OF SAN PEDRO

you can live on San Pedro in a Japanese colony, and know everything about "how" and "why." If you don't meet the president and his wife, where are you? He doesn't come to San Pedro.

2

So everywhere in the world the faces of millions of souls have been directed toward the countenance that will relieve them from the fact that they are limited in their local and chronological existence on this earth, and will never see *kings, and royalty, and princes, and rich men*, and is that then to deprive them of bliss and happiness.

But where are they? They are destitute. They are alone.

3

THE STORY OF CHAMISSO'S POEM

There's a very terrible poem, a man who -- like Charles Darwin - sailed around the world for three years in the '20s of the 19th century, a German poet, Chamisso wrote a poem on a man who was left behind the Easter Island, on a destitute island. And later on -- that's the poem - there were engraved in stone his sighs that nobody ever returned. And he lived there another forty, fifty years.

It's a very great poem. It perhaps even deserves to be mentioned in this connection. It is haunting me to this day. I read it when I was a boy. And I had to learn it by heart, voluntarily. I didn't have to.

It's the fate of a man on whom nobody any longer sets eye. And he finally curses life, as Byron's *Manfred* does, and out of patience with his fate, because that nobody looks at you is the greatest punishment a man can undergo.

4

With this admission that we are made by other people's liking or hating us, we move into the sphere of the religious problem.

Before, if you do not admit this, that this is important to you, who looks at you, and how they look at you, with what countenance, you will never understand that history has to do with the problem of facing, of faces, of human faces. It hasn't to do with figures in mathematics. And it hasn't to do with chinaware, and hardware, and pots and pans, and forks, and Cadillacs, and cars.

Nobody cares. You can be the richest person, stark naked in the desert. If there is somebody who looks at you lovingly and affectionately, that's all you need. And you can starve together, and live it out, and be in perfect bliss.

II

1

But today, people really talk as though things -- the house and the causes -- have anything to do with our historical existence on this earth.

It has nothing to do with history. That belongs to the hardware store, and to the five-and-ten.

2

So whenever you find people speaking of "whats," asking the question "What?" or today is also another way of getting out of this commercial world in the world by "values" - laugh at them. The word "value" is the imported article from the commercial, technical world into the world of the divine presence.

God is nothing to be joked about or be left out.

You all believe in Him, because in any moment, where there is a lacuna in your existence, if people look at you as enemies, or you have to fill this out by a greater force which is not

yourself, but which pacifies your unrest that before he doesn't look at you *patiently, and peacefully, and expectantly*, you don't know where to turn.

You commit suicide.

You go nuts.

You end in the lunatic asylum.

You have a nervous breakdown.

However these expressions run.

So there is any number of insidious terms, imported from the realm of science, and causes and that is reason, and this is "practical".

3

Now history, gentlemen, has nothing to do with the practical, and has nothing to do with the rational, because it's a condition that you can use the reasonable world and can have the peace of mind that you can find out causes.

A madman cannot study physics. He first has to have peace of mind. The peace precedes his understanding. A neurotic person cannot study.

You know this very well. Because sometimes you just have to leave your desk, and get out of this, because it's just all running mad inside yourself. You have to restore it, your inner security. And this can't be done by reasoning, because it is the condition that you may be reasonable.

4

The people today -- it is very strange that they should confuse premises and superstructure. It's very nice to tell a physicist, "You can become a physicist. I'll give you bread and butter. I'll give you a stipend. I'll give you a fellowship."

But he's in the midst of a peaceful society in which he is allowed to go into his laboratory.

*And there is a fire engine that protects the house from burning,
and there is a police force that prevents the burglar from breaking into the laboratory.
There is a military force that prevents the Russians of invading America.*

And all this is first, long before there is science.

That the "Who are you?" has to be solved long before you are allowed to do "what" and to ask "Why?"

III

1

But people are such cowards that as soon as somebody says that everybody believes in God, people say that it cannot be proved.

Well, all the other things -- that we should have Cadillacs or drei-und-halb bathtubs -- that's a very questionable proposition. Why should we?

Perfectly superfluous.

But that everybody has to believe in God, because before he can commit himself into the multitudes of criminals, and follies of the day, where people tempt him right and left to buy unnecessary things, to have unnecessary ideas -- wrong ideas, to mutiny, or to follow false laws, or false standards of behavior that's up -- every one of you believes that he can survive all these temptations.

2

Here you sit and assume that I'm not going to do you harm, which is an incredible assumption.

Which in former days couldn't have happened in any tribe. You would only listen to the man of the same platoon, of the same skin, of the same language.

Now I have a foreign accent. Why do you listen to me? That's very dangerous. I don't belong. Why do you -- because we have enlarged and enlarged our vision, that the same spirit moves in sundry places, in all races and regardless of color -- how is it called? -- race and creed -- that we still can be of the same spirit.

3

So the question "Who?" is the question of the Bible.

And once you understand this, that this is the only interest in the Bible, "*Who is man that you should be mindful of him?*" that's the question of the Bible. And then every one of you asks this question every day, "Who am I?" and "Who am I going to be?"

4

So the Bible is, as I told you, beginning to be written down around 1100 B.C., when the whole earth is already peopled. You have always to keep in mind that in 1100 B.C., the peoples of this earth are already dispersed, as they are today. That's the tremendous facet, achievement.

If you think of the South Sea, and all the difficulties of the ocean lanes, we have to assume that -- except for perhaps South America, where I'm a little doubtful -- the people already had reached out over all the oceans; without any railroads, and shipping lanes, and so on, they have done it.

IV

1

So the Bible comes into the middle of a global confusion.

This you have to understand, that this exists. Then you will also understand why the story of the Tower of Babel is an attempt to make people not disconsolate about the dispersal, to comfort them about it. That it isn't just negative. That everywhere are people warring against each other no longer talk in the same tongue, and in total misunderstanding of each other, the complete magic that sets tribe against tribe, and group against group, and city against city, and empire against empire. Absolute warfare, and absolute hopeless.

And in this moment, the Bible asks these two questions, "Whence?" and "Whither?"

2

Because the identity of man, from his starting point to his destiny, is very questionable. Why am I the same person in the eyes of my parents -- who love me -- and hated I am tomorrow on the streets, and everybody scorns me, is there any identity of purpose?

And every one of you falls out of the nest, just as I do, or everybody else since Adam, and finds himself in this question: Is there any identity between origins and landings?

3

And this is the question then of the Bible, gentlemen: whence and whither, the question of history is its question. In a quite more pungent sense than you think at first, because it is man himself, every one of you has a history -- because he has to identify his beginnings and his ending, which is very difficult.

You leave Europe, and you come to this country; you leave Kansas City and you come to Los Angeles; you come from across the ocean, and suddenly you are elsewhere. Is there any identity, and in America the identity, the godlessness of man takes the form of this-- how do you pronounce it?

(The alias.)

Yes the *alias* is the expression of this loss of identity.

4

And you know, it still exists in this country as a real mental disease.

Most mental diseases in this country are more numerous than they are in any other continent of the world, because of this lack of identification. Most people, when they move into a new city, join a new church, find new friends, forget everybody they have ever met before, never see them again, never hear of them again.

THE STORY OF THE CHRISTMAS CARDS

And so the Christmas cards play a great part in this attempt of the Americans to remain normal, to remain healthy, to keep this identity. You know this very well. They are very important, we couldn't live in this country were it not through the Christmas card we testify that our old friends have lived with us. They are out of sight, but they are not out of mind.

CHAPTER THREE: THE FALL OF MAN

I

1

And now if you ask a question, which no scientist, and no technician ever asks -- the question of your identity -- you enter into the problem of history.

And the Bible is asking this question of you and me first. The Bible is very honest in saying, "I'm haunted with the identity of past and future."

2

Obviously, this is not complete identity, but it cannot be complete lack of identity. So -- "Where do I come from?" "Where do I go?" is the central question of the Bible. And gradually, beginning with man, with the writer of any chapter of the Bible himself, he expands his vision and says, "Well, in a wider outlook, the whole world probably has the same difficulty of keeping its identity as I have."

So the question of the Bible is always empirical.

Will you kindly take this down? The problem of the Bible is to begin with your own experience. It is never legendary. It's never mythological. There is no such thing as a Bible except to be fought.

The Bible is written against the brand new stories of kings, and tribes, who speak of their destiny as a special case. It's always starting with the consciousness of man's own failure to keep his identity -- and now look into the world at large: has it the same trouble?

And it has.

3

So before we go back to Samuel, which I think is at the heart of the matter, in the center of the whole approach, the lack of identity is the starting point. And the transfer of my own personal experience in this respect into the history of the world is the method of the Bible.

Probably the writer of the Bible story said, "The world was created as I was created." That is, I was created, I got a name, and that's a great promise. And the problem of the answer to the problem of whence and whither is that the first half of life is a promise, and the second half of life is its fulfillment. And that's the good life. And when the promise is not fulfilled, it's a failure; and when it is fulfilled, it's bliss.

And that's how the world should be created.

4

Now therefore, since many promises are not fulfilled, there must come something in between: the devil, the fall of man.

The fall of man is the falling-out of the relation of past and future.

II

1

The fall means that the promise is not fulfilled. And many promises are not fulfilled.

THE STORY OF THE FALL OF ADAM AND EVE

A murder, like Cain, or the desertion of Eve by Adam, who says, "It's not my fault," breaks the marriage. If you read all these stories -- it's very funny how little people can read today - the whole fall of man consists in Adam saying, "It's not my fault," thereby defaulting his solidarity with his mate. God asks, "Who did it?" And he says, "Eve."

So he's in hell. And they are driven out of paradise, because husband and wife are one body, and he should have said, "We." That would have been his answer. Since he says, "Eve," the whole marriage is off.

2

It's all very simple, because every word in the Bible is written around this one purpose of explaining that man keep his identity

*despite his fall,
despite his not fulfilling his promise,
despite his deficiencies,*

*and how this remission of sins,
how this deficiency can be cured*

is the story which fills the Bible -- it's a very rational book, Sir. It's strictly empirical. And it is strictly rational. And it just studies the question: how can you be restored?

3

For example, Adam has sinned against his solidarity with his mate.

Capitalists sin against their solidarity with the workers.

Americans at this moment sin against their solidarity with the starving people of the rest of the world. We have half of the wealth of the world, and we are one-tenth of the people. That cannot last, obviously. So how can we get out of this misery?

It's not so simple. We give away our food, then all the other people shout that the prices are dropping in the world market. So we cannot even feed the starving Hindu masses, if we wanted to, with all our surplus food. It's a riddle. Can you solve it?

And the people in Brazil burn the coffee to keep up prices.

All these scandalous things -- but they cry to heaven. They are obviously the fall of man.

4

So there is a promise: there is enough food to go around; and it isn't fulfilled.

And that may go on before we find the solution.

This will be a hard struggle. And obviously one day we'll say, "This terrible sin of the 19th and 20th century that on one side of the globe people starve, and the other, they have too much, this was finally forgiven, because people recognized their solidarity."

III

1

The same with the question of slavery in this country.

And there are innumerable such questions where the fall of man always comes from a breach of solidarity.

The whole point of view of the Bible was that man was created as a unity, despite the dispersal of all mankind over the globe, and wherever he befalls his "Whither?" his common destiny,

*there is bloodshed,
there is despair,
there is decadence,
and there is dying-out.*

2

And you just look at the Fourth Commandment, we can't help it. It takes three or four generations before such a crime is wiped out. This branch of the human race then usually dies out. And it's not a question, that's a scientific, empirical experience.

There are some people say that's very cruel that the sins of the parents are visited on their children, but they are. The child of a drunkard just is visited in his constitution. You cannot change that. But the hope is that he will have no children himself; and nobody will marry him, and so that this strand of life is self- eliminated.

3

So this is just an example.

The Ten Commandments are purely descriptive. If you do the thing, if you believe in one God, then you can talk with the rest of mankind. But if you don't believe in one god, you have fallen idols, and you must go to war and kill each other.

So the problem of the Bible from the very first is the uniqueness of the divine creator of Heaven and earth. You can't go back of it.

And therefore, since 1870, it is the fashion -- especially in this country -- to pretend that the Bible is the talk of a tribal god, "Him."

We wouldn't mention the Bible if this was such an idiotic thing. Why should we be interested in a tribal god of some three thousand years ago? There have been innumerable tribal spirits. Nobody mentions them.

4

The Jews come in the middle of history. 1100 B.C. dispersal is already a long story. All the pyramids are built. The big empires exist of Egypt, of Crete, of Mycenae, of the Hittites - everything. And there in the middle of all this confusion, and all this warfare, there is this tiny little group that says, "I'm not interested in this momentary power. Where are we headed for? Where do I start to express my dismay that all these countries are on their own, that they are walling themselves off?"

It is the time when the Chinese empire begins to come into existence. I think Chinese history begins, by and large, 1500 B.C., and not earlier. And the Chinese have built this wall around their empire, just to express their complete lack of concern for the rest of the world.

IV

1

This is normal among Gentiles. The Romans built this *limes*, it's the same thing, the wall around their empire. And any family does the same with its family convictions that you cannot marry outside the clan, or outside money, or outside the white race, or whatever the taboo is which you uphold.

2

And now the very first word of the Bible is: the failure is always the same.

The one high experience that I am within a hostile world which does not like my face, which is set against me. If you read the Psalms, or if you read any verse in the Bible, it is full of this expression of the dismay that I have so many enemies.

They have held this against the Psalms -- the pacifists -- as being too belligerent. Well, you yourself are of the same complexion. You go here through these staircases and floors,

*and who looks at you,
and who hides from you,
and who is indifferent to you,
and who is supercilious?*

We are just exactly in the same situation.

It's not our fault. If there are two billion people on this globe, it is impossible for all these two million people to like you.

3

THE STORY OF DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER

Dorothy Canfield Fisher, my friend in Vermont -- she died last year - was an old Vermont writer. Have you heard of her, Dorothy Canfield Fisher? Well, she told us the story that she met in Bennington at the college, a very progressive college, a girl. And she happened to say to this girl, who hadn't been asked to dance while there was dancing going on, "Well, my dear. We cannot be liked by everybody."

And the girl began to cry desperately. She had never wanted to know this simple truth, that you cannot be liked by everybody. And it was intolerable to this girl. She had grown up under this, millennia dream of America that everybody can like everybody.

And then you don't need a religion.

4

The American substitution for faith, and religion, and the Bible has been that everybody can be liked by everybody, so we keep smiling. And so we weep inside; and so the people sit in the lunatic asylums weeping day and night, and making up for their too many smiles which they have wasted in their purposive days of life, and then they break down.

Because you cannot like everybody.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE TRANSFORMATION OF SPEECH

I

1

And the more you know it, the more likable you can then remain.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S BEING LIKABLE

And it made a great impression on me, this story of Dorothy Canfield Fisher's. And I trapped myself that I obviously was born on the side of the girl myself, instinctively. We all are. And religion, or faith, or the biblical tradition is an attempt to tolerate the truth.

It's always a victory over our own mythology that we can be liked by everybody.

2

So the ordinary situation, gentlemen, of the rational fellow in this university is purely mythical. Because he entertains the myth that if he is right, thinks right, is clever and so, everybody else will open up and say, "Please, go on."

This is his fictitious situation.

(Timon of Athens.)

Ja.

3

And I think you have there the substitute of all Gentiles for religion. It's this fictitious state of mind.

The word "myth" is today bandied about quite a bit. It's a very useful term if you recognize that all the people who talk about mythology are themselves living a mythical existence, these rationals superior to myth. They all live in this mythical, inexplicable situation, that they suppose there must never be a war.

That's just national mythology. Because they do not admit that they are most detestable people.

4

We all are detestable.

THE STORY OF JOHN BRADFORD

When John Bradford was led to the scaffold in England, he saw another man executed in the Tower, led to the scaffold, a real criminal; and he was there for religious reasons under Elizabeth -- and he exclaimed, "There but for the grace of God goes John Bradford."

Have you heard the story? The first awakening, rude awakening of the human adult who ceases to be a child is this awakening that in the eyes of the world we are detestable.

II

1

And you can always find fault with me; reason enough to send me to the scaffold if you want to. It's just mercy and charity.

If you think of all the ways in which people have been ruined, and have been eliminated from existence -- I just read the story of the six wives of Henry VIII, and the way he got rid of them. These poor girls, including Anne Boleyn, as innocent as can be. He was guilty, so he had to get rid of six innocent wives, because his own guilt cried to Heaven, and you have to expiate by scapegoat.

2

Now, since everybody is in the presence of other people who need scapegoats for their own crimes, or their own deficiencies, it is purely accidental that they don't get axed.

We are in every moment in the danger that somebody has to find a scapegoat.

This alone would show you the terrible dangers of our human existence on this earth.

3

The Jews know this very well; they have always been made the scapegoat for everything, for the last two thousand years, because they have taken this position. That cannot be forgiven.

4

And so I want to tell you: the Bible is written around this fact that people who break into the myth of our existence make themselves hated. Don't believe that anti-Semitism has anything to do with race. It's a religious statement expressed in secular terms. The people of the Bible story are making havoc with the Gentile tradition. It's an aggressive faith. The

Bible is not written for the niceties of an existing order. It's totally aggressive. It breaks into the national myth that this whole group is likable as it is.

III

1

And you cannot understand history, gentlemen, if you do not see that there would be no history in your and my mind today -- critical history -- unless the self-consciousness of any group was put to the task, and thrown out as wanting. Because any national group, any family, any clan, the Rotary Club, Free Masons, the American-Firsters, the British Empire Imperialists, every one group in itself is impeccable, and finds all the evils outside, and always has to pin it on a scapegoat.

The power to say to yourself, "I am detestable," is awakening to the true history.

2

As long as John Bradford is not exclaiming, "There but for the grace of God goes John Bradford," we live in mythology, and we don't live in history, because we are not willing to distribute freely blame and praise. The extreme case that John Bradford is that he says, "There but for the grace of God go I, myself." In between, the single John Bradford was a virtuous man, though a heretic -- and between him and the criminal, with whom he identifies himself, lie all the little colorshades of reality, every one of us, maybe one percent the criminal and 99 percent -- you go everyone in degrees.

But you can only learn to shade, and to distinguish degrees of merit, once you wake up to the absolute conflict of the world as it looks at you -- and you, as you look outside of you into the world.

Can you understand what I mean? The extreme case: here am I, smug, satisfied. Pardon me.

3

And down to the existence of the Mosaic revolt, which it was -- it was a rebellion, a marching-out of the highest standard of civilization of that time. It was as vast an outbreak as the Mormon upheaval, at least in this country, or much more so, I would say. It was a protest against all the national sluggishness in any group.

Now here am I -- "we" is better, because nobody ever is just an "I"; he's the child of his parents -- and I say, "We find that the rest of the world has to be conquered, because it is less good than I."

The conviction of any gentleman from South Carolina, that he looks down on the Negroes and says, "They have just been there to serve."

4

So the rest of the world can be conquered by war. And how they look at you doesn't count.

If you, however, start as these poor Twelve tribes of the Jews, this really nothing. Between the empires -- look at the map where Palestine is located, or the bridge between Assy, and Asia Minor, and Egypt, all the existing big empires of the day, including then the sea kingdom of Cyprus, and of Crete, and the Philistines. And if you put yourself here, as a minority group, and say, "I must find the unity between of all this I must find how all these people are between Heaven and earth still are held together by one common origin and by one common destiny"-- and the first word of the Bible is the last word of the Bible -- then you see that they had to fix their attention from the very beginning on this, which these people avoid, that I and my neighbor don't look at the same thing with the same eyes; that as many people there are, there are as many opinions, and as many tastes, and as many likes.

IV

1

So that I have to find the unity outside of my own opinion. My own table of value, and the neighbor's table of value is making law.

And so John Bradford's sentence, which I recommend to you, as the summary of the whole biblical development of two thousand years, sums it very nicely up: "There but for the grace of God goes John Bradford," meaning that we all are capable to be transformed into everybody else.

2

The transformability of the human character into everything from hero to sinner is the attempt to explain who we are. And the Bible explains this transformability -- I use this term because it isn't perhaps quite so used up as "metamorphosis," and "change" -- it is an important problem.

And the Bible says, "By every sentence that we speak, we are transformed into the man who has said this."

3

Now you and I here sit, and you can think in many terms of naturalism, and say you are just that many cells, and that much weight, and hair color, and so. But maybe, I ask you

a question, and if you are kind enough to answer it, after you have answered it, you are either a liar or a truth-seeking person, because you cannot help making the decision in speaking, whether you tell me the truth or not. And accordingly, you are stamped by what you say.

4

Now this is the relation, gentlemen, of identity between men's "Whence?" and "Whither?" We are transformed by what we say, because we become the person who has said this. You quote a man.

You quote Lincoln for his Gettysburg Address. Lincoln is the man of the Gettysburg Address. Well, the day before he gave it, he wasn't.

SECOND PART: THE MAGNIFICAT

CHAPTER ONE: PROMISE AND FULFILLMENT

I

1

So the incisive statement in a woman's life is after he has said he will, at the altar. She says -- "Of course, he will."

And you know the story at the altar when he asks, and she answers for him, "He will."

This word makes her, because from that day on she has a new name. She bears the name of her husband.

This is never treated with the solemnity it deserves. If we invoke the public conscience and God Almighty as our witness, we have the power to force the community to call us by another name.

2

Imagine what this means! That you have the power to put into the mouth of other people a new address that they have to change. You are no longer Miss. You are Mrs.

People will never understand marriage if they do not see that it is the power invested in an individual to force the community to give her another name.

3

And that's why marriage is not free love.

Free love means you go off on a tangent. But marriage means that you take Heaven and earth as best witnesses, that from now on you have to appear as one before the world, and demand from them to give way to your decision. That's the difference between love and marriage.

There's a great confusion about this in this country because people no longer understand the whole biblical starting point, because the Bible has invented marriage in this sense of solidarity.

Forceful solidarity, compulsory to the rest of the world, and it's breaking up because of your American attitude.

4

I give you an example.

Hundred years ago, every loving couple who wanted to get married would have been saluted by everybody, and everybody would have entitled them -- whether the man was in prison, or whether the man was on a boat, the girl would have been helped.

THE STORY OF A FRIEND OF HANOVER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Now this so happens that a friend of mine who lives now in the little town of Hanover, New Hampshire, came from an old vintner's family, who for a thousand years had had vineyards on the river Rhine, in Gunthersblum. It has a name from the famous Nibelunglied, from King Gunther of Worms. It's near Worms and near Mainz.

Well, this family was Jewish, and he was engaged to a girl who was not, who was a Gentile in the next town. And when Hitler came, he had to leave the country, and he had to give up his vineyards; and his parents later were destroyed. And he went to America, to build up a new existence. He is a photographer now, has a camera shop, which was very hard on him, but he succeeded.

Well, when I came first to this little town in 1935, he had just arrived, and he was asking his fiancée, and she was already going out of Germany, because there were German laws forbidding a marriage between Jew and Gentile, and so she was anxious to join him. And she went to England, because he said, "I can't support you here in America. It's very expensive. Go to England; then you are out of the encirclement by the Nazis, and we can always get together."

So she became a governess in a home, and survived. But then the war came, and she was interned as a presumably German spy and Nazi, and put in a concentration camp in England. An "internment camp," I should think, because they were really not concentration camps. And so she stayed interned until 1945.

Now ten years had elapsed since he had to leave the country. Then he wrote and wrote, and the English would let her go, but the Americans wouldn't give her a visa. And he wrote to Bernard Shaw, and he wrote to all kinds of people. And finally in '48, this poor woman came. And by that time they only could have one child, and then she was beyond the time of motherhood. And so the whole life of these people has been stigmatized by this tragedy, that they couldn't have more children, and that they had to live down thirteen years.

Now I assure you, that with all the lack of communication, and all the deficiencies, this would not have occurred fifty years ago or a hundred years ago. People would have helped these people to get together. Now they don't. They are so hard-boiled. Bureaucracy has so victorious that these two lives -- they aren't totally destroyed, but certainly they have been marked.

And formerly you had the smallpox, and now you get the passport pox.

(In 1935, she was put into the --?)

No, in England, she was a governess for four years. But then she was a German citizen; and since she wasn't Jewish, the English said, "Oh, she may be a Hitlerite."

(war came in '39.)

Ja. To England it came in '39.

Well, I mean to say that at this moment, many people are so demented that they have gone rational in their human relations, and that individualism is rampant. And that the unity of husband and wife is no longer safe and sacred.

II

1

That shows you, I mean if bureaucracy can prevent people, who are engaged to marry, from this then you know that we are in great danger of losing the first power of man to form insoluble communities because every marriage is the beginning of a new nation.

But you have the opinion that you marry inside a nation.

It's absolute nonsense.

2

Abraham founded a new nation; that's the Jews.

And you do, too. How can you know that you don't have to emigrate, that you have to leave this country to go to another that you don't have to marry somebody from quite a different country?

It's all nonsense -- marriage takes place within America, it is true, but just look at it. But it is not true that if two Americans marry, they only marry as Americans. Then they'll get a divorce. You can only marry under God's sun, and under the open sky. Because it has to be stronger than the laws of this country.

3

This is so strange. The people actually in this country, although this is a melting pot, and there are all nationalities, if you tell them this, that they are quite surprised that to marry is the founding of a new people.

And this is the starting point of the Bible. That's why it begins with Adam and Eve. It is not a myth, because the fight against the myth that this marriage vow, the power of man to establish a new people from the very first, is lost to him.

What Adam says in saying, "I didn't do it, but she did it," we all commit adultery and fornication. But then we all leave our power to found peaceful societies from saying, "Oh, no solidarity. She did it. I didn't."

4

And this is the genius of the whole Bible story, that this empirical situation is carried backward, as the seed of all multiplicity, and then finally into the creations and works -- since God created us, man, obviously Heaven was created by His word, too. The whole story that God created the sun, and the moon, and the plants and the animals, has never been surpassed in truth, because it is an empirical transfer of your and my experience, how we come to life by the word that is spoken to us.

Because we are different people

*after we have been blessed,
or after we have been absolved,
or after we have been given the bachelor's degree,
or after we have proclaimed that we are husband and wife.*

The whole community accepts you as different people after that. Suddenly you are M.D. And you know how a doctor is treated; everybody bows and accepts him as the high priest of America.

Well, we have only one priesthood in America, medicine.

III

1

So believe me. Your experience is never exploited by yourself. But if you would kindly do, you would see that words break the continuity and transform you in this one way in which we can accept our identity without loss of faith.

...and there is no loss of identity. "Whence" and "whither," if they are promise and fulfillment, they leave no scars.

2

So the gentle way of history is by promise and fulfillment.

That's why you have to get engaged to marry, so that there is a promise that can be fulfilled. But you are promised a future of your own choosing when you are born.

The promise is with any child. The fairies around the cradle all tell this child, "Go ahead and become what you are destined to become. You have to discover."

A life of discovery.

3

And so the curve of life, from birth to death, from the creation of the world in general, and your own birth here -- to death and Last Judgment, which is the same for the whole and for you personally, Judgment Day is bound up with what is said.

Can we recognize in what has been said before the promise of what has to be said at the end?

4

And therefore the God of the Bible is the power that makes you and me speak, that makes all men speak.

The "spirit of God" it is called in the Bible. And you need -- I'm sorry to be pedantic -- you need a definition of God, although it is entirely impossible -- the best then at this moment will shake you out of your slumber -- is "the power who makes us speak."

IV

1

God is -- that's the third article of the Christian creed, which in the Old Testament, the term "the spirit," and "God said, Let us make men" -- you and I become humans only as far as we can hear what we say, and change what we say.

The mystery of an animal and you is that an animal doesn't hear itself. It conveys, shouts to the rest; but you and I see what we speak.

And that's man's humanity that you can see what you say. And you can hear what you say.

2

And if you look up the Psalms, they are therefore written in responsory, because every word comes back from the second choir,

the Bible is to be read in responsories, because any man who says something hasn't said it unless he allows it to come back upon him, and he accepts it as being said truly.

And the women babble, and prattle, and gossip, and it doesn't mean anything, because they don't hear what they say.

3

And yes, you become a student as soon as you become aware of the fact that what you say counts. If you stand before a higher council where the truth matters.

To Mrs. Duncan, the truth doesn't matter. She's babbling. And she's a very interesting phenomenon. She is a primeval, pre-speaking. She has learned to use words. But she can be free from identification with what she says. It's a remarkable case.

4

It always comes back, this archaic, animal state, if people are not told that to speak is an entering into history. That's the whole difference whether you lie or stand by the truth.

CHAPTER TWO: CASE AND FUTURE

I

1

Well, all I wanted to say, to bring out to you that the whole starting point of the Bible is purely empirical. Man within a totally estranged society, enemy to enemy, dog eats dog, tries to find the thread by which peace, and order, and meaning can be restored.

And finds that only if he can draw together all the original strands, and exploit the Navajo Indians as well, as the Egyptian fellahin to their common destiny. You have to accept all the diffusion as our "whither?" -- "whence?" And we have to patient enough until every one of these *dialects, idioms, creeds*, et cetera, can come to its interment, or to its conclusion within a common pattern.

2

And the funny experience of the human race on this continent is that the red man is still with us, his soul, unredeemed, before he hasn't received some better spiritual acknowledgement than he has in America. The Indian question of the red Indian is not over by his elimination. He's still asking a question.

And I think the solution will be that two hundred years from now, no president of the United States can be elected unless he has Indian blood in him. I'm quite sure of some such strange superstition. Because innocent blood shed cries to Heaven.

I assure you that anything once created has to be included into this process of identification. Because we have this feeling deep in us because we speak, that anybody who can speak is a part of us.

3

"There but for the grace of God goes John Bradford."

If you exploit this one little sentence, you will find it to explain to you the mysteries of the historical process. You see it now in the waking of the African Negro. It's the same thing. There is no creature on this earth that hasn't to be included into the life process.

And to give you one example, which is never mentioned -- our whole *chemical industry, pulp industry, paper, coal, plastic*, what else is it but to include the dead matter that was created before us into the life process again? Don't look at technique, and factory system and industry as something not religious. It is highly religious to feel that all the substances of this earth have to be connected again, have to be reconnected and have all to enter the stream of life.

4

But that's a religion of a scientist. That's the faith of any man who goes out to discover the energies of the globe that all this was at one time one glowing planet and we have to make it into one again. Half of it lies dead, unused, like the oil in Texas.

II

1

And so please don't think this is purely commercial, this is accidental. Man's mind is set on including again the more even his own or his human fellows and brothers, and sisters, than the oil underneath. One and the other is at least equally important to us, because God is one.

The only reason is monotheism. The only reason is because everybody is faced by everybody else, under the countenance of a common faith. The eyes of God are upon the whole creation.

2

Gentlemen, this is just as scientific as that 2 and 2 is 4. You and I cannot keep our peace of mind unless you acknowledge that we are acting in the face of somebody. And since I do not want to act just in the face of you, or any special individual obviously, but have to be stronger, I have to defy your anger. And your suspicion, and your aversion. Since a man has to live through adversity, our faith in God is the power that retains our sanity.

And you will always find that all these so-called atheists make themselves into their own god. Everybody has a god. The atheist is god to himself.

3

So I don't quarrel with him. Let him be an atheist. But he believes just that his own satisfaction with himself is enough. All right. Then he has enshrined the divinity into his own consciousness. If this is enough, let him do it. He isn't interesting.

He is a limiting case, but today people bow to him; and in all good society, they don't mention God, because they say: we know there are several people who are atheists among us, so we mustn't offend their feelings.

I don't see why we shouldn't. Because they have their own god, you may be sure. They are their own god to themselves.

4

If you would only see that you cannot talk of God without talking of man, and you cannot talk of man without God.

Because, who is God? To ask once more this question "who?"

Well, He's the condition who allows me to ask, "Who am I?" Who I am. You and I cannot ask who you are, unless there is a God. Because nobody else, including myself, can hold the scales of impartiality, and of judgment. The others are biased, but I'm biased, too. And I know this. I'm biased perhaps in favor of me. Or I'm so abject that I'm biased against me.

But I'm biased.

III

1

So it is an assumption then, and very, very presumptive on my part to speak in this matter, because it isn't done -- but it is a scientific premise for all social science, that men and God are corollaries in our human language.

If you omit God from the human presence, you get a bundle of nerves. And he's ripe for the lunatic asylum.

And this whole attempt of the social sciences to speak of man without his belief in his creator to me is just silly. It's the antechamber of the human wisdom. I call always the social sciences "the Old Testament" of the social sciences as they are today. Psychology, and sociology, and so on. But it leads nowhere, because man then moves in a vicious circle.

2

Take a questionnaire. Why should I accept what the psychologist says of me as more relevant than what I say of the psychologist? I say he's a fool; he says I'm a fool. Where are we?

THE STORY OF THE DRUNKARD'S WIFE

You know the story of the drunkard's wife in Long Island in the slum. And the social worker comes to see her and says, "Oh. Pity here. I understand that your man has taken to drinking." She says, "Not mine. Yours, perhaps?"

That's the only answer between equal people, that she asks the social worker that. This talking back in the human society is it's a real problem. And it is only if the two, the

sociologist and his victim, look up to a third countenance that they can ever settle their conflict.

3

The sociologist is not in any higher authority than his victims, his objects, or cases, or how you call them. And it's very significant that he is God Almighty, because he calls with the biblical expression the victim his "case." There are the cases.

Now what is "case"?

That's the fallen man. Take this very seriously. A case is man in isolation, taken out of context, and left, as he is, as nature, *unrestored, unredeemed, without a remission of sins.*

4

This is very serious, gentlemen. "Case" in law is a criminal. A legal case that is paralyzed, that stays there on the docket. And his life cannot go on. It's just a case, fallen down on the job. And the social scientist in his naiveté, has taken over the legal method, and makes you and me, when he asks us, into cases.

And that's anti-historical, because in history, what would be in history the real solution?

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY BEING A LAWYER

I have been a lawyer myself for twenty years, but I always held that the only solution of the criminal law is that every judge is only allowed to judge one case and has to go off with his accused, with the defendant and live with him for the rest of his life. That's the only way of settling really any such case, because then a whole life would be committed, to the re-entrance of the criminal into reality.

Now we put them behind prison bars; and they're worse off than before, because we treat them still as cases, after they are judged.

IV

1

Now the whole problem of a crime obviously is from the very beginning to get this man back into the stream of the full life which he has left, because he has fallen down, as we say, on the path. And as long as the judge can sit and decide 231 cases in one -- he prolongs the agony.

The only Christian solution is that this judge says, "One case is enough for a lifetime." And invests his lifetime—I'm exaggerating; but I'm explaining to you what's the difference between a case and history.

2

And so you should revolt against the term "case history." There is no case history, if there is no future.

History is the past see in the light of the future: that's the biblical story.

History sees promises and waits for their fulfillment. And therefore there must be never a case history.

A mere case history means that there is no investment of future responsibility. First, if you become fast friends, then you can look back together at all your errancy of your youth.

3

Case history is a contradiction in point. You can have history; and you can have cases. And cases are such events that have left the stream of life and are like shells on the beach.

No sea life, Sir, but sea death.

4

So now therefore, you will perhaps now begin to understand the problem of the Bible then is to distinguish between fall and promise.

And the Bible is indifferent to the glories of the kings, and the glories of men, and we have read one chapter in which it was brought out that Hannah is desperate. She is despised. David thinks she is drunk, you remember. And that's why she had just the real history, because she is not in a myth of her own contention, and her own smug satisfaction.

CHAPTER THREE: PERSEVERANCE

I

1

To give you a parallel of this - the New Testament is written in the same vein about the birth of Jesus. And take it this way.

In the first chapter already, the hero is telling against himself.

The essence of the invention of the history of the Bible is the power to speak of man not as a hero of the story.

There are no heroes in the Bible. But there are very weak, fallen men who are brought back into the stream of life. "But for the grace of God goes John Bradford." That's the whole story of the Bible.

2

And for example, the Gospel of Mark is the second Gospel in the New Testament, and it can be recognized as being written under St. Peter's influence, because the one Apostle who is held up to derision there is Peter, his slander, his denial of the Lord is only given in Mark.

Now in the Bible, you can recognize a book, because the author talks against himself. That's unique in the literature. All pagan, all Gentile literature talks up. The author justifies himself, and the heroes are justified. They are always right. The whole problem of the Bible is to show that man is betwixt and between. Peter is not wholly judged or condemned.

But the only book in which Matthew is called a publican is the Gospel of Matthew. The other three Gospels, being written by other Apostles, saved this very indecent label of a usurer, which it was, oppressor of the people, publican. But he calls himself a publican.

Peter speaks of the denial in Mark, because he dictated these pieces to Mark, according to tradition.

3

And so we can go in the Bible by this very simple indication that he who is held up to criticism in the Bible, has something to do with the authorship of the book. That's a very original situation.

4

Let us now go into it. We need a break now? Yes or no?

(No.)

(Yes!)

Now who has said the truth? Make it a vote? Who wants to have a break now?

Well, we stay together here. Out you go, with the rest. Five minutes. And we'll meet at half-past, again.

II

1

...that is unheard-of in any pre-biblical literature, this attitude, the smallness that she is not a heroine, she is not inspired, she's not just an instrument. But she has this doubleness of cheer and despair, this alternation. Here she is full of complaint and grief, and then at the end, "For this child I prayed, and the Lord has given me my petition which I asked for."

And so you see in a small way in this chapter already, you have this tension. You begin with identity of bliss and despair, of low and high spirit -- this is the problem. Whereas all primitive existence of man is trying to eternalize, perpetuate one attitude: either ecstasy, or wailing.

2

Here is the whole problem of this one chapter is to put 2 and 2 together, and to see that the same person goes through this ups and downs, this high and low. And keeps her animism.

Now perhaps we go on now. Would you?

(Read Chapter 2?)

Ja.

3

"And Hannah prayed, and said,

*My heart rejoiceth in the Lord; mine horn is exalted in the Lord:
my mouth is enlarged over mine enemies; because I rejoice in thy salvation.*

*There is none holy as the Lord: for there is none beside thee:
neither is there any rock like our God.*

*"Talk no more so exceeding proudly;
let not arrogancy come out of your mouth:*

*for the Lord is a God of knowledge,
and by him actions are weighed.*

*"The bows of the mighty men are broken,
and they that stumbled are girded with strength."*

Now, may I put in this word immediately?

The recognition is that there is a time element in our empirical experience, that it takes time for man to understand. God is knowledge, because He can weigh the actions. We cannot. Therefore "not arrogance come out of your mouth."

You don't know what you're saying, if you only live from moment to moment.

4

History covers the change of mind of people. The "transformability of man," can be taken literally.

"Those who sow with tears shall reap with joy". Make that the content of this whole chapter. And it means that at any one moment on our pilgrimage, we are too elated or too despondent. And therefore, only if we keep the memory of our humiliation in the days of our exultation, and tie them together so that we shall not go wrong.

II

1

With the word with which you perhaps will best arm yourself against the common misunderstanding of the divine presence is "perseverance." It's a lost word -- you may recover it. "Perseverance."

The Christian creed has tried to say that it takes time to know who God is. That's why they speak of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, because you cannot at one moment see all the aspects of the divine action. At one moment you are yourself the genius who does it, and another moment you are far from having any influence on the history in making which you are involved.

Just as Hannah here. She's despondent, and she is elated.

2

Now she says, "Do not be arrogant," because she warns herself against this momentary excess, because the whole story is longer and long-winded.

And you may arm yourself against the physicists. In physics, gentlemen, we try to discount the time element. We shorten everything. To be a physicist means to attempt to understand everything, with a minimum of expanse of time. That's why you have electricity now, and you shoot at 1700 miles an hour, you shoot something into the moon.

Speeding up is the problem of natural science, and slowing down is the problem of history.

Because over two thousand years, you know more about man than you know about this moment. And you know more about your own story over seventy years than you know in one year.

And what you need is perseverance.

3

That's why it is nonsense to take examinations in the history department, because that breaks up your historical instruction into four months' periods. That's not long enough. You have to live into history for years and years before you can say anything about it.

That's why the whole carrying over of the examination system into the humanities department and social science department is poisonous. It destroys your brain. You shouldn't be examined in the same way as you can be examined in chemistry. This is possible in physics, too.

But the whole immersion into the process of historical experience is an immersion into longer and longer spans of time, and not the breaking up of these periods.

4

And that's why we are in a bad way with history in this country, because everything is done to treat it as though it could be reduced to five minutes' experiences, to facts and dates, objective examinations.

You cannot.

III

1

THE STORY OF A COLLEAGUE

I had a colleague, whom I hated -- and still hate -- and he gave a course in comparative literature, and I overheard him saying to a student, "What do you want to know about Goethe?" the German poet. "I can tell you everything about him in ten minutes." He literally said that -- he was a professor of literature.

(Who is it, Sir?)

Oh, no. No names, Sir.

Wherever you meet such a butcher of the spirit, you know that he is just killing the spirit. Because obviously any man you meet in history deserves to be met permanently, may become a friend of yours, like Abraham Lincoln -- and I hope you converse with him quite often. And the longer the time, the more you come to know him.

The same with a figure in Shakespeare. Hamlet you do not read once.

2

THE STORY OF THE STUDENT ASKING PROFESSOR LAMBETH

Not like the student who came back, and asked his Professor Lambeth on the Main Street in Hanover, you know this story. "Professor!" ten years later. "How did you make out with Hamlet? We never went beyond the Fourth Act together."

So he never had finished the Fifth Act, so he hadn't learned yet how Hamlet made out.

3

All historical books deserve to be written innumerable times.

And this again you do not know. You think that an assignment means you read a book once, and then you are over with it. Then it doesn't deserve to be read in the first place. All the books you read only once are technical books. And any real book that deserves to be read has to be read often.

That's why the Bible is the standard book for real historical -- why it's read constantly, because you read it each time with a different slant, and a new understanding.

4

And this is one of the things why you can't get an education, because you actually believe that if you have read something once, you have read it.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY READING HOMER

I read Homer to this day every year. And I'm always surprised. And I began in classics, all my life, I've now allowed myself to write this in my history book -- in a chapter on the Greek poets. But I wouldn't have dared if I hadn't read them time and again.

You can't judge them after reading them once. That's absolute nonsense.

IV

1

And this is again in this story of this famous Magnificat which returns in Luke, in the New Testament, in which the Catholic Church praises to this day. The Chapter two. So it's more than the historical foundation of the praise of women for their faith.

*"The bows of the mighty men are broken,
and they that stumbled are girded with strength."*

Go on.

2

*"So they that were full have hired themselves out for bread;
and they that were hungry --"*

"Full" - would be rich, "satiated" would perhaps be better.

*"-- so that the barren hath born seven;
and she that hath many children is waxed feeble.*

*"The Lord killeth and maketh alive.
He bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up.*

*The Lord maketh poor, and maketh rich:
he bringeth low, and lifteth up."*

Now perhaps you again see that always the bad is put before the good. The whole problem of our faith is that despite the fall, despite the misfortune, the promise still can be fulfilled.

3

And therefore, most people do not understand today religion or Christianity, because they do not know that unless death is put before life, we don't live in history.

The problem of history is that somebody dies, and yet something survives.

As long as you say, "*The Lord maketh alive, and giveth,*" you would be in nature. Because an animal and a tree, they come to life and they die by themselves. History means that the dead leave a trace, that despite the fact that you and I die, we haven't lived in vain.

4

And therefore, it's very good New Testament; there's no difference between Old and Testament teaching. If you take these words seriously:

*"The Lord killeth and maketh alive.
He bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up."*

It's all in reverse. History begins where we bury our dead. And remember them.

First He makes full, then He makes rich; first He brings low, then He lifteth up; first she's barren and has no child, and then she comes forth with child. It is always the surprise that man's idea of himself is defeated, that his self-consciousness is not the real story.

Will you go on from there?

CHAPTER FOUR: SIMONY

I

1

*"He raiseth up the poor out of the dust,
and lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill,*

*to set them among princes,
and to make them inherit the throne of glory:*

*for the pillars of the earth are the Lord's,
and he hath set the world upon them.*

*He will keep the feet of his saints,
and the wicked shall be silent in darkness.*

You can see how the Pilgrim fathers would rejoice in this verse, going to the pillars of the earth beyond the British Isles, and establishing there His kingdom, here on these shores. That's a good Puritan verse.

2

*For by strength shall no man prevail.
The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces;*

*out of heaven shall he thunder upon them:
the Lord shall judge the ends of the earth;*

*and he shall give strength unto his king,
and exalt the horn of his anointed.*

Now here, that's the end of the Magnificat. That's the first verse: "My heart rejoices in the Lord" - that's the Magnificat.

It magnifies the Lord. That's why it is called "Magnificat." My heart magnifies the Lord.

3

Now comes the history again.

*And Elkanah went to Ramah to his house.
And the child did minister unto the Lord before Eli the priest.*

*Now the sons of Eli were sons of Belial;
and they knew not the Lord.*

And the priests' custom with the people was, that, when any man offered sacrifice, the priest's servants came, while the flesh was in seething, and a fleshhook of three teeth in his hand;

And he stuck it into the pan, or kettle, or cauldron, or pot; all that the fleshhook brought up the priest took for himself.

So they did in Shiloh unto all the Israelites that came thither.

Also before they burnt the fat, the priest's servant came, and said to the man who sacrificed, Give flesh to roast for the priest; and he will not have sodden flesh of thee, but raw.

If any man said unto him, Let them not fail to burn the fat presently, and then take as much as thy soul desireth;

then he would answer him, Nay; but thou shalt give it to me now: for if not, I will take it by force.

Wherefore the sin of the young men was very great before the Lord: for the men abhorred the offering of the Lord."

But Samuel ministered before the Lord, being a child, girded with a linen --.

4

Now, here may you perhaps also understand the fact of this. It's the constant problem: can spiritual service be paid for?

All history, as far as I can see, has been not centered around land, or around all this wealth and so, but around the problem whether human relations can be bought for money.

II

1

In the Middle Ages, there has been the so-called struggle for investiture. Have you heard of this? The Gregorian struggle with the empire. Well, it was the question whether the bishoprics and abbots could be bought by money from the king.

And the salability of human worth is today again with our foundations. Because Rockefeller and Ford make people think that you can buy science.

You cannot.

2

And your whole problem in this country is -- we are in very bad shape, because teachers are underpaid. Because teachers cannot get wages. I am paid only so that I do not go into industry, and make money and get rich. I'm supported by a salary, or honorarium, or a stipend, so that I can concentrate on human relations.

3

You must never think that you can pay me for what I'm telling you here.

You cannot buy me. Not for sale. Not for money. I'm very serious about this. A very big question.

I have always tried to tell the teacher's conventions why they cannot go to strike. They are in parents' stead. As a parent cannot go on strike, and a teacher cannot go on strike. You have to get so much dignity, and esteem, and respect in the community that they will pay you as much as they earn themselves.

THE STORY OF THE LORDS PAYING A MAN IN OXFORD

As in England, where a man in Oxford is paid by the lords of the country enough to keep up the standards of a lord's existence, because the lord says, "My son can only join with lords," with the lordly society.

3

Here in this country, the rich man thinks that the teacher of his children can be of the lowlies, like a nurse. And so he underpays him. But you cannot strike, because I can never say that I sell for money. I sell my identity with the people whom I teach.

Can I? Impossible.

But I can be paid for not caring for wealth, for not going into industry. That's what the meaning of the word "salarium," "salary" and "honorarium" originally mean. You persuade a man to forget his commercialism. And since he cannot starve, you enable him to turn the other way, to be interested in your growth, and in your instruction, and not to think of my own financial gains.

4

But as soon as you treat me on a wage scale with a factory worker, an engineer, you get me wrong.

It's done all the time in this country. And believe me, the whole economic system of this country is misunderstood. As long as you try to classify a teacher for what he says.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S TEACHING

I have nothing to sell. You must understand. I have really nothing to sell. But I allow you to listen to me, instead of going to the stock exchange and speculating.

III

1

When I told my boys at Dartmouth that I could have just as much become a bank president, which in fact was offered me when I was a young man, this career, they didn't believe it, because in this country, you think that a man who teaches is such an idiot, that he cannot make money. "Those who can, do; and those who cannot, teach."

And this is why in America I think this is an utterly corrupt society. As long as you believe that teaching can be bought by a high salary, you get me all wrong. There cannot be truth in this, because a salesman is not committed to handing you over the truth.

You understand that selling and buying has nothing to do with speaking the truth.

2

And this has gone through history. And I only meant to say it's here exactly the same. What the people resent is that the services to the Lord can presumably be bought, that these people, get rich on the surface of this. And that's corruption. It is called with a word from the New Testament, simony -- s-i-m-o-n-y.

Has anybody heard the term?

THE STORY OF SIMONY AND THE REFORMATION

Now I only want to tell you. Simony is nothing of the 11th century or the 5th century of our era. It's constantly with us. Any society breaks down in which spiritual truth can be supposedly bought for money. That's the end of it.

The Reformation, Luther got up when this was told his poor peasants, that they could buy salvation for money. That was the beginning of Protestantism.

But we have today see the same thing, gentlemen. The foundations in this country are destroying America.

3

I tell you a story.

THE STORY OF A FRIEND IN HARVARD

I had a friend in Harvard. And I was called there to lecture before this group of 25 graduate students. This friend of mine invited me to do so. He was the chairman of this little club of historians. And when I came there and I talked, they told me that they had just composed a memorandum for the Ford Foundation. And they had written down reasons why they should -- every one of these 25 men who had signed this memorandum -- should be given five thousand a year -- at that time that was a lot of money, ten years ago -- \$5,000 for the next three years, each. Three times 5,000. And it was a wonderful program. I said, "Do you believe in it? Do you think it should be done?" "Oh no," they said, "But that's what they want to get. And we want to get the money."

4

Now here were 25 Harvard scholars who were not ashamed to sell their souls for the next three years, to the highest bidder, and to cheat deliberately. And so it worked more havoc, because once you are cheated, such a foundation gets very disagreeable indeed.

And I've never forgotten the scene. Here were 25 otherwise decent people, who only because they were American -- did not see that the spirit is not to be bought. And the foundations have gone off in this country on the wrong foot for the same reason as here described by verse 16 and verse 17: "The men abhorred the offering of the Lord."

As soon as they know that this can be bought, they would have nothing to do with it. Therefore the teachers in this country have no authority, because people are convinced that they can be bought. How can you trust a man who can be bought?

You must see this.

IV

1

As soon as you think that a man's services can be paid for, he is no longer to be listened to. Why should you? Anybody will say what he is expected to say if you pay him a sufficient number of ounces of gold. And there you move in a vicious circle in this. As soon as you would agree that men are made independent by the support the community gives them, because we expect them to be disagreeable, and competent, and telling unpleasant truths, it will be different.

2

But I see that the churches are in the same predicament in this country. The big shot among the vestrymen will not hear a sermon that is preached against his livelihood.

So we have no class, and that is the deeper reason for an independent clergy, and indifferent for private property. That's why inflation will damage the business community without their knowing it, because inflation takes away all the saving from the middle class.

3

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S LIBRARY

Now when I was young, even as an instructor, I had to glean from my salary to build up my own library. Therefore I was independent in my research.

No longer is anybody today able to do this. He's completely dependent on the public library. Therefore he's less dependent for changing, for example, his field of interest, because he has not his own library. A library means that I'm moving out afield under my own steam, because I collect the material. That is the meaning of your own library, that you are flexible, and you do not depend on your appointment in a department for being allowed to make recommendations about the books which you can buy.

4

So all the new fields of science, gentlemen, in the last 150 years, have been established by people who built up their own libraries in unheard-of directions, in fields that didn't exist before.

THIRD PART: CORRUPTION

CHAPTER ONE: MENTAL SLAVERY

I

1

Now if you inflate the means by which these libraries were built up by personal savings, they are destroyed. Workers and entrepreneurs together -- the corporation -- exploit then the middle classes, their savings. And the spiritual leaders of the community are completely then unable to move even the slightest degree under their own steam. They cannot even afford to buy a book.

So they are not independent in their information. They are not independent in their judgment. Everything is through the big trumpet of the television producer, et cetera.

2

And so inflation is played so lightly in this country -- gentlemen, if you do not establish a middle class in this country that is relatively indifferent to the vicissitudes of prosperity and depression, how can ever the truth be said that perseveres over the rich and over the poor?

Take these verses. They are very modern, that the

"the Lord killeth, and maketh alive,"
the "Lord maketh poor and maketh rich,"
"He bring us low, and He lifteth up."

Who is going to say this, if you live in a country where everybody is completely subject to the moods of the daily currency?

You have a real inflation. Any cent you have has to be spent right away, because tomorrow, the money loses its value. And any human spirit can only persevere if he is relatively independent from these vicissitudes of fortune.

3

And so this hasn't been solved in this country. We have quite the contrary, established a system in which more farmers, more shopkeepers, more professors are involved to the price level and wage level of everyday. And if you get an inflation, there is nobody who can escape it.

4

Now such a country goes mad. It's complete insanity, because everybody has then to struggle for the naked survival, whereas we have to try to establish certain levels of security for different groups in the people. The teacher, the minister, and the doctor, perhaps, too, and writer -- they must live on a longer wavelength than the man at the stock exchange, and the weekly wage-earner.

And now we try to put them all on the same level, and we are inflation-bound to this day, still. And then the country can be written off, as a policy-making agency. Then you're just numbers.

II

1

You cannot have a policy unless you have a sufficient number of people in this country - in a democracy, especially -- who are not overscared by the momentary distress. If you involve everybody into the immediate catastrophe, then the cries of despair and the cries of impatience must overwhelm everybody.

2

So here I hope - here I have shown you that the applicability of such a remote chapter and you may say, obsolete, archaic chapter of the Old Testament is an eternal problem. Are these spiritual services for sale? Or isn't your whole problem to make people who serve you, administrate you so independently?

Take a woman. If she is out in business and has children, she is much more involved in the sorrows and scares of the commercial community, industrial community than is good for her upbringing her children. Because her children should remain in an atmosphere of thirty years' future, and not of an immediate crisis, whether she loses her job or so. That shouldn't interfere with the goings-on in this family.

What should be told in a family has nothing to do with the moment. You should prepare a child for the years that come after the thirteenth year of this child. How can you if this woman is totally involved in the great question whether you will be fired or hired tomorrow.

I don't see how you can. Anything can take the aspect of daily living.

3

Well, I only would like you to generalize on this term "simony."

If you have a better word for corruption, it's all right with me. But it is in every century, the "*trahison des clerics*" -- treason of the clerks is the issue. And you may have heard that Mr. Jules Benda in France wrote this famous book, *The Treason of the Clerks*.

Have you heard of it? *Le Trahison des Clercs*. It's another word for "simony."

And here in this country, you use it, it's the treason of the intellectuals who can be bought. An important term. It's another term for "simony." *Le Trahison des Clercs* by Jules Benda.

It's a standard term. Everybody in the field of letters knows this term. Jules Benda, *The treason of the writers*, which means the people who sell you truth.

4

THE STORY OF PASTERNAK

Well, Dr. Zhivago is a case in point, because Pasternak's story, that he didn't commit the treason demanded from him by the powers that be. And I don't think there is anybody in this country who would have done that. In this country, if the publisher promises you \$10,000, you just write the book.

(Uh, excuse me. What are you saying? I understood that he wanted his story revoked, but when he found out that there was disapproval for it, but the publisher wouldn't do it. It's already on the press and he wouldn't give it back. An Italian publisher .)

Ja. Oh, you mean in this sense, yes. Well, they would have just killed him if he had not officially asked for it, but with the tongue in his cheek -- he was very glad that the Italian publisher didn't give it back. You must understand; there was this double dealing. You put it there, and then you say, "Not my fault."

He had managed to get the manuscript before the decision came from Moscow, so it is very obvious that the only salvation to play it double.

III

1

You mustn't forget. Pasternak is the greatest Russian. I knew that Pasternak was the greatest Russian poet as far back as 1930. If you look at the American Encyclopedia, published in 1935, Pasternak is treated as the greatest living Russian poet. So that's not a man who comes to celebrity, except in this country where you only live by politics, and because he's now a political case, and the Russians have sinned against him, you read his book.

You never would have read the book otherwise. Nobody reads here any book on literary merit.

And that's the rather hateful part of it. And you cheat yourself when you think that you would ever have read the book unless this had happened. It would have bored you stiff.

It is a very boring book.

2

It's still a great book. But boring; that doesn't mean that you wouldn't have read it. Have you read it? Who has?

Only two? Is that all?

Gen tlemen, you are outside history.

3

I give you a final story about this importance of the selling of the spiritual goods.

THE STORY OF GIUSEPPE FERRARI

In 1849, a great Italian, my own predecessor, I would say, in my historical activities. Giuseppe Ferrari was in exile from Italy, because there was then the Austrian prince's governing in Paris. And he saw how Victor Cousin, the man who invented the French school system of today, that this man accepted the position of minister of instruction and faith for the Napoleonic government -- Napoleon III then being installed as the president of the republic, and then later became emperor.

And he wrote a violent pamphlet, "*Les Philosophes Salariés*," the philosophers who can be bought. "Salari,," you can be had for a salary. And that is a brilliantly written, eloquent pamphlet about the danger if you have a society in which opinion can be bought.

4

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY IN DUBROVNIK

And I went to Dubrovnik, in Yugoslavia this last year to an international conference on the university today. That's exactly 110 years later after this pamphlet -- this violent pamphlet by this independent and very poor, destitute Italian exile was written in France. And we discussed the university to death. There were 23 nations. And there were the Russians, and the Poles, and the Czechs, and the French, and the Norwegians, and the Swedes, and the Americans. And so it was quite an exciting meeting.

But very depressing, too.

A French student from Paris got up and said, "We no longer want to be called "students." We no longer want to have stipends, or fellowships," or what they call "bourses" in France, first. "We want to get salaries like workers."

So I got up and said, "My dear man. What a tragic story. In 1849, there was just one bought philosopher in France. Now you all want to be bought."

And it silenced him. He didn't know what to answer -- he had never heard of this brochure of this pamphlet, written 110 years before. And it was most depressing. All the students at this conference had sold out for a quiet life of being paid for, of getting a salary, taking their exams, and that was their relation to the truth.

IV

1

And so it's nothing to be hoped for more -- I'm very serious -- I know what I'm saying -- from the modern university as such.

Because it is taken for granted that you can buy and sell the services. And in as far as this is true, there is no understanding.

2

The truth has to be stated, regardless of profit.

Because the truth is the beginning of the next benefit, of the next profit. The truth has to be said, because it doesn't fit into the picture as of today. New truth can only be added under the one condition that in the existing frame of reference, it hasn't yet received its gratification, its recognition. And therefore, there is no salary for it at this moment, because it hasn't yet proven its value. It's unproved value, is it not, truth?

(Well, isn't the Soviet Union -- isn't the way they're making education the --.)

Oh, shocking, shocking.

(They give you --.)

Oh, the clown that existed there at this meeting in Dubrovnik, in Yugoslavia, this Russian commissioner. We just laughed at him, because he said nothing can be investigated and that the government doesn't want to be investigated. And research has to be governed, and directed, and on it went. No, he was just -- well, I thought you would expect that from them, from the Communists. But that a student from Paris should parrot this, this was the -- so that the whole western world went down in dishonor.

(So they pay you more for better grades, I think.)

Exactly. Oh, pardon.

3

Then there was the question: should you stay in the university after you have graduated? Is there a place for research, for free study? After all, you are in this position.

And because they wanted to deal with the problem of graduate study, post-graduate study. And I wouldn't trust my eyes and my ears.

THE STORY OF AN OLD AUSTRIAN PROFESSOR FROM PRAGUE

Up went an old Austrian professor from Prague, because the Communists -- the Czechs are the greatest -- with the most terrible servility, and these were farrer-gone than any other satellite in the whole Russian orbit. They are really traitors to the whole western idea of freedom.

And this old man, perhaps my age, director of the polytechnical institute of Prague, rushed forward when this question was asked, and said, "Of course, why should anybody study unless he's paid for, right away? So for every examination, a man gets an increase of twenty percent."

4

I wouldn't have believed it. Here was a man who still lived under old Francis Joseph. He was, after all, my age. He had seen the glory of the great Hapsburg empire, with real science, and real search for truth. And here he rushes, because he had his hangman behind him, the commissar, was there, too. And he could have stayed silent.

No, you see.

Tacitus, the old Roman historian, speaks of *ruere in seruitium*, who rushed forth into slavery, mental slavery.

Great sentence.

CHAPTER TWO: RUERE IN SERVITIUM

I

1

And so I give you a collection of phrases, for your benefit, to know the importance of these dangers that beset us.

"*Les Philosophes*"-- pardon me -- "*Salariés*" is I think an important one. I give you the *Trahison des Clercs*. I gave you "*simony*." Now, what did I say with --?

(*That this one: rush into slavery.*)

Ja, *ruere in servitium*. That's how Tacitus calls the surrender of the whole Roman nobility, and literary men under the caesars. The *ruere in servitiam* -- rush in for servitude. So that you go even faster than the tyrant wants it.

2

THE STORY OF HENRY VIII

If you read the history of Henry VIII, this happened with the Reformers. There was no Reformation in England for this reason, because it was all done from fear that otherwise you would lose your head under this bloody tyrant, Henry VIII. And they outdid themselves in denouncing each other, and it was exactly a *ruere in servitium*.

3

THE STORY OF GAETANO SALVEMENI

My Italian friend, Gaetano Salvemini, was an enemy of Mussolini. He was a professor of history in Florence. And he had a wonderful library. And when he had to leave the country, because he had first been arrested, and been a year in prison, and then he got out -- and so he saw that he had to leave the country in order not to be executed -- he wrote to the University of Florence that he donated his beautiful library to them, as a gift. And his colleagues wanted to please Mussolini. So before answering his letter, they telephoned to Rome and said, "Mussolini, confiscate his library. Then we don't have to thank him for the gift."

That's *ruere in servitiam*. That's McCarthyism. And we had it in this country just exactly in the same spirit.

THE STORY OF THE TUCKER FELLOWSHIP AT DARTMOUTH

I have a club there, a little gathering, a so-called Tucker fellowship at Dartmouth, where 35 professors meet. And when Mr. McCarthy came along ten years ago, he thought everybody was full of suspicion, and the FBI came, and everybody was investigated. And before then, when I went in 1950 to Europe, I met this man in the last evening farewell party, and he said to me, a professor of history -- of modern history -- and he thinks he's "honest old John." And he said, "You know, now I can tell you, since you are leaving for Europe, I volunteered to inform the FBI about the..."

THIRD LECTURE: JAHWEH

FIRST PART: REPETITIVE PURPOSE AND UNIQUE DESTINY

CHAPTER ONE: WERTHERS LEIDEN

I

1

...one man, he lived openly to the various stages of life, admitting that he wasn't simply a writer. You mustn't think of him as a writer. But again he felt that after Christ he tried to live out the full life of eighty years in its variety, in its contrasting and contradictory stages to the full.

And under this impact, you must understand, did he grow up -- as I think that America is at this moment in a situation in which he begins to grasp that against the mechanism of the production here, you yourself have to become organic substance.

2

You and I, we are garden soil -- we are topsoil. If we can think of yourself as willpowered or as mind, we will all have to go the analyst and end in a lunatic asylum because of a philosophy of despair.

You can only thrive if you know what thriving means. And "thrive" means

*to be planted,
to be rooted,
to be organic,
and to be patient with oneself,
and to give oneself time*

so that one thing follows after the other. One step.

And I feel it in a world of minerals, a world of jets and and this empty stratosphere the only organic substance that's left are we ourselves. Your brain is not mind and will, but it's organic substance that has to be cultivated and irrigated like any orange grove. And it must bring its fruits in its season.

3

So for example, I think the great crisis that comes over our time at this moment is that here in this country -- Europe, by the way, too -- people have cultivated the child prodigy, for 150 years. Do it faster, that's better.

Now I hope we all feel that this is horrid, a child is ruined by coming too fast, that God is with the slow more than with the fast. And as long as you allow people to go to college at sixteen or fifteen, I think they are completely wrong.

THE STORY OF NORBERT WIENER

This most unhappy Mr. Norbert Wiener, the famous inventor of the IBM, was allowed to go to Harvard at fourteen. And graduated at seventeen; and he never grew up. So his brain is tremendous, but the rest of the man is despicable.

And this child prodigy business may signify to you: what we already were exposed to as a counter-attack, as an attempt to live slowly. And in this connection -- initiation, some form of hardihood, some form of decision, Sir, that's to which I am now trying to show, between the age of child or adolescence and manhood, offered itself as absolutely necessary.

And I don't think what we should do with juvenile delinquents in this country, except initiation. If you do not demand a period of hardihood, and of proving themselves to these children, we would be juvenile delinquents just ourselves.

And I wonder that there are so few.

4

Juvenile delinquency is the necessary result of our society, because children are allowed or asked to live from day to day.

Now a child wants to grow. And a child wants to have a far future, and a long perspective. And you ruin any child if you give him too many presents, for example, for Christmas, then. It's ruined.

A child must yearn. He must long. Otherwise, it cannot reach the next stage.

II

1

Now everything is done in our schools and in our education to make the children happy as of today. And if you enclose a child into such a wonderful candy box as of today, he goes to pieces. He believes nothing.

And that's what all our system of education at this moment does.

2

Now the problem however is -- a tribe, like a red Indian tribe, or if you have our modern society of six million people living in Los Angeles, you will think of this initiation of something of a communal nature. You will say, "Well, the boys must go to camp together," or "They must go roam the Rockies, or they must prove themselves."

However, when I grew up, the individualistic era grew, which draws from the French Revolution and the *Declaration of Independence* to the World Wars. That is, everybody is the captain of his soul.

So Goethe's solution was that the hardihood, this transformation from careless youth to a conscious manhood would have to take place inside one single individual, without any concern with the social needs, perhaps, of the community, like warfare, or like exploration, or going West pioneering. In a closed-in country like Germany, with very narrow boundaries, we had to think up something which posed the question inside the human mind, totally.

3

THE STORY OF WERTHER

And so his solution was that he wrote the *Werther*, the famous *Werthers Leiden*, the book which accompanied Napoleon still when he was a young man in his campaigns, was that *Werther* commits suicide, and thereby establishes the barrier between carefree youth and manhood by saying, "Here comes the point of decision: at twenty, or 23, or 24, you have to make up your mind -- is the life worth to be lived? Then if it is wrong if you face reality and feel not up to it, eliminate yourself."

And you can hardly understand this fact that in our country every young man was seriously exposed to the temptation of suicide, for 150 years since the *Werther* was written in 1770. And it was the same in Europe -- but perhaps more in Germany, because this was Goethe's country.

And whereas in this country, businessmen at 45 and 50 very frivolously blow out their brain with a revolver -- and this is quite common here -- we were asked to make this decision 25 years earlier. And most of us decided then, we would throw away our revolver or we wouldn't play with the dagger. We wouldn't say, "Oh, if the worst happens, I can always go." But we would learn at twenty or twenty-five, whenever this happened -- this maturing process, then we had reached this line of temptation, or this boundary line, and we had decided that this was the will of our maker, and we would not longer be tempted. We would not commit suicide anymore, even in the face of bankruptcy, or indeed of venereal disease, which was a great curse at that time, or all the other curses that come on a man and woman in their years of change.

4

You all know that women suffer, but I assure you that man of 45 and fifty is in exactly the same predicament as a woman who loses her physical beauty at that time. A man loses his imagination. He has seen all the pictures, and it's very hard to live a second life from 45 to eighty in repeating, and always knowing that once before you have done this already. This is the trouble, the difficulty of old age, that nothing is quite new -- and here in this country, they think they can go on with novelties, tiger-hunting in Africa.

But the answer is that the Negroes will shoot them, I hope very soon.

III

1

THE STORY OF A CHICAGO TYCOON

I met such a Chicago tycoon out in Egypt, who was driving down to shoot lions and elephants in Central Africa. This was nine years ago. And I would have liked to shoot him. But why has he to do it? Was sixty, had too much money, and he had seen all the pictures; so you had just to go to the next flavor, the next ingredient, and the next spice.

And anybody who, after 45 is anxious, or curious, is not a man, is not a sage, is not a wise man.

2

And so -- here, this country couldn't live -- the travel bureaus -- unless this wasn't an American vice. And at 45, still be keen to go places, which is absolutely ridiculous. It's the time of becoming a hermit. It's the time for laying down roots. And it's certainly not the time for going fifteen times to Rome and make the pope.

But I know too many of these people. They are people who have never grown up, who still try to keep younger than twenty, because at twenty you do discover: why shouldn't you?

You must know that on your generation lies the terrible burden, gentlemen, for I assure you this is from long experience, and many troubles that I tell you this: you are the first generation that has to advocate the forms of mature life, which is very hard on you, but which has to be done, although you aren't old, you have to think for this problem how to get old.

3

Because the old know. They are either in old-age pensions, or in homes, rotting, or they are fools -- décolleté at 76.

THE STORY OF A WOMAN OF 76

I have seen a woman of 76 here, belonging and making love to Harvard students. And I mean love. And all of this passes here, without any outcry.

So this is quite serious. Since we were individualistic -- all philosophy of the 19th century was, that salvation had to be found by the private people, in your own soul, and inside yourself -- since there was in Germany not much occasion to do this by exploration, and pioneering in the West, or what we say in a narrow country, the temptation was to judge yourself and decide whether you were found wanting or not.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S OWN CLASS

And in my own class, we were twelve people graduating; after the first six years, three had committed suicide.

4

And so this is practical, gentlemen; there's just this as historical. That's not a theory I'm talking of. And my teachers would tell me in Gymnasium -- that's your junior college - that we risk boys, lest we not get men.

And so the losses in the universities in numbers of people who went to pieces in many ways, not all suicide -- you can wound yourself in other ways -- it was, I would say 36 percent. And we had no pity. And we didn't care for the lowest common denominator, and the feeble-minded didn't get any privileged treatment.

It was quite the opposite idea. It was "Prove yourself," and if you fall through the net -- well, there is no other way of selection.

IV

1

You may call it cruel, and you may it call it heroic, and you may call it stupid. But I'm descriptive. This is what happened.

THE STORY OF KLEIST

Now Kleist belongs to this first generation, who tried to establish such a way into reality. And *Werther*, who had been written 25 years before he wrote this -- *Werther* is the story of a young man who falls in love. And since his love is engaged to somebody else to marry, he then eliminates himself from the contest.

And it made all over Europe an incredible impression.

2

I do think that the country here, America with its frontier, it had no reason to establish these inner processes. At that time, you became a man by just being exposed to the demands of life, here. And for this reason, it was never thought necessary.

But since the frontier has disappeared, and you are all now in this inside situation of schools, and examinations, and camps, and protection, for the first time there is perhaps a reason to mention this strange arrangement of the European mind, and trying to place this decision: is life worth living? Is this beyond your own plan, and exposing yourself to the dangers and the judgments of providence, do you have the stamina?

3

You will have to introduce in your lifetime this point -- the last fifteen years will have to find rites of initiation for the young. Otherwise you will absolutely find that all the good children must become delinquents, because what you ask them to live for and with is too poor. And if they have anything -- either they'll be feeble-minded as some when they obey all these orders: "Keep right," and so on, and the good ones will take to murder and perjury, just in order to have something to do.

4

And don't be betrayed.

THE STORY OF A BOY SCOUT GROUP

I have in my own village - perhaps I told you this -- I have a Boy Scout group. I told you this, perhaps. And there is a woman, weight 250, who has the effrontery of taking out these 13- and 14-year-old boys. She's a busybody and daughter of our senator of our state - - of the American Senate, so she's a prominent person. And nobody thinks he can deny her this ruinous activity. But she'll destroy the fiber, and the normal stamina of these boys. They must be with men at that age.

You have women teachers. And they're revolting -- the boys -- but the good boys must drink champagne very often. They must have gangs.

CHAPTER TWO: SUICIDE

I

1

This is all again contained in this story, that Kleist - he's in order to mark off certain boundaries of decision of life, it only takes a few. It isn't necessary that a million commit suicide, if the man is hopeful.

Now Kleist is very famous, wrote very great poetry. And so his fate stands out like a beacon in the sea. But as you need beacons in a stormy sea, so that your ship doesn't go against the rocks, so I assure you, the negative lives lived are not one. These people do not stay condemned. They are victims for our sake.

And in this sense Kleist is a mighty figure, because all my life I have known, and yet fully understanding why.

2

The double influence of such a person is great, because I have always lived with such markers on the map of life. And there's Nietzsche, who went insane. There is Hölderlin, who went insane. I have always felt that these people became insane lest I had to go.

And therefore, I speak with reverence of this very unhappy and miserable man, because -- it's more complicated, by the way -- he wanted so much to grow up...

(and prove himself --)

...yes, that he had tried.

THE STORY OF HEINRICH VON KLEIST

He was never married, was very unhappy in his sex life, obviously, and many mysteries about this. But not very savory ones. And so he wanted to take somebody else with him, who, when he had become a man, who could make one friend. Because "manhood" means, founding a company, founding a household. He never got married. He never was able to convey his passion to any one other person, but he was burning inside all the time. He read his poetry, it's just overwhelmed with sensuousness and passion.

So he firmly persuaded an equally miserable woman to take her life together with him, although they were not in love at all. It was an attempt to prove that he had founded a household, at least in despair. And some common bond in reality. A very strange story.

3

And I won't go into all the details; I have written it up.

THE STORY OF HITLER AND EVA BRAUN

And I've compared it to Hitler's suicide with this strange person, Eva Braun. He never consecrated his marriage, but he was quite incapable. But he had to have as his legal wife a person, and whom he had to take down with him in order to show that he was not just the fanatic of his youth -- which he really had remained, a youthful person, a childish person - - but then he was superior.

It's the same thing. So at a distance of 130 years, Kleist and Hitler frame this epoch in which suicide was an important feature of Central Europe.

It was also in France.

4

This country is very, very strange. But the impurified death motive, which you now read of from the analyst, that there is a desire for destruction and for death in every man. We all can commit suicide. No animal can. It's the limit of our freedom, self-destruction -- very strange thing -- which pervades many people who have self-pity, for example.

Anyone has this element of this destructive desire to destroy himself, inside himself. This strange ambivalence, which only means that man is really free, because he can turn against himself at various points, and goes in this country completely without a sieve, without a filter; "unfiltered," I would call it.

II

1

I have known so many suicides in the best Bostonian family -- it's appalling. But there it comes not as a moral problem, but it just happens. It's never taken up as that one element which proves to a man that he is at the turning point of his own vision, that he can go one way or the other. And don't be frightened by my description of suicide. It is the highest moment in anyone's life, when he learns, that his life cannot And most people in this country never reach this maturity, but they come into life and say, "No."

And Shakespeare speaks of those bournes in Hamlet. He has the word "bournes" for the boundaries of life: b-o-u-r-n-e-s. That's just an older form, I suppose, of "boundary." Anybody knows the statement?

(*"Whence no traveler returns."*)

Well, it is when Hamlet thinks of suicide himself. In Shakespeare, you have this moment of consideration.

2

Only to show you how important this is for this country at this moment.

You'll forgive me this digression, I know. But it has a little bit to do with the Bible, because it is the acceptance of the creature in us, who is not his own master. Of course, that's the whole story of Samuel, if you think of the good woman -- the mother of Samuel, it's exactly her position.

The whole Bible is written around this fact that we cannot commit suicide.

All Gentiles commit suicide and don't think it's sinful. It is only in Judaism that it was considered a lack of faith in God to commit suicide.

And today I think this country is going pagan, in as far as I find more and more people ready to help people commit suicide.

3

THE STORY OF ONE OF THE NICEST WOMEN IN THE COMMUNITY

I have a dear friend. She's one of the nicest women in the community. And we had a terrible argument. She for a while didn't speak to me, because I said, "You can't do that." A man can -- a student or so in college, or a professor -- we had two cases of suicide there. And I said, "Prevent it." And she said, "Oh no. If such a boy is in despair, I have to help him to do it."

That's paganism. I'm not asking so much the question about the candidate for suicide himself, as about the society. As long as you admit that you have to prevent a suicide, you are in the --. As soon as you say, as in the case of any Roman general, or a Germanic general -- "Help me to die," like the sword-bearer has to present the sword to the hero so that he can kill himself before he's made a prisoner, that's paganism. That's the one dividing line and since 1800, the advocates of legitimate suicide have been growing all the time.

And it is very hard for you to realize that this was out of the question.

4

Suicide - I have tried to study the sources about this. It's very hard to find any material. Suicides have been, but they have been hushed up. Whereas since 1800, it's been spectacular. And the press is going out for it more and more.

THE STORY OF A PROFESSOR AT DARTMOUTH

And so a dear friend of ours, a Britisher from Jamaica, was a professor at Dartmouth College, for twenty years. He had grown up in an orphanage in a neighborhood, and had gotten an American education. But he had kept the sensitivity of an English boy, and so never was very happy. He had reached the age of fifty without marrying. And now he fell in love, or somebody else fell in love with him, as it is. And she persuaded him to become engaged to marry. And he didn't feel up to the occasion and was driven to despair, felt trapped, didn't know how to get out of it.

And he lived the last year of his life at our house. So we know a little about him -- and we helped him for one year not to be driven to the extremes. But then he went to Canada; as an Englishman, he had relatives there. And the next day our student paper had the effrontery to have a headline, "Mr. Henderson Dead -- Death Was by Hanging; It Was Suicide" -- as a headline in a student paper.

III

1

And this shows you that suicide is not understood as a spiritual problem of all of us, just as an outer event, like crime in a Hearst paper.

Now if a community, like a Dartmouth College or your college, is visited by such an event, the first reaction must be: "Here, but by the grace of God, goes John Bradford." You know what John Bradford said, not "went somebody else." And the first feeling about such a suicide must always be: "Preserve me from not being led into this temptation."

And then you couldn't have such a headline.

2

You understand, because you would identify yourself with your teacher, or with your student you would find quite a different expression of discomfort or mourning.

And that's the essence of mourning, gentlemen, that you feel that it's our own fate that's happened.

That's why instead you have this denial of mourning here with this famous Forest Cemetery. Or what is it called?

(Forest Lawn.)

Because there death is simply denied; so you don't have the Lord.

THE STORY OF THE CEMETERY FOREST LAWN

"By virtue of the power invested in me by the trustees of this cemetery, I hereby declare you to be immortal."

This is the fool's paradise in which you try to live today. By abolishing death you spare yourself all these lessons of other people's death of suicide.

3

And to round this picture out, this is the story at Dartmouth College.

One is: "Death Was by Hanging."

The second is: this good woman, Mrs. Taylor, who said that she of course would help any student who wanted to commit suicide that was her sacred duty.

THE STORY OF THE BOY SAYING JESUS COMMITTED SUICIDE

And *the third* thing is: my own class -- I gave a course in universal history -- a boy got up at the beginning of the class and said I shouldn't talk about the Church or anything Christian, because after all, Jesus had committed suicide. And I learned that this is the Nazi way in which it's very rampant in New Jersey, and therefore the Nazis are victorious in this country, and they are in many states, as you know.

And it's much Nazism in this country, at this moment. And so this is a very summary of this new paganism: Jesus committed suicide.

4

Now that wasn't the whole story. I was furious, and said so. And then the same class went on. And at the end of the class, there was another occasion for him to make a remark.

And so the same boy from New Jersey got up and said, "Well, after all, Adolf Hitler has sacrificed himself for his nation."

Now grant you, the two sentences correlate, fit in. It's like saying that Mr. Hoover already did the whole New Deal. That's just a Republican poison in a small way; it's a similar way of turning the tables, putting A where B belongs, and B where A belongs.

Obviously Mr. Hitler in despair had to commit suicide. There was no room for him on this continent. And Jesus began His life through the Crucifixion, and has ever been alive after that. And that's why everybody knows this; everybody feels this. And in order to destroy the living Christ, and in order to institute Hitler as having a future in his dogma, you have

to say that Hitler sacrificed himself, because then he goes on living, as John Brown: "And his soul is living on."

IV

1

Therefore, these expressions of suicide and sacrifice are important even because -- I told you that Kleist, this man Kleist - or this *Werther*, the hero of Goethe's novel, you know this book, by name? That's a famous book, *Werther*, who's the hero -- commits suicide.

And they may be treated as sacrificial if we say, "What not? This never." If there are these markers, which say, "Here is the cliff, don't come nearer to this abyss."

In this sense, I feel that Christ is an honorable victim, because in Him then comes into the open a temptation of everybody.

And I must warn you not to become Pharisees.

2

There are three situations: suicide meaningless, and saying, "Here I have come to the end of my rope." And you can say that the Nazis played away German statehood in twelve years, and therefore they always had to speak of the four thousand years or of a thousand years ahead of them. Just they gambled away exactly twelve years, which is quite a condensation of time.

The devil always sells short.

3

What we call the devil is nothing but the shortening of the time that anything real takes. You marry for your life. And you rape for the moment. That's the devil.

That is, the act is concentrated on one moment, and is fruitless, and destructive.

And what we call "diabolical" is always a shortcut, is always an attempt, to live less long than we are meant to live.

THE STORY OF THE INSTALLMENT-PLAN

The installment-plan buying. It's diabolical, because it shortens. But you want to get something which you may get in four years, but you want to have it immediately, so you sell out your freedom. And you are the slave of this immediacy for the next four years.

4

Now this is a positive sacrifice. And I have to introduce this, because it doesn't exist, it seems -- I don't know the vocabulary, although everybody knows that there is a negative sacrifice. That he is a warning: "Don't do this."

CHAPTER THREE: THE CONCENTRATION CAMPS

I

1

Now in a sense, Christ has made the same appeal. "Don't do" -- in the theology of the New Testament very articulate in the fact that it says, "It must never be repeated".

It's the last sacrifice that is necessary. It's a warning to all of us who would like to burn at stake, and to crucify. This is no longer necessary, because the worst has happened. It has been done once to the innocent.

So all the less innocent are included in the path. It must not happen again. So our Christian theology has something to do with this negation of repetition.

2

And once more, the sterile suicide, which is not done in order to teach, in order to convey a thing, or because you have lived for others and with others. And I would say that the student who of his own teacher writes, "Death Was by Hanging," sterilizes the event, deprives himself of any way of learning something of it -- it's just an outside accident on the road. And it has nothing to do with our own soul.

And that's why it is so absolutely gruesome in an educational establishment, such cruelty and such callousness occurs because then life has no relation -- the lives are lived independently from each other.

3

So it is perhaps worth your while to think in these three terms, and say one thing.

What we call "paganism," and must call "paganism," is the right of man to dispose of its own existence between birth and death as though it was his own property. And this includes then the right to commit suicide whenever it pleases him. And I think we all are in this temptation. And I don't know of anyone in this room who would say that there is no situation in which he would say, "I'm quite sure that I won't do this."

So we are all in this temptation of becoming Gentiles, of going pagan.

THE STORY OF SUICIDE IN THE CONCENTRATION CAMPS

And I have learned from the concentration camps of the Nazis that you must understand when suicide is allowed. The concentration camps abolish the name of the person, gave

them numbers. And they ceased to be anything but human material. And this comes from modern psychology who has the effrontery to call people "good material." It's forbidden, but this is done in our educational establishment: "first-class material."

4

Now all these people have produced this hell. The concentration camps are only the expression of one hundred years of analysts' psychology. And you live in this world already. And watch out. Because if a man is only be treated as a number, and has no name among his fellow men, he has no hope for being redeemed by their love.

II

1

Now sometimes despair is so terrible on us, that only the loving eyes of somebody else can redeem us, can bring us back into normalcy. Everybody knows this that you just depend on somebody else's saying "Hello" to you. In a small way, we all experience this every day.

2

THE STORY OF EDITH STEIN

And when I have known cases in concentration camps of Europe, where I would have said that the moment in which they were alive, some famous people like Edith Stein -- you may have heard of this philosopher or so -- when they were abducted, out of their communities -- she was a Catholic nun of Jewish descent -- the abbess and the other nuns in Holland allowed the Nazis to take her away in her midst. The abbess didn't go with her. But now she is worshiped as a saint in this Catholic community.

It's ridiculous. If there was anything in a monastery and a nunnery, the others, the convent had to go with her. And she couldn't have been separated. That's the vow of a nun, that you are a sister in the Lord.

3

And so after this terror that the own abbess and the other nuns deserted her, and just sent her into the hands of a gang that only counted heads and legs, and broke out their golden teeth, and cut their hair, and stole their clothes in order to make money out of them, I think -- such a person -- she didn't, by the way -- can commit suicide.

This is not suicide in the sense in which our human existence is guaranteed by our creator, and asks from us to uphold. Because it's all within the word, the living word, this speech, that we are only human beings, and not animals.

And if no word anymore reaches us, because we have become number 11,022, instead of having our name, when this identity can no longer be hoped for and re-established, then I would say that the commandment of no suicide is not something superstitious, is not a taboo which cannot be discussed.

4

But within the creative process of mankind, where we are spoken to, we are within a stream of power, a field of force that is stronger than we. That keeps us alive.

And once we are thrown away like a skeleton, or an empty skull, it's a different matter. Then the world has cast us out.

III

1

So I only meant to say, we have to find modern concepts, and words, and understanding for this tremendous problem.

For 150 years, suicide has advanced as a moral permission, as something that is not permitted. That have made advance -- and advanced all the time. In the sentence of an American citizen, all by the way of purely of American descent, in my college -- in Dartmouth, three years ago, "Jesus has committed suicide after all," and "Hitler has sacrificed himself for his people," you have the climax.

2

You can't do more. You pervert the vocabulary and the tradition of the human race. And when such a point is reached, only conscious effort can restor normalcy.

That's why I have to discuss these things. Because you are all exposed to this perversion of the vocabulary. So one day, you will have yourself to make up your mind: what is suicide? and what is sacrifice? And will have to be very careful. Otherwise you will get in great trouble in your married life, in the education of your children, in your professional life, and in your political life.

Because if you haven't this near you, you will make terrible victims, if you think that a man -- the savior of mankind here has committed suicide, and the anti-Christ has sacrificed himself for his people.

So pardon me. What's your name?

(Epstein.)

Now Mr. Epstein, you don't mind. But this is the consequence of your question.

(Well, I may ask more later.)

What?

(I say, I may ask more later. This won't stop me.)

3

Well, I think I owed you this, because it is after all the condition under which the Bible story is written is that man cannot commit suicide. And the condition under which all pagan history, migration of peoples, Greek history and so, is written is that man make commit suicide.

THE STORY OF THE ROMAN NOBILITY

The whole Roman nobility from Caesar's days to the days of Titus, to the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem did commit suicide, and eliminated itself from the scene. There was not one Roman nobleman alive in 1700 A.D. They all had committed suicide. And after this, no Roman citizen has ever become emperor of Rome. They were all from the provinces.

That's quite a story.

4

Suicide has stayed in Japan the same. You know the samurai has to commit *hara bushito*, they call suicide. Japan is still one of the few pagan countries left where you can study what suicide is. It's the taking outside, by your own volition -- yourself out of this fabric of life, and of history.

IV

1

THE STORY OF JUDAS ISCARIOT

Christianity has made this very clear in the case of Judas Iscariot, who commits suicide in despair because of his deceit by his own political energy. Obviously this would seem so that he wanted to fall into Jesus' hand, to appear as the Messiah, by violence.

But his suicide is the turning point in the history of the whole world, because after Judas Iscariot's exposure, paganism held that the noble spirit does commit suicide. That it is the way in ending life when your own proposition is crushed. Self-will, which advocates suicide, because if my determination cannot be upheld, then good-bye. I had not achieved what I wanted to achieve, therefore there is nothing for me to live. Hello?

2

And the first word of the Bible, in the book of Samuel, his first chapter, is written around this one sentence: not "my will," but "thy will be done." This is the difference, that the Bible is written as the history, how the --.

Suicide follows inevitably when your purpose has to prevail. If your purpose cannot prevail, commit suicide.

THE STORY OF THE GOTHES

The famous Goths defeated by Justinian's general, Belisar, at the Vesuvius - it was that when the Goths, this victorious German, heroic people, saw that this battle was lost, they all went to their deaths, voluntarily, and eliminated themselves. And so the end of the Gothic kingdom is suicide.

3

Suicide defied its purpose.

But the Bible is written around the fact that man has plans, Sir.

That's why, Mr. Epstein, I have to be a little other terms from you about plan and Christ. Purpose and plans are our contribution to the future. But the real future is destiny. And destiny uses our purpose and plans, but twists them around and does something in addition.

You can never fulfill your own purpose without becoming the most dissatisfied and hungry beast in the desert.

4

THE STORY OF MR. HEARST

A man who has his purpose fulfilled to get one million dollar is in great temptation then to go on and finally he has one hundred million, and he is the most miserable creature on earth, and ends like Mr. Hearst, with this fantastic idiocy there. Have you seen his hunting ground there with these wagons and wagons of not even unloaded treasures from Europe, because he didn't know where to spend his money and where to put his energy?

So destiny is above my forehead. It's up there. I'm led, and I have to learn that my purpose is part of my life, but very small compared to the fulfillment of the higher purposes which are not of mine.

Any bishop who has to say in the Catholic Church, "I don't want to become the bishop," learns that it's not his will that has to be done, but a higher will.

CHAPTER FOUR: UNIQUENESS

I

1

And the fathers of the Revolution in this country, gentlemen, were such great people, because they knew that it wasn't simply their volition. The rebels wanted independence, and didn't care for the future. John Adams and Jefferson knew how difficult such a future would be, that they would have to become like the British government themselves. And they hated the idea, and they didn't see any way out. And this is more than purpose.

And that's why this country still has today the same constitution which it received, because they were very shy of identifying their wicked purposes with the form of government which they had to inherit from the British and had to install on this side of the Atlantic. This is quite a different proposition, which has nothing to do with your volition, and your wishes and your desires, or your plans for your own future.

2

So these are the levels on which the place for suicide is decided. If you only live for your own purpose, and are the captain of your soul, in the last analysis, your complete freedom is evinced by your right to commit suicide.

If, however, all life is one, one spirit moves the earth and the heavens in one history of mankind, then even your own life is only as meaningful as a sacrifice within the whole. It can then, instead of living seventy years, lay down your life for your friends on the battlefield, or you can die as a shining example of what not like Christ, but it isn't that your life ends with your suicide, but that it plays a role in a pattern of life, a tapestry of life which has a much larger sense than your own mentality -- what you think, your own consciousness, what you know about your own interest.

3

You read these four chapters, did you? I said Chapter 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. What's in them?

(...or you're saying I believe, it goes on to talk about Samuel being a prophet, actually and then how God, how He leads the Jews and prophets, and hears that, and the Jews say "Look at this neighboring land. They have a king. Why can't we have a king?" And Samuel's fears -- and he tells them that this is wrong, "You do have God." And so he goes to God with his problem and he tells Him that the Jews want a king. And so God says, "If this is what they wish, then we will let them have a king." And He tells Samuel who should be the king, but doesn't name the person, "Until an event happening, when this event occurred, you will know who should be the king."

And so this shepherd or this boy who watches flocks for his father, is looking for some lost -- I don't know what it was, ox or something -- and he comes to the town and they say that Samuel will tell him where they are.)

Was it oxen?

(I can't remember what they were.)

Well, in many poems and dramas of a later literature this story had been used. What are the animals?

(Asses.)

(Asses, yeah. And it --.)

One way of keeping the word "ass" alive.

(And so anyway, he comes to the town where Samuel lives. And so Samuel tells him that he will find his asses for him; and meanwhile, it seems that he asks him to stay for dinner, or something, and --.)

Not "something." Never say "something."

(Yeah, I guess it is. He invites him into his home...)

It's vicious.

(...and he stays for dinner. And I believe that quite soon he is informed that it's the will of God that he be anointed king of the people of Israel. And then it goes on to defend how Saul is at first supposedly a good man. But when after he attains his rulership, he begins to be a little bit more self-willed and somehow perverted, and contrary to the humility of a pious man. And therefore is asking for God's wrath against him almost, and -- .)

4

Now, I have brought you here quite a valuable article on the book of Samuel, in the Encyclopaedia, 14th edition, because it's still the good edition. The last edition was a scandal. And I'm really sorry to say, the deterioration of this great work is sad.

THE STORY OF THE ITALIAN ENCYCLOPEDIA

Best encyclopedia we have today is Italian. It is a masterpiece of fourteen volumes. I advise you to look into it, even though you do not know Italian, because in its illustrations and in its pictures, it's the most complete book that's ever been published. It's the last sunset of European civilization. It was finished in '39, I think. And it's the collaboration of an international staff of the highest order, completely international -- many Americans, by the way.

And this is very sad.

II

1

But here, this old edition -- which is, I think, 1928 or 1929 -- is still very good. And it reflects better than Mr. Shotwell's book, which I think is on a lower level than this article -- it reflects the best scholarship of the time on the criticism of the Bible. The first brilliant book on the book of Samuel was written by Wenthausen in 1871. I think you should know this period, because he is the father of most of the biblical criticism which runs wild in this country in this moment.

And by and large the biblical criticism in this country is far behind the times. It is still very much of 1871 brand.

2

And they have much genius in this, establishing the sources out of which the Book of Samuel is composed, and from this angle there is nothing to be said against it at all. We have learned a lot about the way in which this author took when he wrote this, from sources. He must have, as you would have to go by your notes -- or somebody else's notes -- if you want to describe what happens in this seminar.

The funny thing is only that this pride of being able to look into people's footnotes, and where they came from, has blinded them to the text, that is, to what the Bible is written for.

3

Now it has to be composed out of certain bricks of reality. But the funny thing is -- I give you this -- that's why I brought you the book - one sentence, which may show you how careful you have to go about using these books of the last seventy, eighty years. I think they are really marvelous, because he says, "*The introductory account of the Book of Samuel, Chapter 1 to Chapter 4, first verse, is a valuable picture of religious life at the sanctuary in Shiloh.*"

That's all he has to say. That's purely external.

I tried to tell you last time that this could have been in Shiloh, or in Biloh, or in Los Angeles. The problem is to distinguish between purpose and providence, between purpose and destiny.

4

From the very outset, that's the whole content of the first chapter: to see that the woman and the baby both don't know what this is all for. They have to serve a higher purpose, and not their own. This the Bible is written about.

Now whether this is in Shiloh is absolutely external, is environmental. But this biblical critic thinks that he has a second Thucydides here, or a second Herodotus, or a second Bancroft, or whatever your historian is as of today. And so he says, "It's a valuable picture of religious life at the sanctuary at Shiloh."

III

1

Now the three terms I recommend to your attention show you the total misunderstanding of the Bible that persists today in academic circles: "*valuable*," "*religious*," "*at Shiloh*."

Now nobody would have to read a valuable book about religious life in Shiloh. It's ridiculous. What it had to do with the religious life in Shiloh?

Nothing whatsoever. And throw the Bible into the wastepaper basket, if this is so.

Obviously, the Bible hasn't made its course through the world in elevenhundred languages, because it gives a valuable picture of religious life at Shiloh. Just incalculable.

But this is all printed and you can get your doctor's degree for that.

2

You are sunk in superstition at this moment, gentlemen, of paganism. And that's why suicide is It all goes together. If man is a purposive animal, and his purposes are frustrated, he commits suicide. Unless he's taken up by a man who asks ten thousand dollars a year and calls himself a psychoanalyst.

You live in a dark world of complete darkness. The sorcerers of Egypt govern in this community. That's psychoanalysis. They interpret dreams, just exactly as it was before the Exodus.

Don't believe it. I'm not really laughing.

This is true.

Mr. Rollo May admitted that much, when he spoke. That's exactly what he said. "*Don't give up the biblical story about anxiety and guilt*". The sorcerer of pharaoh says to pharaoh, "No guilt, no anxiety - and it's all in the stars."

And Rollo May, did you go to him? Who listened to Mr. Rollo May? Anybody?

(This was only by invitation.)

Oh, I see. That's another hoax.

3

Well, why is this all wrong about the Bible?

Because the very word "religion" for the Bible doesn't exist. The religions of the many nations. You must know that "religion" is a generalization. And the Bible fights for faith against religion for the elements that are in every moment in everybody's life, regardless of the outer forms of worship in any one national sanctuary.

And therefore, to say "*a valuable picture*" says that the Bible is one out of many.

Whereas the Bible makes an attempt to show concretely how man in any religious environment, any form of worship -- which goes by *place, and time, and architecture, and mores, and dresses, and costumes* and what-not -- has to communicate with the creator's will as the creature that at this moment has to be created.

4

The Bible is written around the fact that man is in creation, still. That's why it begins with, "*In the beginning, God created heaven and earth*, and now He goes on to create man. And we are the sixth day of creation, today," and the Sabbath, the end of creation, the word "Sabbath" is still ahead.

And the whole story of the Bible is an attempt to make you and me aware that wherever we come from, and where -- we are in the making, in the process of the --.

IV

1

And that's why this first chapter is very eloquent.

This woman cannot fulfill any requirements at Shiloh. That's not enough. But there's something new happening for the first time, and unique. It will never happen again, the birth of her son Samuel. That's the whole story written about.

And to say this is a "valuable picture of religious life in Shiloh" is omitting the whole reason why the book is written. It is written around the fact that despite the religious life

in Shiloh, something totally original was about to happen, that has never happened before, will never happen again.

Uniqueness.

2

And as the God of Israel is unique, because He is the creator of this one world in which we live, which can never be repeated because it's still in process, so against all the many worlds in which the Hindus, for example, live -- worlds within worlds circling around -- the Jews have in the Bible established one simple fact that all the heavens and all the earths are one.

Only one process, that God is unique, and man is unique in as far as he believes in God.

If he doesn't, then he becomes a thing, like anybody else. And if you say, "We are an American," then you have to live according to the pattern of the Joneses. If you say that you have a soul, you can live a unique life.

And anybody who wants to hold up with the Joneses is a Gentile. He has lost the unique process of creation in which you and I are created at this very moment, which has never happened before, which therefore cannot be established as a repetitive order.

3

Now there are many things in our existence, like this here, which are repetitive. We all have to wear dress. And we dismiss them as second-rate...

...and this is very simple thing.

And the masterpiece of Samuel is, because I do feel that it's perhaps the first book that was written down. I tried to tell you this last time, you remember, that it's written in this small, still voice: how does something unexpected happen for the first time, which has not happened to any tribal lore?

In the tribe everything is repetitive. Everything has happened before, everything is taboo, familiar to him. You do exactly what your forefathers did.

4

And so Judaism has a terrible time here between these tremendous empires, and these tribes of Canaan, where everything is done by precedent. And so she has become ridiculous first. She has to think she's drunk. Because the only way in which a free future is reached is always by antagonizing the Joneses.

It is perfectly normal that she should be inspired, and excited. But he has no explanation because something happens for the first time. He has never seen an inspired woman praying with such devotion. So he says, "She's drunk."

SECOND PART: PROMISE, PROPHECY, FUTURE

CHAPTER ONE: PROPHET AND KING

I

1

Now you will always be exposed in any free man's decision. He is the growing point of creation. Any decision you make -- you want to study, you want to marry -- at that moment, you are ahead of everybody else in the universe with this decision. And you cannot complain that the universe is not prepared for this decision.

And it is this lag which modern psychology tries to eliminate by telling you that you don't have to get hurt, that if you act right and adjust yourself, then everything is wonderful.

2

It's nonsense. To grow is painful. Because it means that at one moment, your decision is still un-understandable to the next person, because you haven't had time to convey it to them. And this conveyance had to be first created.

Now this is true in small ways, when you suddenly tell your parents that you are no longer of their opinion and have to do otherwise. And it goes on all your life. And it goes in politics, it goes in the sciences, a new discovery. You are the growing point of creation.

3

And this is the content of the Book of Samuel.

Here is she, the mother; then there is Samuel; then there is the kingdom of Israel. So there are three things, three times, that something happens that is quite disestablished, because Eli and his sons are the legitimate prophets.

Here the woman who, by hook and crook, receives the blessing of the legitimate prophets, and thereby is able to bring her son, as a spiritual successor, so that somebody can inherit the office not by the flesh, carnally, but through the spirit.

That's the important thing.

4

Since he is innocent of the corruption of the office of Eli -- the story you told us - he is able to represent real prophecy which means future.

What is prophecy, gentlemen?

Take it all away, it is the power to see to it that there is a promise that must be fulfilled.

The word "promise" is the American translation for "prophecy." And you should use it. And you should know that it is. "Promise" is the translation of the American language of the Old Testament idea of "prophecy." Under this new dispensation, we call this "promise."

II

1

Now promise demands fulfillment.

Now the tremendous story of Samuel is only how then the next step in the tradition of this people, who are weary of being so dispersed and living among the other nations. How can it be fulfilled? And it can be fulfilled as long as Samuel is with the king. Therefore the establishment of the prophecy in this Book of Samuel precedes the kingship.

And if you read on in Samuel, you will find that this dualism is the topic of the four books of Kings and of Samuel.

Very simple.

2

I had to write for another encyclopedia -- I told you the story --and so I took great pains to work this out. Samuel enables Saul. So you have the beginning of Church and state. That's the essence in the Old Testament tension between prophet and king.

And that's why our modern division of Church and state goes back to the Old Testament, to this book here. Between Moses and then Samuel, the tribe simply overwent kingship. And so never allowed the king to provoke or the danger of a relapse into tyranny and into idolatry, so that the king himself was God.

3

Because that is the effect of despotism that you have to lick the feet of the tyrant -- and treat him as though he was the living oracle, as Henry VIII was treated in England.

THE STORY OF HENRY VIII

There was great danger for ten years in England in the 16th century, that Henry VIII was really treated as God. And even Lord Burleigh, the great minister of Elizabeth, when he came to dine, said that he was sure that he would meet in her his leader in Heaven -- in her and God's Heaven. So he was still blaspheming in calling Heaven "Elizabeth's heaven," "the queen's heaven." So much was at that time the tyrant identified with kingship, with religion.

4

This relapse is always with us. You have it now with Mr. Stalin in Russia. And you have it with MacArthur -- with Mr. Eisenhower in this country. These are all very dangerous suppositions, because they all invite the pope running together again of Church and state into one. Mr. Eisenhower introduces prayer in his cabinet meetings, and so on, suddenly is standing for religion in this country.

It's quite unheard-of. And very dangerous.

III

1

And the division of Church and state is on what American liberty is founded. And it is disappearing fast at this moment, I assure you.

As with suicide. Wherever you get suicide, wherever people live for their own purpose, the whole must be kept together by violence. Because as soon as a man is no longer offering his life within a pattern of common destiny, as to bear fruit, as a seed for fruit, but thinks, "My purpose," "my life," the whole must be taken care of by stern measures.

And the more people are individualists, the more tyrannical the community must be.

2

Now you get the second stage. Samuel recedes into the background and dies. And then you get this tension between Saul, David, and Jonathan. And the disaster occurs when Saul finally tries to kill David, and to commit suicide, because he's so melancholic, because he's a lone man.

Teaching's just too much against the spirit of the Almighty, because the spirit listeth where it blows.

It blows where it listeth.

And so the king cannot be the holder of the whole inspiration of a people.

3

And this is the whole problem of the division of Church and state that one has only an office, and the other has the spirit. We need both. And then you come to the solution, the tremendous climax, the division between David and Nathan, the prophet who is the kingmaker, through whose effort -- who becomes king, because Nathan intervenes, after David?

Who is the next king after David?

It's a great story, that David appoints a successor and Nathan brushes it aside: "I'm the prophet." And imposes on David the son of the adulteress of Bathsheba. And that's why Bathsheba comes into the genealogy of Christ.

4

Genealogy is full of illegalities and crimes, because the spirit of God blows where it listeth.

And this is the whole content of these two books of Samuel and two books of Kings, how the dualism between prophet and king saves the Mosaic revelation in the desert, when people had to live for hundreds of years in a settled order. And when the temptation is that they imitate their neighbors and get strong with a constitutional government.

And so make their kings -- because they aren't so very different from our presidents today -- make their kings oversized.

IV

1

So I feel that you would kindly for the next time go through the whole two books of Samuel, and bear me out on this story. You have to read on till you come to the David and Nathan, and then you have to go into the First Book of Kings for this purpose.

But once you see this, you understand the creativity of the books, because then you understand why Eli had to be purified, his sons had to be eliminated, and Samuel had to again receive his vocation as free as Moses did in the front of the fiery bush -- how do you call it?--the burning bush.

2

The problem of the Bible is how in every generation comes a direct command -- an unheard-of, a unique command -- which continues the story from miracle to miracle, or from decision to decision. Obviously, the history of the Bible is only valid if at every turn there is something unexpected that happens, and thereby proves that the purposes of man must be overcome, must be woven into a higher pattern, a pattern which is not of their own making, which is beyond their expectation.

(I'd like to get something cleared up.

You just said that when something unexpected occurred, it shows that man evolved in a higher order than just a man must fulfill his aspirations for this higher order by including himself, by not depending on precedent, continually evolve toward the higher order. And then you said earlier that Eli rejected or didn't understand Hannah's inspiration and thought she was drunk, because he was resting on precedent. This was an inspiration he didn't understand.)

They never had it, that the wife was inspired. That was not admitted.

(So in that instance, he failed in his understanding a higher order. And then the Jews clamored to be like other nations. They looked around and they wanted a united king and so they looked at precedent for salvation?)

Oh, very much so. In every generation, people want to keep up with the Joneses. And it's our common illness, because it seems to make for happiness. Simplifies matters.

(Well, didn't you interpret this as being worthwhile, then?)

... promises unfulfilled.

3

The promise of America is something that is not represented by Mr. Eisenhower, but by the yearnings of unborn generations, and it will have to be fulfilled and it goes beyond the present-day budgets. The budget of the United States for which Mr. Eisenhower is responsible has nothing to do with the promise of America. They are two things shown up in this budget, it would jeopardize the promise of America, we would have to turn against him.

THE STORY OF MR. EISENHOWER

That's why he said, "They want to out-" -- how did he put it in his press conference? Did you see it?

It was a very important press conference on this, my dear. He said, "All you want me to spend all the money now for armaments. And that would play into the hands of the

Bolsheviks. We would forgo our own promise, our own future, and would just play up to the Joneses, to the Russians. They would like us to put all our eggs into this basket of armaments, and ruin our future."

And I had great respect for him, because it took nerve to resist all these Democratic senators, who have the majority in Congress, who say, "We don't have enough armaments in Berlin; we don't have enough bombs; we don't have enough missiles," and so on. And say, "I still will speak quietly, because I have done my duty." They asked him.

4

It was a strange conference. Two days ago. It's worth reading, gentlemen. I charge you with reading this, because you will find that there was -- I don't know if it was the ...I am myself in ambiguity.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY BEING A NATIVE OF BERLIN

As I told you, I'm very interested in the Berlin issue, because they want to have a school established for me in Berlin. So my own future is decided on May 27th. And so I'm very much of a partisan -- also I'm a native of Berlin.

CHAPTER TWO: GEOGRAPHY

I

1

And but still I admire the president, although he is growing soft, and saying, "Don't get excited," and "Don't let's arm," and "Don't let's put atomic weapons into circulation," and saying, "If I follow the politics today I destroy the real future of the United States."

It's this power that the promise is much more in the future than the immediate present government can hope to act upon it. And they must keep the avenues open so that other peoples have the right to act.

2

Take our forests. If you cut down all the redwoods, you deprive all future generations of this participation in this treasure of nature. Conservation is based on this assumption that the present-day government is not identical with the creation of the world, because there are creatures that still have to exist, after you have spent all your money on nonsense.

(Well, trying to show that you finally described in terms that when they finally did accept the king, they didn't really talk with the other countries, because for the other countries the king was both the spirit -- he was one man, the spirit and the state; and they maintained the prophet and king jointly.)

That's why this prophet statement is so strange. They wrote the books of the Bible, not the king. Although they used royal....

3

But the story of the Bible is that none of them is written, by the powers that be. But it's written with criticism.

That's unheard-of, that you have this admission that these kings do wrong. David has to humiliate himself, just incredible. Moses -- the first great king of Israel; then Solomon again. And we may come then to the temple of Solomon, but I think that should be our next time.

Let's now -- we still have some time left. And I think we have a break of five minutes, and then we have reading of the Samuel text.

II

1

... just to get your question straight. Do you? Then we have to think about it shortly.

(You were answering the question while you were out of the room.)

Did it help?

(Yeah.)

How interesting. It's a very wonderful invention, yes. Well, to me, it's just ...but it can be used just for such a purpose, don't you think?

Now, what is your question?

(Well, I didn't understand that you were saying that this was a fall, one of the many falls that society has experienced. This rejection of individuality and individuality of aggregate communities. And when you rejected this, then it would conform to other modes of society by combining Church and state -- well, that is, cutting off prophecy and trying to get singular promise. Unfortunately...)

Well -- this is a misunderstanding about the word "promise" here. You mean then promise in an election is obviously no prophecy. I meant that the word "promise" is quite legitimate today for the old word "prophecy." That's what I mean.

The promise of America is not of a secular nature, but a comprehensive nature. It's the whole future of man in America. We can disagree on the content, but the meaning is obviously universal.

Would you agree?

(Yeah.)

2

(Another example of that would be, I think, that Saul was in good standing with God until he went out in battle and took the spoils of the)

Ja.

(So it wasn't the fact that he was Well, it was the fact that resulted in the ...)

He didn't understand that this group was meant to have the power to act in a personal way. Or a unique way.

It's always this problem of uniqueness, which today everybody boasts himself, he's "just a human being." And he writes off his uniqueness very often by this word. It's an ambiguous term, like "promise." It can mean the right thing, because if I am a human being, then I am a creature of God that is to be created at this moment, and has to do something unique.

You can also use it to say that I'm one among a million, and how can you expect me to do different?

3

(I think it's that people are prone to do when they read the Bible, a lot of the statements and belief expressed -- take for example that all men are born in the image of God. Ah ha, we're all the same; there's no differences, and so forth. And then, when they have a contradiction, because everybody is personally in God's eyes, and in His..., and ...{.)

The image of God is quite a unique one, because God is unique. And He's the creator of Heaven and earth, and He is the redeemer, and He is the revealer. And so if we are in the image of God, the burden of uniqueness is so heavily on us, that most people run away from this.

The image of God is not a minor proposition. It's a terrible thing. Because, God is in the future, and we never know Him from what He has done, because He's still unrevealed.

And so man is unrevealed to himself.

If you would however take this seriously, the image of God, we would be frightened to death. It's gigantic.

(... it's not interpreted in a fashion.)

Of course not. Well, did you take this down? You should use this as a shield, because if you ... of the circle, the introductory account of Samuel, from the first dedication and calling of the first Book of Samuel "is a valuable picture of religious life at the sanctuary at Shiloh." Thereby the whole thing is generalized, and we can write thousands such stories, there would be no distinction.

Because in Africa, there are ten thousand such sanctuaries; and in Asia, there are twenty thousand; and in America, I don't know how many. And so it's just curiosity that's served.

4

This is the attitude of these critics of the last eighty years, they treat the Bible as a chronicle, a annals, or as of any wild tribe. Therefore, the god of Israel is just a god of the tribes. Probably you were brought up in this conviction, that this was a tribal god. That was very rampant in America.

Just like the sentence, "Jesus committed suicide," corresponds exactly with the writing down of the Bible as the book of these henotheistic, it was called tribal society, who had Jahweh as their individual god, whereas the whole setting of the Bible is that all humankind is strewn all over the earth, dispersed into mighty kingdoms, men everywhere talk in different tongues. And they have a different god.

Difference -- this little group had said, "For Heaven's sake, we go crazy if we would admit that God is limited by the countries and by the kings."

III

1

(...that would not mean that the difference between Israel's acceptance of Jahweh is that they accepted him as more than a national god. A national god is a Supernational?)

Well, you just kindly look up the table of nations in the first book. Would you read the tenth chapter of Genesis, which gives the whole proposition of the Bible. In the midst of time -- in 1959 could you write it just as well today as if you write an Encyclopaedia Britannica. And why not? You have to. It's assigned reading. Where is it?

(I brought Thucydides with me. I didn't bring the --.)

But I told you to read the chapters -- two volumes of Samuel. You have committed suicide here in this regard. How about you, Sir? And you?

Of course, you have a trauma. Would you kindly read the tenth chapter? It seems very boring. And we will see why it isn't.

*"These are the generations of the sons of Noah:
Shem, Ham, and Japheth: and the sons were born to them after the flood.
The sons of Japheth: Gomer, and Magog --"*

Magog.

"Magog, and Madai --."

2

There's still a Lake Memphramagog in this country, on the boundary between Canada and Vermont, a very beautiful lake, because of this. It is full of biblical names.

*"-- Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras.
And the sons of Gomer: Ashkenaz?"*

Don't be frightened. These names are not wanton. You may think that's all foolish. I think it isn't. Please go on.

*"Riphath, and Togarmah.
The sons of Javan: Elishah, and Tarshish,
Kittim, and Dodanim."*

Now do you know which countries these are? The Kittim, and the Tarshish? That's the western Mediterranean.

Go on.

*"By these ... their lands; every one after his tongue, by their families, in their nations.
The sons of Ham: Cush, and Mizraim, and Phut, and Canaan.
The sons of Cush: Seba, and Havilah, and Sabtah, and Raamah,
and Sabtecha: and the sons of Raamah: Sheba, and -)*

That's Sheba. That's the Arabia peak; that's the region toward the Indian ocean, always from the standpoint for Palestine. It goes around the periphery.

*"-- Sheba and Dedan.
And Cush became the father of Nimrod, ... a mighty man."*

That's the country of Mesopotamia, Nimrod; that's Babylon, Assyr, and Sumer, that we know as kingdoms -- we know of all very little.

So he is above around Palestine, from the north to the west, to the south --.

(It's all in the periphery?)

No, he is in the periphery.

(Iraq.)

It includes the islands of the western Mediterranean, Spain; therefore it's not a country. It's even more. The known world "*Nimrod was a mighty hunter,*" that's it?

*"-- Before the Lord: therefore it is said, by ... Nimrod the mighty hunter ... Lord.
And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel,
and Erech, and Accad, all around Shinar."*

3

Now the land of Sinar or Shinar, as we still say, is important, because Abraham came from this. So from the very first, the Israelites have established themselves as being in the region halfway between Egypt and Mesopotamia. And so they never felt themselves, as

somewhere in a desert locality: nowhere, independent. But their whole meaning is that they are halfway, from Egypt, from the isles of the Mediterranean, and from Mesopotamia.

This is their universalism of the very first moment.

4

That's why this geography is not boring, but is a tremendous achievement; it's the first time in the history of the world that a country and a people look at themselves as determined by the outer world and therefore become free of it.

All the people who say -- "We are earth-born," "We are natives," try to establish their viewpoint, their world view without regard to the influence of the outside. The Israelites, however, are very latecomers to the game.

Abraham comes from Mesopotamia, is educated there, in Ur, and in Haran. Ur being at the mouth of the rivers, the Tigris and Euphrates, and Haran being high up in the north. Then he comes to Palestine the first time; then goes to Egypt and learns the ropes there; and then comes back. And so establishes by a circuitous route his being between them in these narrow mountains. It affirms the sea roads, the land roads, the main highway between the then-known world.

IV

1

And this has never happened before in the world, except perhaps the parts of America, that they were consciously feeling that they were dependent on the geography of other countries for their own salvation. And this is an attempt to express this, making the rounds -- and then saying -- now we come to that.

Will you kindly go on?

*"From that land went Assyria and helped Babylon, Rehoboth, Calah,
And Resen ... great."*

2

Now be a little more merciful. These boys all had to go to sleep anyway. So try to read to them as though they were children, who want to listen.

They don't want to listen, but read as though they did want to listen. Will you?

Reading is an act of affection. It's not just a chore. These boys are without any hopes. They are illiterate.

"Mizraim became the father of Ludim, Anamin, Lehabim –

Convince them!

-- Naphtuhim,
 Pathrusim, and Casluhim
 (out of whom came Philistim,) and Caphtorim."

3

And that's very important, because, here we have the Indo-Europeans.

When this book is written, it is still within human memory that these horsemen invaded Asia Minor first. The Armenians stay there to this day. The Hindus went across the Himalayas into India. The Persians, this branch, invaded Persia. The Greeks came to the peninsula, and the Hittites came to Asia Minor.

Now of this there is this memory. You just have to penetrate through these things, because the Philistines are one of these Indo-European branches.

4

We know that they overawed the people there, because they suddenly landed there with their iron. The Hebrews had no iron at that time; they had to borrow all iron products or buy them from the Philistines, who held the seacoast. And they invaded Egypt, by the way, at the same time. They took Crete and made it -- Knossos on Crete.

And so the Indo-Europeans are comprised, and this one sentence, "Out of whom came the Philistines"-- it should not be "philistim," but "the Philistines".

And the Caphtorim are the people of Crete. The word "Caphtor" is the word for the island of Crete, which was very important at that time, because of its mighty palaces, which we have dug out.

So this is full of pep and meaning here.

Please.

CHAPTER THREE: READING

I

1

"Canaan became father of Sidon his firstborn --."

These are the Phoenicians. Sidon was the richest port in the Mediterranean.

"-- And the Jesubites -- Amorite --."

They the people in Damascus. They are already named.

"And the Girgasite --?"

I don't know.

"Arkite, and the Sinite,
The Aroadite, and Zemarite,
and the Hamathite; afterwards --."

Hamath is still part of Arabia -- the south --

"Afterwards the families of the Canaanites spread abroad.
And the territory of the Canaanites was from Sidon, Gerar, as far as Gaza --."

Gahzah? Have you never heard of Gaza, where these unfortunate Arabs are in tents there, the refugees from Palestine. All the reason for the unrest in the Near East comes from the Gaza Strip? Don't you know that?

Really, that's applied knowledge -- reading is applied knowledge.

"-- in direction of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim, as far as Lasha.
These are the sons of Ham, by their families,
their languages, their lands, and their names.
Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber."

2

Now, Eber -- it's important to you -- what's the word "Eber," what does it stand for? Does anybody know? It is very important.

This is the first source for the word "Hebrew." Eber is the tribal hero. Adam lives a thousand years in the Bible. That means this is a form of tribal existence; and then comes Noah. It's always a thousand years.

Now Eber is the name of the first generation, it is always given in the Bible for exemplifying a whole nation. And so Shem -- the Hebrews are simply part of the human family. There is no claim for any extra position of Israel.

3

This is unique, they are not the promised people. They are not the great Americans, they are not David and Uno or what's the other boy? Jacob Proper.

All this nonsense of a native genius. Here is an honorable attempt and chapter; you can't take it seriously enough. It has remained unique for another three thousand years.

It isn't even today that we have such an impartial attempt to distribute the one humanity over the earth without taking sides, without saying, "These are Caucasians," and "These other are yellow," and "These are the black," and make these distinctions. Here is an honest attempt to place everybody in his place to the extent that from Shem - the Semites-- there first come the Hebrews.

4

Well, they are not the Jews by a long shot. They haven't received the revelation. They are just one other group.

Will you kindly read 25?

*"To the elder brother Japheth children were born.
The sons of Shem: Elam, and Asshur, Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram."*

II

1

This is the typical way in which the Bible is written, by anticipation, as any journalist writes today. In the first paragraph, you have to say everything. And then you elucidate.

Most people don't read the Bible like that. And they they don't understand that they have already the most modern technique of newspapers.

Read the first chapter of Genesis. I'll show you an example where this modern interpretation always comes out.

2

"In the beginning, God created heaven and the earth," and then says Verse 27: "So God created man in his own image, and in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

And so people think, "Now, that's one story."

And then comes the second chapter, in which the details are given; so that's another song. But every newspaperman will tell you that he has just exactly to write the story in the same manner. First you give the whole story, and then go into detail.

Now you go to the fifth chapter of this book, and I'll show you how important it is that we include the fifth chapter into the first.

In the fifth chapter, it reads:

*"This is the book of the generations of Adam.
In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him;
male and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam."*

Now here is the introduction of speech, and that a man only knows himself if he is called by his name. Speech of humanity as against the animal kingdom.

Yet it isn't found in the second chapter. So if the modern theologians, rabbis, popes, et cetera, tell you about this, they - or the critics even more so - say they can limit themselves to the first survey. And there is man created without speech. But only when a child is named -- we talked about this before -- he's a complete human being, because then he can *recognize, identify, assimilate, antagonize, and make love, marry, and so on.*

And so this Verse 2 in the fifth chapter is a part of the family story. But it was postponed.

3

Now we have exactly this in the tenth chapter. There it's very important for the Jews to read about their own descent, so obviously he took a deep breath in Verse 21, and he says,

"Unto Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder, even to him were children born."

And so he already has said, "This is our progenitor". But then, you get Verse 22. He postpones the attention. And then Eber only becomes the great-grandson of Shem. But he announces first already: Here we come to our own descent.

That much he gives into the curiosity and the excitement of the people to whom he tells the story. But it takes three verses before he specializes, particularizes.

Eber only returns in 24.

4

So now we are on 25. You will take a Bible, here and read. I don't see why you shouldn't read.

"And unto Eber-"

That's "Hebrew".

"And unto Eber were born two sons: the name of one was Peleg; for in his days was the earth divided; and his brother's name was Joktan."

Oh "Peleg" must obviously mean "division." I don't know this. But does anybody know Hebrew? You should. But I don't know this explanation. The Bible is full of etymological explanations. Ten times to say. Obviously "Peleg" must mean something.

*"And Joktan begat Almodad, and Sheleph,
and Hazarmaveth, and Jerah,
And Hadoram, and Uzal, and Diklah,
And Obal, and Abimael, and Sheba,
And Ophir, and Havilah, and Jobab:
all these were the sons of Joktan.
And their dwelling was from Mesha,
as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the east."*

III

1

You must think that, for the people of that time, Texas was Arabia, or Arabia was Texas. It is still of a great immensity. It was the accessible Africa. If you look on the map, it's just tremendous. And still inaccessible in its center, people live there from oasis to oasis.

Only to explain to you the bigness of Arabia for us is not very familiar.

2

You don't think of Arabia as much -- it's a desert: it's not important.

It's just tremendous. It is bigger than Mesopotamia; it's bigger than Egypt; it's bigger than Abyssinia; it's bigger than the islands of the Mediterranean and Greece, and Italy.

And I have just to bring you up to this, because of the subdivisions he gives for the people who live in Arabia, that they are so numerous. For a man who lives there on the spot, Arabia is overwhelmingly large.

Perhaps will you kindly look up for the next time the square miles of Arabia? And in comparison, the square miles of California and of Texas?

3

*"These are the sons of Shem, after their families,
after their tongues, in their lands, after their nations.
These are the families of the sons of Noah,
after their generations, in their nations:
and by these were nations divided in the earth after the flood."*

Now the next verse.

"And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech."

This is all wrong. Our chapter headings in the Bible are of very recent origin. They have nothing to do with the original. You must never be divided by the divisions of the Bible, as we have them. They have nothing to do with the meaning.

This verse is the end of the previous chapter, and should never be in Chapter 11. It should be the end of Chapter 10.

Then you see what the Bible sets out to prove is: how can the unity of mankind be restored? How can it be restored?

Put there for us, that's the creation -- how God wanted Heaven and earth to be created. And this is the program, or the viewpoint. And therefore, Israel has never believed -- and how can it, with this chapter - in the god of ...? That's today unknown. It's one of the devil's inventions.

4

When you become an anti-Semite, you have to show that they have another god. It's very simple.

Now the hatred of the Jews is always a religious issue. Whether the people who hate Judaism are the Jews themselves -- and very often they are great anti-Semites, or the Christians, or the Gentiles. Jews are persecuted because they pray -- know, or profess to know, or believe, that God created mankind as one.

IV

You read Mr. Ellsworth of this country, *The Parting of the Great Race* -- they say that every man who is not an Anglo-Saxon in this country must be sterilized, because there ... the

human race. Or you get the racial laws in this country where a person cannot marry an Oriental. This is all written against the Bible. And so to support this, you have to turn against the Jews and they have to say they are just another creed.

"We have a religion, they have another religion."

The whole intent of the Bible from the very beginning is to enable us to see that the creation of the world takes place beyond and through these divisions, into these divisions.

But the creation is still in process.

CHAPTER FOUR: RECOGNITION

I

1

As man was created, so we create all the time.

And it is one of the most ridiculous inventions of the devil to say that there was ever a special god.

The Jews are just against this heresy. If their own father, Eber, is put in the midst of a family tree, it has no prerogative whatsoever, except what happens is that one day Moses is called to the burning bush and God says to him, "I am not the God of yesterday; I am the God of tomorrow."

And with this, He creates *promise, prophecy, future, openness*; so creation goes on.

This is the whole, famous name of Jahweh.

2

And the Bible is very careful to say that Adam and Eve, and Shem, and Eber didn't know this name of God. They thought He was the name of this land or the name of this. And so the new name of God, which is perhaps able to draw the people together again, must be of the future.

And so the true title of God, "He who shall be who he shall be," that's the name Jahweh.

3

Now this god could never be the god of one tribe, or one people. It would have abolished the purpose for which the book was written.

Whoever can find the Psalm in which it very simply expresses this? I think it's the 96th Psalm, but I'm not sure. There is the seventh sentence which explains to you the whole problem of the genealogy of all nations, and the whole situation of Samuel, of the promise, prophets. Because it's a very simple verse.

He says, "And God is the God of the people that is to be," that is to be created.

And so Israel then is always in coming, and never in existence; very strange and simple expression. I'm sorry - perhaps you read this through, 94 to 96. One of these psalms.

4

In every Psalm, if you attempt to understand how to read it. But everybody's ears are today absolutely deafened by this biblical criticism, which has tried hard to prove that the Bible is a chronicle of the Jews.

It's the one thing it isn't. It's absolutely uninterested in China. And uninterested in Elia and uninterested in statistics of Panmen or so. It is interested in the unique events that only happened once in order to bring together, despite the divisions of men.

The whole 96th Psalm is written about it. But I think I can find this one sentence which is very strange: "He is the God of the people which he is about to create."

That's by and large the literal translation.

Are you satisfied?

(Oh, yes.)

II

1

(You'll probably develop that more throughout the semester in L.A., that Eli would reject uniqueness. And yet --.)

Well, Eli is a routine, gentlemen. He is corrupt, and he is old, perhaps he isn't too corrupt but for his family. And on the way of inheriting the office, the whole problem -- always that you just go on by routine and repetition, you must know, in all life.

2

Repetition is not wrong. We always repeat.

But repetition always diminishes fire or energy in life. Repetition has to be, because things -- they deserve to be repeated. But what is lost the second, third, and fourth time, is the tremendous act of faith that is in the first act. So the act that is repeated is not quite the same act when it is repeated from the viewpoint of the investment of faith in the person who has to do it.

3

So in every moment when we do something, take the first man who flew, the Orville Wright brother. He had tremendous faith. It doesn't take much faith to you and me to fly now. But still there are people who haven't even inherited the state.

I understand he's the richest man in his town, had his son dying here, and he was in Arabia, and he couldn't take an airplane, because he fears to fly. So he couldn't go to the funeral of his oldest son of fourteen. You know whom I mean?

No, he's sitting.

Well, everywhere.

(Getty, that's the one.)

4

So he is not repeating. He is excluded.

We all follow blindly. After one man has paved the road, there's this trailblazer, we all follow suit. With everything you do here. You sit here, because other people have gone here and been ruined for college, you thin - that's the way to do it. It could be the wrongest picture of history. "In God we trust."

When you trust, then we know the way. It is pure superstition, Sir.

III

1

Because we all have to follow until we come to the parting of the roads, where we feel that these men lead us to a dead-end street. And then you have to break out of it. And that's very disagreeable.

And the fiction story of this country is that everybody can do everything for the first time.

You cannot; 99.9 percent of what you do is repetition, is paved road. Your body is already in routine. All the muscles, everything we have inherited in our body is just an inheritance. Other generations have blazed these trails. And we follow.

2

You think of all our development - that we have a central nervous system and so on. That's the whole story and we just follow it. It may not be the best.

I just read a story that if we had developed wings, we could have a much, much better understanding. All the wonderful article, that we were all wrong, because if we had wings, we could have become much better human specimens.

3

And so repetition is the fate of man And the the problem is where to innovate; when to innovate.

And Eli is routine, is not prepared for any change in the history of Israel. Here he is a cheater, and he thinks that these rotten sons who corrupt the service of the Lord, who can be bribed and bought without any reference themselves, who are outside their own routines, as having no longer believed in the living God, but do this for money, and for a reward, and a paying proposition. These people who have no faith, if anything that should be saved from the first revelation, from the uniqueness of God and this one unique history. It cuts through all divisions - and in this tenth chapter.

4

So he is made the instrument. He first mistakes the woman and is quite unimportant; he's just one of the drunkards. And then he wakes up to the fact that she has a special ..., and grateful for this experience. It's very tender. With his first step of experiencing novelty, he's then willing to do something for her son -- which out of the way and which in fact is against his carnal interest because now he privileges Samuel -- as against his sons. And he rediscovers the holiness of the office.

And that's how very often a renewal, rebirth, regeneration takes place. There is no innovation in the total sense. Eli is still able to employ Samuel.

IV

1

(But I wondered, is this why Eli told Samuel that it was God calling, and this was a sign he was acknowledging that calling?)

Well, the powers that be -- what you call "evolution" today, it's a very poor word -- means that life can be renewed as long as the powers that be recognize that they need a refreshment, and as long as the refreshing elements are willing to take upon themselves the yoke of tradition.

2

Mr. Eisenhower could have come back at the head of his troops, and started revolution and said, "The Democratic Party is totally corrupt." He didn't.

And the temptation was Washington's, too, that he should just establish such an army government in 1783. He declined, because his kingship would have meant this, that the army would have governed the Thirteen colonies, and then we had to wait.

THE STORY OF DE GAULLE

De Gaulle had the same temptation. A very parallel story. De Gaulle came home in 1945, had conquered France victoriously, had liberated it; and he could have stayed on and had his government right away. But like Washington, he retreated, let them show what they could do without him, and after ten years, he has been returned, because the proof was there that you had to have the constitution which was suitable to the experience of the Second World War, and the First, too.

Washington and De Gaulle have behaved quite similarly.

3

Which means that the first attempt would be an abrupt innovation only of the new group, the people who enter the scene after the Thirteen colonies are incorporated, the army, and the supreme commander, as something new in the history of America. That hadn't existed before. So the new office can say, "We are there."

They very modestly went home, allowed the old powers that be, the Thirteen colonies, to try their hand, as though nothing had happened, as though the war hadn't occurred, as though the Continental Congress didn't have to have martial powers, and welfare powers, et cetera, et cetera.

And so finally, the Thirteen colonies -- by the way, a little bit at the urging of Washington - did get together and allowed the central government to come into existence, and Washington to be first president.

Now that's exactly what happened with De Gaulle. Same story. And I'm just amazed about the ignorance of the American public that hasn't sensed the identity -- speaks always of the Fifth Republic, and all this nonsense. There's no Fifth Republic. It's just the first time that experience has been allowed to dictate the French constitution, whereas before everything was theory. Idiotic.

But this is experienced history, that Mr. De Gaulle was necessary to save to country.

4

Now this is the recognition. This word is very important.

In Greek, the word "recognize" is the same word as "read", because the Greeks thought that reading was the recognition of what had already been known before. You read, and thereby are introduced into the stream of things, into that what has already been known before. They thought of reading as entering the living stream of living truth, of perpetuated, articulated, enacted truth. That was the meaning of "read."

And it should be your meaning, too, and my meaning of "reading." You have to read that long the old dusty texts until they begin to speak.

If you would understand that reading is recognition, you would suddenly become aware that history is a process of a Virginia Reel. You know how a Virginia Reel goes. Here you stand, march in, and then comes the next couple, and marches through and you allow them to pass you by.

It is always that the people can only enter the future if they have recognized the previous one, and move through that.

If De Gaulle and Washington hadn't allowed the Thirteen colonies and the French constitution to be tried once more, they couldn't have marched into the future. It would just have been a breaking off, a revolution, with a complete forgetfulness of the experience of the past. It would have been a new beginning, but no inheritance, no tradition, no continuity of history.

The problem of the continuity of history from the very first day since Cain and Abel left their...

FOURTH LECTURE:

PART ONE: THE PHYLOGENETIC HISTORY OF MAN

CHAPTER ONE: COLLECT, SYNTHESIZE, CREATE

1

...came to my college in peace. And my colleague -- and he called himself a philosopher, and one day he was president of the American Philosophical Society. That's the highest rank among the idiots. And literally there were on his assignment board the following items. And on it went. I have seen it with my own eyes. And he meant really that out of his own textbook, which he had composed for every meeting, you had to read three pages.

2

Now gentlemen, you cannot read a book like that. And he just showed that he has no right to write books.

Because a book, if it is a book, has to be read whole.

And then one book is like one sentence. And to cut it up means that it is no book. That it not deserves reading.

But most of you do this. You treat books as though you could split them into three pages for a beer.

My dear people, every book is a breath of God, of the spirit. And you will never understand *speech, language, literature, history, politics, religion*, if you do not know that a book is nothing but one sentence, in a more artificial way. And then you can read the book for the second time and analyze it. But first you have to read it through.

Not one of you does this, except with obscene novels. And these textbooks fall in with this, and they are written in this butcher-like fashion.

3

But here, I want to bring you back to the normal experience. As we begin originally, one sentence in the old tribe, one chant was a whole book. That was as big as the Bible, or *The Iliad*, because it was all the tribe had to be said about the hero who had to be celebrated.

So if you say take grammar, you treat grammar as though it was elementary. I assure you that in the sentences and in our forms of grammar, all the problems of poetry are hidden. That is, every one sentence is already a whole book.

If you only would do this with your own experience, you would again begin to write poetry and to sing. But my boys tell me in my college -- I always was despondent -- that after twelve, they don't write poetry. That is, they become cynic, stupid.

4

The whole is earlier than its parts: this is the first fact of history, and the Bible is written around this topic. And I come back here to the Bible.

The miracle of the Bible is that it has such a breath, that over a thousand years it's one book. And we have to try to find out how this is possible.

This is my problem with you.

And I have tried to show you that over the last seventy years the approach has been just the other way around. One sentence, and then ten sentences, then a chapter. And if you read Mr. Shotwell, or if you read the Encyclopaedia Britannica, the Book of Samuel consists of seven or six strands, and it's patched together by some idiot, as a textbook today is glued together with the scissors.

II

1

But why should we read such a stupid book? Inexplicable that to this day it is still mentioned. Do you think that these textbooks will be mentioned as long as soon as the superintendent of schools does not get a discount? That's today just a question of your textbook business. The greatest racket in the United States. It's a purely financial proposition.

And so everything is now judged from your experiences with textbooks. And if my colleague, Professor Wright, if he could afford to say to a student, "You can read a book by reading three pages every day," first of all you should know that such a book doesn't deserve to be read. Second, it was never finished; and never did anybody know why it was written or what was in it.

But it was good for an examination. To spit it back, to vomit it.

2

And you should be ashamed. Don't read a book -- even if you read the end first, I prefer it -- as though you're just looking at the book, and see the title page and read the review, and then say you have read it. Most people help themselves today by reading just the review and then saying they have read the book.

Because a review at least pretends that the critic has read the whole book.

Don't believe it. They don't. Criticism in the western world is perhaps the most prurient, and the most putrid profession that there is. I have great contempt for the sick state of the reviewing trade. But here it is connected with the publisher, the big writer, too. You are in: every book that the publisher publishes is praised; if you are not in: you can't do anything.

But you ought to know these things that the Bible is written to preserve, to train every generation in its power to judge books.

Because the criterion of a book is: is it one sentence?

3

THE STORY OF ARTHUR SCHOPENHAUER

We have a famous philosopher in Europe, Mr. Schopenhauer -- you may have heard his name -- the great pessimist who first introduced Buddhism in Europe. Now when Schopenhauer published his system of philosophy, he said, "Dear public, I'm very sorry, but you will have to read the whole book first, and then begin to read it a second time. And if you have any difficulties in reading it the first time, go on! Go on! For heaven's sake, don't give up, because it's one thought I have tried to express in this whole volume. And I'm" -

of course it was a stroke of genius.

4

Now genius means fresh, means creation. And how can you stop. You cannot first look at the little finger of the "Pietà" of Michelangelo, and then afterwards look at the head. That would be very funny. Any picture you embrace, and any piece of music. But with books, you are so corrupt by the textbook, which is the opposite from a book, which should never exist -- and you, as seniors, should not read textbooks.

You are too good for this. You should read the highest and best literature. Instead of learning common textbook, *What to Think about Shakespeare*, isn't it much better that you read *Hamlet* instead?

But you don't. You all read this chlorine faucet water. That's what you drink instead of going to a real spring. You never receive the first things first, and the second things as second things, because in your way there stand always this second-hand literature.

Dictionaries, and grammars, and textbooks, and examination papers, and assignments. And therefore it is very hard to talk to you about anything that real men really think, and really write, and really do.

III

1

THE STORY OF THE BIBLE

Now I have tried to build up an understanding of the Bible by beginning in the middle, where the Jews were forced to begin to write. They had lived three hundred years after their flight from Egypt, obviously, in an oral society, in protest against the sacred writings in Egypt. If you've ever seen a temple of Egypt, a pyramid, you know it is scribbled and covered with sacred signs. And the cosmos is magically bewitched. So Moses, seeing the horrors of this astrological prison, went out of it and founded this nation under God.

Just as we Americans think they are a nation under God, that was the same idea of freedom, that no outer form -- neither Communism, nor capitalism, or any other form of system -- could be identified with the life of a people.

2

And you are in great danger at this moment of backsliding into Egyptian darkness, because I hear more and more people say that capitalism is identical with the American way of life.

It isn't at all. Americans are free to adopt any way of life, and to have many ways of life. And as soon as you think that capitalism has anything to do with America, I can only tell you that you are back to the sorcerers of pharaoh. And we have at this moment, from 1910 to 1945 or -- in brackets - to the next election because it always only shows fifty years later -- you have a definite attempt on the part of the American intelligentsia to forsake the freedom of the children of God, and to backslide into Egypt.

You have psychoanalysis, which is exactly what the sorcerers of pharaoh did -- interpret dreams, and predict, and tell people, that they're just pieces that can be taken apart and put together. It's again this building up out of elements the person; whereas the person is first, and the elements come later.

3

The word "analysis" tells us this heresy. And a machine you can build up out of parts, but not without the vision of the inventor how the whole machine works. So it isn't even true that in an elementary way that machinery can be built meaningfully out of parts. You have first to know how the whole thing is going to function.

Now obviously the same is true about the human character.

Your life, your seventy years, are God's melody which He tries to compose.

You are His poem.

You are His piece of music.

You aren't yet ready.

The movement is at this moment perhaps vivace, or allegro, and the adagio is still to come.

But you are in the midst of it. You have to hear carefully whether this composition will come off. You can break it off.

4

Now you are told that you consist of the parts that have already gone before.

This is exactly the Egyptian darkness against which the Bible is written.

The Bible is written around the simple fact that man experiences himself as divinely complete.

If the image of God has any meaning, then it must mean that God and men begin with the whole, because you cannot subdivide God. If you can, you have superstition. You get the Greek gods, or you get the Hindu gods.

God is one, indivisible.

IV

1

Now man is of course, too. You hear today "Peace is indivisible." How can anybody believe that who believes that man is divisible, can be analyzed?

I warn you against one word that has played in this country a tremendous role. That's the word "synthesis." It has comforted all these *analytical magicians, and sorcerers, and witchcraft doctors, and devils*. Whether they are in politics, or whether they gradually develop

Huh? What went on?

(I was helping out a friend. I was applying yesterday's lecture.)

What was yesterday's lecture?

(Ah)

Nice.

2

Now, the Bible is not a synthetic, glued-together thing, as people make it today. It's the same through the ages. It's one spirit moving through the ages.

If it isn't, then it isn't the Bible. And it doesn't deserve to be listened to or read. You can reject it. But don't help yourself by saying, "It's an interesting synthesis."

3

What do we call "synthesis," gentlemen?

You have A, B, C, D, uranium, and thorium, and plutonium, and all the metals, gold and silver, and then you syntheticize something. That's the idea of "synthesis," that is, that the parts are older than the whole.

Now what we all do in our science -- what any engineer, by the way does, Mr. Feringer -- is something quite different. We live and we are a stream of life, like the Colorado River, on this earth, the human stream. And we have this vitality to bring into the bed of the common life all the dead materials, by getting coal, and electricity, and water, and what-not working with us. In this sense, there is synthesis. We bring them back. We add them to the stream of life which we ourselves constitute, but we cannot make life.

Synthesis is a bringing-in, an endowment of our mainstream of life which we here constitute in our naked bodies, and our living bodies, and our living souls. We syntheticize indeed -- if you would give a new notion to the word "synthesis" -- to add to, to join with. That's what you can mean, also, and then it's a good thing. We make deader things join the march of life, the march of time.

4

So the word "synthesis" is to me the great divide between the heresy today which tries to construe life out of death; and the other, which says that the deader parts -- like a machine, like the metals, like the bridge which you build -- is an attempt to join, to incorporate dead things into the living substance of our existence. And that's the true meaning of engineering, and having the genius of expanding man's life into the outer world, because engineering has to do with genius.

And it means "to create," and to generate.

And we generate. We bring up high voltage in electricity, or whatever we do. That is, something that is less vital, can be joined into our own existence.

CHAPTER TWO: ARABIA

I

1

And therefore, I invite you to redefine this word "synthesis." It's very popular still today in the modern American analysis, history. For example, historians think that they syntheticize their filing index, their card index, and they write the whole book.

That isn't true. They must have had a sympathetic experience of the whole they want to write. And they must join this experience. And then they can subdivide it, and articulate it. And the word "articulation" shows you what we really do in thinking and in studying.

"To articulate" means to have a whole; to hold onto it; but to subdivide it; to give it limbs, members. This is articulation. And all we do in the humanities is to become articulate.

And "*artus*" in Latin – articulation -- means "limb." That's all it means. But it's very important. If you stick to your guns and say, "The humanities make us articulate," then you can never forget that the whole is older than the parts. Because you can only articulate if this whole experience is with you.

2

Take any person. If he has really something to say, he's embarrassed, and he's shy, and he is ashamed, and he blushes. And then under the pressure of this embarrassed feeling, he begins to articulate, because articulation frees us from this embarrassment.

You are overwhelmed by a great experience. You are in love. Well, if you can write this poem, you articulate; and then you can say it.

But you can't take a sledgehammer and kill your sweetheart, because you are so overwhelmed. You have to become articulate in order to be expressive, because the subdivision, the articulation means that this whole ceases to be a terror, and ceases to be something that you cannot live down or survive.

3

Articulation is our way of dealing with the future.

And I come back to the Bible, because the Bible is written so that man shouldn't be terror-stricken, but should be able to articulate what God has done to him. And otherwise he would be so awe-stricken, and would just fall down in embarrassment, or exhaustion, or terror, or panic. All these words are the real experiences of a child. If you are honest with

yourself, you have to appreciate *your panic, your inner terror, your horrors, your fears, your anxieties*.

4

Mr. Rollo May here gave this lecture the other day -- have you heard him? did you go? - in which he admitted very nicely as a revolutionary analyst said, "Anxieties and guilt were necessary things for life," that you couldn't amputate them, because that's the way we have something to articulate, and to conquer. And a man who has no guilt feeling, and has no anxiety certainly is just an impudent pig. That's all he is.

Because we are all guilty, and I, too, everybody is guilty for having sinned, and everybody is anxious not to make good. And all the people who tell me that they aren't, I just think that they are very impudent. And shamelessness is the end of life.

You can distinguish in any society its future. If it's impudent, and shameless, and naked, it has no future.

Because what is shame? It's the power to grow, to take time. That's all it is. It's the cover over the growing plant. Like around the flower -- the bud, you have this sleeve which covers it. And it can only go after the thing has taken place.

II

1

Now articulation, gentlemen, therefore is embarrassing. While you haven't articulate, you are trembling. Kierkegaard called this "*with fear and trembling*." But as any poet who is writing his poem is trembling that he may not be able to articulate, he has this tremendous shock, this experience, this blow on his head; and before he has articulated it, he's sweating, and he's trembling, and he's fearful.

And it is very strange that in your age, where you are fed on creative arts, and museums, and concerts, that the process by which anything is created -- that is, being ashamed -- is pooh-pooed and ridiculed. And people say, "You don't have to be ashamed."

Well, a person who isn't ashamed doesn't grow anymore.

The only way in which you grow is through shame.

2

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S RECORD

I have myself published a record, "*Make Bold to be Ashamed.*" And I had a terrible experience in a women's college in the East. All the foreign students -- girl's college, it was -- wanted to hear this disc. And no American girl. "Oh no. '*Make Bold to be Ashamed,*' that's dangerous." It is.

It changes your life, if you know that the secrets of your life are gradually to be articulated. But then you begin to live.

3

No the word "synthesis," is therefore quite foreign from the 24 books of the Old Testament. The Bible is not a synthesis in your sense of the word, of 24 individual books. But it is an attempt to say 24 times the same thing, in better articulation, more fully, more completely.

I tried to show you that the Bible has this terrific task, to put this little man -- here, this little Jewish mother of Israel in the midst of all the people's history on earth. That is quite a task. I showed you in Genesis 10 all the people, and in it the Hebrews a very little, little something. And then the sons and descendants of Eber even more divided. And so who are these Israelites?

Just nobodies. Just as today. A very small minority. And in this minority, a despised woman who is taken to be a drunkard, producing the salvation of Israel: Samuel.

4

So -- how come? This is the problem of the Bible. How can -- within a context that is the whole of creation -- how can you and I play any role?

Now it is the opposite from all pagan history, who begin and say "We are very important," and "the rest of the world didn't exist; we are the real McCoys. I'm from Missouri. And Missouri is the real country. And everybody who is not from Missouri, doesn't matter -- doesn't count."

The Bible says, "No, I know the world is terribly large. And there are millions of people, and there are ten thousand nations. And yet obviously, in this little spark of my own heart, I am exemplary. I am also the whole. I am the image of God. I'm not God".

This is the problem of the Bible.

III

1

(I think maybe I should mention -- you wanted me to look up the square miles of Arabia, compared to Texas and California, and so we could put it in dimension, now. Arabia is one million square miles. California 158,693 and Texas 267,000.)

So you saw these people of antiquity were faced with this Arabia as something impenetrable. You can imagine -- four times Texas.

Don't tell the Texans.

And it is to this day impenetrated. There are no railroads going through. It's still desert. And therefore we underrate the constant awareness of antiquity that Arabia was the block, the one impenetrable thing.

Of Africa, one didn't know much; one hadn't sailed around it, and one had only penetrated to the Morocco, to the Atlas Mountains. But Arabia was there, because there was the mouth of the Euphrates and Tigris on the one-hand side; and there was the Red Sea on the other. So *Egypt, Abyssinia, Mesopotamia, Assyria, the Sumerians* -- everybody knew of Arabia. And it was in the midst of everybody, and you couldn't get into it. You couldn't get through it.

2

So it is a strange situation that from the point of view of the ancient people, Arabia was the center, the impenetrable center -- we look at Arabia as an appendix, somewhere. And just as appendixes go, they can be operated away, and you can have an appendectomy. And we think that the Fertile Crescent for the ancient people must have been the center of the universe.

This is not true. But do you have a map there, by the way?

If you think there, Zion is located, and you get Egypt here, and you get Mesopotamia here -- Shinar, as it is called in the text we have read -- then you get Arabia, the situation is very eccentric, is very strange. The Arabia is this impenetrable something which God created, too.

3

And from it, all antiquity has gotten this spur. The one of the great declamations of the Bible, which I may mention in this context right away, is that the desert is as much God's country as the fruitland. *For the Egyptians, and for the Romans, and for the Greeks, and for the Sumerians, and for Babylonians*, this wasn't true. The desert was just a stumbling block. It was something to be forgotten. It was not there. It didn't rank with the real land.

And the Greeks, for example, and Romans and we, too -- they had two words for "land." Land meant the cultivable, the arable land; and "bush," and "prairie," and "desert" were terms that meant the ground over which you have to move, because it cannot contain you. Just a stumbling block, an impediment.

4

All ancient people till the coming of Christ divided God's world into two quite different layers of land: the cultivated land; and the non-cultivable land. And the great outcry of the Bible is that Arabia, the desert, the bush, the whole -- all the land is God's, and not just Egypt, and not just Rome, and not just Greece.

So they created a new terminology that "bush" and "land" was the same.

IV

1

And in this connection you may understand the stories of the monk a little better.

THE STORY OF THE CHRISTIAN MONKS

The Christian monks went into the Egyptian desert in order to prove that the Egyptian desert was just as high-rating in God's eye as the fruitland around the river, that the two layers out of which the earth seemed to consist for all primitive people, or for ancient people, all pagan people wasn't so. So the famous story, the monk of the old Christian Coptic Church in the third century was asked why he didn't come a little nearer to the Nile for his water supply, and why he had to stay in the desert. "Yes," he said. "It takes me the whole day to go to the river and bring back the water. But I, with my long life, have to prove that God created the earth, and did not create just the Nile River valley."

2

And that was the only way of getting rid of the superstitions of an American god, or a god of California. And if you live in Southern California, you are again exposed to this strange superstition that you can pick and choose your climate, and that there is one region which a man should live, and others which they shouldn't live.

Obviously, we have to live everywhere.

And so you live on this rainy peninsula, don't you?

(Yes.)

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY LIVING IN VERMONT

And I live in a region where we have six weeks in a row, subzero weather. And it's really hard to believe that one lives here.

But you take this equality of man on the whole surface of the globe for granted. And this isn't anything you can take for granted. It hasn't existed for a long time. And the first word of the Bible is written around this experience of the whole of creation, that in the beginning, "God created heaven and earth."

That is no exception to this stumbling block of the center of the experience of the man of the antiquity.

3

Let's now read these chapters of Samuel. What's in these first six chapters?

(Well, Samuel was bor after what we talked about last meeting. And Eli got given a bad And he ...Eli. And he falls over dead. And one of the sons' wife also dies; and there is a ..., because of the glory God has left to)

Would you show me what is it?

(Ichabod.)

(The glory of God.)

(There is no glory.)

(Oh.)

(The glory is departed from Israel.)

Does anybody know what role the word "Ichabod" plays in American history?

(Ichabod Crane, I think, is about as close as)

(It's an old American myth.)

There are no myths possible. What is it? What's an old Amer can myth?

(I was thinking of Ichabod Crane.)

What is Ichabod Crane?

(Oh, well, I repeat. It's an old American myth or folk tale.)

So tell us.

(Well, there apparently at one time was -- it's a fantasy, there was a village, supposedly isolated. And IchabodCrane, who comes from a questionable area somewhere in New England --.)

There are no questionable areas in New England.

(It's a fantasy ...individual; it could be placed anywhere, is a schoolteacher of small children. And he comes into this area. He's a very superstitious individual. And as the story goes, he falls in love with the town belle, who has a rather roguish admirer, and he plays upon Ichabod's superstitions to get Ichabod to leave the country, so that he will have a clear chance at this girl who loves him, anyway. And was only messing around with Ichabod so that she can make him jealous. And that is the story of Ichabod Crane, the American myth.)

It's a typical, true story. It happens every day.

4

No, but this is something more important. Does nobody know what the poem "Ichabod" means?

(A poem?)

Has nobody read it?

(Is that Daniel Webster and -- ?)

Proviso. In 1850. Who wrote the poem? Benét lives today. It comes from 1850. That's hundred years earlier.

(Are we talking about The Devil and Daniel Webster?)

Oh no, that's Benét.

(Oh --.)

It's an important poem in the 1850 and 1851, the year in which Melville wrote his Moby-Dick, is the great divide in American history. And so "Ichabod," since it is a biblical name, may help you to understand this.

CHAPTER THREE: ICHABOD – THE GLORY OF THE COMING LORD

I

1

When people in 1850, Melville, when he wrote *Pierre*, and John Greenleaf Whittier, when he wrote "*Ichabod*," thought that the light had departed from Israel. It was the falling from grace of the United States of America.

And therefore, this is a very actual verse in the Bible. People in 1850 felt that the same thing had happened. "The glory has departed from Israel."

And I asked you all to read Greenleaf Whittier's poem "*Ichabod*," because it's a biblical poem.

2

And you cannot understand American literature if you do not understand this relationship, that all your ancestors' thought understood history in the light of the Old Testament. And you don't understand history because you have absolutely no criterion when the light has gone out of a country and when it is shining.

You think prosperity is the light of Israel. The Bible would call this the worshiping of the gods of Canaan, and of the idolaters. And where is your ...?

(Where? The one on Israel?)

"The glory is departed from Israel."

THE STORY OF THE POEM "ICHABOD"

And when Ichabod was given as the name to Daniel Webster, it meant we had lost him. And it's perhaps the last moment in American history in which this identification with the biblical situation got hold of a whole people. We have one later, that's the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," by Julia Howe. That's the same feeling that here now, in the Civil War, the same situation is reached, that the Bible tries to describe in the hearts of man.

And I assure you the greatness of the United States people, in the eyes of the rest of the world, depends on this relationship. Nothing else is interesting. You bastards aren't interesting for the rest of the world. But this power to say "The glory has departed," or -- how does the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" begin?

"Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord."

Now, you can see the relationship. The two go together.

3

And here you have a typical -- that's why I'm mentioning these things -- here you have something of the relation of the books of the Bible.

THE STORY OF THE BATTLE HYMN

Here is a lady -- poetess; and here is a man, Whittier -- absolutely different background. And one writes in 1850, and the other writes in 1864 the "Battle Hymn of the Republic". And they jibe, they dovetail. And it is the same vision. One is, "I have seen the coming of the Lord," and the other is, "The glory has departed from Israel." And you have to string the two together to understand American history.

That's how people felt, that after fifteen years -- I don't know if they knew each other. Certainly Mrs. Howe must have known the poem by Whittier. This I would suggest. But the main thing is quite a spontaneous creation, the "*Battle Hymn*," and she didn't read "*Ichabod*" for the purpose.

4

But this is how the people of New England at the time illuminated the march of events, in the light of this knowledge that at every one moment, every little mortal could either keep the covenant, or could break it.

And I feel the "*Battle Hymn of the Republic*," and "*Ichabod*," -- you bring the text next time, every one of you, and you copy it for your own purposes. And put it together. And you will be surprised, because that's the beginning of an American bible. This is how you should compose your American history gradually. You should see that all these events can be suddenly made to fit, if they are seen in this simple story of man's heart, and man's humility, and man's pride, and man's fall. This is nothing -- for five thousand years old.

II

1

You are exactly in the same mold today. If you get married, do you marry under God's heaven? Or do you marry for the candle lights on the table, and your dowry? Or do you marry because the boy has a sex appeal? You can all marry on these different levels. And in one case, the light has departed from Israel; and the other, you have seen the coming of the Lord.

The level on which we move is at any moment at stake. You can always do it on the lowest common denominator, and on the highest common denominator.

2

THE STORY OF HELEN KELLER

You just have to think of Helen Keller, where there's a poor creature, destitute, and she represents the whole of the human race in her striving and in her struggle, by the support of these wonderful people who believed in this piece of creation, that God created this little brat, too, with all its impediments. And there you have a glorious story today. I would suggest that Helen Keller constitutes exactly such an example. And the American worship of her is a good case in point. That's again unique.

You wouldn't find this in Russia or in any other country, or you wouldn't find it that Franklin D. Roosevelt could have become president after he had polio. It's a unique story in this country. It's still a biblical story: that the physical handicap is not held against him.

And you should be proud of this. That all comes from the Bible. It's absolutely un-Greek, or Roman. A pagan could never be advanced, if a man who couldn't walk. Impossible.

3

So please, "*Ichabod*" and the "*Battle Hymn*." You bring your text, and I think you will not find it ridiculous if I really request that you write it down in longhand -- you may type -- typewrite it, if you prefer this -- for your own sake, into your notebook, because it explains the whole story. And you will find that it is very strange. One is looking backward, that's the past; and the other is the coming.

And there you have the full notion of a history which is still incomplete, marching on.

4

And in order to recover your sense of historical proportion, you must get this period into your vein, the tragic period from 1850 to 1865, when the spirit leads the country, and falls really among the thieves, and then has to be redeemed by this terrible, bloody harvest, of which the *Second Inaugural* of Lincoln speaks. That's why I think the *Second Inaugural* of Lincoln is greater than his Gettysburg Address, because it is connected with this "*Ichabod*," with this fall of man. And his rising again. You know what he says in the Second Inaugural?

Well, then this is Number 3 you have to read for the next time. So we go on from here.

Please.

III

1

After the light has departed from Israel, where are we?

(We were here, where Ichabod was born.)

She can only see the dynasty of Eli, this poor wife. This has ended. Now the spirit has to come from quite a different corner.

And you may take this down, gentlemen. This is already the great example of the sentence of the New Testament that the spirit listeth where it --?

(Bloweth where it listeth.)

Bloweth where it listeth. Here the Eli story is at an end. And she says so. "The light has departed from us," and where can it come from now?

And the biblical story is exactly the same theology as in the New Testament: the spirit of God moves freely, and no flesh and blood has a privilege to say, "We are the anointed. We have it guaranteed." In every one moment where a man says, "Oh well, God cannot fail me," he's already gone. Down and out. Because the fear and trembling, the embarrassment, the power to articulate leaves him at this very moment. He repeats.

2

I've seen doctors and quacks.

Most doctors - to give you an example of what the Bible means by this departure of the light. Most people who have a routine job -- you are a teacher.

THE STORY OF A TEACHER

Well, you go to a school of education, and you take your degrees; and nothing can really happen, because you know how to handle these ruffians. And you hand out papers, and they are answered, and nothing ever happens. However, you can have a direct relation in this classroom at this moment to this child; and you can feel that this child, for example, needs nothing more but not to be asked to write a paper. And if you have the power, and the glory of God is shining upon you and you will treat this child not according to rule, but against the rule.

The same is true of a doctor.

THE STORY OF A DOCTOR

I had one case where I saw a doctor act as a genius. Our minister's wife fell sick with puerperal fever. And I ran to a friend, a Jewish doctor who was a specialist on the effects of poison, and a great authority on this. And usually he didn't practice much. And so I persuaded him to take on this case, because here was a family, and there were children. And it would have been just unthinkable that this good mother, and her child shouldn't pull through. And he went to bat, and he took death as his personal enemy. And he fought it day and night. And she did pull through. She's still alive to this day. And that's thirty years ago.

And I have seen that this doctor treated this illness as his personal destination. This was not something from the books. He didn't say, "In this case, take aspirin". But he just couldn't sleep. Here was an acute battlefield and, like any general, like Stonewall Jackson, this was a unique situation, and not from the book.

And the same with a lawyer.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY LOSING A CASE

When I became a professor of law, "Well," I said to myself, "I must know how it feels to have a lawyer, and how the laity feels about being served by lawyers. So I have to get a lawyer and lose a case." And I did. I didn't pay my book bill with the bookseller, and he sued me. And I went to a lawyer. And I have never seen such a miserable performance. He didn't listen to my arguments. He knew everything better. And I felt just as a bird in a cage.

And most lawyers say to you, "Let me do this". "I know how to handle it." And so the client never gets real justice, but the case is handled as one of five hundred cases.

That's how you are treated in the hospital when you have the influenza or so. You are Number 374.

But my friend, this minister's wife, would have never have pulled through if I hadn't found this man who took this out of the ordinary and said, "This has never happened before, and will never happen again. This is my case."

3

And I always hold that our penal laws will not be improved unless we say that every case has to be judged by a judge who then has to live with this case for the rest of his life, so that every judge will only decide one case in his whole life -- like my doctor -- which is solved. Then justice could be done. But you can't do justice if you mete out six months, two years, five years, life sentences -- a conveyor belt. That isn't justice. That's just mechanics.

We take all this for granted, but we can't go on for long like that. If you look at our children, they aren't served with this kind of justice. You have to find people who take it upon themselves to say, "This is a unique case, and I'm in this unique position that it has fallen to my lot to live with this case."

4

And this is the biblical attempt to show that there is no such law and routine, but that every event has to be built up into a complete, unique lightning and thunder from Heaven and has never happened before and will never happen again.

And all of our professions are sick from this.

And if you go into a factory, a well-instituted factory, you will find that if there is still any spirit left, they'll take every campaign, every product as a unique thing and then go on to the next campaign. And you should think of a good factory as consisting of campaigns.

THE STORY OF MR. HENRY FORD

And Mr. Henry Ford once said, "I made a great mistake in going on with the Model T for too long. It ruined my factory, because the people over the years went to sleep. They produced the same machine all the time." That's not a factory, he said. A factory is an institution by which you can cope with the new, with the new commodity, with the new thing every day. If we don't, we die, because it's repetitive.

And Henry Ford had this immense capacity to see in every moment something that hadn't happened yet before.

IV

1

But that's what we call "genius."

And so you can see that a child has genius, and our whole school system is an attempt to abolish genius. Because the higher up you come, the more you are told, "Don't get excited, we know all about it."

But at your age, you must be told, "We don't know nothing about you, you have never happened before."

2

Perhaps you now begin to understand why this modern situation is so dangerous, because everything you learn about man today is a generalization. That is, it's toning you down, is minimizing your uniqueness.

And then God is not one.

Everybody in this country is polytheistic.

*You believe in science;
you believe in sports;
you believe in arts;
you believe in sex;
you believe in nerves;
you believe in anything –*

only not in God.

Because God is in coming. "*I have seen the coming of the Lord.*" And the Lord thinks it's very funny that you think because you took a doctor's degree in medicine that you are now allowed to practice medicine. That's not enough. If you do not treat this sick man, at this moment as a complete surprise, you will never be a real doctor.

3

I have a good example.

THE STORY OF SMILING

I got a paper from a medical student in Cleveland, Ohio, at this moment. A few days ago it came. And it's an old friend of ours. And she wrote that she had to watch the child's behavior in the first year. And as you know, the great event in a baby's life is that it smiles. And when it can smile, it suddenly can communicate. And she writes about these psychologists who observe smiling as a physical reaction, probably coming from the gas inside of the baby, or something. And observe it. And she's very furious about this, having studied with me long enough, and writes to her professor, that it was a scandal that this observer did not understand that he was meant to respond to this smile. That the child didn't want to smile in vain, but it was an invitation. And it was forcing the other person to come around and do something to this baby. That's why a baby smiles.

4

It's the first language of mankind. The child doesn't smile in the abstract. But it smiles because another human face suddenly seems to come under its power. And that's why it a

child smiles. And this disregard for its creative capacity that this child suddenly can speak to you, shows you just how even smile -- the great spirit of that wave that weaves us together can be just made an observation of this naked kind of dead thing.

It was a very eloquent plea on her part that the psychologist should at this moment, be himself under the spell of this smile, instead of having the effrontery of treating this child as a baby, and not as an ensouled being that has a right to make itself heard, and cannot be omitted.

CHAPTER FOUR: TO BURY THE SONS OF ELI

I

1

Now I cannot explain the meaning of the Bible unless you allow me to use these present-day examples. I'm sorry, but that's what it's written about. The point, however, being is that the legal, routine succession is defied by the Bible.

Eli has no offspring. His wife despairs.

And now the pedigree of the human race, in the eyes of the Bible -- it is constantly in this way that it somewhere peters out. Here, that's then the last twig, the shoot. And you have to go back to the center to bring forth a new branch and a new twig.

So the whole Bible is written about the withering of those twigs and shoots that go too far out on a limb. And the Bible is written about the varieties of the human race, and its center. And therefore it has a tremendous racial ideology, you may say, because it defends the power of man to return to the growing point.

2

THE STORY OF A JEWISH FRIEND

And I had a Jewish friend, a very famous Orthodox Jew, who always said, "The Jews are here above the ground."

How do you call this in botany? We call it the "heart" of a plant or of a tree. Have you such an expression?

(Stem?)

No, inside the stem, there is one living center, from which everything -- the branches only spread above this, and not below it. And it's higher than the roots. It's therefore not the whole stem. But it is this side of the branching out, of the diversification.

(It's called a heart of a tree.)

It is.

So then he says, "Israel is the heart of the human tree, and all the nations, the proud nations go out on a limb."

3

And it is therefore, anti-Semitism is very natural, because everybody who is out on a limb -- *all the aborigines, all the variations, all the races* are terrified of being reminded that they are out on a limb, that they are specialists that they have specialized.

*The Americans with mechanics, or with the gadgets, or with dollars;
and the French with ideas;
and the Germans with scholarship;
and the English with mission, or a navy, or the commonwealth;*

and you can characterize any nation for its specialty.

And Israel is the reminder, that's very nice, these specialties, but beware: you have to be able to bury the sons of Eli, and to write "*Ichabod*," and have to start again.

4

Exactly what happened in American history between 1850 and 1865 that the Webster era, and the nicety about South and North definitely came to an end in 1850. And then God kept His breath, and the spirit of God didn't move in this country until Fort Sumter. And then it had to be done by violence, and blood; because if the spirit doesn't move, then God's judgments work in another way.

II

1

And the phylogenetic history of man is not in zoology; but the history of man is this constantly being called back from our specializations into the mainstream of life.

What I told you about synthesis for coal and electricity is true about our human specialty, too. Just as the raw materials on this earth by technology are brought back to serve, to join, so the races of man have to be brought back into the mainstream.

And Israel is this very inconspicuous, and even ugly heart. -

The heart of a tree is very inconspicuous. It has not the great buds of civilization.

2

And that makes the books like Spengler or Toynbee so very funny, that these people describe only the specialties, and never ask how they are re-organized from the center. That's why they are very poor books to my estimation.

What do we care for 23 civilizations? I'm interested in the heart of the matter. How the people, in all these civilizations were human beings. What do I care whether they were Chinese, or Egyptians, or Romans? It's an unbelievable book, this book by Toynbee, for this reason. It's an anti-historical book.

3

The problem of mankind obviously is: how do we remain men, despite the fact that we have water toilets, and bathtubs, and all the specialties, and orange juice? And can afford all these things?

Obviously, if we afford them too much, and become just Southern Californians, we are wiped out.

The Southern Californians have to keep identity with the Russians, or we have a Third World War.

THE STORY OF THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

I missed this, yesterday. I think the president made a very good speech, but he didn't include in any way the inhabitants of the Eastern bloc into his concern. The time has passed when he can afford this. He had to attack Khrushchev in the name of. Khrushchev's subjects, because obviously if we cannot find something we have in common with the people who live under Khrushchev's yoke, we cannot make peace. It's impossible. Then we are just two blocs, then we must hammer away at each other.

4

But that isn't true. Below the surface of being Americans and being Russians, obviously, we have still to belong to the heart of the tree. That's why Genesis 10 was written.

This is the meaning of this 10th chapter of Genesis.

But it doesn't help you to boast that you are Hebrews or that you are Assyrians. It doesn't.

III

1

So I recommend this to you. If you want to have it today we have to use obviously biological terms to be understood. The Bible has nothing to do with morality; it has nothing to do with philosophy. It has very much to do with biology.

It is an attempt to show

under what conditions do the members of any body politic retain the plasticity -- you can put this down; it's a good biological term -- retain the plasticity of representing the whole human race.

2

...-- and now comes my fulmination, or my high point -- if they can bury their dead and say that an era is at an end, because if they cannot say, "The light of the Lord has parted from Israel," they cannot rise again. They cannot declare with "the light of Israel has departed," the sons of Eli were out on a limb. They were corrupt. Therefore the life of Israel has to start somewhere else.

And in this sense, gentlemen, the Bible is written around man's power to end and begin periods, to end epochs, and say, "This is over." The humanity is distinguished from the animal in the simple fact that we bury our dead.

No animal dies in the face, if it can help it, of any other animal. They all run into isolation. The animal has its life to itself. It is finished. It is enclosed between birth and death. And that's its life.

3

You and I, however, by the fact that you bury your parents -- in a normal situation, when you outlive them -- have to say to yourself, "All the functions of my parents now have fallen upon me." They are no longer. So you become aware of the functions of other people, and inherit them.

And this constant inheritance of heredity is the real problem of humanity, and not the heredity of the genes of the biologist. Our problem is that if we cannot say to ourself, "Now my childhood is over; I'm no longer the son of my parents. I'm now on my own, or I have even to substitute for them and their function in society," or "for the older generation," you can say, for the Enlightenment, or for the 19th century, or for the Reformation, or whatever you choose as having seen its day -

you would think that you are no longer Puritan, for example.

4

Most of you are without knowing it. And because you do not know how important and eternal the function of Puritanism is in America. So I would advise you perhaps to ask yourself, if you really want to bury Puritanism -- if it wouldn't be a good thing if you would represent the first Puritan again after *The Last Puritan* has been written.

You don't know your heredity, and therefore you are not in history. Only a man who has, like this wife of Eli, at one time said, "*The life has departed from Israel*" -- that's exactly what it means -- would know that the prophecy in Israel, the function at the center of Shiloh has now to be built up in another way. The sons cannot inherit the spirit.

IV

1

It is in this very little feature that you are able to say, "*The light has departed from Israel*," by which we believe in resurrection. This is the whole meaning of resurrection. The power to say, "This is over, therefore, the same spirit that has shone has now to start once more. It has to be created in a different form."

That's how the Church came about, when Christ had departed from this earth.

And the Old Testament -- only to show you this -- believes in resurrection in this Book of Samuel, already, that man has to say, "This is over." "*The light has departed from Israel.*"

2

And it's the same problem with the two world wars -- you have not had the power -- this whole country, this mighty country has not had the power to face the issue, to deal with the two world wars as one great crisis.

And yesterday the poor president had to defend against this country mutual aid. And he had to say that five soldiers of the Allies against one soldier in this country. So perhaps you better did something.

3

And I read these resolutions now of the taxpayer of the United States who say that three to four billion dollars is too much for the defense of the United States, when five million soldiers of other nations defend us against one million soldiers of this country. And we are the richest country in the world. We have one-half of the wealth of the whole world. And nobody would dare to reduce any other budget by fifty percent.

And these people dare to reduce just this mutual aid program, because they still think it's the foreign aid program.

And that shows you the complete irresponsibility of the American citizen at this moment, because you can reduce any budget by ten percent or five percent. You cannot whittle down fifty percent.

And it will be done. The Democrats will do it. And I think they are traitors.

4

Because it's just cheap. The real situation of these two world wars was that they were fought with all the Allies in common, with the English and the French, you cannot deny this. Even with the Russians.

Now after forty years of this experience, we treat these people as foreigners, as outside our history. And I would say the light would depart then from Israel, because it would mean that the lesson of these forty years isn't learned.

And you will see. If the Congress cuts even one cent out of this budget, the United States are in a bad way. They are dishonest. They do not face up to what already has happened, that we depend for our survival on the identity with the Allies.

And most of you don't feel like that. You are all good Democrats, and are all for Mr. Engel, or Brown, or whoever it is, and think that you can be demagogues, and just play domestic politics.

SECOND PART: THE FOUR OFFICES OF THE BIBLE

CHAPTER ONE: THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE ASHCAN

I

1

So this danger is always there. And there will always be the hatred of the people who are inconspicuous in the heart, and do not specialize.

Whether they are Quakers, or whether they are Jews, or whether they are the Parsees in India who play the role of the Jews more or less in the Eastern world – the community always has to have an inconspicuous group that cannot afford to write a Greek philosophy, or great pieces of art, or like the Roman senators conquering the world, but who simply teach this humility of the inconspicuous; who can hear that at this moment this little baby has to be treated as a unique being. That this illness is a challenge, not to the routine performance of a hospital ward, but that this here -- somebody -- hasn't happened before.

Who has been in a hospital?

Well, then you probably know what I'm talking about, Sir. We are treated in a hospital. I've been there. And I felt I was treated like printed matter. Business papers, at reduced rate, yes, but --.

No -- like the smile. I was observed. But I'm not included in this machinery there. I'm passing through it.

Well, we have a break now? Ten minutes.

2

...Now I would like to have an opinion here from this group. You can imagine there's plenty more to be said about the historical meaning of the Bible. On the other hand, I'm perfectly willing to go over to other things, other texts. And you could finish this today or perhaps next time. And what's the feeling of the sentiment here?

May I hear your opinions on the matter? You can imagine that if I went on as I have, unfortunately, then I'm always carried away with this, because nobody seems to know the simple thing about the Bible. It has been completely buried under Greek, academic distortion, and so on.

3

Today I wasn't prepared to dwell so long on this story. And I would cheat you out of the real truth if I wouldn't talk about it. So I would like to hear somebody. Are you anxious to move out of this? Or are you anxious to stay in this?

Honest opinion required.

(I personally would like to stay---.)

Well, who would side with him?

(-- going to the other books in the Bible, or to other ...?)

Oh we would go over to other history books. We are after all quite free to do what we decide here to do. And so what do you think?

(Oh, well, I've been talking to the gentleman here, and I think that perhaps stay with the Bible also, but bring in Thucydides, which we talked about earlier, and draw comparisons just like we intended to bring history and the Bible to them.)

Here is this assignment. Well, I feel too that perhaps it is wiser at least to step over into the other fields. Perhaps we come back to this, and in comparison.

(In other words, Sir, what I was wondering whether it wouldn't be wise to go on, and perhaps allude back occasionally in order to --.)

I'm quite open to doubt. I have no principle in this matter. This is a new thing I do myself. And only in going along - I've written on these books, and so on -- but seeing our need -- I don't know what is the more urgent need.

4

So I get however these two texts written out by you. Pardon me for being pedantic about it, because I do feel that for example, "Ichabod" is of considerable length and it's very eloquent. And Whittier was a Quaker. And so I think it's one of the finest and most important documents of American history, this "Ichabod." And there has been much discussion about it.

Webster suffered terribly under it, and Webster's friend argued the case with Whittier; and Whittier, who was a very tender-hearted man in later years, was quite willing to concede that it was very severe.

But I have found that the later judgment is always the worst judgment in such historical creation. And I call it the "philosophy of the ashcan." That is, the story because later a man says, "I shouldn't have done this," doesn't mean he shouldn't have done it. It doesn't mean it at all.

And most of you think this way.

II

1

THE STORY OF A FRIEND WHO VOLUNTEERED AS A PRIVATE 1941

I have a friend who is now high up in the state department. He was professor of philosophy when the Second World War broke out. And quite a man in his own right. He was a full professor at a university, married, and forty years of age. And when the war broke out in 1941, he volunteered as a private. Then he took his corps examination with the highest standing in the corps area, although he was forty. So they are hard on him, being a corporal. And in due course, ended the war as a captain.

And then he came back in '45; he came to our house and complained bitterly that he was such a fool to do this. If he had gotten a commission as a colonel in the first place, right away, he would now be influential and a policy-maker in the United States. But a captain, that was just nothing.

And I said to him, "I'm very glad, because thanks to you, we won the war. And thanks to the corn colonels, the so-called, we nearly lost it. And I call this the philosophy of the ashcan, your motivation now. Now you think that you weren't clever. But for heaven's sake if, at the outbreak of a war, people are clever, you just can't win a war. And that's hard doctrine for you, but that's how life is."

2

It's much more important that this friend of mine did volunteer as a private, than that he should have gotten a commission as a colonel. That would be of no interest whatsoever; and it would not have helped the war effort. But it would have satisfied his ego. And that he would have been a profiteer; and that's the worst kind of man who, in an emergency of his country, tries to aggrandize himself. Such a man deserves our contempt. Nothing else.

Contemptible.

I have a neighbor who is such a colonel, and I wonder that we won the war.

3

And this you have to decide. If you ever go into the telling of a story to your children, or to your class, you will have to beware from this seemingly cleverness and sagacity, that because later on the thing looked different, it was stupid in the first place. Any sacrifice looks stupid in the first place, because you can only make sacrifices at one moment in your life, and you usually aren't up to par.

We are usually living in suspended animation, and at 35 degree of Fahrenheit, we just don't act like great souls, but like very cheap poodles. And so then to judge the great heart and the magnanimity of a man from your poodle situation is just ridiculous.

But that's what most students try to do. You sit back, and you are indifferent, and you are clever, and you see all the sights, "How could he? How could he? What a fool he was!" Then you call such a man an idealist, which I take as a curse -- I'm not an idealist, gentlemen. I have tried hard not to be. Idealist? This is stupid, is illusion.

4

But a man has to do what a situation demands. That's "must." That's not idealism. Where there is a necessity, has it anything to do with idealism? It has to be.

The human race demands this. The future of the humankind, and if you have any love in your heart left for your neighbor, then you have to do it. Do you save a child from a house on fire from idealism?

III

1

Don't misuse this word "idealism," because you bury all higher duties under this strange word of "idealism."

Idealist is a man who doesn't know what life costs. He thinks he can get away, and do wonderful things without investing his future -- that's the idealism. Cheap.

But everything costs its price in life. If you jump into this building, you can be burned. And if you do it, just the same, then you act right. If you are an idealist, you think, "Oh, it won't matter." And that's nothing worthwhile.

I'm neither materialist, nor an idealist. I think both are as stupid as pessimism and optimism. We are in this life here, and are responsible for this growth of the tree of the humankind. And whatever is demanded -- you are not an idealist if you bring up your children right. You love them, that's all. Not idealism.

You understand, Sir.

2

And the other is equally stupid. How can a man be a materialist, or how can he be a realist? All these *-isms* to me are useless for any decision you have to make in life.

But if the United States were to survive, people like my friend had to exist, who came forward and forgot themselves. And had no illusions that they might lose their lives, and might be ruined. He could have come back a cripple. That's the worst result of a war. It's a much more easy to harden yourself to be killed on the battlefield, than to come back a burden on everybody for the rest of your life.

3

Well, this is only to tell you that the philosophy of the ashcan is not for you as historians. You are responsible for re-living the moment in which the decisions have been made. And your rationalizing later is worth nothing.

If an historian thinks that he should sit in judgment and say, "How stupid for Mr. Lincoln. Shouldn't have come to the theater. Then he wouldn't have been assassinated," then you are just as an ape.

And most historians and modern historians, these debunkers to me are just monkeys. They monkey around with something that's just beyond their comprehension. And they call this "science."

I call it ashcan philosophy.

4

Half of what is called today "historical science" is analysis in trying to dispute the high duties and decisions of the man. And the historian says, "I would have never volunteered." "I wouldn't have been Abolitionist." "I wouldn't have --."

If you look at these historians, you wonder why there isn't yet slavery in the United States. If you read Charles Beard, you just cannot understand that anything has ever moved, because everybody is a liar, and everybody is just dictated by private interests. And how any soldier ever went to war for the abolition of slavery is absolutely un-understandable.

IV

1

The modern historian straddling the fence of science and history and calling himself a scientist, has really just moved into the situation of a cynic, and of a skeptic, and has nothing to do with science. But it is low-grade intelligence.

And the modern American intellectual is a despicable individual, because he takes stock of the human events from his easy chair, or whatever it is, and judges these people before he has done anything himself. What has he done, that he has a right to distinguish between great moments and low moments in history?

2

And since he doesn't recognize Thomas Paine's sentence, "These are the times that try men's souls," then he doesn't even know that there are times which try men's souls. He has no right to write history, because history is the chain of events which have tried men's souls. That's all history is. By definition. Other events do not have to be mentioned.

You don't have to mention when blacktop was introduced into Los Angeles, and all these niceties that they tell in your textbooks now. But the times that try men's souls, these are the times with which you have to become identified so that you may not fail, and your grandchildren may not miss them out; these decisions.

3

And that's why "*Ichabod*" is such a simple story. "*The light has departed from Israel.*"

The whole content of the Bible, then to exploit this one seminar hour which we still have, is written about the discerning of the spirits, the discerning of the spirits.

That's a rare expression, and I offer it to you, because it hasn't been talked down, and it is not commonplace. And so perhaps it makes you sit up.

In one place in the New Testament it is mentioned, that we have to discern the spirits.

4

And so you haven't discerned the spirit of this debunker, and of the skeptic, and of the philosopher of the ashcan, and the spirit of a man who is ready to listen, to obey the orders of the day, for example.

And so Eli's wife has to discern the spirit.

The whole Bible is written around the discernment of the spirit.

CHAPTER TWO: LIFE NOT YET ARTICULATE

I

1

You look so desperate. It's really very encouraging, once you know this, because the Bible is written around the question:

what's leading to death and what's to destruction? And what's leading to life?

And you all should know these stock phrases: "the more abundant life," and all this, "everlasting life."

Well, these are petrified translations; and I warned you against all these terms, because they don't convey to you something you have to decide yourself.

2

What do we know of life everlasting? What do we know of the more abundant life?

Then we think of the farmer's market. That's the more abundant life. But that isn't.

The meaning of the Bible is very simple. The things that lead to withering on the stem, to the petering out, and the problem of the central stream of life --.

3

All races, according to the Bible, are variations. And according to the Gentiles, they do not believe in one origin of the human race, because they do not see that the races are all deviations, and all in danger to deviate too much. And they have to be called back all the time into the mainstream of life.

But as I told you, whether you take "synthesis" for the things of the world, or you take regeneration for the races, it is always the same thing: to be watchful where the light goes, where life marches on, where the mainstream of life is to be expected.

4

For example, in the last fifteen years, I have seen many graduate students rush into service of the state department. Because they still thought that's elegant, that's fashionable, that's the future, foreign service. They all find out how disappointing it is, and come back very, very quick; because obviously the state has no future. There may be no wars, and therefore statehood is very ridiculous. It's obsolete.

II

1

And in the 16th century, as you well know, quite the contrary. The secular nations became important. And so out of monks came the humanists.

Erasmus ceased to be a monk and became a humanist and a philosopher. Out of theology then at that time sprung the natural sciences and the philosophers.

Now today, obviously, if a man wants to make good, he has to go into society, he has to go into a factory, has to go into a colony, he has to cultivate international relations. But he has to avoid all mere state, government things.

2

But government pays at this moment very well. It's a great temptation on the lower level of keeping your ... you'd better go to civil service. But if you are an adventurer of the future of the human race, there is nothing to be had out of becoming a second Mr. Eisenhower. If you offer it me, I certainly wouldn't try to become president of the United States, or foreign office.

He can't tell the truth to his people, to nobody; he's in diplomacy. Poor man. There's nothing creative about it.

3

But for the last four hundred years, it was the dream of every secular man to become king: "Every man a king". And I would suggest that these times are drawing to a close, and this is the discerning of the spirit.

That what was great in 1800, where the greatest minds of this country rushed into politics, might not be too -- I'm not, by the way, saying that I'm an authority. It's my own judgment that this may be so. But I invite you to test me by discerning the spirit yourself.

The "spirit" means the amount of futurity; that is, on one road, the amount of futurity of unsolved, unformed things, the plasticity that's demanded.

4

Genius is plastic. And where the life is not yet articulate, or formulated -- you can also use instead of "articulation," "formulation,"-- there is the futurity. And I would think that the relations of the human races and inside the human family today are the crucial questions. And I think that a man settling in Georgia certainly is more courageous than a man running for the American senate.

He will be probably killed there by the gang. And in the American senate, he would just be paid for his relatives.

Yes, politicians have to come in. If you will only move into a third era of human society, if the politicians, or if the state becomes an automatic thing, negligible -- that you have post offices, and postmasters. It's all right. They are very nice people. But it isn't of the primary decision.

THE STORY OF HERMAN MELVILLE'S TRAGEDY

After all, when Herman Melville became an inspector of customs in the harbor of New York, and that was the end of his life. That was his tragedy; that was a catastrophe. Before, he has been the greatest living American. And nobody knew it. And that was his tragedy.

III

1

So this is the discerning of the spirits, that you know the amount of vitality, the word "futura" is in order, that is on the path of your life, that which has yet to be created. And the less articulate it is, the more is it in the whole. The more the things become specialized -- a doctor today is such a specialist. In 1940, gentlemen, ninety percent of the doctors of this country were general practitioners. As of today, you know how many general practitioners we have left?

(One percent.)

Twenty percent. That is, medicine has ceased to be interesting and exciting, because specialization is much less creative. It doesn't represent the whole.

You are in great danger today. You go to a hospital to fall into the hands of a dozen specialists, so you are nowhere. You aren't treated anymore as your parts are treated. And here, the mighty have fallen.

2

Now medicine, in the book of *Arrowsmith*, by our friend Sinclair Lewis, is still holding the center of attention as the great thing. And the most wonderful profession. And I always say that the only aristocracy in this country we have are the doctors. And the only priesthood. We have no priesthood in this country. The ministers are low-grade. But the medicine man in this country is a medicine man. That is, he bewitches the people. He is an authority.

Doctors here are consecrated. But underneath, they have lost the reason for which they are consecrated, because they have become specialists. That is, they are so subdivided, that the

individual doctor even tells you that he no longer is treating you in the old sense in which my doctor did it.

I have told you the story. He was still a doctor, although he was a specialist.

3

But today, we are so organized, that not one of them can speak up, because the other nine have to be listened to, too. I don't know where the journey in this country goes into --. From 1910 to 1945, I think this country has lost its direction. It's moving in vicious circles. And it is your generation that has to provide the courage for the older people and it will be very difficult.

But that's what you have to do: to open again a belief in this country, a faith in the real future of America. At this moment, everybody is left on the defensive. And this for the next year until you have a recession.

4

Well, is this important, whether you sell twice as many automobiles as the last year? Is this the future of this country?

This has nothing to do with the future of America. It's minor. But everybody is talked by the mass media into the belief that this is terribly important. But why should we? We are gutted with automobiles. So if one year you have to sell fewer, well, it is not very important. It can be one way or the other. But to make you believe that this is important, is just to me ridiculous.

IV

1

THE STORY OF MR. CHAMBERLAIN

When we were in Greenfield together here, Mr. Chamberlain and I, there were two men, father and son from New York -- businessmen. And we wanted to start an adult education forum. And these men said it made no sense to do this. We had a war anyway now on our hands. This was in 1953. And we looked at him askance, and the two men said, "Well, everybody on Wall Street tells us that without a war, we cannot keep our economy going."

2

This is only five years ago -- six years. Now they would deny it. Every American denies the foolishnesses he said the day before. But here they said this, and they were not chased out of town; they didn't commit suicide; they didn't feel dishonored.

Now if two people in their sound mind, of different ages -- father and son -- can come from New York and tell us that you have to have a war in order to survive, then you'd better smash the Constitution of this country, because it is an abomination.

3

And this is allegedly a peace-loving country. This is one of the biggest lies in this country, that we are peace-loving. The most aggressive country in the world. It always has been. Americans are aggressive people.

I have nothing against it, but you should confess it. But you have this wonderful arrangement that here you sit, and are all pacifists. And tomorrow you conquer the world. And there's no connection between the two situations of yours.

4

And this I despise, because that's no discerning of the spirits. Do you think the United States at this moment owns half of the globe, and half of the riches of the world, because it's a peace-loving country? Why not admit it?

This is a great task. Somebody has to govern the world. And I think it has fallen to the Americans because of their debonair attitude -- I prefer to be governed by the American government than by the Russian government. But somebody has obviously to govern all these countries. Do you think Cuba is a sovereign state? Or Puerto Rico is a sovereign state? And Nicaragua is?

CHAPTER THREE: TESTIMONY

I

1

The discerning of the spirit.

Now, this can only be done in strict empirical fashion, because the spirit moves in sundry places. And now, what I wanted to perform today before we leave it, is to draw your attention to the attempt of the Old Testament to transpose man's own experience, how difficult it for instance to get to this courage to say, "This is over, and this begins".

The light has departed from Israel. We have to start on another track. We have to admit that we have failed, that this is a dead-end street, this getting out of the dead-end streets, that this is the constant endeavor from the first word to the last word of the Bible.

2

In biology, you would always admit that - take the pedigree of the monkey and men.

THE STORY OF EVOLUTION (EDGAR DACQUÉ)

The latest doctrine there is that man is in the central stream, and that the apes do constitute side branches of this mainstream of development, that we do not directly spring from the gorilla or chimpanzee, but that they are out on a limb, whereas we kept going in the middle.

But I think that's sound doctrine; that's biblical doctrine.

3

The Bible tries to say that all the deviations have to be called, as I might say, to order. That every deviation that goes too far has to be paid for, because it's proved a dead-end street. And if you take shells on the sea, and if you take the sauriae, the great big animals, they all have proved that after a while they became so big, and so specialized, and so varied that they died out.

All paleontology is simply the story of the Bible, played backward.

That if you become too big -- a dreadnought today has been abolished in the navy, because it's far too complicated a vessel. The smaller the vessel today is, the more human it is, as you and I are, babies, we are plastic. So in every generation we can take a new shape. Man

-- the weaker he is, the more powerful he is, because he can then take the necessary steps for adjusting himself to this moment.

4

-- now I come to this fact that this is called in the Bible "history."

History is the step out of nature by which an individual centers not on the shape with which it enters the world, but the shapelessness, so that it can obey orders as of today.

Any animal is born under orders of yesterday. And any human being is born under the orders of today. And if he is a creative leader of man, and an aristocrat, a priest, he is born under the orders from tomorrow.

If you become a postmaster, you obey the orders of today. If you become a social scientist, you may be obedient to the orders of tomorrow.

II

1

So in the human race, there is a division between people from tomorrow, and people from today. And in nature, the natural beast in us is the man of yesterday, as we have been.

And every one of us is under this discernment of the spirits. You have to know of yourself: how far you are of yesterday, and of today, or of tomorrow.

2

Every human being is a trinitarian.

The Trinity of the New Testament is not an invention of some clever, subtle spirit. It's an experience. You and I all live under the divinity of the past, under the divinity of today, and under the divinity of tomorrow. The spirit - that which beckons us from tomorrow, that God created the world long ago -- it's a good world -- and why shouldn't we comply with what it is? That's yesterday. And then we have the customs of our society as of today, so that this epoch, this century, that's as of our era; that's as of today.

You can become a doctor, you can become a professor, you can become all this, that's as of today. Because today is where you remember that at one time it hasn't yet been, and where you know that it won't be always. This I would call "today".

But that you have to breathe, this has always been; so that is yesterday.

*So the physical man in us, the natural man is of yesterday.
The historical man is of today.
And the Bible now calls the man of tomorrow the "prophetic."*

3

And there I feel I can't stop about the Bible before I have explained to you why the Bible is a prophetic book.

Not just the prophets in the Bible are prophetic. The whole book of the Bible is written around the fact that the future is as real as the past, and that a prophet is a man who judges today from the point of the ends of time.

Prophets are not predictors, gentlemen. Today is a great confusion at the New York stock exchange because they think that it is to prophesy, if you predict the business cycle, or the stock exchange, or the investment trends. That prediction has nothing to do with prophecy. Prediction concludes from yesterday and today what's going to happen tomorrow. That is mere causality. That is deduction.

But prophecy says, "This can't go on anymore," and all prophecy judges today from the viewpoint of the whole history of mankind, from our destiny.

4

Prophets are judging today and say, "Therefore all prophecy includes disaster." That is, there is no true prophet who doesn't say that between today and the end of time there will be some disaster that will have to overtake the fools of today, the excesses of today.

Any prophet can be recognized if he has the courage to say, "I do not predict wonderful days, but the price for these wonderful days is that you give up certain things that at this moment obstruct the future."

III

1

And so prophecy and prediction in this country are strangely confused and mixed. The secular mind has only this thinking. Here, a physicist can predict that if he puts so many things -- so many substances in a crucible, and then he will have a nice explosion, or whatever it is. What he calls a synthesis or some damn thing.

So this is the view of time in the physics laboratory. Because we dominate nature, nature is as of yesterday, and it is always the same. And the conditions of the natural processes therefore all belong to yesterday, even if they happen tomorrow. This is still yesterday.

2

The creation has not been changed, but you and I are quite different. We can see that if this bubble of our stock exchange doesn't burst, we'll have an inflation. And therefore, if we were real citizens of this country and thought of the middle class, and the poor, and our children, we would forgo this bubble, and have no inflation. And a prophet can say that if you go on with this inflation, you will undermine the authority of your government. Because a government that cannot borrow money anymore, that is no government.

THE STORY OF MR. ANDERSON

And Mr. Anderson, our head of the Treasury, got really panicky. Last summer he was a soft money man. He was quite willing to play along after Humphrey had left, with the inflation people. But when he saw that the credit of the United States was impaired, and he hadn't heard of this, just; that if you have soft money, then the state cannot borrow money, because you have to pay it back in the same currency, and the public won't do it if they know that they only get eighty percent of their money later on, paid out.

And so, he had to learn it the hard way.

Why such fools can be made secretary of the treasury, I don't know.

3

It's remarkable. In this country, the whole future is mortgaged by the present.

William James wrote in 1910 that no country and no era had wasted the future so much in favor of the present, as our generation, our time does. That's what we call installment buying. That's just a similar way of mortgaging the future.

You can see this.

Now the prophet is the man who understands that "future" means plastic, freedom. That if you mortgage your future for the next thirty years, you have to pay off your house, obviously you have that much less liberty with regard to your decision. And on it goes. And the more you do this, the less you can be footloose, and can start all over again.

4

THE STORY OF INSTALLMENT PLANS

For example, in America the workers cannot go strike. It's very wonderful for the association of manufacturers, if they live by the installment plan, because the wife says, "We can't afford this, we lose our property. We have to make these payments, and the strike fund isn't big enough to keep our payments up." So if you have enough installment

buying, you assure that the strikes cannot happen. But that means that the freedom of the worker is impaired.

IV

1

So prophets, gentlemen, are connected with the present by their inclusion of a catastrophe, of a minus, of something, that the present does not end in the future, as in physics, but the present stands condemned, to a certain extent. The outgrowth, the excrescences, the abuses, the mistakes of the present prevent the true future to happen.

That's what the prophet tells us. That's why the prophecy comes from the end of time into the present. A prophet is not a man who lives in its spirit today. But you look at today in the light of the end.

He's already with God, and looks back.

2

And if I may say this, gentlemen, if you are beside yourself, you can prophesy.

Anybody who has to defend his own home, and his own interest is not able to be a prophet.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY HAVING BEEN ABLE TO PROPHECY

But I have been able to prophesy. I have foretold Hitler at the end of the First World War, I was so beside myself, that is, I was so sacrificial I didn't care for myself, my wife, and my belongings. I sold my library. I gave up my position. I lost my fortune and everything. And even my dearest predilections -- the Church, and scholarship, and state. And so I was able to prophesy.

So I said in 1918 all about Hitler. It is printed. You can read it. And the prophecy came true.

And so I know what prophesying means.

3

Prophesying means to judge the present in the light of the future. But it is very expensive with regard to the personal happiness, or emoluments, or advancement of the person who does prophesy.

And since people no longer believe that there is prophecy, I want to witness to you that I have prophesied in 1918. But when I came to this country and had to fight for my survival here, I did not prophesy the Second World War. My prophetic qualities were renounced. I was given to the fight for survival, to the struggle. So the same man -- I myself -- know that you can be a prophet, and that it leaves you again, the spirit. And you become an earthenware, and then you live on this ground.

That's a good life, too. Then I live as of today. And God doesn't want us all the time to be on one side of the fence.

4

But one person has to testify to you that to be a prophet is just as much a reality as to be a businessman. And if a man is only a businessman, he is just a poor, very limited, very restricted. And if he's a playboy, he's just of yesterday, because he only plays with things that are already there.

"To play" means to be young.

"To be in business" means to fight as of today.

And "to be prophetic" means to belong to the future.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE OFFICES

I

1

And so in any decent society you have to have the three branches of the human race represented.

*Art has to be prophetic;
teaching has to be prophetic;
politics have to be prophetic;
the Church has to be prophetic.*

These are the priestly elements.

And then there are the fighting elements:

*a soldier,
and the engineer,
and the explorer,
and the inventor,
and the scientist –*

they are as of today, and the workers.

*And the children,
and the sportsmen,
and the artists,*

they are as of nature. They are genius. They are born as they are. They are good -- and so they play with the world.

And that's why you can be an artistic genius at the age of twenty. But pope you cannot be at the age of twenty.

This present pope is 76. That's not accidental, because back all the prophetic offices go with renunciation of the physical life, of your own life. It can happen that you are young. But it's an exception. And usually your governors are people who no longer are self-seeking.

2

You cannot have a fighting man as a president. Then he would just seek his self-aggrandizement. You expect from a president that he is regardless of selfishness. So I hope

you won't elect a president who wants to get rich on this, or who wants to have his family enriched by it.

3

Now according to American definition everybody is out for himself. Then you couldn't have a president, because the president must be a man who's not out for himself. Or why elect him otherwise?

And this is so terrible. You have been taught that the one office of the president may be perhaps an unselfish office. But you don't believe in priesthood; you don't believe in prophets; you don't believe in teaching; you don't believe in priests.

Teaching to you is a technique. And priesthood is a routine. And that's dogmatic. Prophets are just illusionists, and they are idealists.

And you have therefore made this tremendous realm of magistrates, and officeholders who date from the future of the human race, who represent your destiny. You have made them shrunk into this one tiny office of the president. All the others are self-seeking, fighting people, Theotis, with elbows, in your imagination.

4

Most people think everybody is out for himself. Gentlemen, if you think I am out for myself here, why do you listen to me?

Go home.

Isn't it absolutely ridiculous that I should be considered here a self-seeking individual who just wants to become famous and waste your time? You believe quite instinctively that I'm representative of the future. And I am appointed to point out to you the discerning of the spirits. What in the light of the future belongs to human history, and what is just the fall of man?

The earthly nature, his fear, his panic, his cowardice, his ignominy.

II

1

You all -- you wouldn't sit here, otherwise. But if you analyze your own picture of the world, the prophets are not included. You think that prophets, gentlemen, are fools. They happen once in a lifetime, perhaps, or in a century. There's Isaiah and Jeremiah. "Oh, well, strange. How they ever occurred nobody knows."

Now I can only tell you that prophets are just as immortal as plumbers.

THE STORY OF RICARDA HUCH

And there is a great poetess in Germany, Ricarda Huch, was her name, who wrote a very beautiful book. And in it, she simply says, "At bottom, every human being is prophetic."

Just as he is a genius. Every child is born a genius, and every child is born knowing something about the destiny of man. And he knows very well, if he's not corrupted, and a wife knows very well, when her husband has fallen in evil ways, and has wrong company, and when he's out for his real destiny. You trust her, that she can warn him and tell him, "If you go on like that, you miss your destination."

Don't you believe this? How can she know this? Because she's prophetic. That's not deduced from his small beginnings as a boy in the village, but because she has a complete intonation what man lives for, in what direction we should go.

2

So please. The Bible holds that rulers, teachers -- you can also say "judges"; they are all included -- priests, and sages, or dying men -- that they all belong to the prophetic bracket.

3

So I want you to enlarge the word "prophet" in the Old Testament.

Moses is a prophet, because the destiny of man is his problem. The books of the Prophet are only specialized books. But the Book of Kings is just as prophetic. Kings in the Old Testament, it isn't said "ruler," but it means "kings" -- kings, and prophets, and teachers are all part of the prophetic kingdom, or the prophetic branch of government of man.

And so you have all the people:

*the young who play,
the adults -- I would say, who fight; and the old.
And the word "priest," gentlemen, is the Greek word for "old."*

A presbyter; that's the full term of "priest," is an older man. Older; that is, he belongs to a third generation.

4

And you cannot understand the Bible if you do not understand that the five books of Moses, the book of Kings, which we are reading, and Samuel; the prophet: Isaiah,

Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and so; and the books of wisdom are all four branches of the prophetic office.

That's what nobody seems to know today.

Nobody. Terrible.

III

1

But the Jews say -- who has read the five books of Moses? May I ask indiscrete question? Who has?

You haven't? You haven't?

Well, you will see it's the last will of Moses. That is, I, in my sociology have now published a scheme of offices. And I have given exactly as I said here, four offices to the priestly age, from sixty to ninety, physically speaking.

The ruler, the teacher, the priest.

Now comes the strangest man; the man who makes his will.

The greatest act of a man is to be able to create a successor, to be succeeded.

In Philosophy 59 it was, I choose to be succeeded, to appoint a successor. But you can call it physically to make a will, to find somebody who will continue.

2

THE STORY OF MARC AURELIUS

Marc Aurelius, for example, is a pagan emperor and is considered the best emperor. And he fell down on the job because he was a pagan, because although being a good emperor, he allowed his physical son to follow him, -- and he himself had been appointed as an adopted son. And because he hadn't the moral guts to prevent this rascal of Commodus -- his son, his physical son, his carnal son -- to follow him, he didn't make his will. And he fell down on his priestly office, on his prophetic office.

And the tragedy of Marc Aurel is that only Christians can know that he is a tragedy. The pagan spirit to this day, the humanists, praise him to the sky. "Marc Aurelius, the philosopher on the throne." And to me he's effete, and a complete weakling, because his wife and his son intimidated him to such a degree, that he allowed -- knowing that Commodus was a scoundrel -- to follow him.

And the whole example of a whole century of emperors had been that you could only continue the Roman Empire by adoption. Because that was a selective process. You could see who shouldn't be.

3

And there you have the difference between Bible and paganism.

The Bible demands a prophetic spirit. And the sons of Eli cannot follow the father. And that's what happened here. All in this little book of Samuel.

But Moses is the man who makes his will. If you read Deuteronomy, the whole story there is -- and these modern critics do not understand it at all -- the whole story is how Moses was able to bequeath his vision to these obstinate Jews -- so he had to herd them together for forty years in the wilderness so that all the older generation could die off, because they wouldn't understand.

The whole story of Moses is the patience that he knew he could be successful. He wasn't allowed to see the promised land. He only could make his will.

4

THE STORY OF CARDINAL NEWMAN

If you want to have a man in modern times who had exactly the same fate, you know who that is? Cardinal Newman. In his day, the successful Catholic in Britain was Cardinal Manning. He was the man responsible for the infallibility dogma. In Rome in 1870, he's a convert also from the Anglican Church -- and he was made cardinal at a very young age, and was made archbishop of Westminster in London, and he was a successful man as of the day. And nobody thinks of Cardinal Manning today. He is completely forgotten.

But in every university of this country, there's a Newman club. And Cardinal Newman had to be ninety. He was made a cardinal at 78. And he only had to live out these twelve years when he was already very old and broken, so that it could sink in, that this man, who had challenged both churches -- the Anglican as well as the Roman Church -- was a better Christian than the pope and the archbishop of Canterbury. And today everybody admits it that he has done more for the reunion of the Christian churches than anybody else. But he was out of favor with anybody in his time. He couldn't even become a little bishop.

And if you look at the American bishops, you know it takes very little to become one.

And this is Cardinal Newman.

IV

1

And in Cardinal Newman, you have the problem of Moses that all his contemporaries had to die before he could come to fruition before people could listen to him. All his contemporaries said, "Oh, Newman? That's just Father Newman." He was called "Father Newman" till he was 78. He had no title in the Catholic Church.

You know, in a Catholic Church, when you are just a father, you are just nobody. And you aren't even monsignor. You are nobody. Nobody. You cannot imagine how despised he was, and how everything failed him, everything.

But now the only man who is interesting in the history of the Catholic Church in the 19th century, I assure you, is Cardinal Newman. And the rest is absolutely unimportant, because he left a legacy, and this is the prophetic office.

2

And so for a man who makes his will, we have the word "testator," in Latin. Would you understand what I mean, to make a testament? I want to use a word that is not dead. And so allow me to put in this word "testator." It's the hardest of all these four offices.

3

Now the Old Testament consists of four types of books.

The first is that of the testament -- that's why it's called the Old Testament of Moses. And now perhaps you begin to wake up and see that the word "testament" is quite a good term for the Bible. In the five books of Moses, Moses makes this testament.

Then in the next books, the Chronicles, in Kings, and Samuel, the people are ruled. That is, there are people who rule unselfishly in the light of the prophetic destiny of Israel.

Then you get the books of wisdom, which are teaching -- *Proverbs, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiastes*, and how all these books are called.

Since you haven't read the Bible, it may interest you that there is a constant, whole Greek quarter of the Bible, which is teaching wisdom. But it is not Greek teaching, but it is wisdom, which isn't the same as philosophy.

And the last is the prophetics, where the prophets -- they are priests besides, some of the prophets were priests in their own right. The true priest is a prophet. And they are the prophetic books, properly called.

4

So I have only tried to leave behind with you the simplicity of the Bible. It is the unfolding of the prophetic office into its four department of

king, priest, teacher and testator.

This is very strange. In this country, everybody endows universities and makes wills of the most complex character. And yet it has never dawned on you that it is a specific feature of humanity.

We are burdened with many meaningless wills. Think of all the family trusts, where people are bound to the third generation. Don't you see that this is the concentrated effort of reaching the future, of determining the future?

And the true man determines the present from the future, and not the future from the present.

And ...

FIFTH LECTURE: THE BIBLE AND THUCYDIDES ARE ANTI-MYTHICAL BOOKS

FIRST PART: ICHABOD AND THE BATTLE-HYMN OF THE REPUBLIC

CHAPTER ONE: DANIEL WEBSTER AND "ICHABOD"

I

1

Well, what would you say if we compare this harmless place in the Bible, where *Ichabod* is named with this whole poem? What is the tremendous difference? Or what may explain to you the importance the Bible has had through the ages?

To compare the text of "Ichabod," the poem, with the one sentence, where the mother of Ichabod is provoked to call him with this name? What's the tiny, and yet very important, difference? What do we hear in the Bible about Ichabod?

(Well, that the glory of God has departed, and this represents the reality in all of history of the need for the favor of some greater power than our own selves. And that the recurrence of this, every individual is always going to continue whether it be --.)

2

But what is the difference in the poem?

I understand what you say, very eloquently, about the place in the Bible. But that a man should then write a poem on Daniel Webster, calling him "Ichabod," with all this content - - don't you see that this is quite incongruous?

(... the Old Testament --.)

What is the incongruity?

3

Let's first state the incongruity - look at the text, please. Look at this one verse in the Bible. You cannot understand the history of the human race for the last two thousand years, if you aren't very clear on this point.

Because the whole human race, in the last two thousand years has done nothing but write a poem like "Ichabod." That's the whole content of your history, whether you read the *Declaration of Independence*, or whether you read the *Bill of Rights*, or whether you read the

great proclamations of the popes in the 13th century, and the 12th century, and the 11th century.

4

And since you are Americans, you decline to see any continuity. You are sick with this island-hopping of your mind. You think everything is just a fact here, and there is a fact.

And if you read Nehru's history of the world, which I recommend highly, you have the whole American mentality. Nehru could be an American. No sense, no continuity. Everywhere is spotty. Here is a fact; there is a fact; and there is a fact; and there is a fact.

II

1

Now it isn't that simple.

Thanks to the Bible, every chapter in human history has been spiced, and braced, and staved together with the help of "*Ichabod*" poems. That is, for every event, there has been an illumination somewhere in the Old Testament. And has gotten the title page.

Cromwell, that's the fifth monarchy, that's of Daniel, for example. Anything you care for in the history of the human race so far -- Karl Marx is an old, ancient prophet of the Old Testament.

It's very simple. Justice must be done. Justice is more important than mercy.

2

That goes against the charity ladies of this country. You cannot understand the pathos of Bolshevism, if you do not understand the fight of the Old Testament for justice is first, and mercy comes later, and you cannot run the world without the Ten Commandments.

But all Americans try very hard to say that the New Testament is enough, and the Old Testament isn't needed. In comes Marx, and reminds you of the completeness of the whole story that without justice to the worker, charity balls and charity performances are just horrid, as they are at this moment in this country.

So "*Ichabod*," after all -- how many stanzas? Will you tell me, how many stanzas?¹

¹ ICHABOD by John Greenleaf Whittier (1807-1892)

(Nine.)

You see.

3

Now I want to draw your attention to the fact that we learn from the story of the Bible with us what development really is. It's just one little crystal in this text, "Ichabod." "*The spirit has departed from Israel*". And nothing about the pre-history of this man.

But here is a great man, Daniel Webster. He has a wonderful story of genius, and charity, by the way, and great tenderness, and great firmness, and has upheld the Union for

So fallen! so lost! the light withdrawn
which once he wore!
The glory from his gray hairs gone
forevermore!

Reville him not, the Tempter hath
a snare for all;
and pitying tears, not scorn and wrath,
befit his fall!

Oh, dumb be passions' stormy rage,
when he who might
have lighted up and led his age,
falls back in night.

Scorn! wold the angels laugh, to mark
a bright soul driven,
fiend-goaded, down the endless dark,
from hope and heaven!

Let not the land once proud of him
insult him now
nor brand with deeper shame his dim,
dishonored brow.

But let its humbled sons, instead,
from sea to lake,
a long lament, as for the dead,
in sadness make.

Of all we loved and honored, naught
save power remains;
a fallen angel's pride of thought,
still strong in chains.

All else is gone; from those great eyes
the soul has fled:
When faith is lost, when honor dies,
the man is dead!

Then, pay the reverence of old days
to his dead fame;
walk backward, with averted gaze,
and hide the shame!

twenty years, from 1830 from his great speech against nullification, "Union and liberty forever," and now he's fallen. And the spirit has departed from Israel.

4

Now what has happened, gentlemen?

The whole story of the spirit is first in him and now it departs.

So "Ichabod," in the case of the poem, compared to the Bible, covers two generations of life. The final moment is only so terrible, because what was in Eli, the father of Ichabod, was in this man Webster, so that he comprises more than one generation. You may call this a trick, but it is much profounder.

You and I, my dear people, we represent the whole human race in many generations. You all can live the nine lives of a cat not only, but your mother's and your father's life, and your grandparents' life, and your own life, and your children's life, if you're led to.

III

1

And this is the incredible story of this poem "Ichabod": that practically, first the grace is shown you and then the departure. He couldn't show it otherwise. But in the Bible story, obviously, first Eli is the anointed of the God. He is a prophet. He had sanctuary functions. It's only Ichabod, where the mother says, "Now it's all over."

But with Webster, it's one and the same man.

That's incredible. Ichabod never had the grace of God, had he?

2

It is, of course, too simple a matter for you to consider. You are all so in travel, and dealing only with mileage and quantity, that such a small consideration that anything is here can topsy-turvy in this poem, the quotation. That doesn't even occur to you as important. It's too small a matter. You cannot think. You cannot read a text. You have been absolutely ruined by a course of your idea of animal evolution.

In history, man himself-- Mr. Webster -- goes through all the stages of the Old Testament story. One and the same man is the evolution story. As the animal kingdom, one is an ape, and the other is a gorilla, and the third is man, and the first is a reptile, and so on. And it's all separate. And still in the Old Testament, a whole man has to wear the curse of Ichabod. This whole, poor boy, after all, he's innocent. He's just born to Eli, and he calls -- the spirit has departed. And the whole man's life is signified.

3

And the whole Old Testament, is compared to our era still in this sense pre-human, or Old Testament "antiquity" as we call it, the ancient world, before the revelation, before redemption, because every man is only one type, one thing. He's pharaoh. Or he's Moses. But already in Moses, by the way, the Jews always had this inkling that redeemed man lived through many phases and chapters, and that he is humanity, that the man is not an atom, as you think of man. But that evolution passes through your own life.

And here it is shown how the whole story of the Jewish sanctuary at Shiloh has been lived through Webster, and now has come to an ignominious end. It has a negative outcome.

4

But this has always struck me, the incredible -- Whittier, being a Quaker and being a poet, he lived through this whole Old Testament incessantly. And the less he could use it in the liturgy -- the Quakers, after all, have no readings, they have no texts, they have no sermonizing -- the more it entered his spirit.

IV

1

Now this is what we call really "evolution," gentlemen, in the true sense of human experience. In our era, man evolves through these stages first of the Old and then of the New Testament. He's either condemned -- we call this the "Last Judgment," we call this the "hell" and "devil."

You laugh at all these things, you think we are through with them. It isn't true. Before a man comes to an end, he is judged. He stands judged.

2

THE STORY OF FREDERICK ROBERTSON

A very wise minister, Mr. Frederick Robertson, a very great Englishman who died in 1851 -- if you ever come to his biography, I recommend you this book very much -- Frederick Robertson was a leading minister in England. It was said of him that he was a prophet, a poet, a king, and a saint. And that's all we can hope for, that he was a complete man. And he died very young, I think at 38 or 40. Forgotten what.

And he said in a funeral oration once that, after all, if we were so lucky in our era that if we had loved each other and lived in an affectionate community, the judgment over a man at his death and funeral were usually the right one, that people had come to understand each other in our common life to such extent that what was said honestly, at the moment

of a man dying, was usually quite a right assessment. The good, and the evil, and the significance of the community, that we could hope for, that sins were not buried, that man wasn't forgotten, and wasn't misinterpreted. But at least in normal times, finally it was all revealed. After all the revilement, and all the defiance, and all the battles, people would come to peaceful terms with each other. And the eulogy, or the feeling of the community -- more than this formal eulogy at the grave, was in fact able to cope with a man's role.

3

Now that isn't true in days of outlaws, and in days of constant enmity. It's not true of the Old Testament story at all. Men are enemies to each other to the bitter end. And you just have to think of vendetta and vengeance everywhere, and these people never forgive each other and see each other in the true light.

So evolution is the story of "*Ichabod*" in the historical sense.

4

And what I can do in this seminar with you poor, demented people is only to wake you up to the fact that the scientific era is over. That is, an attempt to treat man as a piece of nature. That if you do this, you destroy a piece of your community. You are not parts of nature, because we are able to tie together ends and beginnings. And we can survive death.

No animal can do this. We are regenerated.

And Webster gets this poem in the hope that he too, even, through this his poem may still repent, and be regenerated. Even beyond "*Ichabod*" there is still hope for Daniel Webster. You must understand that otherwise the writing of the poem made no sense.

And that's a great story.

CHAPTER TWO: THE CONTINUITY OF HISTORY

I

1

Ichabod is one, just this type. And Eli is another. But the poem is written because of Webster being Eli at once, and Ichabod now, and let's hope that God will forgive him. That's the meaning of God's forgiveness, which is unheard-of in antiquity. That a man can be restored to his former honor, and just because he acknowledges that one phase of his life is without the divine grace.

The continuity of history is here carried into the individual life, and I think most people in this country do live the nine lives of a cat. But they only live it as a cat. You should live the nine lives of a human soul. That is, knowing these phases of each other, facing these phases, these chapters.

2

The whole problem of yours today in Los Angeles is: everybody here has nine lives. They came to this country, to Los Angeles once, either your parents or you yourself. And you will not stay here for all life. We all lead today many existences.

The real problem today is despite this, which is now already the conquest of the Christian era -- that we are allowed to live more than one life, that we aren't stamped out a slave forever, a black man forever, a white man forever, a nobleman forever, a peasant forever -- you understand -- that we all evolve through these various stages.

Your problem and mine is to live these lives as a human being facing these various phases. Having no alibi, and no aliases just, and not running away from our past, and not running away from our future.

3

And so you must see if we read this great poem "Ichabod," you enter history only if you keep the Old and the New Testament. Ichabod -- the model case, one woman has to be the scapegoat. "The light has departed from Israel." That's a whole generation. But as our sins are forgiven, don't think this is a metaphor. Or don't think that's something for the Sunday church.

The ministers don't understand this for a long time already. They have all apostasized. Rabbis and ministers do not know anything, but the poets still know it. And you still can know it. If you read this poem "Ichabod," you are in the New Testament, because it's the application of this Old Testament in which still every man was just one item, or one definition, or one had one meaning.

4

Not one of us has only one meaning. You all can hope for that you go on from one station to the other.

From one light to the next, from one rebirth to the next.

And you all take it for granted, gentlemen. Only I have to wake you up to the fact that in Los Angeles, which is perhaps the summary of all western civilization, in a strange manner, this Southern California is the extreme of everything the human race has dreamt of for thousand years. You are in great danger to take this splitting up in evolutionary phases in your life so much for granted that you break up, that you are like the fission of the atom. That is, you live so many lives, that they lose unity, they lose continuity. It is so easy for you to start all over again.

II

1

I had this story.

THE STORY OF A HOMOSEXUAL

We dismissed a man, a tutor in our college, because he was a homosexual, and he threatened the boys. And so he went to another university, and they didn't know anything of his background. Of course, we shielded him, and tried to give him a new start. And what happened? He was made the patron of one of the dormitories.

Now, in antiquity, or in any Old Testament vengeance situation, absolute situation, or, pre-Christian, this man would have been cast, in iron chains and either would have been burned at stake -- perverts were not dealt very graciously with. We make him the gardener, the goat into the gardener, which is not a good idea, either. Because we give him a chance to start all over again. And everything has never happened. And that's the exactly opposite exaggeration.

So we are over-Christian today. Let me tell you this.

2

We have lost the power of the antithesis between the Old Testament and the New Testament. And so you all pride yourself -- that's why you are, for example, all pacifists. And you allow any number of divorces, as in this Duncan case. That's the end of civilization. She is a prostitute who uses marriage as a shield for her prostitution. That's very serious. If marriage can be abused even by one for such purposes, something is very

wrong with the way we enter upon marriage. Because it shows that it is entered upon absolutely without any consideration of any consequence.

So the son can be with a lawyer, and that this law school student whom she married, can be a lawyer, that's just all incredible. It's the end of the world, gentlemen. You can be sure that such a world cannot survive. It has no longer persons who live -- but just little fragments of people.

3

So the old world of antiquity, gentlemen, has made everyone serve in one capacity, and therefore has denied man's right to be reborn. There is no remission of sins in antiquity. What we call "revelation" is the drawing away of the veil so that man can survive his own previous form. Because any form, any state of will and mind, if you have any mentality in antiquity is final. And so man is under a veil, because that's what we call "the mind," "My own mind."

You remember in class, I tried to tell you that mentality was fickle and that we had as many minds as we had chapters in our lives. I'm of a different mind very often. My mind changes, and it's given me for change. The mind is not the root of my soul, and my existence, and my identity. You cannot identify yourself with your mind, because you have a childish mind, you have an adolescent mind, and you have a mature mind. And therefore, the mind is not the point of identification.

4

So this poem, "Ichabod," is suddenly posing the question, "Is not every one of you the whole story?"

III

1

And this has to do with the -- well, I give you a simile.

THE STORY OF THE MEDIEVAL CHURCHES

In the medieval churches, which tried to recapitulate the Old Testament, you have the architecture laid out in such a way that it begins with the precinct leading up to the portals of the cathedral, and it's called the paradise. And then you enter the door, then that's the time of Noah, the covenant with God. And then you go forward and then comes the Old Testament and the Jews; and then come all the stages: kings and prophets, the six eras of the world are laid out; till the apses, you have the Last Judgment.

So the people in the Middle Ages were quite aware that what they should inculcate in a man was the road from Paradise to Last Judgment. That's why there is a portal in every cathedral called the gates of Adam and Eve. Because after Paradise, fallen man enters here the Church and therefore needs the Church. In Paradise, the animal kingdom, he doesn't need any revelation or any speech, or any word. Animals live unconsciously and unhistorically.

2

So I only wanted to show you this problem of evolution has harassed the mind of people for the last two thousand years. And therefore, the Gothic cathedrals were built to represent our march through the six ages of the whole world's history: three ages pre-Christian, and three ages post-Christian, to the Judgment Day.

This all strikes you today just as symbolism, as you dare to call it.

Wherever you read the word "symbolism," kill the author, because it deprives you of the seriousness of the business. This is not symbolism. This is impregnation with the power to live through many ages. The word "symbolism" is one of the most obnoxious terms at this moment, because the *literati* in the English department speak about it, and devalue it thereby.

This is not symbolism. That's experience. That's empirical.

3

Now today, it's the individual. Mr. Webster -- and you, too -- you live through all these stages which man has lived. And we recapitulate in our own life these various stages, especially the fall of man.

And obviously today, the whole struggle between the organized churches and the academic campus is that on campus everybody pretends in his lectures and in your examinations that God doesn't exist, that you can deal without him. He is never mentioned -- it's just bad taste to mention Him in college. And it would be very bad taste not to mention God in Church, you will admit. There you have to over-mention Him; and here you have to under-mention Him.

4

There you have again this breakup of the various stages of your mind into absolute, separated entities. On Sunday, God is praised from ten, eleven to twelve ten thousand times, and in the college, He isn't mentioned once. At least not in a way that you believe in Him; only in the way that other poor, benighted souls have believed in Him. Historically, God may be mentioned. But that He's present in this room, gentlemen -- and ladies, you know it very well, but it mustn't be mentioned.

But He's here, I assure you.

And the devil is here, too, waiting for his opportunity.

IV

1

As long as you break yourself into these animal creatures, who are, from ten to eleven philosophers, and from eleven to twelve theologians, and from two to three at night, animals, and so on, you are the unhappiest of creatures. You are not in history, but you are broken into fragments of a zoological garden.

And that's how I see most people try to live. They try to live in these absolute water-tight compartments without awareness that these phases are one wonderful life, the whole of creation.

2

So the only way in which you can teach children history is by pointing out such poems, of "*Ichabod*," who have this double punctuation: the name is still taken from the great single case in the Old Testament, but it's already reconciled with the whole of life, with a longer, continuous existence.

But since I admit it, Mr. Webster is a re-born soul, and he can be forgiven.

THE STORY OF WHITTIER ON HIS DEATHBED

And Whittier said on his deathbed, by the way -- he was of course wrung by Webster's friends very often about this poem -- at the end he admitted that much that perhaps Mr. Webster had lived down this poem, that perhaps God in His mercy would not consider the poem as the last word about Mr. Daniel Webster.

3

Now this may not even strike you as something unnatural, because you take it for granted that we go on from mood to mood.

This isn't quite true, gentlemen. Remember, if a man dies unrepenting, like Mrs. Duncan probably will, she just goes to hell.

You only must think that hell is a state not somewhere else outside this world, but in this community.

She will be a blot on this community for a hundred years to come. And that's what we call "hell."

And you cannot redeem her. She is just there. And she's on you, this city, this civilization, this age is identified with her. You haven't shaken her. Of course, we have to do the minimum in showing our abhorrence, and extinguish her. But since he doesn't repent and since she doesn't admit it -- the only contribution such a criminal can make is admission, and saying, "Yes, I have sinned." Then it's all over. Then you can go on.

4

Now the second story is, "*The Battle Hymn of the Republic*," and you have a similar problem. Is history just: has Jesus just died in Nazareth in 33 of our era? Has He? That wouldn't be very interesting. So in peacetime, people believe this, however. They write biblical criticism; they write novels about Paul or about Jesus, what a nice boy He was, and how obedient to His parents, and nobody understands how such an obedient boy could ever become a rebel, and could ever protest, and so on. But He did.

Well, people who write these sugar-coated articles for Easter in the paper, which I now have to read in these horrid Los Angeles papers -- they don't care.

The only way in which you can express your belief in this new era, where man passes through all the stages from Paradise, over fall, to redemption, to rebirth, and to the Last Judgment, is when you still expect yourself judgment.

CHAPTER THREE: THE OLD AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

I

1

And this is "*The Battle Hymn of the Republic*" written about: "*I have seen the coming of the Lord.*" That is, when you suddenly see that history is half the future and half the past, that you are exactly in the middle between the future and the past. That what we call the present exists only -- now may I put down this law, which I haven't formulated, but Goethe has formulated --

*man has exactly as much past as he has future, and he has exactly as much future as he has past.*²

2

Modern man has no future, because he is impertinent enough to try to have a past of seven hundred million years.

That's not given to the human race. All this talk about geological man frustrates you, because there has to be equilibrium. Man has only that much past he has future, and he has only that much future as he has past, if he is a living creature.

² Battle-Hymn of the Republic by Julia Ward Howe

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord:
he is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored,
he hath loosed the fateful lightning of his terrible swift sword:
his trutz is marching on.

I have seen Him in the watch-fires of a hundred circling camps;
they have builded Him an altar in the evening dews and damps;
I can read His righteous sentence by the dim and flaring lamps.
His day is marching on.

I have read a fiery gospel, writ in burnished rows of steel:
"As ye deal with my contemners, so with you my grace shall deal;
let the Hero, born of woman, crush the serpent with his heel,
since God is marching on.

He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat;
he is sifting out the hearts of men before his judgment-seat:
Oh! be swift, my soul, to answer Him! be jubilant, my feet!
Our God is marching on.

In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,
with a glory in his bosom that transfigures you and me:
as he died to make men holy, let us die to make men free,
while God is marching on.

And today, modern man has no future. I can assure you that. It ends just here at the beach. And that's why you have the Oriental Exclusion Act, because you are so afraid of anything that looms from the other side of the water. Here Manifest Destiny has come to an end at the Pacific Ocean. American history as American history ends. That's all over. You have no future.

3

And that's why Adlai Stevenson came out and said, "We are just fearful people. We are timid. We don't think that the future is with us anymore. It is with somebody else. It has left us."

Well, gentlemen, all the modern science is trying to throw you off balance by telling you that seven hundred million light years are what matters. Well, then you don't matter. But if you have just a past of six thousand years, then it doesn't matter very much if you would kindly help to add another thousand years to the story. Then that's still worth a real effort.

4

And what this history seminar or any history teaching at this moment must try to do is to encourage you to give the next thousand years a chance, and not just your own pleasure, and your own retirement age, and and your own old insurance. And you cannot even insure your old pension, if we have inflation.

And inflation means "no belief in the future." That's all what inflation means. Inflation means, "After us, the deluge." That's what the French nobility said before the French Revolution. "*Oh, après nous, le déluge.*" After us, the deluge.

And that's what every American today says. And that's why the country can have no future.

II

1

They say, "Oh, if I only make money today at the stock exchange, let's have inflation." All the manufacturers think that way; all the workers think that way; Mr. Reuther and how all these lobbyists call themselves.

Because people are not afraid of the Last Judgment any more. They don't think there is a Judgment Day. They don't think that their sins have to be admitted. They never consider possibly Ichabod, "*The spirit has departed from Israel,*" my dear.

All these politicians, if you tell them that Mr. Webster winced under the poem, they just laugh. If you wrote today a poem, "Ichabod," would they take it seriously? Would they apply it to themselves?

2

This is the distance we have traveled from 1850 to today. You cannot reach any of these men today in their conscience.

What is conscience, gentlemen?

The violence between future and past. It's nothing moral. Conscience means to be conscious of where we stand. And we stand always between being heirs and being founders. Every human being has as much future as he thinks himself a founder; and every man has as much past if he thinks himself being an heir.

3

Now you don't think yourselves founders. You marry because your sex urge demands it. Not because you want to have children, or found a new republic, or settle a new island.

So you are not founders. You are just heirs. And you know it very well. A mere heir is a degenerate, a rich heiress. The worst is Barbara Hutton, or Gloria Vanderbilt, or so. Poor people, just heiresses. They get bandied around, because they have a fortune and they have a name, and they can never make a real life, because the future and the past are not in balance.

And this is the Old Testament, and that's the New Testament in all of us.

4

And the condition of a new phase in your life is that you acknowledge your inheritance, your heritage. This is the strange balance. That's why every new phase has to be entered upon *deliberately, gratefully, ruefully, tremblingly* -- under this "fear and trembling," as Kierkegaard has said, because you always know that you are losing something, that you're shutting one door, and it can only be done under the dire need of necessity, that we live on.

III

1

THE STORY OF CALVIN COOLIDGE

Old Calvin Coolidge, a Vermonter, used to say when he asked if he should veto a bill, he only asked one question: "Is it necessary?" And any superfluous bill was vetoed.

And that I recommend to you in your own life. Ask yourself about the serious decisions in life: "Is it necessary?" It's the only guide you have. Not "Is it right?" or "Is it good?" Just "Is it necessary?"

*Because sometimes it is necessary to break the law, obviously.
And sometimes it's necessary to observe the law. This is your incredible freedom.*

If you found a new society, you will always have to break the laws of the old society. But if you don't found anything, and just are pleasure-seeking, you fall under the law, and there's no excuse.

2

So the same act can be your freedom, and the same act can be your curse. Not two cases of *eloping, or marrying, or getting engaged, or choosing* are of the same character. It is just two spirits, the meaning can be absolutely different.

One can be *Ichabod*, and one can be *the coming of the Lord*.

3

Now without the reading of the text of the Old and the New Testament, I do therefore think that people are completely given over to their blind passions -- in every generation, to the fashion. And so you get, since 1850, a rage of the spirit of the times.

That is, we think that the times themselves contain men.

THE STORY OF A MAGAZINE CALLED THE AMERICAN LITERATURE

And I've been to the library this morning to read up on some American writers. And there is a magazine called the American Literature. And the whole attempt -- you know this, probably, American Literature? It's a very good magazine, it is in its own way. You know it? Who knows American Literature?

Whew! How can you escape? All these textbooks condemn you to eternal death. You've never seen it?

That's where your professors get all their knowledge. Yes. Look at it. You will always get an A in their English courses if you read this magazine.

4

Well, I'll just to give you an example what happens if you are addressed as "Ichabod" or with "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," of the battlefield of life, that there is a great moment at this moment -- either from the future or from the spirit that is departed.

The two poems are so great, because one is on death, and end, and the other is on the beginning, on a new foundation. We came upon these two, but they are extremely opposite, and extremely significant, because "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" and the "Ichabod" tell you that every human being -- when I open my mouth or you open your mouth to a serious statement, we call into life, and we condemn to death.

IV

1

Any gossiping monster, or any judge, or any student -- you don't know this -- that life and death are on the human tongue. That's why the Gospel of St. John begins: "*In the beginning was the Word*". We cannot speak without saying of a part of life that it has died and departed, and of other elements that we still expect the future, because we must speak in tenses. We cannot speak other than as "I was," "I am," "I shall be."

So if you say, "Germany was a great country," and you say it has died. If you say "Germany is a great country," you give it a lease on life. You say, "Europe was a great civilization," then it's all over. If you say, "Europe has still a future," then you give it a lease of life, and you invite everybody who subscribes to this sentence to do something about it.

2

Most people have no idea that by speaking we commit constantly either childbirth, or murder, or execution. Some things deserve to be executed. We bury them.

But mark this well: to speak means to call into life, as the wonderful saying is: we call into life; that's done by speech. And the word "*to call into life*," it should bring it to your attention that we speak us into being, or we bespeak us out of being.

If you say, "This man is a down-and-out," or "He's done in," as you treat all the old people today after 65 -- "Oh, put him into a convalescent home; put him in an old-age pension, and so on, it's over with," you no longer expect anything from them.

3

To speak means to decide over life and death.

And if you only knew this, you would know that the way you speak is powerless, because you don't know that you are involved in the creative process of mankind by which we constantly re-arrange those things that have a future, those parts of life, which we want you to carry into the future, and those parts which we put on the cemetery.

To speak means to decide over life and death.

Now you no longer can understand the architecture of a cathedral as really meaningful. You no longer believe that man goes from Paradise to the Last Judgment. This form in which it was expressed in the Middle Ages is probably gone for you - at least not for me.

But I see you, and you will look at these buildings and say, "That's just pictures." And you will not enter the cathedral with the feeling that you march through time. I at least haven't found any American who is capable of this experience.

4

All right. We have to drop it.

But it's obvious that you and I must make an effort to give ourselves and future generations some corresponding evolutionary experience, that vitalizes you, not in the form of the whole history of the human race, but your own march perhaps through your own ages of life.

CHAPTER FOUR: YOUR OWN TIME

I

1

And therefore, gentlemen, the curse you have to fight is that you are immersed into any one age, any one generation, any one spirit of your time, which is the great devil that today goes around and tries to devour you. You are told that you are the angry generation, or you are the postwar generation.

Don't believe it for a minute. It's all nonsense.

Your whole problem is to live through a number of generations, and to do your part to reconnect all generations in your own life, and in the life of the country, and in the life of the human race.

2

And here I give you an example.

THE STORY OF MR. LEE MASTERS

Here, we have a great man in this country Mr. Lee Masters. You know probably who he is, the man who published the *Spoon River Anthology*. Have you ever read him?

(Yes, I have.)

Well, I think he's a very great man, and an important man, because he signifies a note in American literature without which this would not be any longer a part of the human race. It would just be America. Lee Masters in his pessimism represents the connecting link with the rest of the human race, because he's critical of the American situation as of this moment. He's a wise guy, and he was completely destitute ten years ago; he lived in a poor house and then people came to his rescue, but he lived actually in the poor house.

And that's how you treat your geniuses in this country. But you have always done this. Nothing has changed.

3

But if you do not speak of "Ichabod," and if you do not speak in terms of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," this is what happens. That's why it seems to me so very important. I hope it is in this volume.

Ah yes, I know where it is. Now listen. It probably wouldn't occur to you that it is the fall of man here, of modern man in this article. A quite intelligent man who has written the article. Let me read it to you.

4

So Masters is simply a part of America. Have you read the *Spoon River Anthology*? Have you heard of it? It's a very good book. It's very important. Have you read it?

Well, yes. He's a forgotten man. You do not expect -- poetry is eternal. Shakespeare has no meaning, if he isn't even played at all, today. What is Shakespeare's meaning if he just was acted under James I? And you accept it. In this one case of Shakespeare, you do not wonder how it is possible, to acknowledge him. I hope in the field of Donne, you are of the same opinion. He speaks to you, doesn't he?

II

1

Now Mr. Masters, however -- although I think he deserves the same kind of timelessness -- any great poetry is in this sense penetrating into any spirit of the time as a warning that there is more to life than this spirit of this one time.

That's what Shakespeare means. The idea of poetry that it reaches a penetration, which goes under the skin of the uniform which you wear in 1959.

Could you possibly think of time in terms of earth, in terms of space, and say that man is rooted in time? And that, just as a tree has to outgrow, by his putting down deeper roots into the surface of his soil, and go beneath it, and above it -- in the same sense, any man is born on the topsoil of his own time. But he has to put down his roots underneath this, and grow beyond it.

2

Man is a creature in time. We have our roots in Heaven. These are our roots.

The brain is our roots, not our crown.

It's our darkest part. It's our part which has inherited all the categories of the past. Here, in your mind, that's the most conservative part of your being. Your heart is much more exposed to novelty, and your touch, and your senses. The mind is a conservative man.

The cells of the brain are the only part of man's body that are not renewed. They are unregenerators. That's why without repentance, the human mind can never have a new idea, because the heart has to throw up such a violent denial of your prejudices, that a new

chapter in your brain is opened. You can only eliminate false ideas in your brain by closing the book, by moving into another part of your brain, because you cannot renew any memory in your mind.

3

The physiologists can tell you this, that the brain cells are that part of the human body that are not regenerated every seven years. Every seven years, you have a new body, except for your mind, except for the brain. That's continuous. And that's why the renewal of the brain is something that cannot be brought about by the brain itself. It can only be brought about by great, strong passions of faith, and fear, and love, and affection -- that is, when the whole body is worked up, when you are beside yourselves, then you can throw up blood into this brain and eliminate whole chapters of your mental life by saying, "That's Old Testament; that's bygone".

4

This is how we renew ourselves. That's why rebirth is a physiological process. It is the victory of the rest of your body over the mind.

III

1

Here, now listen to this. I have never seen anything so cruel:

"It was somewhat of a shock to this reviewer to realize that Mr. Masters, who has written his autobiography, is now 67 years of age, that he's contemporary with William Vaughn Moody, Clyde Fitch, and Booth Tarkington, and that 22 years ago have passed since the sensational Spoon River Anthology in 1915. The appearance of that book so definitely marked the success of the prewar modernists"-- poor poet - "the success of the prewar modernists"; that's not a place for Shakespeare -- the victory of Marlowe, you condemn him to death -- "the appearance of the book so definitely marked the success of the prewar modernists that it is still hard to think of its author as anything but a young radical.

"Yet even at that time, Mr. Masters was not young. Spoon River was the culmination of many years of struggle to find expression for a thwarted and stumbling experience. And its attainment was never repeated. An era of literary history brought to a close by the Life Records in a Storyteller's Story, A Book about Myself, and Across Spoon River," all books by Mr. Masters. "Even though there may be still further to go in Following down Time and The River, the special kind of frustration of the generation which reached its maturity before the '20s and which reveals the sources of Mark Twain's dismay in The Mysterious Stranger has found its voices, we can never return to the faith of Emerson in nature identified with an all-good, because science has its clutches on the psyche, both social and individual.

"But the work of Masters, however vital, was destructive if utilitarian. It marks the recognition of the challenge of science, not the solution of the problems presented.

"The naturalism of Masters is not the naturalism of younger writers. This much we can tell, even though the scene is too close for us to have much perspective or judgment on the issues itself."

2

Now here is a man buried alive, because there is nothing beyond the spirit of his own days. He is just catalogued.

All this literary criticism in America is an infamous zoological garden, an attempt to bury people alive.

You have to turn against this, gentlemen. Is your soul immersed in the year 1959? Are you obsolete because your first utterance took place in 1954, and now it's all over with? Has a man who wrote in 1954 not the right to be as fresh as the morning dew in 1974? What's all this talk about belonging to a certain generation?

3

You should despise this. That's how we begin. That's our prehistoric existence. You all are born in a certain moment. And it's your damned duty to put down your roots so far that you cover the thousands of years since Adam.

And Jesus is the second Adam, because He did just this. He was David's son. He was a prophet. He was a teacher. He was a Jew. He was a human being. And He was just as much a Gentile as He was a Jew, and therefore He can speak of Himself as a second Adam.

Because six thousand years of history, or five thousand years are all comprised in Him.

That's your duty, too. You are the man of all ages. You are not the man of your own age.

4

And this is putting down roots. You are the beginners of an endless future of future generations, or you are a harlot, or you are a murderer, or you are somebody who obstaculates the road to progress.

IV

1

We begin, as I say, once more in time, as a plant begins in space.

But that's not the story of the plant, and that's not my and your story. But if we have a seminar in history and a history department in this beautiful university, gentlemen, then you are in this history department to learn how people put down roots; that is, how we absorb other chapters of history. And we cannot read anything on history without posing yourself the question: how much future, how much past, balanced between the two. How much do I get deeper into the various spirits of the time so that I can pierce the crust, the hard crust of my own time and cease to belong of my time, and I wish everybody of you goes to Heaven as Lincoln went when Mr. Edward Stanton, his secretary of war, said -- what did he say?

("Now he belongs to the ages.")

That's the meaning of it. Very simple.

2

Who cares when Lincoln lived? And what we call "legend" is only when a man has become so powerful that it doesn't matter anymore that he would die in 1865. Everybody, every one of you has to become legendary. To become a legend means to rise finally above the encrustation by your own time. And that's what everybody has to hope for.

Formerly people called this, "He goes to Heaven."

Gentlemen and ladies, you will have to find a parallel expression, because wherever you turn to, you cannot be blessed if you are only a product of your own time, because you haven't then - not spoken. And to speak means to make room for the past and the future, and to decide what shall belong to the past and what shall go into the future.

3

And you cannot help -- whether you open your mouth and you make this decision. If you say, "It is," and if you say, "It was," and if you say, "It will be," you create the universe. That's why we know that God created the world, because we are part of it. We create it, so what's wondrous about it that He created it?

And still creating it, through us. Everybody knows it -- because everybody speaks. But when they sit down in these classrooms, and examine you, they turn against everything they do themselves.

4

So -- pardon me. This is the story of "*Ichabod*" and "*The Battle Hymn of the Republic*."

And you can see that our history at this moment is in terrible danger, because it has no power to invoke against these acts, these superstitions of the moment that man is a part of

his own time. What is his own time? Of this fleeting moment, like this poor Masters, who stands condemned in the terms of Mr. Muir, that he's 67 years old, and has to belong to a certain generation. Then he says, "But in 1915, he was already"-- this was written '37--40, so it doesn't hold water at all, because my generation in 1915 used to be 25. And now here he was 40 when he came out with his *Spoon River Anthology*. Now he's 67.

Procrustean bed.

SECOND PART: A COMPLETELY NEW TASK

CHAPTER ONE: THE INNOCENCE OF HAPPENING

I

1

And the infamous tone is: "The work of Masters was" -- I tell you, that's condemning the man to death. "It was." St. Augustine and Shakespeare have a much brighter future than you and I. I can assure you that. They are still coming. I still see the coming of the Lord in their works, but not in yours, and not in mine. We're just hangers-on, and dragged along with their genius.

Whom do we mention in history? Those who still have a future. Nobody else has to be mentioned. But we have to sift this wheat from the chaff all the time to save all these people who have a future, more than you and I.

2

So I think this review is a very good example -- let me read it to you once more:

"It was somewhat of a shock to this reviewer"-- then he shouldn't write a review if he has no relation to Mr. Masters, except as a museum curator of a museum of fossils.

"It was somewhat of a shock to this reviewer to realize that Mr. Masters is now 67 years of age." That's the fashion today. I take this just as a typical review--"As he was a contemporary with William Vaughan Moody, Clyde Fitch, Booth Tarkington, and that 22 years ago have passed since the sensational Spoon River Anthology in 1915. The periods of the book who so definitely marked the success of the prewar modernists" -- you have even difficulty of getting oriented -- "it marked so definitely the success of the prewar modernists, that it is still hard to think of its author as anything but a young radical."

He tries immediately to draw your attention just to -- here.

"That even at that time Mr. Masters was not young."

What of it?

"Spoon River was a culmination of many years of struggle to find expression. And its attainment was never repeated."

That's why it was a great book.

Even in the dirty soil of this moment, 1959, you can ... And then you can decry the handicap of being born in a barren time. That would be your special greatness.

"An era of literary history is brought to a close by the life record."

And that's all just for the museum. "An era of literary history."

Is Shakespeare brought to a close, because Ben Jonson lived longer than Shakespeare by an accident? As a matter of fact, Ben Jonson survived him by 25 years. But who mentions Ben Jonson?

But according to this, Ben Jonson, since he comes later, obviously he must be closer to us. And you live all under the auspices of this superstition.

3

Put it down that man is a creature of time, and you begin to be shaken up by the truth, that the moment is the smallest item, just as you put a seed as a matter of fact, on top, only half-an-inch deep in your garden soil. But you expect this soil to put down roots. And what is the consequence of this today? That most of you are at best grass, and not one of you becomes the tree. That oak and linden should simply signify first men like *Philemon and Baucis* in the old mythology, that's un-understandable today.

You are all too pleased if you are of one year, "Class of '58" or "Class of '62" you call it. And so you are reduced to an annual. But man is perennial. And the decision has to be made by you: are you perennials, or are you annuals?

But you try to be seventy times annuals that if you live every year a separate life, and it doesn't dawn on you that to live means to penetrate this crust of one year, and become perennial.

4

And these similes are not similes. We are organic substance.

And in a machine age of steel and iron, all you and I can do is to reconsider our own existence as the remnant of the organic world. We have to represent the topsoil when the machinery keeps drilling two thousand feet deep into the subsoil. And this is your and my honor that we live organicity that we live in the way in which organic life lives, through many passages, and many forms of existence without ever losing our identity. This you can only do -- you can only live the nine lives of a cat if you have access to the nine ages of human history.

II

1

And that's why I thought that -- uncommon as it is -- even you people graduating in American history or majoring therein, should know something of antiquity.

That's not wanton, because antiquity is the mosaic, out of which every one of us has to compose the phases of his life. We are cursed and blessed in alternation. At once we are Ruth, and at the other moment we are Hannah, and once we are Alexander the Great, and the next moment we are Jeremiah. And we have access to all these types, of kings, and prophets, and martyrs of antiquity in alternation. And we read it like an open book.

And that's the whole meaning of the Bible.

2

Now here we come to a Greek - Thucydides - who has gotten the Gentile mind out of mythology, just as the Jews. And he has created another aspect of history.

All people, you and I -- if you have to tell the story of this seminar, here -- that's why I wanted you to write a report -- to make you aware how all history at first is mythical. A myth begins with the end of the story, and then goes backward.

And what you saw in Samuel was the achievement that the story began at the beginning without anybody knowing anything more than he knew at that time. And that's the Book of Samuel. The modesty that not one of the participants of the game has power over the future. He lives on faith. We know already, but the people there don't.

3

Now myth makes the people know ahead of time. And that's, therefore, because I know, so probably there you, too. Whenever you get a mythical story about railroad kings, or vested interests, you make them always all-wise.

Most myth about American history is written about Mr. Rockefeller or Mr. Pierpont Morgan knowing what he was doing. I assure you, neither Lincoln nor Pierpont Morgan knew what they were doing. They just do it. The myth, however, puts tremendous plans and cunning octopus, spider into the minds of people. They aren't that clever.

4

But myth always begins backward. That is the normal behavior of boys, and cheap students, and classroom performance. Anything that is learned -- all your colleges are mythical institutions, because they know already the outcome, and think everybody did. And so they look at the other people as though they have performed on purpose. And the modern philosophy of, for example, utilitarianism is a typical academic idea, that people all are purposive, and get what they want, and do what they please, and plan, and there is always a nigger in the wood pile. And there's a boss -- he bosses everybody.

And that's the intellectual attitude.

III

1

THE STORY OF MR. LINDBERGH'S BABY KIDNAPPED

When Mr. Lindbergh's baby was kidnapped - that's thirty years ago - the French had the same attitude, the intellectuals in Paris. A friend of mine went to Paris, and he was immediately interviewed about the Lindbergh case, and they in Paris knew much better than the people in New York. And "Oh," they said, "He wasn't kidnapped. The boy wasn't kidnapped." "But he was. There was Bruno Hauptmann. He was really kidnapped." "Oh, no. No." "Now what's the story?" my friend said, who is a professor at Harvard.

And they said, "Oh, we know. There was a will of an uncle of Mrs. Lindbergh -- Morrow Lindbergh, very rich man and," they said -- "the will said, that she could only inherit money if there was a child." For a childless marriage he didn't provide. "So they had to have a child, but they had no child. So they adopted this child. And when then, that she was pregnant, and had a child of her own, they wanted to get rid of the first-born child. And that, instead of kidnapping -- poor Hauptmann was paid for eliminating the adopted child, which they had only adopted in order to get the money."

2

Now my friend was so upset. He wrote home to California where they had lived. There never was an uncle, there never was a will. The whole story was a hoax. And he told them so. He couldn't convince them. They said, "Well, if there was no will, if there was no money, the first child wasn't"

They know in Paris.

This is the myth of the intellectuals, because then everything was planned; it's a purposive scheme of things. Everything falls into the pattern of being known from the beginning.

You will see that all pseudo-history comes from imputing to the people that they didn't stumble on gold, but that they planned to find the gold in Klondike in the first place, for example. Everything is planned.

3

It has been said of the British Empire that it got together in their sleep. And that's a much truer story. The English are a great people, because they have never believed in purposive schemes. And they don't. That's why they got this big empire in sleep.

I think Manifest Destiny has played a role in this way here. This wasn't planned. It just came by circumstance.

4

So myth is always -- will you kindly take down this rule of knowledge?

At the end, we know the results, and we are apt to know everything in reverse order.

Therefore, we clothe the beginnings already with the results of the end. We dress up the mind of the beginning as though we knew the results. And it is very hard for us to understand that by faith and perseverance, results are brought about which have absolutely nothing to do with the will in the beginning phase or the plan, or the purpose.

IV

1

And so the people reduce, as Charles Beard does with his *Declaration of Independence*, they reduce the Declaration of Independence to purpose, that these people had to protect their property. It's childish, because people do many things without purpose, but under necessity.

You don't breathe for any purpose, but you have to breathe. And you sit here, I hope, without any purpose, because otherwise I couldn't teach you. You are unable to learn if you have a purpose. The more purpose you have in getting an A in an examination, the worse as a student you are. You have to surrender your purpose in order to learn.

2

And that's about any phase of life. If you cannot act spontaneously -- so that's why the Bible says, that you shouldn't prepare speeches as the Quakers do. Because if you will stand before magistrates and authorities, God will tell you what to say at this moment. And the more you plan it, the worse the speech will be.

Purpose is the curse of the student in looking into history, that he carries the knowledge of the end into the beginning.

3

Now Thucydides is, like the Bible, an attempt to cure the curious mind of later generations, the only curious mind from this superstition. What we call today "history," since the Bible and Thucydides is an attempt to do justice to the contemporaries of an event by not putting into their mind anything that they couldn't know at the time.

It's the innocence of happening which had to be restored.

All the forecasts are mythical, which we find in ancient history, that people were told beforehand the outcome of the Trojan War, and so on. That's why it is not history. But in the case of Thucydides we will see in which way he works.

4

But this is the problem of the classroom.

And here again, I want you to reconsider your statement. Today it's a great fashion to speak not only of symbols but of myth. Every second schoolchild has now to write papers on myth. But the myth of the school is the first you have to look through before you understand that myth is eternal, that everybody today is superior to myth.

Don't believe it for a minute. We all live by myth. And it is only with an effort that we wake up from our myth. We all impute to other people that are *purposive, and shrewd, or clever, and intelligent*. And they aren't; and we aren't. And one thing is always mythical.

The myth is empowering the participants in the struggle of having a hold over the event, or should have a hold. Don't be miscarriaged. Whereas in real life, there are always influences that are bigger than the event.

Myth is also isolated.

CHAPTER TWO: MYTH

I

1

Every myth is by itself. It cuts out.

A friend of mind, a great thinker in Europe, Hans Ehrenberg, once has said that all myth confines the powers at work in history to a specific place and a specific time.

So the whole reviewer of Mr. Lee Masters is mythical, by putting Mr. Masters in this box. You see, that's a myth.

2

The most outstanding example at this moment of the mythical treatment of history is a book by Perry Miller on Herman Melville. Has anybody seen it?

THE STORY OF PERRY MILLER'S BOOK ON MELVILLE

Perry Miller is a very good man. That's why I mention it, because it's so tragic. And he puts Herman Melville, the greatest American spirit we have - the representative of three hundred years of American history -- he puts him not only into the year 1850, but he makes him a part of the New York coterie, who tried to save American literature from New York. And he says, "He was only there a very minor star in the galaxy of New Yorkers. And I only treat him here as an appendix to Washington Irving and all the greater lights."

So poor Melville, not only, is not expanded into the reality of his existence, but he is even lowered. He is no longer Herman Melville, but just Arcturus Beta in a constellation of minor lights on Broadway.

(This is the Perry Miller who wrote the biography of Jonathan Edwards?)

Yes, yes. There he has fallen from -- that's "Ichabod."

3

You could write a poem on Perry Miller entitled "*Ichabod*". The greatness departed from Israel. It's horrid.

And I'm dealing with Melville this week. It's probably right after Easter. And I'm just horrified, that I have to come as a non-American to rescue Melville from the clutches of

this. Bury him not only in space but in time, but in space, too. Just making him an appendix of a little group in New York -- what has this man who went to the South Sea to do with New York? He after all, he had to live somewhere.

But is this reason enough to bury him under the rubbish heap of New York?

4

But that's all that myth is -- an attempt to make one section of time, and one section, of space single, universal, omnipotent.

I have tested it. It is perhaps to you a very strange definition. It's capable of real, of universal application. And since the word "myth" today is so popular, you'd better make something out of it.

Revelation is the courage to write the tenth chapter of Genesis. And to say the Hebrews -- my dear, that's not very much. They are just the sons, the grandsons of Sem, and therefore Sem is one brother only of Noah.

That's a very small story. That's anti-mythical.

And the Bible and Thucydides are anti-mythical books.

II

1

Because they are quite aware that history begins anywhere without a purpose, that it has ramifications far before the time crust of the moment of the individual, and far beyond. And that the implications are more important than what this little man marks off as a field of action in his own right, and his own mind, and also what the onlooker, who looks back tries to impute, who begins arbitrarily somewhere, and that this man's wicked plan.

Here, the father of the Constitution planned the defection from England. Or like Mrs. Lindbergh, she wanted to get the money; it's all planned. Whereas kidnapping is the disease of the American body politic, that has been brought about probably from the red Indians, in a slow process of centuries. And it comes to a climax in the Lindbergh case.

2

So myth is an attempt to impute the knowledge of the end to the past, and puts time and space into separate boxes. In this you can connect first cause and effect in such a way.

I think we have to make a break here.

CHAPTER THREE: ORGANIZED ASSOCIATION

I

1

Well, I have no finals for this seminar. So I have to put you to work during the term. And I would like you to write a biography -- or the life of -- a "biography" is too proud a word; I don't mean this - but it's the life of Thucydides and of Caesar.

And with the life of Thucydides, I mean what we only know of Thucydides through his book. All that is known of Thucydides comes from his own text, mostly. Nearly all. And supposedly the later life of Thucydides was written up late in antiquity, simply composed of the facts mentioned in his own history about himself.

2

Now that's a very strange situation, of course, and it's very interesting. You will have to go to the library and find older and better translations with indices about Thucydides. I see that this edition has no index, so you cannot be sure that all the places where Thucydides is mentioned are found in your text. So you have to go to the library and work a little bit more carefully about what he says of himself, and what we therefore have to conclude.

It is as much as in the case of Thucydides as in the case of Caesar. Very much light is thrown upon the book, if you understand who the man was and his position. They are not learned men in the sense in which today a man becomes a professor of history.

3

And one thing that you should carry away from our meeting -

to be a historian is not to be a professor of history.

And to be a professor of history is not to be an historian.

And to be a professor of philosophy doesn't make you into a philosopher.

To be a philosopher is one thing and to be a professor of philosophy who can teach other people's philosophies, and systematize them; that's a different story. We are today in this handicap that the academic professions have swallowed up the original faculties of the human race, which are

prophecy, and history writing, and poetry.

And more and more poets are made now college professors, just to have a roof over their heads. And so it is possible that in fifty years, the American students will believe that the

arts and sciences are really taken care of under the sheltered roofs of institutions. All the poets have become institutionalized; in other words, have gone insane.

4

And this is a very great danger. To be an historian is an original capacity of man. Any grandmother has it who tells tales. That's an historian already, the beginning at least of one. But to be a professor of history, and to be examined in history, and be a senior -- that's something derivative. That's second-rate.

I myself am in this position. But we have to be very humble and say that we take the existence of historians for granted and now build on them.

II

1

Now Thucydides is not of this type, and the Book of Samuel is not of this type, and Caesar is not of this type.

And one of the worst situations in this country is that there is a defiance that these are original faculties of the human genius to become a historian. And it has absolutely nothing to do with any status in the community.

The same with poetry. It is hopeless to demand a literary recognition of a writer. This is still known. But it's the same: Benjamin Franklin was a physicist, but he was not a professor of physics. His was a direct relation to the lightning rod, and not a relation derived from an appointment by other people.

2

I tell you why this is very important at this moment. Because we now have foundations who support now the arts and the sciences. And so it seems that they are all taken care of. They have the Guggenheim for creative effort, and so on. And we have the Rockefeller Foundation, and what- not. Eight thousand foundations.

Well, will you kindly consider that to have to go before a foundation is already proof that you think that you can make yourself understood before you have achieved what you do.

Now any real achievement is something that hasn't been done, yet.

And therefore it can never be approved beforehand by a president of a responsible foundation. He has to disapprove it, because it's uncertain. It's not safe.

3

Now all these people have to play it safe in these foundations. And the bigger they are, the more. The Ford Foundation has to give four hundred million dollars away to all the schools, because that is safe.

It's useless. Perfectly useless. Nothing has happened to this distribution of four hundred million dollars. But if you would give five thousand dollars to an unknown genius, you would be able to make yourself ridiculous. And probably would.

And people have told me that these foundations - that they prefer to give away five million dollars than to support a real genius for four thousand dollars, because with five million dollars, they support a growing enterprise, something that everybody already knows about and approves of. But four thousand dollars that may be thrown away.

Of course it may be thrown away. But perhaps what you do with it is much further than if you save Herman Melville for having to become a customs inspector in New York, that would be certainly a greater deed than to support obsolete cancer research, as you do in this country now with hundreds of millions of dollars, just because Mr. Pasteur lived in 1879.

4

Cancer research in this country is a great example of a complete waste. Just because the presidents of these foundations are obsolete. Anybody who is not doing a thing himself is less knowing, what can be done than the man in the front line obviously.

III

1

So we are very much handicapped at this moment, because these foundations publish even their philosophies. The Rockefeller Foundation has the effrontery to publish the philosophy of the Rockefeller Foundation.

Money has no philosophy.

And how can they know how to handle a growing universe and a growing spirit?

Philosophy of the Rockefeller. Nobody laughs. It's the most laughable thing I've ever heard in my life. Philosophy of the Rockefeller Foundation. The arrogance of money carried a little too far. Money has no philosophy. It's a means. Means have no philosophy.

2

But this means that these men in the Rockefeller Foundation, they have supported astrologers and the most subversive mentalities, sectarians. Because that's nothing original. Nothing creative. Nothing that hasn't happened before that they couldn't catalog.

Geniuses are now only to be found in this country in lunatic asylums. Because there is an absolute abhorrence, except for jokers. The only originality you have is Bob Hope, and such people, and Will Rodgers, and so on. But clowns can be original; the Marx Brothers can be.

3

Now -- so we have this,

the story of the folklore.

And then you have the historian.

And then you have professors of history.

And finally, you have organized science, or organized historiography,

as we have it today with these foundations, and these magazines, and the American Historical Association: organized association. And everything serves quite a different purpose.

This is prehistorical folklore. The historian is creating history. They are reporting on the creation of history. And these people unfortunately think that the reporting on historians is more important than being an historian.

And so the difficult situation in which we are in every field of human endeavor at this moment, that the organizations of history, of painting, of architecture -- whatever you take -- are in their selection of what you should support, always inclined to support the second-rate man as against the first-rate man. Because the first-rate man is an unfinished, a raw product; and the other has already has the cellophane, and is salable, and six recommendations and everybody says, "Oh, that's Course 180, or 198". That's already in the catalog.

4

You cannot organize creative effort. You can only organize derivative effort.

This is important for you to know in your own life.

Now that's not true of the historian only. It's true of any other field. It's even true, I assure you -- which will startle you -- of medicine. But I have seen original doctors by birth. We talked about this here. And I have seen people who have a doctor's degree -- just perfectly indifferent. You can be an M.D., but that doesn't make you into a physician, in the sense

of Hippocrates. For many doctors, the oath of Hippocrates is the only moment in which they are face-to-face with original medicine. The rest is textbook.

Anybody who goes home after an eight-hour day, and says he has done his duty is second-rate.

Take a nurse. They have now the eight-hour day. Now -- that's second-rate.

IV

1

THE STORY OF A GARDENER

In our garden, we have a gardener. He is hired by the owner of the house. We have nothing to do with it. Now a friend of ours who's lame, limping, had carried their garden chair downstairs in the garden -- somewhere down below, and wanted to get it up when it began to rain. And she was afraid that it might get wet. And so she asked him, this gardener from San Pedro who was working there and his wife, both -- would they help her -- she was limping, she's lame, had an operation -- would she kindly help her to carry the chair up? They said, "No," because they weren't hired for that. They were gardeners.

2

Now the danger of any such professor of history, too -- or any professional man -- is that it isn't within his tariff, within his contract, so he hasn't to do it.

So many people in the hospital there destroyed their family relations, because fifty years ago, there was no social service for the relations of the man who went to the hospital.

THE STORY OF GOING TO THE HOSPITAL

My friend Richard Cabot started in Massachusetts for the first time a service for the family of a man who had to go to the hospital -- or the mother, especially, for the children. That's now understood that there is some such interest on the sidelines of a treatment. That's the usual surgeon, in a hospital setting thought that wasn't his consideration, what happened to the family.

Of course in many cases, the patient couldn't even get well, because the mother was so much worrying in her bed in the hospital over the children so that even the medical effort was frustrated, because the children were not cared for.

3

This is now a case in point where the average professional man was not taking the situation in, but acted within the limits of a profession.

Now you cannot become an historian if you act within the limits of what is expected to be a textbook in your profession for an examination. That's a different story. That's derivative.

Textbooks are one thing. And original history is something else.

4

For the historian, the boundaries of his task are to be discovered as he goes along. And for the professor of history the boundaries of his task are all pre-established.

That's why you are on safe ground in a textbook. Nothing ever happens. It's all delimited. The limitations to the next department, and what doesn't go in, and what does go in, it's all predisposed.

(I don't like textbooks.)

Well. Good for you.

CHAPTER FOUR: THUCYDIDES

I

1

So Thucydides and Caesar are the stars of the historians. I don't say that I would have to write history as they did. But you understand: the principles of our own history could be different. But the originality, that we did something for the first time, is important.

Just as the Book of Samuel is. Something was done in the discovery of the task.

2

And may I make this remark that is against all your evolutionary schemes?

The first is always the best. Jesus is the best Christian. This nobody can deny. Moses is the best Jew. Abraham is. The first is the best.

That's against all your grain. Any pluralization, the multiplication of great model will always lead to a watering down, to a dilution of type. The first must be the best. Otherwise he couldn't be creative.

This is against everything you have imbibed. And therefore I have to struggle. Thucydides and Caesar and the Bible are the best. Homer is the greatest poet of all times. Very strange. Hard to understand, but he is, to this day. There's no greater poet.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S BITTER EXPERIENCE

I have learned this by bitter experience. I grew up as you did grow up, with all these superstitions, that later is better.

So in this sense, your going to the ancients for seeing what it means to create out of nothingness a picture is important.

3

Now would you kindly begin to read this text? And see in what this originality consists, how it is, on what it is based, or what makes Thucydides a beginner of a completely new task.

(Read the introduction? Or --)

No, his own text. No introduction.

"I began like this since the very outbreak of the war, in the belief that it was going to be a great war, and more worth writing about than any of those that had taken place in the past. My belief was based on the fact that two sides were at the great heights of their powers and preparedness, and I saw too that the rest of the Hellenic world committed to one side or the other. Even those who were not immediately engaged were deliberating on the courses which they would take later. This was the greatest disturbance in the history of the Hellenes."

Now will you take down this sentence? This one sentence. You have no text? You write it down, this sentence this weekend. Will you kindly say it once more?

"This was the greatest disturbance in the history of the Hellenes" -

(how do you pronounce that? Hellenes?)

THE STORY OF PRONUNCIATING GREEK WORDS

Well, it's arbitrary how this man tries to do. We used to say "HELLens" in English. Now people are more sensitive to the original Greek poem, so they introduce "HELL een ess." But how to pronounce it, the Greeks would say "HELL ay NEHS," that's the European pronunciation. In America, we use what is called iotacize. That is, you prefer for the eta, the sound "I." HELL en EEs. Perfectly arbitrary. I can't tell you. It's a new invention fifty years ago, that the translator would have spelled it H-e-l-l-e-e-n-s. And, for example, Greece is officially not "Greece," the "Kingdom of the Hellenes," at this moment, in Hellas, the newer kingdom of Greece.

So would be somebody be good enough to look this up in the postal directory and go to a regular Post Office and ask them to show you the international list. And -just as it is with the Netherlands - it's called the "Kingdom of the Netherlands," and not "Holland." Or not "Dutch." So I think that the official title is the "King of the Hellenes," the king of Greece. It's not "King of Greece."

So obviously it should then be "Hellens" today. But he said "Hellenes," and I don't blame him, because so many beautiful Greek forms have been transmitted to us through the Latin and then have been shortened.

(I've heard one pronunciation with that spelling, of "HELL een.")

No, well. It's Hellene -- it's the full Greek form without any transformation, whereas before, down to 1900, we quoted the Greek names -- that's perhaps useful for you, you have heard of these Greek forms in their Latin transformation. And as we said not Zeus, but Jupiter very often, so in Swinburne, you can find still "Ulixes," instead of "Odysseus" even, and well, give me another -- "Hercules" instead of "Heracles". Greek, it's "Heracles." "Hercules" is the Latin transformation. Well, I think that "Hercules" is only in Shakespeare. It's all "Hercules," and never "Heracles." And now every poet would write "Heracles," and it has disappeared, the Latin intervening form. I'm just looking for other such names that would have undergone the same -

You see, "Alexandros" we say today very often. But the Romans say "Alexander." So you say still, "Alexander the Great". That's the Latin form. The Greeks never said "Alexander"; they said "Alexandros." That's just one more. Well, Agamemnon the same. Yet you say Achilles. But in Greek of course it's Achillois. Achillus, this is like Odysseus. But the Romans said "Achilles," so we say "Achilles." And probably ten years from now, we will all say "Achillois."

And any Greek word has in the humanistic period of the Renaissance been adopted first in its Latin form, not in its Greek form. And it's only now that we recover our sense of propriety and historicity, and give the names back their old splendor.

4

"Aristotle" is of course the Latin form, instead of "Aristoteles." People will, I think -- well I don't know in this country, it's too popular.

The more popular a name, the less you can change it.

We in Germany already say "Aristotles," which is nearer to the Greek than "Aristotle." Because Luther threw out Aristotle for good from the schools. We had persecuted Aristotle, so now he has been purged and can come back in his pure Greek form.

But you are still all Aristotelians; it's very benighted.

II

1

THE STORY OF SCHOLASTICISM IN EUROPE

This America is the only country in which scholasticism still holds sway over your minds. You still believe in the Aristotelian logic, and that was the great bible of the school-men of the 14th century. You have still colleges, all the forms of the medieval university.

On the continent of Europe, that all has been abolished. The Reformation destroyed all the remnants of scholastic forms of scholarship.

You still have a master of arts. There is no master of arts in Germany there. You have a bachelor of arts. That's all medieval terms. We have no bachelor of arts.

2

So Luther, and Melanchthon, and all the reformers in Germany turned against the schoolmen, against Thomas Aquinas, and against Bonaventura, and against Abaelard, and said, "That's all superstition." And Aristotle, being the patron of the medieval university,

was destroyed on the continent. And you here, and wanting to have all the good traditions of everything that was found in Europe, have been very shy. You have the common law of England, and you have the universities of the Middle Ages in your set-up here.

It's very interesting. The type of university life on this campus is much more akin to the medieval university than the life in Paris or in Heidelberg. That's much more radically changed.

3

THE STORY OF THE CONSERVATIVE FRONTIER

So the more you come to a frontier, the more conservative features you get. The oldest English is spoken in America. In America, it's "Berkeley." How is it in London?

(BARK ley.)

That's new. "BER kley" is old. In my own town, we call it "NOR witch." But in England, the town of Norwich is called "NOR itch." The "w" is not pronounced. So we have kept the older pronunciation. And the Pennsylvania Dutch still speak 17th-century German. The Germans speak 20th-century German. So the frontier is always conservative.

And the Moslem in Bosnia in Yugoslavia still have the fez, the turbans whereas the Turks in Kemal Attaturk's Turkey don't have it. And they still have the harem for the women in these Moslem provinces of Yugoslavia.

Because the more you come to the frontier, the more unable is the region to change on its own, the more anxious it is to show that it has still the old tradition.

4

Since again, this is unknown. You think the frontier is modern. Fortunately it isn't, because that's the only way in which old things can be retrieved, from the frontiers. There they are preserved. Cockney English is three centuries more recent than the English spoken in Pennsylvania or in Vermont.

III

1

Now why did I tell you this? Because I wanted to tell you that the historian here makes a tremendous statement.

"It's the greatest occurrence in the history of the warfare of Greece."

This is the sentence you should single out, because it points out to the fact that history originated with the feeling of elation that something tremendous has happened. The biggest is just good enough for history.

Again, this is today objected to.

He doesn't even argue the point.

Will you go on?

(Do you want me to read that sentence over again?)

This one sentence. Has everybody taken it down? I think it's unique. I know of no other historian who only states, "That's the biggest event". And it's the opposite from Samuel. It's bigness, the greatness, the exultation. Standing out, show. Here, it's the essence of secular history, that it is not moved by the little emotions, the small, still voice of the heart. But it is moved, because mountains have been displaced, have been moved.

2

The Greeks had a special word for this, showy fest, as they called it. It was something to be shown at the festivals of the land like on the Fourth of July, that's the Declaration of Independence. But it's very American to say this about any event then: "It is the greatest." And this is a good reason to write history.

Go on, here.

"This was the greatest disturbance in the history of the Hellenes, affecting also a large part of the non-Hellenic world, and indeed I might also say the whole of mankind."

The greatest under all aspects. And he makes three distinctions: the Athenians have a history, the Hellenes have a history, mankind has a history. So again -- in the opposite sequence as in the Bible, you get the inner ring, the wider circle, and the extreme circle. It's all in space. We are here, in the middle, Athenian history; Greek history; human history.

That's your vision of universal history. In concentric circles.

3

"Although I have found it impossible, because of its remoteness in time to acquire a really precise knowledge of the distant past, or even of a history preceding our own period, yet after looking back into it as far as I can, all the evidence leads me to conclude that these periods were not great periods, either in warfare or in anything else. It appears, for example, that the country now called Hellas had no settled population in ancient times. Instead there was a series of migrations, as the various tribes came under the constant pressure of invaders, who were stronger than they were, were always prepared to abandon their own country. There was no commerce and no fishing, and ..."

Will you now kindly understand that what he's now doing is to reason why this is the greatest event. And he will now give you a glance into all history that leads up to it, always under the aspect: why is my event the greatest?

This is not very clear to most readers, that he's now building up his case to prove that this is the greatest case in history.

Go on.

4

"There was no communication and there was no commerce and no safe communication either by land or at sea. The use they made of their land was limited to production of necessities. They had no surplus left over for capital, and already the..."

Well, this "capital" is just infamous. That's not a Greek term. And that's just an invention of this New School of Economics. He knows nothing of this.

Capital -- these translations are so impertinent, so impudent, because they carry back into the old history the categories of these modern men. It's not right.

IV

1

"since they lacked production of fortifications, and at any moment an invader might appear and take their land away from them. Thus in the belief that the day-to-day necessities of life would be secured just as well in one place as in another, they showed no reluctance in moving from their homes, and therefore built no cities of any size or strength, nor acquired any important resources. Where the soil was most fertile, there were the most frequently changes of population. As in what is now called Thessaly in Boeotia and most of the Peloponnese, except for Arcadia and in the others of the rich parts of Hellas.

For in these fertile districts, it was easier for individuals to secure greater powers than their neighbors. This led to disunity and often caused the collapse of the estates, which in any case were more likely than others to attract the attention of foreign invaders and the most interesting to occur in Attica; that Attica, because of the poverty of her soil, was remarkably free from political disunity."

Now that's completely arbitrary. This is not a footnote; that's in the text. But in your edition there, it has been put in a footnote.

(Well, he made a statement in his introduction that he felt that had Thucydides been writing this book in the present time, he would have placed certain passages in footnotes. Therefore he has taken the liberty himself.)

I know. But what do you say to that?

(It would be included into the text, rather than putting it in a footnote.)

No. And if so, has he a right for this reason, because he invented footnotes, to change the text and do better? It's incredible. The arrogance of these people is just -- I can't understand it.

2

You would not write the Psalms today in this responsory mood, in one-half verse, and one-half verse, as we do in our responsive reading. And so you'd better treat the Psalms then without the repetition. That would be the consequence.

(I am curious to know, how much did they use footnotes at all in antiquity?)

No footnotes. But they would say, "Let me here digress." And then they would return. They would call it a digression.

(Couldn't we say that he's here just trying to make Thucydides fashionable?)

I'm afraid he's just trying to make him into a textbook. Not fashionable, a textbook. It's a lowering of the rank. Fashionable would be still excused. Footnotes are not fashionable.

3

Now this footnote put it up in the text. "Certainly Attica" -- let me read it to you to see here how the famous Jowett translates it.

He was the greatest translator of Greek texts -- he was the master of Baliol in Oxford. And it's a little boring now, because it's Victorian style. But I still think that he was much more careful. He would never speak of "capital," because capital is something quite different from the amassment of wealth.

In Mycenae, we find these treasures, so that the king could be liberal, and generous in giving premiums to heroes with the golden spear, or golden helmet, or what-not. But that's not capital. That's a treasure, or work, or whatever he calls it. And that's what Thucydides is speaking of. He's not speaking of capital. He does not speak of new investments.

"Certainly Attica, of which the soil was poor and they enjoyed long freedom from civil strife, and therefore retained its original inhabitants, and in confirmation of my argument supported by the fact that Attica, through immigration, increased in population more than any other region. For the leading men of Hellas, when driven out of their own country, by war or revolution, sought as asylum as Athens, and from the very earliest times, being admitted to rights of citizenship, so

greatly increased the number of inhabitants, that Attica became incapable of containing them, and was at last obliged to send out colonies to Ionia."

Now, go on, please. Who has the text? You have, do you?

4

"Another point which seems to me good evidence for the weakness of the early inhabitants of the country is this. We have no record of any action taken by Hellas as a whole before the Trojan War. Indeed, my view is that, at this time, the whole country was not even called Hellas. Before the time of Hellen, the son of Deucalion?"

THE STORY OF DEUCALION

Deucalion. Deucalion is supposed to be the first man who created offspring by throwing stones after the Great Flood, in back of him, and then men would arise. So he is an important person. Deucalion is the Noah of the Greeks.

THIRD PART: TRIBES - VALLEYS - GREEKS - JEWS

CHAPTER ONE: THE GREEKS

I

1

And may I say this in passing?

THE STORY OF COMMON TRADITIONS

That the Greek mythology and the Old Testament had very many of these traditions in common.

The pounding of the titans against the Olympus, toppling the mountains of Ossa and Pelion, on top of all the other in order to storm Olympus, obviously is related the story of Babylon, building a tower that reaches into the sky.

And we have every reason to believe that the Greek traditions, which were founded between 1500 and 1000 B.C., and must have been formulated at that time, and the Jewish tradition, probably connected through the Phoenicians, went back to a common attempt to cope with the antecedents of the human race.

2

This is not limited to the Jews and to the Greeks. They all - everybody -- you, too -- you have some way, even dimly, to look at our antecedents. And the Bible is not understood if you do not see that the Jews undertook to stabilize the minimum of common tradition in the first books, in the pre-Jewish story, that everybody would have to admit that. And so - they being surrounded by people who had gone through similar experience of migration and settlement - the first book of Moses is to be taken as the summary of the common experiences of the human race, only in such a way that the Jewish writer keeps it clean from superstition.

That's the whole story of the founding of Egypt, and the founding of Sumer and Assyr, and Sumeria, and Nineveh -- Babylon in the story of Noah. Noah is the purified founder of a country with wine, and after the flood, then.

3

Well, I could go on. It's a long story. But I only wanted to tell you that the tradition here of Deucalion is not a purely Greek tradition. Just as we have traced the origin of the Jewish tradition in the Old Testament to a wider connection with Babylonian myth; you must do

the same about Greek mythology. That's not simply Greek, but it's an attempt in Greek terms to justify what was known of the power of people to deal with flooded land, to irrigation, with turning the desert into fruitland.

4

"Deucalion. The name did not exist at all. The biggest parts were known by the names of different tribes. But the name of Pelasgian predominated.

THE STORY OF THE WORD "PELASGIAN"

Now the word "Pelasgian" -- there was a Pelasgian ritual you find still in the days of Caesar and Augustine in Greece. And it's pre-Greek. And the significance, as far as I can make out, is that it has to do with the tradition of using irrigation. "Pelagos" means the sea. And as Poseidon was at that time the god of the pre-Greek population -- after all, the god of water. So it seems that the -- how do you call the people who go down in the swamps, the stable building --?

(Lake-dwellers?)

Lake-dwellers. That "Pelasgian" is a term like "lake-dwellers," the people who knew how to cope, and how to put to use water, and flood, and inundation. And that they were called "Pelasgians" from their art of dealing with the *pelages*, with the water. This cannot be proven. But I think the word "*pelas*" "*pelagos*" also means stork.

Now the stork is famous for his long legs, that he can stand in any flooded area and still reach the ground.

II

1

And so we have reason to believe that the Greeks gave to these original inhabitants when they came there, a name from what they were doing. And what the Greeks were not able to do -- the Greeks came as belligerent, as warriors, over the mountains of the Balkans, invading this territory. They found a civilized countryside, with fruit trees, and fields, and cattle-grazing, and plowing, and harrowing, and harvesting. And it seems that they gave, in their astonishment, the name to these people as the people who knew how to fertilize land in regular circulation with water.

It would be the same here, when you come to such a region, what strikes you in Los Angeles is the miracles water can do. So everybody has to have a swimming pool to waste a little more water than is necessary.

We are all Pelasgians here.

2

"After Hellen and his son had grown powerful in Phthiotis, and had been invited as allies into other states, these stayed separate -- and because of their connection with the family of Hellen, began to be called Hellenic. But it took a long time for the name The best evidence of this can be found in Homer who, though he was born much later than the time of the Trojan War, nowhere uses the name Hellenic for the whole force. Instead he keeps this name for the followers of Achilles, who came from Phthiotis, and who were in fact the original Hellenes.

For the rest in his poem, he uses the words Danaan, Argives, and Achaeans. He does not even use the term "foreigners," and since in my opinion, it's because at this time, the Hellenes were not yet known by one name, and so marked off at something separate from the outside world. In any case, the various Hellenic states. By Hellenic, I mean both -- they were both those who took on the names city by city, as a result of the common language and those who later were all called by the common name weakened themselves in my opinion with one another in those kinds of collective actions brought about the Trojan War. And they did not cast any eye, even for the Trojan expedition unless they had previously acquired great knowledge of"

Now, look -- I can't draw really, but in order to draw your attention to the fact of the migration of the name "Greek." And that's quite important, because of Thucydides' life in Athens -- Thucydides had his wealth up here. He is a mine owner, at the coast.

3

THE STORY OF THE GREEK MAP

And here is his favorite Chalkidiki, where the monks of Athos sit. And here it would be Saloniki -- Thessaloniki. You have heard of the city of Thessaloni -- Paul writes a letter to the Thessalonians. And even up there and this would be the Balkans and Macedonia. And here is Thracia. Here is Troy. Here is the entrance to the Marnae, and here is Byzantium, Constantinople. And you don't have to go into this.

And Homer is written in a dialect which was obviously spoken here, in Lesbos, and here at the shore -- south of Troy, of Asia Minor -- here, I have put Miletus here, the island of Chios from which probably Homer sprang, the oldest man from whom we know anything about Greek, and whom Thucydides here is quoting as a proof.

Now the motherland of Greece is Thessaly. Here is the home of Achilles. And Achilles is the hero of the center region of Thessaly, which is called Phthia. Phthiotis you have read in the text just a moment.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY CLIMBING PHTHIOTIS

I have climbed it two years ago. It's very wonderful to behold the way, and when you stand there, where the Achilles' home is supposed to be, you see the Ossa and the Pelion, and you see how people could think that if you could only put one on top of the other, you

could climb Olympus, because in front of you, you see Olympus in the north, and on your right, you see Ossa and Pelion; and Ossa is triangular and Pelion is square. And so you are very tempted to put the triangle on top of the square and reach up to Olympus.

4

And if you once have seen this, you understand that everything in -- ritual -- method and mythology, methodology centers has been born in this Hellenic region, of Phthia, where Achilles' home is.

And you have lost this connotation. You hear of Athens and of Sparta, and you never think that when the Greeks came across the Balkans on these two pathways to the Valley of ... here, which is very narrow indeed -- here, I should put it up to ... and then they came down this valley here, they found the first agriculture, the first, and cultivated land in Thessaly.

Today this is still big agriculture. Thousands and thousands of acres are cultivated with American machinery. Americans agricultural implements are everywhere over the place, and only in Thessaly, because only there you have these large fields in Greece. Everywhere down south is much smaller, it's much more high. It's more mountainous, and there aren't even ..., so you can't combine the effort and really combine.

III

1

THE STORY OF THE GREEKS AND THE ANGLO-SAXONS IN BRITAIN

Now let us consider then, that at the time that Thucydides writes, he is still fully aware of the full picture of Greece, because he is here, far away, as an Athenian citizen, however. But he has mining interests. So he is quite aware of the in-between. But most people who live in Greece, and live on these islands here, they are colonial, or they live in Sicily. The one city of Miletus had one hundred colonies in the days of Thucydides. One hundred other cities all having sprung, the New England of England, Miletus.

But just as the Anglo-Saxons came from the continent of Europe once to England, so the Greeks -- the great colonizers-- had come from these backwoods of Saxony called Thessaly.

And you do not think of these people of Anglo-Saxons as continental people. You think they are island people. In the same sense, I would suggest to you that you have to think of the Greeks in their majority consider themselves as British -- that is, living on islands or on peninsulas. But they had also come from the mainland, not only of Europe in general,

beyond the Alps, and then to Thessaly, and their superiority has been the horse. They had conquered Greece because they had horses. And the original settlers in the valleys of the Mediterranean, all around the Mediterranean, were all bull people.

THE STORY OF THE BULL-FIGHT IN SPAIN

That's why you still have in Spain the bullfight to this day. That's pre-Greek, pre-Indo-European.

2

THE STORY OF THE INDO-EUROPEANS

The Indo-Europeans conquer these countries by their superior cavalry, by their chariots. The Armenians, the Hindus, the Persians, the Hittites, the Greeks, the Romans, the Celts, the Germans -- they are those groups who overrun all the old settlements of the world only because they had the superior armament of horses. That's all they did.

Otherwise -- if you go to India today, they boast, these Brahmins, that they are all from the white man's stock. But they aren't. They are all very colorful indeed. But the conquest of India came from the horsemen who passed the high mountains in the north-west.

And Mr. Nehru or Mr. Gandhi pretend that they all come from their stock. It was a handful of people. And I don't think there's anybody in India who has anything, except some maharaja, may have still some blood from these old conquerors, because this was a minute group of people. But they have imposed their literature, their poetry, their religion on these conquered people.

3

Now it's very similar with the Greeks. I think nine-tenths of the people living in Greece in the days of Thucydides had not one pint of blood of Indo-European descent. They all were conquered by these horsemen, by these charioteers. That's why they have become very proud of being like the Picts and the Scots in Scotland, who are not Indo-Europeans. They are all pre-Indo-Europeans, but they are very proud that they are Anglo-Saxons.

And I think therefore the story of the spread of the word "Hellen" is a very good story, because there is this little island of the Hellenes, and we find it still here in Dodona, in Epirus. The priests there were called "vellens," that's the same name. And they were still pre-nomadic people. They were not allowed to build temples.

The priests of Dodona are quite important for us, because they still represent the state of affairs in which the Indo-Europeans were nomads and therefore never built temples. They prayed to their gods in the grove, in the forest.

4

So today we are very much aware of the intrusive character of the Greeks and the Romans into Mediterranean culture in which settlement, irrigation, astronomy, and temple-building was already prevalent. And for these medieval people -- you find them in Sardinia today -- they are quite fashionable. The Etruscans belong to this group, and are all over the Mediterranean, everything you travel in Europe -- in Italy, in the Mediterranean today is very much *en vogue*, when it can be pointed out that it's pre-Roman, pre-Greek. Think of Crete, and Mycenae.

IV

1

Now well, the difference is always that pre-Greek is without the horse, and without any reminiscence of the old warrior and tribal order. That had been uprooted already in the Mediterranean. It's a purely an era of settlement, and of Isis and Osiris, and of sky-worship. The flood at the harvest time, you have to deal with the sky.

The Greeks come in, and try to keep as much as possible -- because they are the victors -- they have pre-Mediterranean mores and convictions, and call these people who are just given to the water problem or the irrigation problem the Pelasgians.

2

And I think that makes sense to you. Perhaps you can learn to distinguish then three layers -- the Greeks are a special people, because they are nomads who enter a settlement and try to save from their nomadic features as much as possible by building it into the settlement civilization which in itself is later.

So the Greeks are modernizing the settlement civilization of the big empires by trying to rescue a part of the pre-settlement mores of the wild tribes.

To give you a stunning example. The Phaeacians -- you know who they are -- the Phaeacians in Homer. Who are they?

(They have a little island on which the)

And what do they do to Odysseus?

(They treat him as a guest; they are very gracious.)

And so it's the ideal country.

THE STORY OF THE PHAECIANS

The best island in the Mediterranean, which is ruled by And in this shipwreck, Odysseus learns without great astonishment that the 25 sons of the King are married to the 25 sisters of him. They had 25 sisters. That is, incest is a rule in Egypt. And it is a rule in all agricultural countries, because you don't want to split the property.

3

And that's a second, a later stage. In any nomadic civilization that's strictly forbidden. People are put to death if they mix with their sister. So this is a very clear case, where the Greeks supersede which you would call a later civilization by abhorring themselves these modernized, matriarchical -- as you may call them, or I call them better "sorority" -- marriage, and get accepted as a higher civilization, because while the Phaecians are shown as the more advanced people, the more cultural people.

And they have the elegance, and all the advantages of civilization. And what we find as Greek culture, just as much as the Jewish, Judaism and Greeks both appear after the earth is settled in the river valleys where there is irrigation, and after the nomads have spilled all over the whole earth.

4

So Jews and Greeks are third attempts. They come very late indeed. And you cannot understand Thucydides or Plato, for that matter -- if you ever read Plato -- without understanding that Plato, as well as Thucydides, and the writers of the Bible took it for granted that there were Egyptians and Scythians, that there were migratory tribes and settled cities.

CHAPTER TWO: GREEKS AND JEWS

I

1

These two layers were accepted. And the Jews and the Greeks both protest against these forms as in themselves impossible.

And the difference between the Jews and the Greeks is the following: the Greeks prophesy a time when there will be neither incest-marriage and the deification of kings, nor mere migration and more constant warfare; but the Greeks try to mix the two.

So if you have two states of life, you can say, "I compromise." That the Greeks did. Or "I will rise above them." That's Israel. But both have in front of them the same world of migratory tribes, and in the river valleys, definite settlement. As in Thessaly -- also final settlement, where people say, "We won't move."

2

THE STORY OF THE EGYPTIANS

To this day, the Egyptians don't migrate. Syrians migrate, Arabs migrate, Turks migrate. The Egyptians don't. You have no Egyptians in the city of Los Angeles. You have everybody here, but the Egyptians still drink Nile water, because Nile water is sacred.

And when the Americans brought into Luxor a water supply with artesian wells, the Egyptians to this day won't touch it, because it's not Nile water. They prefer the old river civilization to this day.

3

Now this is what the name "Hellen" stands for. The word "Hellen" became so important, in Greek history, because it reminded the people of their pre-Mediterranean relations and rules. If you said "Hellen," you meant a man, an invading horseman, as if you say, "Anglo-Saxon" today in this country. It's a similar connotation of antiquity.

That's why a Hellen is a man who has not succumbed to the lures of the Orient, to the soft-boiled ritual of the harem, and the pharaoh, and Osiris ritual and the cult of palace, and all the fertility rites of the Mediterranean. Although he uses these means of existence, he is still superior to them with his free spirit as a warrior.

4

(The last passage in the very last passage in Herodotus speaks of it, where Cyrus, after they had conquered the Medes, and made themselves lords of Asia, the various tribal chieftains came and said, "Now that we can do it -- let's go down into the civilized Fertile Crescent and make ourselves lords of that country." And then he -- "No let's stay here; otherwise we'll become soft, because soft countries breed soft people.")

Did anybody have to read Plato? Or did anybody voluntarily read Plato?

(No.)

Nobody has read *The State* by Plato?

(The Republic.)

Well, in *The Republic*, Plato makes this distinction between the three political orders -- don't you remember? -- of the tribes, and of the country. Only he gives them different names. But you have to just use our modern names to understand what he's trying to tell, that the Greeks are in a special case.

The Egyptians are the ones of the belly; the warriors, the nomadic tribes are of the chest, of the heart; and the Greeks must be of the mind -- here, of the front. You remember?

This tripartition is the way in which Plato recognizes that the Greeks are neither nomadic warriors, nor citizens. City-dwellers. This is the way in which he puts it.

But Thucydides' attempt here to say what is Hellenic. Hellenic is neither Persian, or Assyrian, or Egyptian.

II

1

Well, I could try eloquently. But you do not understand Greek -- the Greeks and the Jews, and why the New Testament speaks of having broken down the wall between Greeks and Jews, if you do not understand that in antiquity the Greeks and Jews both were beyond the experience of the majority of the people in the sense that they came from one order -- the nomadic order -- appropriated the benefits, the advantages of the settlement order, and tried to synthesize the best of both.

2

This is not known to you. You take today the Greeks and the Jews, as they were just tribes or on the other hand, countries. That's not true. Both were perfectly aware that they had to digest older forms of life and transcend them.

That's the whole content of the Bible as you may now recall, that you must live in Canaan, but you must not stoop down to their native gods, to their idiosyncrasies.

And the Greeks were perfectly aware of this, too. That's why they were so proud of being Greeks, and not barbarians. The barbarians are sunk in one form of government. The Greeks are combiners.

3

So the Greeks are proud of mixture of forms. And the Jews are proud of not being taken in by any one existing form.

One is negative. The other is synthetic.

The Greeks could never, therefore, outgrow these two older forms. They could only have various states of mixture. But they kept them before us.

4

And this is not mentioned in your textbooks. But I don't know why, because our whole tradition is aware of the fact: the Greeks are the summary of the previous historical life on earth.

And the Jews are the token, that this isn't good enough, that it is still broken up, too fragmentary. It's not union enough.

III

1

And so, whenever you open the New Testament, you will find in the letters that there is no longer Jews and Greeks. The whole problem of the conversion of the Gentiles -- why Paul had to go to the Gentiles -- is that the unity promised to the Jews can only come about after all the Gentiles have been fermented by the Gospel.

And then the Jews can become Christians, too.

2

Paul only goes to the Gentiles for the sake of the Jews, to prove to the Jews that they may now come to rest, because the Gentiles are no longer just sticking to their guns, but are willing to come to the third order which the Jews had prophesied.

The Christian mission did not come about for the sake of the Gentiles -- you mustn't think this -- but to prove the Jews right. That's what Paul says in the Letter to the Romans, that the Jews were right, so far, as long as the Gentiles were obstinate.

But if the Gentiles should soften, then the special role of the Jews could be given up.

3

THE STORY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

And that's the meaning of the creation of the state of Israel at this moment, that after 1950 years, the thing has come full cycle. Now the Jews may become normal nations, because the nations have ceased to be prehistorical, to be pre-Greek, and pre-Jewish. In as far as they have, this story is at an end.

4

So will you kindly read the whole first book of Thucydides? It will also serve you for your paper.

And I want to get this biography of Caesar and Thucydides within a fortnight, because otherwise I can't -- or a little longer. But let me have it on April 15th.

What are you laughing at?

(That's the same day as the other paper in ... is due.)

Yes, yes -- to burn them all together. Make a bonfire.

SIXTH LECTURE: THUCYDIDES AND THE WORLD WAR

FIRST PART: WHAT IT IS TO LOOK AT THE TIMES

CHAPTER ONE: THE THIRD CENTURY AFTER CHRIST

I

Unfortunately we have not enough to go around, because my friends in the other section haven't obeyed orders, and haven't brought back their papers in time. I have for you this article, and I think in contrast to what we have been doing here, this may round out your picture of the problems of an historian.

So I want you to read this, and write a paper on it during the month of May, so that I may have it back on May 20th.

2

This is quite off the beaten track.

THE STORY OF A SYMPOSION IN LONDON

Twenty years ago, there was a symposion -- or it isn't twenty years ago, I think -- there was a symposion in London held about historical problems in general. And this contribution is by the Italian historian, Mr. Momigliano, who had to leave Italy, when Mussolini was raging mad -- in the Hitler days of Mussolini, when he already had lost his brain really.

Because there are two Mussolinis, you must always think: one intelligent one in the first half, and one broken man in the second. And Momigliano lived in Buenos Aires, as far as I know. He's now back in Italy. And he has done something unique.

He has put before any student of history, as he calls it, an unsolved problem of historical forgery without solving it himself, but only showing the situation. And so it's like a quiz, or like a puzzle, showing you the intricacies of our dealing with genuine or false sources.

And I think this introduction -- since you never will get hold of it; published in an English publication of the Warburg Institute in London, I thought I should make it accessible even on the Pacific coast, although you are far out of reach of civilization.

3

And I have, all told 12 copies. Now, we are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. But my friends in the other section, as I told you, haven't been very good about it. They were expected to give it back to me yesterday. So I make an attempt here.

And you will have to give this back to me. It's quite precious. It cost me twenty-six dollars to have it made. So I spent a lot of money for you. And if they don't come around-- I still think they will -- you will have to share this. Every one of you will have to share with his opposite number here. So look at it.

(Yes.)

That's your opposite number. So this will go here, this will go here, this will go here, go here, and then you two.

(You want me to pass it on?)

Yes, you two. You will be. You have one, haven't you?

(No, no. They didn't --)

Oh, yes, it goes across here, and you go across here. So she is privileged on this side of the house.

(Now, one of you must pass one over to --.)

No. It's all right. We have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 copies, and there are only 12 people.

(Oh, I thought you wanted us to look at them now.)

Oh no, no, no. This is for May 20th.

(I know that.)

I shall receive the paper, no. At this moment, we will put it aside, and we won't go into this now, because that would just be a waste of time.

4

I want you to review it and give your own conclusion, what you think of this situation.

II

1

Now I may have to say one more thing. It deals with our main source on the history of the third century A.D.

THE STORY OF THE THIRD CENTURY

Now the third century of A.D. on the one-hand side is the most important one, because it is the time at which the Roman Empire succumbs to the necessity of going Christian. At the end of the third century, Constantine becomes a Christian and capitulates, and moves his capital from Rome to Constantinople, which is the biggest event of ancient history. He says, "The ancient gods of my city of Rome will pursue me, as a Christian. I have to leave it to the bishop of Rome, the pope later, to cope with Jupiter Capitolinus and Juno on the Capitoline Hill."

2

Now this greatest exodus is never celebrated in your historical tradition, that it isn't the Christianizing, the baptism of the emperor; but his exodus imitates the exodus of Moses from Egypt. It is the exodus from the false gods of Egypt to a new city.

And it should always be taught in this way; it isn't. And I think all your textbooks leave you therefore in the dark.

For the world, gentlemen, and the history of the world the exodus from Rome to Constantinople is the event of the Crucifixion, arrived. That is, it took three hundred years before what had happened on Golgotha made epoch in the history of the visible world. Before, it was just invisible, lived in the basement of the history, in the Catacombs.

3

So this is why I think: to cope with this document is just more than coping with some historical document. The third century is the darkest of centuries, because we only have this source of which we do not know how much it is genuine, and how much is a rhetorical forgery in honor of Constantine, the great Christian emperor, who is now already putting the finishing touch on the victory of the Christian Church. The "Historia -- August-" --how is it called?

You read out the text. No, it's on top. It's on the top.

("Historia Augustae.")

"*Scriptorum*." It is the collection of the writers on the third century -- dedicated to Constantine, officially -- to show that he was inevitable to show that the empire couldn't go on like that. So it is our only document purposely written as a history of the third century. We have fragments of other historians; we have inscriptions; we have coins; but we have no history.

And this has something to do with our attempt now to dabble with ancient history, because it must make you sit up and think, "What is antiquity?"

4

An antiquity is still a time in which time can be dissipated, and break down. The later times and tales of antiquity are less known than the time of Thucydides. That's an incredible fact. That is, the people in the last three hundred years of antiquity, just as perhaps the government of Montezuma in Mexico was one of terror, horror, human sacrifice, cruelty, and agonizing dissipation, and complete disintegration.

III

1

Now it's opposite from your idea of progress. You think history must be a straight line.

That isn't true. People have just as many times gone back on what they had known, forgotten.

THE STORY OF THE EARTH ROTATING AROUND THE SUN

As it was known 250 B.C. that the earth rotated around the sun. It was totally forgotten a hundred years later. And remained forgotten for another 1500 years.

And don't believe that it isn't possible that this happens again. The idea of progress is stultifying your brain. History doesn't go in this way at all.

And this third century is therefore, as it is one of the darkest, one of the most instructive things of history, because something very great came out of it: the first time that an empire survived its own gods.

Will you take this down?

2

THE STORY OF CHINA

You see it in China, how brutal such a survival of one's own god is. In 1911, the last Chinese emperor was deposed. Ever since, China has been in turmoil.

And you speak of Communism and Mao. Don't be betrayed. The breakup of China is the story of the next three hundred years, and nothing that happens now is very important. Don't read the papers with such exaggerated interest. These are all momentary developments -- if an empire, like China, with six hundred million people, has to give up its pagan script, which they are doing now -- its gods, because they were hieroglyphs, as in Egypt of old, forty thousand literary minds -- breaks, as the Egyptians did, when they became Christian, breaks down its temples, and gives up its whole literature, which they will have to, because they take up now our Latin script -- that cuts very deep.

And you can't be surprised that this leads to an incredible change and transformation.

3

And if you study the third century, you may get a picture of what is going on in China now, and how long it will take them to achieve this.

They are giving up their gods. They are giving up their history of four thousand years. And so don't think this can be done -- these slogans, "Communism," or "socialism," or whatever it was, is very important. They don't care. They want to get out of something. What to get into, they can't tell.

4

Now I mention this because you may compare 1911 to something like the year 300 in Roman history. And if you read the history of the 19th century in China, you know what a terrible story it is. Boxer in 1900, the Opium War against the British. And nothing counts. It's just disintegration.

No -- all the efforts made in every decade of Chinese history in the 19th century can be imparted *too late, or too early*. Too late as far as the empire goes, the purely Chinese solution -- and too early for any integration into the industrial world of the West.

So nobody can be successful.

IV

1

Now this is part of the story of the third century. It is too early to go Christian, and to give up the Roman gods, and it is too late to restore Roman piety.

The best emperor the Romans had is the last pagan emperor, Diocletian. And he governs, as you may know, from 284 to -- and, what is it? - 08? And he is known only for his Diocletian persecution, usually, in history books.

But there's a law in history, which I'd like to mention to you, that

never is a bad ruler the cause for a great revolution.

2

Because revolutions are not made for people, for individuals, but for a mis-rule in the bones, in the structure of a government.

THE STORY OF THE CAUSE OF REVOLUTION

So Louis XV, who was a bad king, did not lead to the revolution, because people said, "Perhaps a better king can still cope with the problem of the French constitution." But when Louis XVI came, who was a good king, then they had to behead him.

The same with James I. James I was drunken ever day. So they didn't make a revolution, because they said perhaps it's just the fault of King James I, in England. But when Charles I, who was a nice king, had to do the same tyrannical thing, they said, "Something is rotten in the state of Dane," and beheaded him.

3

One of your illusions is, since you are just moral people that wickedness leads to revolutions.

The czar of Russia, in 1917 was a very nice person, and meaning well. That's why he had to be murdered, because the constitution of Russia was impossible, and not the czar.

King George III, as you well know now, was a very decent chap. But the independence of this country was ripe for quite inner reasons, so whatever they did, even when they took back the Stamp Act, it didn't help any. After all, the Parliament in Britain was very reconciliatory. They revoked the Stamp Act. But it didn't work.

4

Will you kindly then take down:

revolutions have nothing to do with individual wickedness, because people will always forbear an individual's wickedness, hoping that the next will prove better.

You didn't overthrow this government because of Mr. Harding. He certainly was an unscrupulous man. And Mr. Grant's misrule was just horrid in 1870, following years. And you wait until you elect another president.

So wickedness in high places, as it is called, is not a reason for a revolutionary change.

CHAPTER TWO: TIME AND SPACE

I

1

Now that is against all your moralizing stories in the little red schoolhouse.

Since you are all taught by women teachers, you all get a wrong impression of history.

History has nothing to do with morality. History is efficiency. And the individual can be very well rejected and forborne, as an exception. But after the exception is thrown out, and the rule proves to be impossible, something has to be done.

So Christianity came after the best emperor of the Roman Empire had proved a failure, and not the worst.

THE STORY OF DIOCLETIAN'S GARDEN

Diocletian is a very great ruler. And he was so wise that he even -- as you may not know -- survived his nephew's, Constantine's, Christianization. He simply retired to the famous palace in Split, and planted his orchard and his cabbage, and said, "Empire? Not for me, anymore." They called him back one time, and asked him to "Come back and for Heaven's sake, help." He said, "Sorry. I'm only interested in my own garden now."

2

So God favored him, you may say that the mercy of God was on Diocletian, the last persecutor of Christianity, because he had no ambition of his own. And so he was spared. And as a human being, as in the flesh. Carnally he was again not the victim of this transition.

But Rome had to be given up, the city of Rome. And at that very moment, the empire entered the history of God with man, instead of remaining under his private god, under Romulus, and Jupiter Capitolinus.

3

All these things have completely slipped your minds. For the last fifty years, people have been told about the Roman gods as though there were no gods. And the Christian gods certainly as though Christ wasn't God.

But if Christ is not divine, certainly the history of the world can absolutely not be told. The divinity of Christ is in the fact that three hundred years after His Crucifixion He rose from the dead and moved the emperor of Rome to Constantinople.

What is it? Please come in. Well, this is not a good place to sit.

4

Well, this has all to do with my attempt to arouse your interest in the third century of our era. It's the darkest, the most obscure, the most misjudged.

Hundred years ago, if you went to college in this country, it would always have been taught that Constantine was the receipt for Pontius Pilate, that the Romans three hundred years later knew better than what they had done in Jerusalem.

Today, as you all concentrate on a so-called "life of Jesus," which cannot be written and which doesn't exist, you are completely unable to understand history. Because without the Christian era there is no universal history. There are only the history of China, or the history of Japan. All pagan history is disconnected.

The only attempt to get into a world history has been made by the people who wrote the Bible, who prophesied that there would be one history of mankind, and the Christian who did it.

And otherwise there is just no history.

II

1

THE STORY OF A FRIEND WHO COMPOSED A WORLD HISTORY

I have a friend who is a pagan. And he was very true to his paganism. He composed a world history, in five big volumes, in German -- Hans Helmolt is his name. One is Europe; the second is America; the third is Australia; the fourth is Africa; and the fifth is Asia. Now you look at the Australia volume, and you can imagine how thin it is. There is just no Australian history. But nevertheless, he was at least true to his paganism.

In paganism, space comes before time; and in Christianity, time comes before space.

2

And you take down this rule, you will look through all the paganism that is rampant around you, which disconnects the times, because it falls for spaces.

All the American history which you learn today is pagan history, because every attempt has been made in the last forty years to dissociate America and give it a special place as though it was an historical entity of its own, whereas obviously it goes from independence to interdependence in 1776, it can only be explained as a revolt against Britain, and now it can only be explained as a pivot around which the world is integrated into one global system.

And if you omit this, you falsify everything.

This country, after all, is peopled by immigrants. They are no native Americans, except the poor Indians. You are not Americans. You are people who have come to America.

3

Therefore America is on the run. It's a dynamic force. It has been used as a bridge, to bridge over the differences between the various continents. As soon as you take today a nationalistic American history, you try to become an ancient pagan again. And this is, with the Renaissance mood in all people's mind, the great heresy today.

You read Plato, you read Aristotle; and you read into your American history something in space, something local. It's all a racket.

This whole university is riddled with this paganism.

4

And what does it mean?

That space dominates time. That's Mr. Einstein's doctrine that time is the fourth dimension of space; therefore time can be neglected. You first take here, a square, they call this America, and then say, "I write the history into this."

Therefore you find nothing that points beyond or before this space. The space is then not the crystallization of time, as Constantinople is the result of the Roman Empire becoming Christian.

But you look at the map and say, "Byzantium lies in such a wonderful position that of course it had to become one day the capital of the world."

But the force that drew the Romans into Byzantium, it's simply omitted. It's all geography.

III

1

You find this in all your textbooks today. You have to decide. Everybody has this decision every day again to make: is space dominant of time, or is time dominant of space?

If you move your house, then time is dominant of space. You decide where to live.

THE STORY OF THE WHITE ELEPHANT

If, however, you inherit an old farmhouse, and have a white elephant on your hands -- as I know a boy, he married -- he was a boy from New York. The only thing that connected him with his past was this heirloom of a white elephant. His father, who was a big bank president in New York, had rebuilt -- because he came from this farming community. The father committed suicide. He was left all alone: no mother, no father, no relatives. He was an adopted child, by the way. He lives now in this little village in upper New York state. He has married the *belle* of the town. She's very ugly. And then he was so homesick that he had to find somebody. This girl has completely emasculated him. He's not allowed to go to New York. He wanted to go to Norway, establish a business there. He's wealthy. She is a poor girl, from a foreman there of the factory.

But she has stripped him of all his locks, like Delilah, the Samson, because she insists that he has to stay in Granville, New York, because that's all she knows. She is a country girl; she's frightened by the big city. She couldn't stand up there with anybody, and couldn't hold her own. And this boy, at the ripe age of twenty-five, we had to give him up. He was my student. And one of my colleagues, we were very close to him, we have seen him go down and go down, because the space nightmare, that he has to live in Granville, New York, where he doesn't belong at all, has destroyed him.

Generation of vipers.

2

And so I see this all the time going on in this country, now. The lure of mere space -- it is the same as the mother complex, similar. The womb. Because the womb is also something, not you choose and you decide for, but you go back into. It's the same story. And as you know, this problem is very much with --.

If you say at this ripe age of yours, "I have to live in Southern California," you can't have any life. You don't have to say, "I must leave Southern California," but you must be free to say, sometime, "I don't know." As soon as a person decides that it is a certain place where he has to live, he loses a part of his freedom.

3

THE STORY OF MR. MUSSELMAN

In 1935, when the Oxford Group movement came about, I met a number of interesting people in this connection. And one was a Mr. Musselman from Pennsylvania. And I tell you this story, because I think it has very much to do with our being historical -- diseased today.

He said, "I come from the deathbed of my father. My father was a Mennonite minister in Pennsylvania; so am I. So my father knew that he was going to die, so he called me in and said, 'My son, we came to this country three hundred years ago, because we didn't want to take up arms. We are peaceful people. And because the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire demanded from his subjects that they were ready to serve, and to be put into the army, we left, and came to America.'

"Now I am afraid. I look around, and I feel" -- it was after the First World War, and before the Second -- "that we may have conscription in this country. So you have to promise me that you will keep the congregation fit, so that if this calamity should occur, we can leave again."

Now my contemporary, my friend, the son, said to me, mournfully, "My father didn't consider our quandary that now there is no place to go to. You could go to America, three hundred years ago, but what do we do today?"

4

And so we are so space-ridden today that you live already as though space could contain you. And that's why you have to make a special study of the conditions of human freedom today, because if you cannot emigrate, if the passport can be taken away from you by your state department, then you are licked indeed. Then you are just cogs on the wheel. The free movement - to decide in which country to live is the great privilege of everybody who lives in this country, because in his ancestry, he has this one exodus of Constantine to Constantinople.

Every one of your parents, grandparents, or so, sometime made a decision at one time to come to this country.

IV

1

THE STORY OF THE NEGRO QUESTION IN THE SOUTH

And one of the problems of the Negro question in the South is that the Negroes did not make this decision. They were kidnapped and brought here. So there isn't this great event

in their lives, that in one time in the family history they said, "We go." And if you could find for the colored people in this country such a decision, the whole integration probably would look different. They have never, in their strain of blood, made this spiritual decision, that time comes before space, that you create the next space yourself.

All the important questions of the Negro problem are never mentioned in this country. It's a very strange situation. You write volumes, and you have Supreme Court decisions, but what it's really about, nobody ever cares to know. It seems that you don't want to know. One is, that everybody else in this country came not as a slave, or at least nine-tenths. There have been servants, the indentured servants. But that's such a small group, and it could be amalgamated with the rest.

2

So will you kindly read then this paper with some interest with the historical problem itself if you can penetrate into the darkness of the third century, then you understand the eternal problem of history to move out of a given space into the next.

Today this is so difficult, because you have to move out of America as a mere nation, or as a mere self-contained isolated continent into its becoming a part of the universe.

This is a spiritual movement, which doesn't consist in your giving up the space here. But looking at it in a new light as being part of the globe.

3

This is a new spiritual emigration, which is much more difficult to perform, because if you take a ticket, your legs are informed that you are moving. But mere thought will not do this.

That's why I'm still advocating a worldwide service, because if you do not move into Vietnam, or China, or Tibet, or Africa, the globe will not become a reality to you.

4

Today the decision has to be made in every generation. Some people put space before time. Their homeland -- that which is due at this moment, like the South in 1860. In order to defend states' rights, they neglected the hour which even the czar of Russia heard in his ear when he emancipated the serfs. The czar emancipated the serfs before the Southern gentlemen decided to do that.

Do you know when the czar emancipated his serfs?

(In 1863)

Before Mr. Lincoln. It's very important.

We just followed the Russian example.

CHAPTER THREE: SPEECH AND REALITY

I

1

And again, you see what paganism does.

This is not in the American textbooks in connection with the Civil War. It's just not mentioned. You speak of Alaska, because that's space. That was bought in 1867. But gentlemen, what you bought from Russia is the example of the emancipation of the slaves, and you got it for nothing.

That's not in any textbook. It's somewhere mentioned perhaps in a footnote, but not under the real, spiritual pressures of the atmosphere of your daily newspapers. How can you read in a paper that the czar has set the serfs free in 1861, without this working up steam in this country?

2

I think all American history at this moment is absolutely polluted. The people who wrote the history in 1870 give you a much better picture of the American Civil War than the people who write on it today, because America has lost its faith in the unity of world history. It's now trying to have a nice, happy, national history, at a time when all other nations have to give up their national pride.

And so I think all history books written as of the last twenty years are lacking in faith and perspective.

3

And there you have a good example of backsliding.

Take the educational system. Since 1910, America has not made progress in its educational system, but regress.

Now you have to understand that nobody is sure of progress. The more you say "Progress is automatic," the more you may be sure that it isn't; then you go backward. Progress is a constant uphill fight.

And the tragedy of this great country is that since 1910, when William James died, and Theodore Roosevelt went out, this country has lost its soul to pragmatism. And pragmatism means there is no continuity. It all comes by itself, automatically.

Nobody has ever before believed in automatic progress. But you are made to believe this.

4

So what happens is that you move in a vicious circle today, and the issues are just endless, because nothing is ever solved. Imagine, that since 1914, this mighty republic has not been able to conclude peace.

THE STORY OF JAPAN

Do you think the treaty with Japan is a peace treaty? Do they have anything to eat? Do they have anything to live? This may be in paragraphs written, but that's not a peace, because we haven't given them a place - no trade with China. Obviously the only peace treaty we can give the Japanese is to give them a certain area within which they can trade.

II

1

One of the ridiculous phrases, this Treaty of Versailles. Is this a peace treaty with Germany? They said, "Peace is declared." Oh, that's not a way of making peace. With the Russians we are at cold war.

For forty years this country has struggled desperately not to make peace.

And it has succeeded.

2

And this comes all from the idea that America can hold off, and you go places. The Hawaii statehood and the Alaska statehood shows you the unimportant steps that are taken by the Congress. It's very nice that Hawaii and Alaska are states; will never be. This is a pipe dream.

It's very nice, we have two more stars. But they are not states in the original sense of statehood. With 35,000 people in Alaska and white people -- that's not a state. It's just a nice occupation for the Congress. And the aunts and daughters who write the letters there.

Congress just does superfluous things at this moment, because the great solutions are too difficult, that it would tell the people that hard times are ahead, and not prosperity. So the poor president has to haggle over three billion dollars foreign aid, when it should be fifteen.

3

Because we are in a global situation, and we are not in a local situation.

It has all to do with the sermons on history which you hear in your schools. If you dance around the flag, then the two more stars in the flag are the important thing. But if America is a star-spangled banner inviting all the nations of the world to join the open sky of our real creator, then the story is very different. Then it isn't the two more states of Hawaii and Alaska, that matter, but whether the other states would also feel to be stars in one galaxy with us.

And that is the promise of America.

4

All this to be told about the year 300.

So May 20th, may I have this paper -- what you think? And it has great implications, whether you say this is written at the end of such a critical era, when Rome was given up, or whether you think it's a belated forgery of people who had really no political standing.

Did you get a machine?

(Yes.)

Well, after the recess then, we should do --.

III

1

We plunged into Thucydides, didn't we? Did you find anything about the man in the book? Who is Mr. Thucydides?

(An historian.)

Well, is this true?

Here, the little word "F" is the stumbling block. What we call "history" has been determined by Mr. Thucydides. He's the first historian. Herodotus has been called the father of history, but I think Thucydides is the first brother of modern historians, the oldest.

What we call "history" has been determined by Thucydides.

That's quite a strange thing. What our departments of history now proclaim is Thucydidean history. And so he's more than an historian. He's the historian, the yardstick of history.

(He's been called the father of scientific history.)

2

We come to this. Sure.

It's the Greek aspect of history. It's the anti-Jewish aspect.

And we live on two strands. For everything we speak today, or we think today; always the Greek, and the Jewish -- the Israelite. "Israel" is perhaps better, because only that has the spiritual connotation of a different language, of a different approach. The Israelites are indifferent to space, and the Greeks are given to space.

That is, for the Greeks, the history is predetermined by the people who carry it out. By the Israelites, it is the epoch, which is determined: "At one time, God sent His son. At one time, Egypt has been relinquished. At one time, the great flood comes."

So it is always:

the Israelites have to do with the epochs of the world, with the eons of eons, with the ages of ages. The Greeks have to do with the fate and destiny of cities, of the individual entity, of the body politic and its history.

So everything I have said against American history has its protagonist in Thucydides.

3

You have to look through these two eternal strands of our human thinking. Christianity is an attempt not to allow one or the other to get the upper hand. It is the synthesis of these two.

There is an American history as a part of the universal history.

The Old Testament doesn't write such an interesting story as Thucydides about the individual -- it's not interesting. It goes by. But the Greeks are. So Thucydides is the father of scientific history.

That's Point 1 about him.

4

When did he live? Would you tell me?

(455 B.C. to 400 B.C., according to the --.)

Well, is it known?

(No. I say, according to this book)

Well, there is great uncertainty about his life, as a matter of fact. But what is the outstanding event which authorizes him to write the history of this? What was his position?

(Well, he was a general --)

Yes, but on the basis of what?

(On the basis of his wealth and citizenship.)

I think wealth, yes. There has even been a suspicion that he was not a simply an Athenian, but may have been mixed in with Thracian origins. That he was a half a native of a non-Greek country, which adds zest, because first-generation people-- as I really care to think, very much being one, an immigrant -- are the best.

Because they make the greatest effort.

IV

1

Thucydides has every reason to make a real effort to prove his Athenian value. He had to do more than the ordinary. So he was like a '49er in California. He owned gold mines in Thracia. And where is his home? Where is this? Could you show it to me on the map?

(I think I can show it to you on the map. Just I haven't got a map. But I can tell you -- is there a map here? By looking in the book. I guess -- the closest to No, it isn't. They show Macedonia in here. I know that's here; it is. No it isn't, either. It's to the right of Macedonia. To the east.)

East. To the east. On the way to Constantinople. Well, I asked you to look up the places in which he is mentioned, didn't I?

Did you find his own participation in the war? Could you tell me? What does he do? I think it's a very significant way of mentioning his own actions. Can you tell me?

(In Thrace, he was supposed to go there as general to -- I can't remember the names right now -- to fight off this Spartan general. But he came too late, or the day after the Spartan general had taken over, something like that. And then he is put into exile after this)

Well, "put into exile," that's not good English. How do you say that?

(He was exiled.)

2

Always try to keep the verb a verb. Don't use these circumlocutions. This is horrid. This is the death of language. That's really always the end, when you have to kill the power of the verb.

This country is riddled with noun-mindedness. So the language becomes brick.

I mean this. You treat language as consisting of bricks out of which you build houses and "mental pictures," as you even call it. And as soon as you treat language as visibility, it dies.

Nouns are subordinate to verbs. We speak because we have to describe our place with regard to an act. Language means -- which you do not know, and again there is this complete pagan teaching about language in this country at this moment.

I can say, "I shall be exiled," "I am going to be exiled," and "I am exiled." And the three tenses describe your position towards an act. Language is not the power to say, "I am exiled." Or "I am green," but is the power to place myself with regard to the time of another event. Therefore the three tenses are pre-given.

3

We speak in order to be able to say what is behind us and what is in front of us, because we have to live.

Now living means to leave something behind in time, and to go forward, to decide what is dead and what is living.

That's why we speak. And therefore, if you can't say, "I am exiled," you are abusing language as all schoolmasters do abuse it today by saying, "We want to say that this is a book." We don't speak in order to claim that this is a book. This you can throw on the table. And everybody sees what it is. For this purpose, we don't speak.

But we have to say, "I'm through with Europe". "I'm all for Asia." In this moment, you decide what's the future and what's the past. That's why we speak.

4

So all the tenses of grammar are simultaneously given. We speak, "This was," because we want to be able to say, "This shall be," because we have.

Otherwise we are suffocated as by the lack of oxygen when we dive into the water. Life is full of corpses. Every human being at every moment has to breathe freshly and has to bury his dead. And we speak in order to decide what we have to leave behind, and what is coming, at what we are in.

CHAPTER FOUR: THUCYDIDES AND HIS STROKE OF GENIUS

I

1

So the three tenses of grammar give you the skeleton of speech: "have been," "is," "shall be." And you have to decide where you are at this moment, what you decide: my parents, that's the past; my wife, that's the future, and my children.

If you can't do this, as most Americans can't, they can't speak.

2

That's why most boys here can't get married. They have mistresses and mothers. Because they never can say that they have to leave their father and their mother, and cleave to the wife of their choosing.

That's why we speak. The marriage vow is a good example; that means a break in time. And from this moment on, your father's home is behind you, is the past. And your home which you are going to build is the future.

And that's why we have to speak.

Any oath you take, is such a decision: from now on, this is alive, and this is dead.

3

You come to this country, here, an immigrant, you take an oath to become a citizen of the United States, you forswear allegiance to all the past gods, to the emperors and kings of Europe, and you become a citizen of America.

For this you have to speak.

Because it is only speech is made to mention breaks in time. That's why history is a natural with human beings. We are historical beings, because otherwise we will be killed by the masks of the dead.

You could never leave Europe, never become an American citizen, you could never marry if you couldn't say, "This has been," and "This is now."

4

So I want you to understand that to speak historically is the first breath of life for a human being which makes that we are able to transform the world, whereas all the animals have to stay put and remain where they are. An animal cannot say, "Has been".

And we can.

And all you learn about speech, or what a lesson it could be, is all wrong, because today in this country, people undertake to tell you, "This is a newspaper," "This is a book," "This is an envelope," "This is a chair," and they call this language.

For this, nobody would care to create language. But you have to create language in order to say, "One thing has been, and the other thing is to come," because you have to date your life. You have to emerge.

II

1

So this is Thucydides' attempt to show that he is an Athenian. And I think now -- could you give me the chapter in which he speaks of this event? I think it deserves some scrutiny. Where is it?

Well, I think it deserves scrutiny, how he puts his own engagement and his own participation. I think it's very subtle. What is subtle about it? Will you tell me?

(Page 290 -- about the gold mine?)

Now, by the way, which chapter is this?

(288 -- Chapter 8.)

May I say that is one of the most horrid translations that exists which you have? It's only cheap, but in every respect. Which chapter?

(Chapter 8. Book IV, Chapter 8.)

Let me try to find this.

(It's about the fourth paragraph, according to this translation.)

Ninth paragraph. Now I have here an old, stodgy translation, by the greatest British translator of the 19th century, Mr. Jowett, who was master of Balliol. You may have heard his name here. Translated Plato, too. B. Jowett, M.A., master of Balliol College, Regis Professor of Greek, University of Oxford. And it came out in Boston, too. And it's infinitely

more trustworthy than this translation, which is made readable, and thereby forced to simply go off from the truth.

Let me read then my text.

"The passage of the river was a complete surprise. Against Amphipolis now Brasidas led his army here."

2

Allow me then to bore you with the text, just as a case of historical analysis, of text analysis:

"Against Amphipolis Brasidas now led his army. Starting from Arne in Chalcidice, towards evening he reached Aulon and Bromiscus."

Do you have this?

(Yes.)

It is worth your while to compare, how the two translators call it

"At the point he reached Aulon and Bromiscus at the point where the lake Bolbe flows into the sea. Having there supped, he marched on during the night. The weather was wintry and somewhat snowy."

I'll pass over this, and we go now over to the next paragraph.

"The general to whose care the place had been committed by the Athenians sent for help to the other general in Chalcidice, Thucydides, the son of Olorus" -- now Olorus, as I told you, is not a Greek name -- "who wrote this history. He was in Anthasos, an island colonized from Thasos, and distant from Amphipolis about a half-a-day's sail."

Half a day's sail, I would suspect, means twelve hours. I'm not sure. But it raises the question whether a day is twelve hours or 24 hours at that time. I'm afraid the 24-hour day didn't exist, and it could well be there's just six hours.

It's quite interesting.

3

For the human beings, day and night are clearly divided. That we speak of "day" as 24 hours, is the result of the last four hundre years only, and of the abstract reckoning of modern mathematics and physics, it's very late. The daily laborer is a man who works from sunrise to sunset. And that's what we mean by a day. "A day's work," and all these things.

I think it's quite interesting. I don't know what they say in the Greek text. I didn't bring it.

"As soon as he heard the tidings, he sailed quickly to Amphipolis with seven ships which happened to be on the spot. He wanted to get into Amphipolis if possible, before it could capitulate, or at any rate to occupy Eion."

Where's Eion? Do you have a map?

Is it near Amphipolis? Is it further out to the sea?

(Yes. Yes.)

It's so to speak, the harbor of Amphipolis? Like the Piraeus, on Athens.

"Meanwhile Brasidas, fearing the arrival of the ships from Thasos, and hearing that Thucydides had the right of working gold mine in the neighboring district of ..., and was consequently one of the leading men of the country, did his utmost to get possession of the city before his arrival."

Now there you have the subtlety.

4

The tragedy of Amphipolis is now laid to the great respect which Brasidas held for Thucydides. So the failure of Thucydides to come to the rescue of Amphipolis is here turned into a merit of Thucydides, because he filled Brasidas with such respect for his importance. I think this is the crown -- if you understand this, this is clever indeed. It may even be true. We don't know.

But it certainly shows that Thucydides turned a very awkward situation in his favor, because he explained now the victory of Brasidas, with the respect for Thucydides. This I think is the subtlety of the performance. Without saying a word, without telling you that he's interested in Thucydides at all. It's all put at the doorstep of Mr. Brasidas.

III

1

"Fearing the arrival of the ships from Thasos hearing that Thucydides was one of the leading men of the country, did his utmost to get possession of the city before his arrival. He was afraid that if Thucydides once came, the people of Amphipolis would no longer be disposed to surrender."

You understand the whole logic of this?

"From their hope would be that he would bring in allies," such an important man, he could bring in allies by sea from the islands, or collect troops in ... "relieve them. He therefore offered moderate terms for claiming that any Amphipolitan or Athenian might either remain in the

city"-- very mild conditions, indeed -- *"and have the enjoyment of his property on terms of equality, or if he preferred, might depart, taking his goods with him within five days."*

It seems to me that since this is the only place in which he is shown as engaged in the history which he writes, you should give a certain importance to this one and only case.

2

And at the end of the paragraph after the surrender, then Thucydides says of himself:

"On the evening of the same day, Thucydides and his ships sailed into Eion, but not until Brasidas had taken possession of Amphipolis, missing Eion only by a night. For if the ships had not come to the rescue with all speed, the place would have been in his hands on the next morning."

Thucydides now put Eion in a state of defense, desiring to provide not only against any immediate attempts of Brasidas, but also against future danger. He received the fugitives who had chosen to quit Amphipolis according to the agreement, and wished to come into Eion. Brasidas suddenly sailed to Eion, hoping that he might take the point which runs out from the wall, and thereby command the entrance to the harbor. At the same time, he made an attack by land. But in both these attempts, he was foiled. Thereupon he returned and took measures for the settlement of Amphipolis. The Edonian town of Myrcinus joined him"

and we don't have to go into this.

"The Athenians were seriously alarmed --."

3

Now what is said about the fate of Thucydides?

(Chapter 3?)

Will you read this, now in your text? All about Thucydides.

(All right.)

"The history of this period has been written by the same Thucydides, an Athenian, keeping to the order of events, as they happened by summers and winters, down to the time when the Spartans and their allies put an end to the empire of Athens and occupied the long wall and Piraeus. By then, the war had lasted altogether 27 years, and it would certainly be an error of judgment to consider the interval of the agreement as anything else except a long period of war."

One has only to look at the facts to see that it's hardly possible to use the word 'peace' for a situation in which neither side gave back or received what had been promised. And apart from this, there were breaches of the treaty on both sides in connection with the ... and the Epidaurian waters, and in other respects, too. The allies in the Thracian area continued hostile as before, and the Boeotians were in a state of truce, which had to be renewed every ten days."

So if one puts together the first ten years' war, the uneasy truce which followed it, and a subsequent war, one will find, reckoning by summers and winters, that my estimate of the number of years is correct within a few days. Also that, for those who put their faith in oracles, here is one solitary instance of their having been proved accurate. I myself remember that all the time, from beginning to the end of the war, it was being put about by many people that the war would last for thrice nine years. I lived through the whole of it."

So how many years would this be?

(Thrice nine years -- 27 years.)

"I lived through the whole of it, being of an age to understand what was happening, and I put my mind to the subject so as to get an accurate view of it. It happened, too, that I was banished from my country for twenty years after my command at Amphipolis. I saw what was being done on both sides, particularly the Peloponnesian side, because of my exile. And this leisure gave me rather exceptional facilities for looking into things. I shall now therefore go on to describe the disputes that took place after the ten years' war, the breach of the treaty, and the warfare which came afterwards."

4

This is the heart of the book, of the whole work of Thucydides, this chapter. And it is strangely interwoven with personal faith and his real concern, his concern is which? Against whom does he argue here?

And I may tell you one thing. It's the only place in which there is even the slightest hint of any religious interest in Thucydides, religious in the sense of mentioning an oracle, which was given there about the war, beforehand, some connection with the priestly or templar traditions, or judgments on the matter. Otherwise, Thucydides, being a scientific historian, is absolutely secular. It's just a question of cause and effect, and of reason. And he is really a Greek. But he has this one great concern.

IV

1

What does he want to prove?

(Is it one continuous war?)

That it's one continuous war.

And this is his stroke of genius. It's his inspiration.

2

The Greeks are the nation of geniuses, gentlemen. Every Greek is, whom we mention today -- whether it's Aeschylus, or whether it's Prometheus, or whether it's Demosthenes - - we worship the Greeks as a nation of geniuses.

Now a genius is able to hold onto us a specific inspiration: the poem. That's an inspiration. Later, he may be very stupid, this man.

Like Edgar Allan Poe, he may even go insane. Or he may give up the spirit, like Melville, before his death.

3

The inspiration is, in regard to history, the opposite from what the prophets, or the Bible tries to do. The Bible insists on the continuity of the history of creation. All creation is one breath of God. A thousand years are before him as one day.

The Greeks say the opposite. They say, "I don't know anything of what has gone on before." Thucydides begins and say, "We know very little of the past. But this event I shall stamp with the inspiration of my genius as the outstanding event of all times." And he made it so.

4

And if we read Thucydides, we actually believe him, that the events from 431 to 404 are the Peloponnesian War. And he has made you believe this, as far as you are interested in Greek history at all.

And this isn't true. From the purely skeptical point of view, you can just as well hold that in the year 423, peace was established for nine years -- the so-called Peace of Artedimus. And so he has here this one, that's his great enemy, the possibility that somebody denies his vision, that man should look at the times -- here, I have put them, the dates, the three times nine, my dear man -- as being one.

SECOND PART: THE HISTORIAN CREATES PAST AND FUTURE

CHAPTER ONE: THUCYCIDES AND THE WORLD WAR I AND II

I

1

Now in order to make you understand what importance this can have for the decisions of mankind, I am engaged in a profound battle with the pagans at this moment who try to say that World War II is a war by itself, fought against Mr. Hitler, and that World War I is something different.

And I insist that there was an armistice between – just as Thucydides, you may say I don't claim great originality -- but the inspiration which guides me in my historical attempts is to prove that 1914 and 1945 must be considered a unity if we want to understand what we should do about it.

2

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S ADDRESS IN GERMANY

I have given an address on January 30, in Germany to this program, which I developed there before a group of influential business people, and I tried to show them why, if we do not make this effort to see Mr. Wilson and Mr. Roosevelt as one, having one and the same problem to solve, we will never understand that the World War II was not accidental, just the brute, Hitler. But that it did attempt like any vaccination, to bring back the virulence of a poison that's in your body, and to make it virulent again, so that you can operate now on the patient there.

THE STORY OF MR. FÖRSTER

You know when you have had the diphtheria, and the consequences are with you, there are doctors now -- the doctor who treated Lenin, for example, had the idea, the first man who operated on the brain, Mr. Förster, that you should bring back the old infectious disease which had become latent, in order to be able to cure it. You have a disease, it becomes chronic, it weakens you constantly, but there is no fever anymore. It doesn't work actually. So he had the idea he would vaccinate the patient with the same poison, so that he could treat it. Then he would get the diphtheria poison, or the scarlet poison, or whatever it was, out of your body.

3

This is the problem of the historian. The things latent, the things not mentioned, the things inarticulate, and the first effort is: since you live day by day, by the daily news, you are inclined to think that one year is disconnected from the other. And therefore you do not see that we are paying the penalty for Versailles today -- for the Treaty of Versailles and the Americans' marching out of the Treaty of Versailles.

And that's why we have the Cold War, because we have not learned to make peace.

4

An historian has just published a book, *The Art of Making Peace*, and shown how it has completely gone by default. After Mr. Grant demanded the unconditional surrender at Vicksburg in 1864, it was, I think, or 1863.

(-1863)

This formula has poisoned all international relations, because Mr. Roosevelt had learned in school, that Grant asked for unconditional surrender at Vicksburg. Now you can ask in a civil war for unconditional surrender, because allegedly you know where to go back to. But you cannot ask for unconditional surrender and have no terms for the peace. That's no solution.

That's what we have done.

II

1

Unconditional surrender is one of the most stupid formulas, because it has lulled to sleep, not to ask it from the enemy is all right. But it dispensed on the side of the Allies with all mental effort to understand the future. And to write just an adequate peace. And so it blinds the victor himself. It paralyzes him.

Well, we have dealt with the red Indians in this manner, but you can't deal with the half of the world in this manner.

2

So today we have this chapter of Thucydides. You should learn it by heart. It is the power of Greek genius to make you understand an epoch, the unity of an epoch; and that's the creation of the human spirit; that's an act of faith.

Nietzsche, the German philosopher who is there still with us, to plague us for the rest of our lives, I can assure you, said, "History will always be an article of faith."

3

Now you understand, this has nothing to do with any special creed or faith. It means that you can only write coherent history if you bank on the unity of an event. You create this unity. You can always also tear it apart.

You can say that 1917, when the United States entered the World War I, that's a new event, that's the American war. And you can distort thereby the whole picture, and cut the World War I even into little pieces and say that the first three years is European war, and the last year is the World War.

Obviously, it would make no sense. The thing is a little more complicated. You cannot separate America's entrance into the World War from the previous events.

4

Still in your country, if I read the books right, the attempt is always made to begin the history of the World War I, for America, at least, with the entrance in the war, which is not true. If you want to understand America's contribution to the World War, I will remind you of two dates.

And again, it's Russia and the United States who share the laurels of the event. Only to show you that epochs are inspired, insights, acts of faith.

THE STORY OF RUSSIA AND AMERICA 1914

We had this 1861 emancipation of the serfs in Russia, and -- when is it, in America?

(1863)

Now, look at these two dates. In 1914, the Russians make war. And they have no other way out. It wasn't a question - already they were in the throes of their own revolution for the last nine years. So the government just simply couldn't go back down, because they at least had external successes, since they had only defeats at home.

III

1

And at this moment, Mr. Henry Ford of this country gave his workmen the five dollars a day. That is, he solved for all practical purposes the cleavage between capital and labor in

declaring that his workmen were his customers. Which is an absolutely new idea, and which made for the solidarity of capital and labor. Because if the workman is himself the customer and can buy a Ford car, Mr. Ford is just as much interested in the wealth of the worker, as in his exploitation.

In 1917, the Russians make a social revolution, and America enters the war. And you have this exact reciprocity. The Americans have first solved their labor problem, and then gone to war, to impart it to the rest their possibilities, their industrial system. And the Russians had no industrial system. So they first go to war, then are forced to give up the war, and do something different. And industrialize - what they are doing ever since.

2

That's why Russia is really peace-loving, because it has paid the penalty of having to go to war, and then finding that war didn't work.

3

Now nobody in this country has the imagination, strangely enough; they look at events day by day, to see that when America did this in 1914, that what Henry Ford acted for the United States was much more important in this moment than president, and Congress, and anybody else. He changed the system of the United States, the social system.

And you know how it is expressed?

THE STORY OF LABOR DAY

We even have a great symbol of this. We have Labor Day. In all other countries, including this country down to 1914, Labor Day was May the first, and it was a day exclusively of labor, of the proletariat. It was invented in this country, 1889, May the first; and it has now become the national holiday of the Russians. It is celebrated in Paris. It's celebrated in Berlin. It is celebrated in Rome. But in this country, it was quietly moved to Labor Day in September, because it is not a class day.

With the resolve of Mr. Henry Ford in 1914, the whole idea that it had to be an action of protest on the part of the workers against the existing order has broken down. And you know all what Labor Day involves in this country. It is no day of opposition.

It's one of the grandest histories of the world, but the Americans don't care to write it up.

The dislodgement of the revolutionary May the first, and its replacing it by Labor Day in September means that capital and labor in this country are reconciled. That's all what it means, but that's quite a bit.

4

And therefore, the Americans went to war with the good conscience to export an article of faith. And the Russians went to war in order to start their own revolution.

THE STORY OF THE LEADING RUSSIAN BOLSHEVIK IN EUROPE

I can tell you that the leading Russian Bolshevik in Europe, a man who was shot then in Munich in 1919, when he headed the government in Bavaria for a while, went into the barracks of Munich in 1914. And when he found that the Bavarian farmers were not at all eager to go to war in July of '14, he said, "What? You do not want to help us to abolish czardom?"

He was so revolutionized himself, that he thought these poor Bavarian peasants and farmers had to be very keen to abolish czardom in Russia. Of course, they weren't. But he thought this was the great global event. The war was fought for the abolition of Russia's despotism.

IV

1

Only to show you the universal engagement of men's hearts and minds in this struggle, this is a true story. And it shows you that wars are always fought for spiritual points. They are never fought for what you read in the books, for economic purposes and so on, because you can't get people to be shot dead on the ground for somebody else getting rich.

Oh, very kind. Very kind. See you tonight?

(Yes.)

Here?

So let's have a break here.

CHAPTER TWO: THE REDISCOVERY OF WORLD WAR I

I

1

It means that genius has always to perform in every generation a task. People live through events and call all them "happenings." "This happened."

Now happenings have to be transformed into events because we run through so many things. They may happen to us, but they remain haphazardous. The Peloponnesian War is not an haphazard, thanks to Thucydides, in our mind. It's a necessary event.

2

And this has not yet been done for the last forty years, I assure you. And this is why we are in bad shape.

As soon as the stamp of inevitability, of necessity can be put on these last forty years, the Homer of this Trojan War has been found; and then the Trojan War can come to rest. And every event has to be made into an event, by this act of faith that we cannot have lived in vain: these sufferings, "These dead cannot have died in vain."

3

The Gettysburg Address and the Second Inaugural of Lincoln have done exactly this to the Civil War. Then it became an event that had its meaning.

And mere happening, Fort Sumter and so, this is all meaningless. It could have been wrong for example, to go out and call of arms after Fort Sumter was taken.

Why not -- why not abide by it?

4

THE STORY OF PEARL HARBOR IN CLASS

I told you perhaps that on Monday, December 8th, 1941, my students in class argued that we didn't have to go to war against Japan. They said, "Pearl Harbor? We just refuse to accept that. That's not war." Twenty-four hours after the event.

II

1

It is incredible that scientists will deny that they know anything of the future.

Well, they know certainly that there shall be science. That's dogmatic. And then these same scientists rant about dogma. But they have a very peculiar dogma. They say, "Science comes first. Science is important. Science is necessary. Everything has to be sacrificed for science."

Isn't this dogmatic? And isn't this absolutely hand stemming from the future? Because science is very imperfect as of this moment, and only if it is later making progress is it the real science.

Many things in medicine today, for example, are believed that -- in my mind -- are mere superstitions. Well, we keep going in medicine, because we hope tomorrow there will be the true medicine.

So it is with, with every field of human endeavor.

2

Now if you could see that the scientists are nothing but the branch of the human prophecy turned towards the earth, and earthly things, the things of matter, you would understand that we all -- you at this moment, living here at UCLA -- are preparing for the future. What keeps you here is the firm faith that it's worthwhile studying here and preparing yourself for the rest of your life. And as soon as you would give up this idea of preparation, you would become a very unpleasant hangover. You would become a student who could never leave this place.

And there are such individuals, but everybody feels that they have just missed the boat. Yet, according to your philosophy of time -- if you go to the logical semanticists of this college, and listen to their philosophy of time -- future doesn't exist. Nobody is here except as of the moment. Every one of you is here, because he has quite a firm conviction that for the next fifty years, he should be equipped here.

3

So you know much more of the future than you care to admit. Everybody who is alive is drawn by the future. And you remember what we said at the first half of this meeting, that the pressure from the future is the agent that makes us try to say of those things that are past, "have been."

I told you that all human speech, all human articulation is this attempt to get your elbows working both ways, moving in time, not moving in space.

The scientist, who deals only with space and can tell you that time should be treated in the laboratory as the fourth dimension of space, at the same time is ambitious and wants to progress, and he believes only in time. And he has nothing to do with space in his own personal career.

THE STORY OF WERNHER VON BRAUN

He is called from one country to another, like Mr. von Braun, who goes from Germany to Florida. And it doesn't matter. He wants to execute his great dream of the future. So where is space with him? He is only making this progress from year to year to come nearer to the realization of his dream. That's an historical process.

4

And so I think all scientists themselves are just blind to what they really live. The life of a scientist today is the outstanding example of an historical existence which is dictated to, which is articulated by the future, and therefore takes a profound interest in the preparatory steps already done in this regard by people in the past. Any scientist is engaged in dealing with the history of his science, because he has to select all those data which are still there, unfinished by former explorations.

III

1

THE STORY OF MR. OTTO HAHN

I remember the simple story that in 1938, Mr. Otto Hahn, in Germany, the father of the atom bomb, of the atom fission, published his results. When uranium could be cut into halves. And they'd no idea at that time that there would ever be a bomb made out of this. But Mr. Enrico Fermi -- the man who's in this country now -- he had made the experiments leading Mr. Hahn to this statement four years ago. And he didn't know what he had done. It was Mr. Hahn's business then to go over the record, and to interpret these experiments. And they might have been done fifty years before, and say, "This is it."

Only to tell you that people in the history of science don't know what they are doing, why they are doing it, you see. That the reinterpretation of such an experiment is very often due to another man. And you find this time and again, in mathematics.

2

Has anybody a special interest in mathematics?

THE STORY OF MR. GRASSMAN

Well, you may have heard of the -- how is it called in English? *quaternio* -- theory of Mr. Grassman. He made this discover and his statement in 1849, if I'm right, or 1846. And he was so disgusted with the people of his time -- no mathematician understanding what he had done -- that he went off into Sanskrit and wrote then an equally elegant and important volume on Sanskrit -- Hindu culture for the last thirty years of his life. He just gave up mathematics, and became a reasonable man. And then fifty years later, the mathematicians discovered that this was the next step in this study of higher equations. And Mr. Grassman, all of a sudden, became a terribly important stepping stone for the new theory.

3

This is how science rediscovers the past constantly.

And if you would understand that this is just an example as how you have to rediscover World War I at this moment as the cradle of all the problems besetting as of this moment, you would understand why I am waiting for Mr. Thucydides as of today. A man who makes all the schoolchildren see that they have to live after the last forty years, and cannot go back to the orange groves, and the wild western films of 1900.

And as long as you go to the westerners without relating these westerners as a mere past to your real, present problems, you live in a dream world, because there is not this intermission; there is not this break with the past.

4

THE STORY OF OUR WESTERN MOVIES

I think our western movies are an excellent example of this desperate attempt of any group of people to hold onto something that does no longer exist. And that's all right. Fairy tales are all right. But you must know that they are fairy tales. As soon as you say, "These are fairy tales," it's all right. But as long as you take the sheriff there and the cow puncher too seriously, all our young boys will shoot each other, as they do.

IV

1

And I think this is a dream world, for most youngsters today. You should measure Sunday school and school instruction both by the power they have to break up the dream world of the youngster. If they enter this dream world and support it even, entertain it, and don't make them into historical beings, they have missed their task. Religion and

history make this attempt to make us aware, shoot us into this decision, this decisive point that we decide at what time we live.

2

You care to still listen to the rest? Or don't you? Then we shall go on.

So may I add my criticism?

I want you to understand, I haven't given back these papers. I would have to have been quite violent. And this whole list -- past, present, and future -- you have to throw out. It's a curse of this naturalistic tradition, that people write these three things in this fashion.

Try to always write "future" first, "past" second; and then see that the conflict between the two, that's the present.

3

Look at your own life. You live as a child at home, and in school under the routine. You fall in love. That brings a break. All of a sudden, you have to use subterfuges to stay away from home; you have to begin a life of your own. You can't tell everything; there are secrets.

And there should be secrets, by the way. You shouldn't tell your...such a thing. It is a secret. It's your whole life. And you cannot explain it to anybody else, if it is worth anything.

4

Now this little seed, which it is, the more the seed is in the ground, the more hidden it is; it has to grow. And all of a sudden, you develop a tension, and you have to let the seed grow, and the old tree from which you are a chip that has to die inside yourself, has to become less. You have to be able to give less and less to the authority of your elders, and to trust more and more to That takes time, and it takes ten years, before you marry. If you overdo it, you elope. That is, you make an artificial break, where you should make a transition, where you have no presence then. You have just the future, as an urge, and the past as effect.

CHAPTER THREE: THE MIRACLE OF THE PRESENT

I

1

The present then, is the process during which we are absolved and redeemed from the past, and are made ready for the future. So the present is all the time a process of - how do you call this? -- "*abwickeln*" in German -- liquidation, you may say, you know you want to close down. You want to establish your own firm, a new one. And the process of transition in which you have to liquidate the old firm, and prepare and register with the new.

That's by and large what the present is. It's a constant involvement.

2

Here you are in college. You are still partly living on a scholarship, or on your parents, or on some sideline income. You are preparing, and at the same time, you are liquidating links with the past. You are still in school, but it's a high school. We call "university" a higher school of learning, an institution which is definitely not simply an annex of the customs of the past, which contains some germs which the older people did not receive into their care.

The university and a school are distinguished by this one fact that a school tries to transmit what the parents also know, the three R's; and the university tries to transmit you certain things which your parents have not known, yet. That's the difference between high and low.

3

All this is unknown, and therefore the present has this very strange connotation with you. In nature, there is no presence. You must always say that in nature, while I am speaking here, physically, the second half of my word, of the sentence I haven't finished yet, is a part of the future; and the first half, which I already had pronounced is past, and there is no present.

And would you kindly keep this in mind? All the natural scientists borrow from us -- the historians, the theologians, the religionists, the faithful people -- the notion of the present. Any scientist who talks to you of the present, as a scientific fact, lies. It's always an act of faith, present.

Never is the present in existence except on faith.

4

You believe that you are between your parents and your grandchildren. But that's all. If it isn't in you as a power of the future now working into you, your grandparents aren't represented. As we say, "represented".

II

1

Representation is by you only taken to be a local representation. You elect a representative and send him to Washington. That's your representative.

But my dear people, the present is the meeting ground of the future in which you believe, and the past which you have experienced, or which has left its mark on you.

2

And therefore, throw out the word "present" as often as you can. Scrutinize it. Use it not -- then you will only find where this is legitimate. And you read all these gentlemen -- Laplace, Euler, Einstein, Planck, all the great physicists -- they all bandy around this word "present" as though they had any right to it. Because they need it for their scientific studies, for the laboratories.

But that's an act of faith given them by the community. We believe that they should have their day in court, because we believe in their future vision. We create the present.

3

And I give you -- perhaps it may help you. Or it may not. It may complicate matters, I don't know.

The word "present" comes from the religious faith of the presence of God, that God is omnipresent. Present is always connected with the divine, with the superior spirit; whereas past and future, in a mechanical sense, come from physical observation. It would be too long a story to explain to you how even the physicists stole this word "future" from religion.

That's a sidelight.

4

But the main point is: never allow your atheistic, agnostic colleagues in the science departments to use the word "present" as though it had any meaning within their mouths,

unless they admit that they have it as faithful laymen, as citizens of the community, as members of the human family. But not as scientists. The scientist has no right to use the term "present," because it doesn't exist in any of his experiments. You can never have a present when you look at things in a laboratory. There are only past and future.

III

1

I would even call their future just an elongated past, because it's pre-calculated, and they say that goes on for another sixty minutes, or it takes three days -- I won't go into this.

2

But my main point is, as a practical thing of you, I think you will emerge from this smog, which today is so much in Southern California as it is in the minds of men. They can only sell you science as a religion, because they have stolen this word "present" to which they had no right and claim.

Where is there any present in their scientific picture of the world? Everything is rushing on. It's just a mere maelstrom of constant change.

3

Now here we meet, and they meet in their lectures in a good spirit of peace, of friendliness, of presence of one spirit, and that's an act of faith. Here we meet for two hours; and this is one present.

4

And that's a miracle. That's a creation of the human family. It has nothing to do with nature. It's not a natural event, that I can go -- and you allow me to talk here.

Well, ...

SEVENTH LECTURE:

FIRST PART: WHEN - IS THE QUESTION

CHAPTER ONE: THE FLAIR OF THE UNIQUE

I

1

... ancient historian wrote one of his volumes -- there is Polybius. But before doing so, let us go back to Thucydides.

I had asked you to find out, didn't I, what his personal circumstances were. We were just in the midst of it. Is that right?

(Yes.)

What have you written?

(Well, it's just ...)

Well, tell me.

(Tell you? Start from scratch, or do you just want the last phase of it?)

The last phase.

(The last phase, all right.)

"History contains those selected things which allow an event to occur at a certain time, which can never again occur." That's the last line.)

Well, pointing out the uniqueness of the event. Do you have it?

(Yes.)

2

Well, about this uniqueness -- you will always run into this. There has been raging in the 19th century, and at the beginning of the 20th a philosophical discussion on the kind of the facts in history and the kind of facts in nature.

And although I think at this moment this discussion is rarely mentioned, I grew up under this cannonade, these big guns on both sides: the philosophers -- it had very much to do

with Marxism, because if you have a revolutionary theory of Marxism, you are apt to generalize, and the individual event is then just one phase in a process, of which you have an abstract notion. And so people and places become of minor importance -- always the same struggle. You can read the most fantastic things.

3

THE STORY OF A DESCRIPTION OF THE CIVIL WAR

I read an American writer's -- what's the name? Hacker, I think -- description of the Civil War in this country. It was written in the '30s, when here Marxism was the cheapest way out of all thinking. So then the South with the slave-owners and the North as the industrial had to be depicted as making war on each other as two different class systems.

It was very hard to think why a railroad man and a planter are really different classes. They just aren't.

And then the third thing, he was still very despondent, this gentleman, because the workers of America just didn't follow his class patterns, but all supported the Northern course, and couldn't be set up against the capitalists, the wicked capitalists. And he was quite despondent, because the pattern which he had in his head, from Marx's book on English industry, just nowhere fitted the American nature.

Which is the deepest reason why there is no Marxism at this moment in this country to speak of. But it just isn't true.

And this was as late as 1937 that this American gentleman wrote this desperate outcry, admitting that he didn't find in American history the simple pattern he was bound or bent on discovering.

4

And so a school in the University of Heidelberg was at that time manned by two outstanding philosophers, Rickert and Windelband, and they were of the old Kantian tradition. And they said, in so many words, that all events in history were unique, and that made them into historical events. And in as far as they were not unique, they were questions of natural science, and not questions of history.

And so that's a very nice distinction for you, as a starting point.

II

1

Unique events are historical events, and with the kind of corollary, in as far as an event is not unique, it is not an historical event. That all people have to eat and to digest is not historical. That's natural.

So Charlemagne had to eat, and President Eisenhower has to eat; and that's not a part of history because it is something that befalls all mortals. But in as far as Mr. Eisenhower visits Mr. Dulles in the hospital, that's a unique event; and that's an historical event.

So then it helps you a lot first of all to be shoved into the awareness that the people who will make history, live history, or read history obviously are involved in this double process of nature and of history. And in as far as the thing is repetitive, we call it nature; and as far as it is not repetitive, we have to call it history.

2

History is the story of the events which at one time did not form a part of nature, but entered the process of existence.

The first steam engine of Mr. Stephenson is an historical event. Now we are so hard-boiled that all the trains that run every day on schedule -- or not on schedule -- do not hit us as historical. But in as far as they depend on the invention of an inventor, on the getting-together of shareholders, on a new law that allowed such companies to perform, on government grants, they are still historical events, because this original law still has to be protected by the courts. And in as far, therefore, as the unique beginnings are now established in institutions, these institutions depend on the will of those people who have once made these laws.

And once you abolish this, and you turn the right of way of the railroads -- as they demand now in California -- into freeways for the cars, the whole phase, the whole chapter of historical railroad building is passed over, is superseded by another chapter.

3

So the first law is a useful law. Historical events are unique events. Natural processes are always there. They are not unique. They can be generalized.

And since in this country-- Mr. Charles Beard is a case in point, this man Hacker is a case in point, who tried to exemplify the Civil War as just one case of the eternal class war -- since you have this tendency in this country to find the common denominator for all and everything, you can see that history has a very difficult time in this country, because all the time the psychologists, sociologists try to pretend that all this follows a certain pattern.

4

For example, whenever you hear a person in this country say, "It's just politics," he has abolished history. What people mean by "It's just politics," I have never quite understood. It seems always to me to dismiss the thing as no problem at all. "Just politics". Because I think then it just becomes interesting -- how can you transform it into a political history? That's the whole problem of politics, isn't it?

So "just politics," it's no answer to anything. But you hear it all the time. And then people stop thinking and say, "Well, that's just as it is. Can't do anything."

But obviously the thing becomes then interesting only, because then you have to do something about it, you man. You have to form a third party, or you have to expose a politician, or whatever you have to do.

III

1

So this is one of your stock phrases by which you try to dismiss history as a natural process, because as soon as you say, "It's just politics," even politics has simply become a digestive process of greed and eating, and cannibalism, and dog-eats-dog, and whatever have you. And you have made it into a natural, repetitive process, like breathing, and sleeping.

The catch of this neat dualism between history and nature is however in a little closer inspection of what makes it unique.

2

And this the Kantians, my friends there in Germany, did not discover, or did not discuss.

The event is unique because it has an irreplaceable date. It is only the unity of the history through all times that gives to this hour, to this moment in which we mention an historical event, the quality of belonging to this event.

THE STORY OF MR. EISENHOWER VISITING MR. DULLES

That Mr. Eisenhower, as I read in the paper this morning, yesterday visited Mr. Dulles is part of the event. You cannot abstract from the time moment in this case. It isn't the same, to say that Mr. Eisenhower frequently visited Mr. Dulles, for example, or regularly visits Mr. Dulles. The historic significance of his visit yesterday is that he still treats him as secretary of state. And the question of whether he should finally hand in his resignation or not is quite a tragic question. The man probably would collapse in the moment -- it is because that's his life. He hasn't aimed at this. And so Mr. Eisenhower tries to prolong his

life by allowing him to have the name of secretary of state. Here, the life of Mr. Dulles is involved in his still thinking of himself as secretary of state.

And so this is a very human gesture on the part of the president, that he says, "I do not wish to withdraw the drug that keeps this man going."

The papers never mention this.

(Why do they allow some state department officials and newspapers to get hold of some information, and report it over the radio and newspapers, so that Mr. Dulles will get that information, like they don't think that he'll return to his job?)

Because it's an untenable situation for people in the state department. Somebody must have the responsibility. And therefore, I don't know this, but that's politics again. These people feel that the regard for the private person of Mr. Dulles has gone too far, and that he must be forced out. That's a battle.

(It's not very kind to him.)

3

No, but can you always be kind? War is not kind; politics is not kind.

And you must never hold against a man that he is stern.

My dear man, you can go too far in kindness. It doesn't help that you have an invalid, and want to be kind to an invalid. The country cannot be run by invalids. We have a dying president and a dying secretary of state. Well, it's very serious. It's terrible. Just look at the president, how he looks. So people just say, "I don't care." It's more important for the summit conference. They must have a secretary of state who can resist the president. For example. Our president as well as the other. Imagine in four weeks, this meeting is going to start. Is this really possible with Mr. Dulles?

4

So there you have a real, historical issue. Both parties are right. And perhaps you take this down as a corollary in history.

You can be sure that in an historical issue, all parties are right. The question is always in history "when," and never "what."

Because both sides always have a point. But there comes a time -- well, once to every man and nation comes the hour to decide.

IV

1

Now it is very difficult for modern man to give time the quality, which it is. You have black hair, but you also have only one life to live - and the uniqueness of your life in its being placed between these times. And your own time is the highest quality.

The awareness of your time is the state of human consciousness most readily lost. If you go drunk, or take narcotics, the first thing you lose is the awareness of the time. When you go on a spree at eleven o'clock in the evening, and you have one cocktail too many, you don't know what time it is; you don't care. You still know where you are, but you don't know when you are. Time just loses its importance.

2

So it is like the perfume. Our sense of smell is the most easily stalemated. That is, you cannot smell for more than a few minutes a perfume. Afterwards, you cease noticing it.

Seeing is the difference. Seeing is not staled. It stays with us. But the fatigue of our most subtle sense of life, which is smell, is most easily corrupted and lost.

The same with the time sense. It has probably very much to do with each other. I think the sense of timing is exactly in the historical sense for larger units the same as the sense of smell; the scent, the flair.

3

That's why a politician can be corrupt and blind with his eyes. But he must have the flair of the events of the future. That makes a politician.

And that's unknown to most people today. We live near Hollywood. And everybody is here put on a screen, and everybody is made visible. But life to come cannot be seen, but it can be scented. And the sense for historical future is flair. And it is completely destroyed in our civilization.

4

And that's why you are out of history; that's why you live in a dream world, because you have no sense of the hour. It's just "plenty of time."

CHAPTER TWO: INTERPENETRATING BODIES

I

1

So the United States entered two wars too late on a battlefield which was strewn with destruction and corpses. And if in both cases, the United States had come in right away, the loss would have been one percent of what it was, because you can't get the United States to get off from the idiotic sentence, "Seeing is believing," which is one of the most stupid sentences I know, because seeing is not believing.

2

Seeing is the opposite from believing. When you believe, you trust your scent, your flair. And if you want to see, you will marry a nice-looking whore, and you will be the most unhappy creature, because she looks nice, but she smells not well. And that has a spiritual meaning.

The good things that have a future may be tiny. A baby is very inconspicuous, but it has a future. And it smells much better than the grownups.

3

And so the sense of scent, I like introduce into your historical thinking, because all the people you deal with in history-- take Lincoln -- had flair.

I have read in the last days a very saddening book, the most violent, anti-Lincoln book that has been written in this country. And it's quite useful because, when you study the most hostile writer, you know then everything that can be said against your hero, and you can see: is there anything the matter with him?

THE STORY OF MASTERS AGAINST LINCOLN

Now this man is so full of venom, that there is nothing he doesn't hold against Lincoln. And there is a nice story in 1856, Lincoln gave a so-called "lost speech." We have only the notes taken by his friends, and we don't have a manuscript. It's called the "lost speech." And my author is this Edgar Lee Masters, rants about this, and says, "What a man! There, he goes to a meeting, and he has not one note put down. Obviously, he didn't know what would happen, and he didn't know if he should speak, and he didn't know what he would have to say. And so here is this seclusive, and very secretive man, who doesn't want to make up his mind one minute too early."

Now that makes a statesman.

4

It's the greatest compliment he could have paid to Lincoln, because you understand that *to be in politics means never to say anything too early, and never say anything too late.*

Because the whole problem of politics is timing. Nothing else.

Everybody has ideas. There are the Abolitionists, who for thirty years shouted at America, "No slaves." But then comes Lincoln, and he waits until 1863 before he says the word. And it's all the difference between a man like Garrison, the great Abolitionist, or Lovejoy.

And a president is not elected for ideas, but for the timing. And since nobody knows this in this country, our statesmen are ruined. They have to kiss babies, and they have to smile, and they have to look good, and they have to be shot when they go to church, and so on. And this is nonsense, to take away all their strength. Their strength is to retain the instinct for timing.

II

1

(Would you say that in the 1956 election, the issue of stopping hydrogen bombs, which was such a prominent feature of Stevenson's campaign, was too early? And poorly timed?)

I'm trying to ge back to --.

Well, I do think that presidents must never deal with means, but only with ends. And I still think the hydrogen bomb is a means. And therefore peace is an end. But hydrogen bombs are not on the highest level to be discussed. They are means. And all pacifists, who are struck horrified by means, don't get the point. The passions which make war, after all, that's what statesmen are about to calm people down. But the throwing of the bomb is always instrumental.

2

Now if you once suddenly feel that your arm is tied back, and you cannot throw the bomb, because you destroy your own country that could be a phase that's reached. But I think the public discussion again of this will not do very good.

I think Mr. Eisenhower, as well as Mr. Khrushchev knows that there is no war, but can't sell it to their electorates. The people still are running, and the departments are still running with the bomb. And no one thought that there will never be a war, as long as people are in their five senses.

3

(I was just trying to find...)

But it's hard to make it an issue in an election campaign.

Marx had one great wisdom. He said, "No parties will make revolution in the future. The conditions of production will." So he, Marx is the great deplorer of the Communist Party. If it goes on by Marx, you can't have a Communist Party, because it's not a partisan issue. And the same is with bombs. The conditions of production of the bomb are universal, are worldwide. And we shoot them into international space, and therefore practically wars are already on the way out.

For war in the old sense you need territories which you can define. There will be struggles -- most violent struggles, I'm sure. But they will not have the territorial problem of boundaries.

Take Berlin. Berlin is the first interspace problem.

4

And it is exactly what Mr. Riemann said in mathematics that we have now a mathematics of interpenetrating bodies. And who knows a little mathematics? Who has --?

You must know that this is a special branch of mathematics to deal with the problems of interpenetrating bodies. Have you heard of it?

(No.)

Well, better do, because that's the latest fashion.

III

1

Well, as a matter of fact, it's older than the international confirmation was -- I think in 1857 -- Mr. Riemann published his first paper on interpenetrating bodies. But science is always prophetic, it's doing in the spine what's happening in the flesh.

2

Well, why do you make such a terrible face? You're such a pretty girl, why do you do it?

(Well, I was thinking. I have Dr. Gough. He's been complaining that we've known about these non-Euclidian geometries for so long. We know Euclid's wrong. But the teachers just refuse to teach any non-Euclidian geometry.)

Well, you go on your own. Why do you wait for ...?

(I didn't know about this in geometry.)

Well, you bring us some information next time, please.

(What's the name of this book that you talked about, Edgar Lee Masters, on Lincoln?)

Well, you know, I'm not a mathematician.

(No, Edgar Lee Masters.)

(On Lincoln. You say ...)

Oh, Edgar Lee Masters, *Lincoln -- the Man*.

(Lincoln--the Man?)

3

Came out in 1931. It's a very useful book. For example, the greatest speech I think Lincoln ever made is the Second Inaugural. And this poor man, this Masters -- who comes from Illinois -- and it's vanity that makes him write the book, because he has some personal traditions in the family about Springfield and Lincoln, so he feels provoked to write this book, because he has this in. He knows something. He's in the know. That is one of the awkward features of the book, that there is vanity in the man in writing it, that he can boast of some special information. But there's no special information

And then he comes to the Second Inaugural; he prints it in part, the most beautiful sentence -- and says, "This is sheer madness." And that's all he says. So the man is so mutilated in his soul that the fact that Lincoln there says, "Both sides are wrong," is beyond him. The poor guy is so violent, that one has to be right.

4

His hero is Douglas. He said if Douglas had been made president, then there wouldn't have been a Civil War. It's all so incredibly naïve. He has no idea that things got worse every year beginning with 1845 in this country. And since he doesn't know that history always operates in this strange law that things have to get worse before they get better, and has always this evolutionary streak, if you just wait long enough, the things will adjust themselves always, come out right, anyway.

He of course has already this school, which is dominating in this country -- if you adjust, you conform, and never make a decision, and the decisions are then made by nobody knows. This not making decisions is the theory. You don't make decisions. And you don't date. You don't say "Now." And you don't say, "Today."

IV

1

THE STORY OF MASTERS

But Masters -- he ended in the poor house, and I think he deserved it. He's a very terrible man. And he destroyed his marriage, and he destroyed all his love life. And a genius in endowment. And it's a very tragic case.

But if you want to study America's intellectual class, intelligentsia in its complete decline and deserved contempt, you'd better read Masters. He's the man of the *Spoon River Anthology*, and wrote a very beautiful book, *Domesday Book*. And he had all the gifts of genius, and destroyed himself by trying to sit outside history, and sit it out by his intelligence, and looking at things. So *Lincoln--the Man* is just to him a spectator from the outside.

2

I thought this very wonderful, printing the Second Inaugural, and saying this is madness. And then saying, he comes to this meeting of the "lost speech," because he hasn't made up his mind whether he shall speak, what he shall say, and when he shall speak.

Now that makes the real man, who allows himself only to be the man of the hour.

3

The New Testament says the same: Don't prepare your speeches. In the moment in which you will be put on the spot, God will tell you what to say.

The Quakers were not allowed ever to make a prepared statement about their case for this reason. They always quoted the New Testament for this. And the whole problem of the New Testament is to give Israel, which had lost its place in history, its sense of timing, back this flair for things to come.

And when the Church loses this, you get latter-day saints, and you get Pentecostal sects, because

the whole of Christianity is the sense of what is dead and what's alive, the sense of life, and the sense for the dead.

4

And I told you this in this group already. We speak in order to define what is dead and what is alive. That's why we speak. That's the only reason why we must speak. Everything else could be done by sign language.

But in order to say, "This has been," I need words, because corpses are not present. They are not visible. So we all the times secrete, or separate, or segregate not black and white, but past and future.

CHAPTER THREE: GIVEN TIME

I

1

(I was wondering, you know so many theologians are always talking about transcending time...)

Ach, these idiots! They are just Kantians. Most theologians are poor philosophers. They borrow some frame of reference from philosophy, and then plunge into their thinking. They never know that the Apostle Paul and the New Testament have fought all the Greek notions of philosophy. Read the Letters of Paul. He's down on them.

He says, "This abstraction of time and space is nonsense. Look here. Here we are in this hour." At this moment, we are now. We know that there is something that has gone on before this. So we are rooted at this moment in this situation. And we can look backward, and we can look forward, as students, at least.

2

With regard to your home life, you have parents, and you can look backward to them as older, and you have expectations in your life, and you look forward to them, and they probably are not connected with your parents very much.

So you have one past which is filled with your family background -- as we rightly say; "background" is an appeal to backward -- and so the the experiences of man is that he's all the time alternating between looking forward -- as we dutifully say in our letters when we accept an invitation: "We are looking forward to seeing you tomorrow night" -- and we are looking backward.

3

Now you, however, live in a physicists' universe -- that's an abstract time -- in which you say, "There was a beginning somewhere, and we go forward to today, and we go forward." That is, the people in natural science try to persuade you that you are always living in this evolutionary way.

Look, our conscience and our experience in time is quite different. Our experience of time is awakened whenever we can make this break between backward and forward looking, and when you think of your head and of your body. I'm able to turn this way and this way. To be in history means to have the freedom of alternating between backward and forward.

4

This is quite something different, because it roots you.

Now the modern intellect is uprooted, completely extirpated from his fertile living ground. A child is rooted, because it looks up to the parents and says to them, "When are you going to die?" A naïve child will ask such a question. "When are you" -- "Oh, you are very old," this child will say to his grandmother. "When are you going to die?"

II

1

And the child therefore can teach us what Christianity and what Judaism tried to teach: how man actually lives in time. He lives in time by alternating this point of view of looking backward, and looking forward.

When he looks forward, he's frightened with all the dead corpses and superstitions he's meant to carry forward to the future, so he elopes. He leaves father and mother and cleaves to the wife of his choosing, because forward-looking, he's frightened by the past. Then he's loyal again, and to the silver wedding of his parents he comes, because he has also an amount of tradition and loyalty in him, and he will not break away totally, but he has to balance the past and the future. Every one of us has to do this.

2

And therefore, the real experience of time, this fine perfume of now, and what's tomorrow, this feeling that a politician smells. "I smell a rat," "fishy," they say. A very good word, for the historical sense. "This is fishy. I won't touch it".

You know where in the world this is getting you. *There is something rotten in the state of Dane.*

3

This is the real experience of time which every child that is born of a mother re-experiences.

The big philosophers, however, and the Kantian philosophers, and the theological positivists -- these victims by gangsters, they tell you that they learn all about time from the laboratory, from physics. That is, they are far removed from the experimental, empirical time of peoples, of nations, of judges, of families, of real people. And they go to the laboratory and they take out a stopwatch. And they say, "Abstract time is that we call this now 9:30, and now I count up to 60," and within 60 this bomb orbits, circles the

universe, or whatever it does, as this last shot there, the satellite. That is, this is dead -- the time of dead things to which we only add the time element.

4

You can take one definition.

Dead things are those who have no time within themselves.

You take this chair; there is nothing of the time element in it. It has no time. It's out of time. Death means to leave the time process. That's what it means.

III

1

Now if a physicist deals with dead matter. That is, his stopwatch adds the time element artificially, abstractly to what this chair in itself doesn't do. I let this chair fall; and then you count, then that takes half a second for it to fall down. But whereas you and I have this time sense inside of us, when we live, the chair hasn't. You have to add it from the outside, mechanically. You have made the clock. And the chair doesn't know anything about it.

2

So in death, time and reality are separated. Or time and matter are separate. And in life, every element of the living process carries its own rhythm, its own death warrant. You and I have a sense of time.

Who comes under the Beatitudes in the New Testament -- who is blessed?

The man whose sense of time coincides with his given time.

You are a lucky man, if you have to live eighty years, if you have something to live for during eighty years.

The devil is the power in us who tries to sell out quickly. The devil is always selling you short. That is, devil and God are not separated in anything but the time sense.

The devil says you can have this pleasure now, where you can only have it after you have served well.

3

The only difference between the diabolical streak in every human being and the divine is only that in the divine streak, you have for example perseverance. Until you have earned the money, you will not spend it. The devil tells you, you can forge a check. So you forge a check, and so then you think you have the money. It's a very short operation, and you don't have it.

Whole nations have been selling short and buying short on the installment plan. That is, their sense of timing has not identified itself with the given time, the creature in us and the creator in us must come to a harmony.

4

Everybody has a sense of his allotted time. And you find this with the consumptious people, the artist who knows that he has, like Keats, or like Chopin who had to go early; Schubert -- such people know that they have just a very short time, and they spend it in a feverish activity in order to fulfill themselves.

Other people live beyond time.

IV

1

THE STORY OF A FRIEND FORTY YEARS OLDER

I have a friend -- oh, "friend," I -- saying too much. He was forty years older than I. I visited him when he was over ninety, every year, to his birthday, and he had jubilees one after another, 50th jubilee of his doctorate, and 50th jubilee of this and that. And he always said to us -- the whole faculty went to see him -- he said, "Death has forgotten me." And it was his greatest punishment. His wife had taken her life, she had thrown herself out of the window. And he was such a cold fish that when everybody went and tried to help and rescue her, he said, "Don't touch her. First, notify the police." And that was his reaction to the death of his wife. And so death had forgotten him. He had to live too long.

And you must know one thing you can live too long. And that's a curse. It's just like a confinement in a prison. This man was in prison, and he felt it. And he told us so. He had no worries. Not big -- but life was not real. So the man had to live to his 97th year.

2

And as soon as you begin to understand that life can be too long as well as too short, you will perhaps begin to understand perhaps:

our problem is that God has given us as creatures a limited time, and that our will and our insight has to try to keep inside this allotted time.

3

We have here, a gentleman who has written a wonderful play on Newman, and another play on Justice Holmes, about the nonagenarians, about two blissful people of ninety. And they're two great plays by Emmett Labery. And I recommend them highly to you if you want to come near to the historical problem. One is called *Second Spring*, and the other is called *The Magnificent Yankee*. I recommend it highly for all you do in your classes, eye-openers.

4

And now I found a story to triple it. And I sent it to him yesterday. You may be interested.

THE STORY OF VON GÖRGELY

There is in Hungary, a hundred years ago, the revolution of the Hungarians, the Magyars, against the Hapsburgs -- they were already once crushed by the Russians, just as it has been now. And this is a great tragedy that it has happened twice.

What the Russians did in 1954, it was, wasn't it? Or '56? When was the Hungarian --?

(October '56.)

'56, -- the czar did in 1850, when the Hungarians had thrown off the domination of the Austrians, for two years successfully, and the czar suddenly marched in his troops into Hungary from the north and forced the Hungarian army to surrender.

Now the commander-in-chief of this victorious Hungarian army that finally had to surrender to this new army, and much bigger army of the Russians was Görgely -- von Görgely. This man had to live 98 years. He died in 1916. That is, from 1850, when he was pardoned and not courtmartialled by the emperor of Austria, on the behest of the czar, the poor man had to live to 1916, hated by the Hungarians, because he was the only officer of the Hungarian army that was not shot. So they all said he was a traitor. And he couldn't disprove it, because he said, "I have nothing to do with my being pardoned. The czar of Russia wrote a letter to the emperor and said this man who has surrendered to me deserves my treatment. Don't shoot him. And I had nothing to do with my being pardoned."

But this man, imagine, to live 66 years, after you have been a leader of your country, ignored within Hungary. And he died in the First World War, which was the opening wedge for the second surrender of Hungary to Russia.

So this man Görgely is to me a great figure of the tragedy of time. He had to live after his highest moment in 1850, for 66 years. That's an unheard-of tragedy to me. And it's a punishment. It's a harder punishment than if he had been executed right away in 1850. Then he would be a great name in history.

Now I asked Hungarians, and they didn't know that the man had lived on. Just a ghost -- no, a forgotten man.

CHAPTER FOUR: MARX AND JEFFERSON

I

1

Well, as soon as you approach history as this problem of being up to date in our own given time, that my time allotted to me, and my will to do, and to time, must be harmonized, history becomes a concrete task of a nation, or of a people. There is an allotted time spent, and in this time, you have to make the right decisions to fill this time spent fruitfully, or you are just put on the bier, and carried out without your having lived out your life.

(What would you say about Lincoln? Would you say he was rescued out of life by being assassinated?)

Well, certainly. The tremendous thing of Lincoln is that.

2

Well, that's a very strange thing.

THE STORY OF LINCOLN'S ASSASSINATION

First of all the greatest miracle of the assassination is that he was assassinated after he had done his work. And it is absolutely un-understandable why he wasn't assassinated before. Because obviously, before, it was just as easy or even easier. He was unprotected all the time. And when he marched into Richmond, he wasn't assassinated.

THE STORY OF LINCOLN'S MARCHING INTO RICHMOND

And again, by the way, Mr. Masters' attacking him for his going to Richmond and sitting down in the chair of the mighty, whereas to me, this is the most Franciscan act of the whole career of Lincoln, that he marched on foot into Richmond.

Mr. Masters, this devil, can even twist here the lion's tail and says that it was just terrible that he didn't do this, and walked unprotected into Richmond.

3

Your question is, I think, that this assassin was in some kind of coalition with God, obviously, because he helped a lot to establish Lincoln in the hearts of this country. And I put it this way.

THE STORY OF LINCOLN'S BURDEN

When Lincoln had to travel from Springfield to Washington, he suddenly saw that what he had wished to become president was not what he had wished to be. It was a wartime president, and in a torn country. And it was quite clear to him that it was tragedy all around, and he didn't have one cheerful moment after that. He felt that the presidency was just a burden. And that dawns on any candidate very gradually that what he has desired all his life, suddenly tastes very sour. And I think they had to pay this terrible price, and he was spared then more. The burden had become unbearable.

4

(Well, I was comparing him with your Hungarian general, then, because Lincoln had trouble with his own party...)

Of course he had. They would all have --.

(...they would all have made mincemeat out of him.)

Of course they would. No, it was great -- very merciful.

II

1

(Did Thomas Jefferson omit his presidency on his epitaph, because he had to change his attitude during the time of office. That is, before office and after office, he was an agrarian, democratic type of thinker. And in office, he had a change for expediency?)

Well, you say "for expediency." But don't you think the office make a man?

As a party man, you have the perfect right to put one foot down and say, "Emphasis is on agrarianism, on sectionalism, on what-not". On small farmers and so on. Then you come into office and you see that the office is comprehensive.

2

THE STORY OF JEFFERSON

And so I have always felt that it is the honor of Jefferson that he took Louisiana. If he hadn't, he would have been a small man. He would have stood in the way of his mission. And I feel that only as president does he rise to the stature of which, as a party man or as a man just of a program. I think you have to change program. I cannot feel that programs are good enough.

3

I think Marx's insight, for example, that parties cannot solve the struggle of the classes, but institutions, and the way we produce will bring about the new society is a much deeper insight than anything they have done with his memory in the Communist Party, because that makes him a very small man who is tied down to certain rules -- some of which he has laid down before he has lived, before the society has lived, before the industry has developed.

And so for example, I would say that Marx -- opposite from Jefferson -- tried to be president in his private thinking, and was then a party politician in his activities on the basis of his insight.

Jefferson was a party man in his insight, and in office, he was a not-party man.

4

Marx and Jefferson are mentally at opposite poles, because Marx dug deep enough to free himself from his own mentality, and to say, "These laws of history go beyond human mentalities. There are many mentalities involved, and used, and function, because everybody thinks as he works." That's, after all, his great insight.

And so a philosopher at his desk has certain ideas. A worker at his loom has certain ideas. A capitalist at his ledger has certain ideas. But they all have to collaborate. That's production. That's society.

III

1

THE STORY OF MARX

So I think, when later, the poor Marx -- because he was very miserable in England, and in exile, and no money. And his children died from consumption. They died really, and his wife died, from hunger. And in such a tragic situation, you have to do something. So he founded this ridiculous International. And then they have now parties all over the world.

But that isn't even his idea. His idea was that the world wars were the big world revolution. And he would have only contempt for Mr. Stalin's or Mr. Khrushchev's claim that the Russian Communist Party has anything to do with the world revolution. He would have laughed at them. Parties cannot make revolutions, he said. That's his dogma, his real dogma.

2

So it is quite funny.

Here you have Jefferson, 1780 -- or 1775, if you want the *Declaration of Independence* - that's his mind. And then he becomes president. In 1803, we get this big chunk of land, and he rises to the occasion and forgets that he has been the man of agrarianism. And in Marx's case, in 1847, he is already the man of the Louisiana Purchase, because he dreamed of world revolution, all proletarians of all the world, solidarity. Just as Louisiana Purchase means all of America, the seashore, the Pacific Coast. And so Marx, that is his anti-Hegelian, anti-rational, anti-Enlightenment revolt.

Marx said, "I must do opposite from Mr. Jefferson." He's just as much anti-Jefferson, as he is anti-Hegel, or anti-Kant, or anti-Voltaire. He said, "All these people reason out a good world. I'm not going to overestimate my own thoughts. I'm looking at the conditions under which people produce, and therefore I'm just one of the producers. I produce ideas. Other people produce wheat, other people print money. Therefore, I'm only one of the ideologists. And therefore I will not give a damn to my own theory."

That's his greatness. "My theory isn't good enough. I must imply the needs of the workers."

And that's why he says, "Proletarians of all countries, unite." That's like his Louisiana Purchase.

3

And if you can stand this comparison for a moment -- and then in 1865, he publishes his *Kapital*, and in 1867, you get the First International, and these are makeshifts of expediency to deal with the problem on hand, and to find a place for yourself in the future society, which every man has a right to struggle for.

And so, Marx is really dialectically -- as we said -- abolishing the rank of philosophy in Jefferson's mind. Jefferson had to learn by politics. And Marx, quite vice versa had to learn that there was still room for a little bit of will and philosophy inside the non-will, historical process of economic materialism.

4

And I think it may help you. You have to live this out today. You have to distrust your philosophies, gentlemen. But you have not ceased to philosophize.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S PARTS

I hope I have done this myself in my life. I always said to myself, "That isn't my whole life." I have been a soldier. I've been a worker. I've been many things. I've been unemployed. And life is more comprehensive than what my mind contributes to this. But it isn't worthless what my mind contributes.

So the book of Marx, the *Kapital* or the *International*, are not worthless, but they are minor compared to his deepest insight that man has to root himself in time.

IV

1

And I would say that, gentlemen, that Marx has rescued from the biblical tradition the fact that man first is rooted in a unique time situation.

Jefferson said that at all times all men are created equal. All enlightenment is timeless, natural law. And all Marx is historical.

And what I have told you today is simply in this sense, every human being has to be a Marxian, because Marx comes from the Old Testament. And in this sense, the Bible is simply true, that we are rooted in time. And these great phases of class war are nothing but the translation of your time and space inside your family into the life of the peoples of this earth written in large. That's the human family. This is exactly the situation you meet yourself in your own upbringing and in your own growth.

2

And what I'm trying to tell you is generalized Marxism.

I've never been a socialist. I've never been a Marxian. I've always felt it was quite arbitrary to put so much emphasis on the class issue. But the sense of history -- that's a different thing. That is an act of liberation from the abstract idea of physicists' time, of non-historical time, which only applies to dead things for which we have to put up an abstract time.

(What you said about the class war, with regard -- I wasn't quite clear on that point. Could you repeat that?)

3

Well, I have told you. I feel that we have to rescue Marx today from the Marxians.

Kierkegaard and Marx, these two people went against the Enlightenment -- and Nietzsche, by the way, too; and there are others: Ferrari in Italy, a forgotten man, partly; and Melville

in this country, I talked about him yesterday; Herman Melville has his great role in this country -- that they have this deep feeling of the now, and that all we know about time is only the concrete time of our situation, between the past and the future.

And what the scientist tries to sell you is an abstraction. That's not lived and experienced time. But that only applies to chairs, and walls, and bricks, and geology. Abstract time. And you know how far they go.

They tell you that there will be no time in space, so that a man will not have to eat for ten years if he's up in the air -- this is all nonsense. It won't go. It's today in the paper again. I just had to laugh. You know better than these physicists. They tell you, if you go in this abstract space, then you suddenly will stop growing, or shitting, or breathing, or sleeping. They have gone mad, because they think this is dead.

Well, this is just empty, the stupidity of this.

4

And so will you kindly take this? What you know is that you live here in this classroom, the schedule of your studies.

This hour is a part of your being a student.

Therefore this hour is contained in the term.

And the term is contained in the academic year.

And the academic year for you is contained within the four years you spend in this college.

And if you look it all up, it's all your education, as you call it.

SECOND PART: NATURALISTIC AND HISTORICAL TIME

CHAPTER ONE: MORE THAN ONE CALENDAR

I

1

Now education has its own time process. The mind can be developed regardless of your social ties.

At the same time, your family has a time. That's another time process that goes on. Your parents age, and your sisters and brothers grow up, and you grow up and you want to get married.

And therefore, while the academic clan doesn't care for your biological time as a family man, that's a reality, too. That's another time. And it may be a tragedy involved. A girl has to marry a year too early before she can finish her studies. Or opposite. She thinks that it's so important that she gets her degree that she makes her man miserable, because she says she won't marry him.

2

And so there are conflicts.

Concrete times are plural. We live in more than one order of time.

Comes the war, the man is drafted, and you have to become a nurse, or a WAC, or a WAVE. There is a third time. The conflicts of nations, the history of mankind is quite merciless about your family, and your studies. So you get a third time.

And I have written many books on this problem of the plurality of the calendar, of the human calendar. Man lives in more than one calendar range.

3

Now here is 9 to 10, and here is your working day, from 8 till -- let's say -- to 10 in the evening. And obviously my hour today here is embedded in this larger rhythm of mine and of yours.

Then we live in an election year -- next year, perhaps, and then on November 4th, there will be no lectures, because the political calendar of the country says, "No lectures today," and that crosses out this rhythm.

And then another quite a different rhythm comes in, as your citizen calendar.

And then comes the soldier's calendar.

4

This leads us too far.

What I wanted to say is the abstraction of time *per se* is taken from the experience of more than one calendar. And when philosophers talk to you big about time and space, laugh them into their face. It is nothing but a generalization. All we know are definite calendars, definite times.

There is a political calendar in the life of the United States.

There is a family calendar where your nephew has to be christened,

or you have to go to the wedding of your sister as her best man, or what-not.

And then there is a funeral.

This has nothing to do with politics. But it has very much to do with your life, because at the funeral you may meet your future bride. These occasions of family calendars are of the first-rate importance in your biography.

II

1

THE STORY OF A FUNERAL

I have such a colleague -- his best friend committed suicide. And for the funeral, the sister of this man came. And he as a friend, and the sister as a bereaved sister, went together to the funeral, and they were both forty years of age, and both bachelors and never thought of marrying. And the shock of this event was so total that they surrendered their isolationism, and got engaged, and now they live here in Claremont, or in Riverside. And there is so far beyond their expectations this one event their lives, this funeral service made history.

And that's a real story. Only this catastrophe of the brother opened their hearts to each other.

2

And so we would be all the poorer if we hadn't this family calendar. These are important things.

The best marriage is always the marriage concluded on the wedding on the previous wedding. The friends of the bridegroom are the given candidates for marriage for his sister. And if this would happen more often, there would be better marriages.

The reason for this is, if you have first a friend, and then you marry his sister, you have something to talk about, because the exchange with your man has been on intellectual grounds, very often. They have something to share. But if you meet the girl just for her good looks, that's not a good basis for marrying.

(It was unique that they met at the funeral --)

Weddings and funerals are matchmakers - should be. So they are epochal events in the smaller range of this calendar.

3

Now, would you understand: what the philosophers and the physicists call "time" is the abstraction in the literal sense, the generalization of real times, experienced by you. Because we have

*a political calendar for the great history of the United States;
a family calendar; and an individual, educational calendar;
a career calendar you may say;
and a work calendar,*

there has of course been a natural instinct to speak of time in general.

However, my dear people, if you have here these seven books, everybody who then speaks in the abstract of "book," knows that he first had to experience books before he can give a general definition of a "book." However, with regard to time, these people try to make you think that you can define time without having experienced it in real life.

4

And this is incredible. The abstraction of time is always based on the empirical experience of time. But nobody in the last 150 years, since Mr. Jefferson -- he is one of the culprits in this process; he is this abstract thinker, and that's why he's so dangerous -- people have said that you can understand life by abstracting from the date from which it occurs. And you cannot.

III

1

In 1800 it's very different from 1959. Everybody knows that there is a spirit of the times, the rhythm of life. And what you experience at twenty is not the same as what you experience at sixty. How could it be? And what you experience today is not the same as when you did the same thing at the age of ten.

2

And therefore, the rule I want you to understand is: philosophers abstract from times really experienced. And you cannot therefore allow them to go along and define time from dead objects, and astronomical time. They have to dig down to the experienced time, which they never do.

3

They abstract -- the word "abstract" may have no horrors for you. For me, it has. God created the concrete world. He didn't create geometry. Geometry is the abstraction from real bodies, and real lines, and real points.

Jefferson says that the geometer knows the thoughts of God better than the chair-maker, or the carpenter.

This is nonsense. God created things with time and spaces, and expanse. And what you call "geometry" is an abstraction.

4

(Is that the influence of Plato?)

Of course it is! Down with Plato! Down with Plato!

IV

1

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY CALLED PLATO

I was called as a student "Plato," and so I have some right to say that I have been imbued by him. And he's a very great man. But today he does just harm. The human mind is ruined.

Plato replaced the five regular bodies, his mathematical discovery of the five regular bodies, and thought that was God's greatest creation. Imagine, a cube God's greatest creation! When a baby is God's greatest creation, and a flower is God's greatest creation.

That is, all the irregular things are His real creations. And those regular abstractions, they are for this impoverished human mind who can only think in straight lines, and points, and squares, and cubes, and circles.

2

And if you meet a person who believes that mathematics is divine and creatures are distorted, and irregular, shun such a person. Shun them, because they are doing an injustice to God's creation. God has created a world in which in every moment you have to re-perceive the beauties. Everything is different. Every moment is unique. Every flower deserves to be looked upon on her own merits. You can't get away by saying, "Oh, this is just a rose." You have to write a poem on this rose. You have to talk her up, and not down, this rose. And anybody who tells you "that's just" that, dismiss him. He's the enemy of the human race. Oh, "We have seen all the pictures," "That's just politics."

This man doesn't allow this moment to become divine, to become alive. He says, "It's just politics," and he goes home. And sleeps. And therefore, nothing is done.

3

The difference between the naturalist and the historian is:

the historian says, "Think of it! It's really this!"

And the naturalist says, "Oh, it's just --."

And these are the two eternal attitudes in your own heart. It's like breathing out, exhaling, and inhaling.

And that's why people today are so very shot.

You have given up the word "inspiration," because if you would use it, you would know that we look at things as natural when we expire, when we try to get out of it. And we are inspired, and we get involved. Today they say "philosophy of engagement," for this reason, "engage," philosophy of the involvement, existentialism.

Well, these are desperate cries of people who want to get back into the empirical time. You have heard these slogans.

4

That's the old contrast between the biblical tradition of time and the platonic tradition of time.

CHAPTER TWO: ENLIGHTENMENT

I

1

(But everyone's conception of God, for example, must be timeless. He's supposed to be some...)

Oh, but it's all Greek. Don't believe it for a minute.

Any person who has ever prayed knows better. How is God timeless?

God becomes man.

God comes to earth.

History is His revelation.

You don't believe it.

God created the world,

and He is still creating it. It's a process.

How can He be out of time?

These are all Greek words.

2

Nowhere does the word "timeless" occur in the Bible. Show it to me. It's the invention of the platonists. We are flooded with these neo-platonists, platonists, theologians, who sell you their Greek philosophy as Christianity. It has nothing to do with biblical tradition. And it has nothing to do with Christianity. It's the the living truth as against the schoolman's truth.

People who want to look at the world better abstract from time and space. But people who want to live, can't afford that. You have to hear the rhythm that tells you today to take a day off. That's a decision you have to make.

3

THE STORY OF MANN AND WANN

In German there is a pun possible between "man" and "when." And I had to gave a big address for the industrialists of Germany on the thirtieth of January of this year, and so it's quite fresh in my memory. The whereabouts would lead us too far. But I made this pun -- or this point there that industrialists themselves could not just outproduce their competitors. They had also to learn when to stop. And I said -- because this they had in

common with the poor customer, whom they wanted to deluge, that when you are at your best in eating, you have to stop, not go on eating. When it tastes very well, stop. When you are tired, you have to know how to sleep. And an industrialist who can't sleep, and has to take tranquilizer is already, destroying himself.

4

Here I am told at the college they give you tranquilizers for the exam. If this is true, this college has to be closed right away. It's a diabolical institution, because the time rhythm is no longer relied upon. It's not cultivated. Because "tranquilizer" means that the rhythm isn't functioning. That's why you are not allowed tranquilizers.

Girls shouldn't smoke, I can't help feeling, because they have a deeper necessity for being in tune with the universe. Your rhythm is the most sacred thing you have received. We are far more apt to break rhythms, because man must create new rhythms, and you must preserve the existing rhythm.

II

1

Man is the institutor of the next rhythm. For example, in a factory, there is a new rhythm of production. That is man's contribution.

But women have to cultivate all the existing rhythms. From holidays to weekdays, and to sleeping matters, and if the mother doesn't provide enough sleep for her children, she's a murderess.

2

Now I said, there is

*a man in us,
and a when in us.*

Usually, in a good marriage, she is the "when" and he is the man. And the woman has to say to a man, "Now you stay home tonight, and that's just too much". She has to cure the rhythm, when he breaks it by overwork, or by worry, or whatever it is. In a good marriage, this is the case.

3

So I had a very intimate friend present at this speech, a head of a big school system in Germany. And he has many troubles at home in his marriage, then we had dinner

together after this speech. And he said to me, grinning, "You know, that's all right with a normal marriage, that he is the man, and she is the when. But in my marriage, I have to be the when."

So I was very proud, because it had so affected him that he immediately could see that in his case it had to be the other way around. And obviously it's in many such cases that one has to play the role of the other.

When and man.

4

All nature considers man without his when. Once you understand this, you will open up avenues into history which you haven't seen before.

History says, "When was man created?" and "When were the United States founded?" "When was the time which tries men's soul?"

III

1

And this greatness of Paine's pamphlet, which made him a great man, is that he went to Valley Forge and wrote, "*Now is the time which tries men's souls.*" And in this he became just as Jefferson of the Louisiana Purchase, bigger than Thomas Paine's little Reason. The man who wrote *Reason* -- you know, he wrote this later, was a dogmatist and a fanaticist. He wrote this in France. But the man who wrote the pamphlets of the Revolution War was in the thick of fighting, and he knew exactly what had to be said now, at this moment, regardless of what would have been said later. And he re-established his own freedom, that you say different things at different hours of life.

2

So the unique character of the date has to be added to the theory that history deals with unique events, because very often, it is only that this happens, at this moment that the event becomes unique. It's enough for an event to be needed at this moment in the creative process of the whole.

So time is a quality of living bodies on processes. And where you have dead processes, the quality is not inherent in the process, the time.

So never take natural science as the judge of historical processes. The natural process is impoverished by the time element that's lacking.

3

Take a sleeper and a dead person. The sleeper at this moment has no consciousness. But he's fully alive, his rhythm is waking him up at one time; and therefore, as a sleeping individual, we still belong into history. And the person who sleeps well -- the Bible says, "To those whom He loves, God gives it in their sleep." And there's some great truth about it, because to be able to sleep well is a condition of being a fruitful and creative person.

And therefore, all this overrating of consciousness is nonsense.

The secret of a person in history is that he is just as much at peace with the world when he sleeps as when he is awake.

And so this constant improvement of Mr. Jefferson and all his adherents: get more intelligent. No more solve all the quizzes; become a quiz kid. And so - this is all *blöd* - nonsense.

The problem is the alternation between consciousness and unconsciousness.

4

THE STORY OF ENLIGHTENMENT

I had a big debate. One of my dearest or closest disciples is very down on me, because I have no love lost for the Jeffersons, for the Enlightenment. And he wants to save the Enlightenment. And he's quite a dangerous fellow, because he has the press at his fingertips -- he has the means of production in Europe. And so he can print what he pleases. And so we nearly fell out. On the one-hand side, he worships me; and on the other hand, he hates me. It's a very heated-up situation, and a terrible situation, because you never know what's happening next. And in order to defend himself against myself, he has grown a terrible beard, and my psychiatrist friends tell me that I'm always in danger of being shot by him.

And I tried to tell him that God created just as much night as He created day. And that to demand from a child prodigy to sleep less and know more is just murder. You kill this child. And perhaps the plant in us and the animal in us have to be balanced. And we have just to always sink back into unconsciousness as we have to wake up to consciousness. And that's just hateful to him. He wants to see more light. I can't see that. More neon light is blinding. I don't want to have any neon light around my house. I want to have it dark at night.

IV

1

And we have reached this stage -- you can understand this very well -- that man has so much light and has abolished night to such an extent that philosophers, certainly, thinking, have to add this condiment, this grain of salt, that this enlightenment cannot go on. More light is not in itself a blessing. It has to have the right proportion of light, the right amount of light. And you have to sink back into pre-consciousness.

2

And I don't think there is such thing as subconscious. That's an invention of the Enlightenment. If you have enlightenment as a normal state, that everything is known and conscious then you have to coin this phrase, "subconscious". But I know that to be conscious is a disease, and that when I am sound asleep, I must dismiss my consciousness, to get a new one the next morning. The mind has to be recreated all the time, after all. I have to dismiss it. I have to be able to forget. That's as healthy as to remember. If I cannot forget, I am sick. I can't forgive my enemies if I can't forget.

3

And therefore, as soon as you see that this rhythm is the problem of history, you do not believe any more that to know more and to become more informed, and you will discover that the human soul has always been the power to change one's mind. That's the so-called subconscious. And it is only when people are -- as in Vienna, there were in the days of Mr. Freud, also whooping this Jeffersonian line - that to know more and more and to be conscious of everything you do all the time was ideal, then you created a subconscious, because you were just unable to perform.

Subconscious is, so to speak, after you over-strain your intention to be conscious of everything, then you can't swing it and the unpleasant things are dismissed into your subconscious. You have tried to become aware of everything, but you can't swing it. They call this "repression," or whatever they do.

4

A normal person can dismiss -- I have never thought that my conscious life is identical with my person. I'm much richer than my little consciousness. And as soon as you admit this, it has no need to speak -- when you mean the human soul -- of the subconscious. I think that is in a gray area between the realm of the soul where we dismiss mental impressions and thoughts and say, "I've been stupid. Don't think about it. Forget about it."

We say this when we are normal. And we can.

The Enlightenment however has preached for the last two hundred years, "Forget nothing. Buy the Encyclopaedia Britannica." And "Read the Hundred Greatest Books."

I've never heard a more idiotic proposition, because I read a book when it is time to read it. And out of time, the Hundred Books must not be read. There are some mathematical books in the Great Hundred Books of Mr. Hutchins which have to be read when you are out for mathematics. And you can't read them out of time, out of your lifetime, out of your biography. They are devaluated. This is treating your intellect to a feast which will spoil your stomach.

CHAPTER THREE: CHILDREN ARE PRE-HISTORICAL

I

1

All adult education has this tremendous problem to teach these adults here -- this man is in this terrible labeled industry of adult education. And the whole problem of adult education is to re-evoke in an adult the usually lost sense of the timing, or when he should now go on a hike, and when he should now study this and that -- it is not the problem of a hobby, but when to have a hobby. That makes this difficult in adult life.

You will all discover how difficult it is to know, when to stop.

2

Well, the last thing I wanted to leave with you today is that the way you read in the papers about time and space should be criticized by you, and you should become aware that the times of which we know are all in the plural.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S SOZIOLOGIE

I've written now a universal history with the title -- it cannot be quite translated into English, but the title is quite eloquent -- the *Vollzahl der Zeiten*, the "full number of the times." And I have put -- although it is an historical book on the history of mankind from the caveman to today -- this plural of "times," to emphasize that it is not a philosophy, but experienced time of empires, and peoples, and kingdoms, and cities, and families.

The Bible has this expression of "the fullness of the times." And I've preferred not to have any biblical allusion in it, and just to speak normally today, the full number of the times.

3

So the cure is use the words "space" and "time" always in the plural, and you can't go wrong. Speak of "times" and speak of "spaces." And never say "space and time."

Doesn't exist, except in the abstraction of the mathematician.

There it's quite legitimate. But you are not allowed to speak of space and time, or you will destroy yourself. Your life is lived in this room, and in your living room, and in the library in spaces, and in places. And your time is divided up into various rhythms of the calendar. Your studies, and your military service, and your political career, and what-not. And therefore "times" and "spaces" are the historical expressions.

4

And Thucydides has created this stern epoch of the Peloponnesian War, this specific epoch. We just ended there, didn't we?

So forgive me, I think I have taught you something useful outside what I was going to tell you, but it is important, too.

II

1

So whose paper do I still have to get?

(The other side, too.)

But I'm forgiving. So when are you going to serve?

(He has to check his paper for 180, too also.)

What?

(No Friday, Friday. Thursday. Friday. The next class meeting.)

What are you saying?

(No. I have to do the paper for 180 yet)

Well, if you had said, "I couldn't give you this paper today because I had to write the other paper," I would believe you.

(I did.)

But now you said you had to write all the three papers, and not one is on time. This makes no sense.

(No! The paper for 180 is due tomorrow, and I'm handing that one in tomorrow.)

Are you sure?

(I'm positive.)

Well, that you should have made more clear.

So please.

(It'll be there.)

2

Now, I'm back to Thucydides.

I was asked by one of you a very pertinent question. He said, why is this a possession forever, if after all our life is in process, and how can anybody proclaim that his book on history should be an eternal question?

I do think that to come after an event is an educational problem. That you come after the Fourth of July of 1776 is something that has to be impregnated on every generation.

I have this disk, "*History Must Be Told*," for this very reason. People today try to go naked and to believe in nature only, and to be tanned, and muscular, and healthy, and what-not, and analyze away from all historical complexions and complexes -- try so much to believe the animal in themselves that you think history happens to you without a deliberate effort. And into this abstract time which other people measure, you can be lifted -- you can be taken by the astronomer who tells you that you were born after 1940.

But -- where's some chalk?

(You deposited some --.)

I usually put it in my pocket.

(I don't think you'll be able to grasp it.)

Thank you, thank you, thank you.

3

And would you kindly begin to see that children are not in history, that they have to be lifted up upon this time level of the life of nations, or the world of the human race, by education, by a deliberate effort?

As long as you think that children enter the historical process automatically, you have not understood the difference between this pluralistic, experienced time and where you have to take your stand between past and future by your own freedom to look backward and forward, by this experience, what the old people who were revivalists who call "conversion" by this power to free yourself from the accident of birth, and to become a decisive fact in the life of the race.

4

However you express this -- you can express it religiously, you can express it mentally, you can express it just by power of your own power to doubt yourself, to be shaken up, to split, and don't be down on the schizoid. A certain amount of splitting is necessary for the

historical being. You have at one time to say that part of you belongs to the future, and part of you is an eggshell that has to be dismissed.

III

1

And therefore today that we have schizophrenia in these quantities is the result only of your not getting hold of your schizophrenia, because it's just as much a blessing as it is a curse, that we can doubt, that we can split into two beings, one being part of our mother's womb and our father's society; and one being a prophet of the future and of future things. Today nothing is made of it, because you are told that younger people are the future.

I assure you of one thing. Children are unhistorical and block the future. The future is created by old men.

Mr. Lincoln is much more a man of the future, than the children that lived in his day.

2

But this is the superstition that comes from your pragmatic education, it comes from progressive education, it comes from the cult of the child in the last hundred years, that you think children automatically belong to the future and old people belong to the past. It's just the other way around. All people in responsible positions create the future against the dreams of their children.

Children are prehistorical. They are not in history. They are down below. They are on a level of playing with the past.

And this is perhaps the most shocking thing to you.

3

But Mr. Thucydides knew this. If a Greek grew up without reading his history, he could assume that to go to the Olympic Games, or to ask for an oracle in Delphi, that was enough; that made you a Greek. He says, "People who haven't taken to heart the tragedy of the decisive conflict between Sparta and Athenian cannot in the future be called Greeks". And this means that they have to face tragedy.

Now who wants to face tragedy?

The Civil War came about because people couldn't face tragedy in time. And they could have. There was a proposition to indemnify the slave-owners. The North was willing to pay two-third of the cost. And it wasn't even debated in the South. You couldn't get the people to believe that the issue was to be settled.

4

So most people live prehistorical.

If I go around in Los Angeles, this is the ideal situation of a prehistorical humanity. You are all prehistorical except for your car, which reminds me that you are very modern indeed, and the smog. The smog is the history of Los Angeles, and the people are the children. You are all prehistorical.

That is, you are far behind the decisions that would have had to be taken in the town against the smog long ago. And they're postponed, and postponed, and postponed; and things will have to get much worse before anything will be done against the smog. You know this.

Now they say it's too expensive. And when the first corpses will lie in the streets from too much smog, then they will have to do something. Nobody has yet died officially from smog, so nothing is done.

IV

1

You can always say that before death is stalking in the room, people will daydream, and say "It isn't so bad."

The Civil War. Before people were killed in a war, simply there was no discussion possible, because people didn't think it was a vital issue.

Vital is something that entails death, gentlemen.

Will you take this down? It's a good historical sentence.

2

Now, the vital issues are such that will not be faced before somebody has to die for them. That's a vital issue. And all the rest is bunk. And that's why history is so cruel. And that's why wars have their way, because people will not believe the time at which they are living before the shots are fired. Before they say, "Oh, it isn't that bad." So they are out of history. They are out of the time stream.

And you have to decide it yourself. These natural brats, these ghastly people, the *young, cruel, oblivious, reckless, ruthless* children are not beautiful in themselves. That's nonsense. That's all sentimentality because it is very good for the modern adult to say that so that he can shift all the responsibility on the children. "They'll do it." They'll never do it, unless the old gives the example.

3

The old have to do the new things.

The children? What do they do? A girl plays with dolls. What are dolls? They are a reminder of old fashions and customs. You play wedding, and funeral, and school, and birth. What do boys play with? With soldiers, or with building stones, or with machinery that has already been invented. All children play with the old forms of life. They play themselves into life by using up the old historical forms.

The oldest plays of the children are also the oldest institutions of mankind.

These pawn games. That's the old way in which justice was done.

THE STORY OF A PAWN

In the courts, that the party that sued had to put down a pawn so that the judge knew that he would comply, that he wouldn't run away after the judgment. The parties had to give an earnest of seriousness to the judge.

That's the pawn -- you know these pawn games, you still play it here in society? Where everybody puts in something into the common -- ?

(Kitty.)

So children play with the past, and that's called "education."

4

But the moment in which they take up a stand in society comes very late.

In your life, it may never come, because you are employees. Employees are never asked to make a decision. And we have today a society where I have to tell you these things, because if people at the age of fifty or sixty are still just employees, they'll never grow up. They'll never make decisions. They always play another man's game.

And therefore today we have-- through spiritual means, through deliberate teaching of the adult -- to cover this lost ground. You have to recapture what industry denies you, by a tremendous effort to get into your own time.

CHAPTER FOUR: PEACE HAS TO BE CONCLUDED

I

1

And this is what Thucydides feels the historian should do.

Anybody who has read his book is now a Greek, because he has been able to live through tragedy.

2

It's the same, as I told you before -- I may repeat it, perhaps -- that *John Brown's Body*, was written by Vincent Stephen Benét in the hope that anybody who reads it would live after the Civil War, would know that these sacrifices cannot have been in vain.

And there are two parties today in the world. The one who says, "The future comes about automatically by the newly born," and the other who knows that the future has to be wrestled from the resistance from this prehistorical dream world of the children by grave decisions of the adult.

3

(As an example of something which reinforces this, I was thinking of the film, "He Who Must Die." It's to me one of the most compelling films I've ever seen.)

Who has seen it?

Only one. Well it's extraordinary. It's this Greek passion play. It's in the Egyptian Theater?

(No. It's the Sunset Theater, at Sunset and Western.)

It's an extraordinary play. You would oblige me if you would go there, because I think we could then really speak about what history is and what it isn't. It's a great play. Have you seen it? It's unfortunate that such a great play - it's a French play based on a Greek text -- that such a thing should not go over big. It's just so eccentric, a foreign movie, and so it doesn't seem to hit the center, the bull ring. I'm sorry. It's an important movie.

4

And our friend Thucydides has done this. The funny thing is, I told you, that he has created this one period as a period in which the Greek mentality gels. And we take this to be the mature Greece. And after all, the Age of Pericles to this day is there and we only

owe it to historian. So for you people who study history, I think it is an incredible experience to see that here, a man who writes history simply changes the living picture of the past as it lives in every human being today.

II

1

This is quite some achievement. Mr. Nehru, a purely Eastern man in his *Glimpses of World History*, is still influenced by Thucydides. You wouldn't believe it, but in this tremendous power, history writing has, that Nehru thinks that the Age of Pericles is great time. And he only knows anything about Pericles from this speech which Thucydides makes Pericles deliver here in -- where is this speech? Have you found it?

Who has read it, by the way?

(Everyone who's got the book.)

2

(Thucydides himself admits that at some of these speeches he wasn't present; but that he writes others' opinions of what was said. Now how do we know that Thucydides was present when Pericles made the funeral oration...?)

Oh, you're quite right. The authenticity in the modern sense of source research is most doubtful in all these respects. What I have, however, tried to make you able to believe - perhaps you won't do -- is that the historian is the last tuning fork which reverberates the events; that in him, they still work themselves up to such a pitch that he must witness to them. He is a witness of events.

3

Homer is the witness of the Trojan War without which the Trojan War cannot end. All human life has only been lived where it is told.

This is the essence of my disk, which perhaps for you it is very hard to get.

You live in a scientific era so much that you think, "Here are the things," and then there is a science of these things, and books are written about it, the history books; and they are just apart as this is: event, and here's the book. And I can write the book, I cannot write the book. Perhaps an historian or there are many historians who study this. But they are in some way of life here, and there is an event that is all closed and it has gone by.

4

My whole experience of history has been the other way around, that an important event also finds its singer, its herald, its historian. Its importance is measured by the greatness of the story that is told.

That is, it is not arbitrary.

You live in this natural box. Here is natural man; and he can do as he pleases, with all the things he finds that may have gone on before.

III

1

I don't think we live that way. It is forced out of you.

If there is a crime in your family, you have to bring it out in your genealogy, if there is a mysterious story in your own background.

The same is true of nations, and peoples, and humanity. A great event must become articulate.

2

I always make this very simple point, which the modern sex... do not understand that the difference between sex, and marriage is that love wants to be declared. The declaration of love is one phase of the love process. Sex doesn't want to be; it wants to be hidden. And that's why love is not sex.

Sex is a process in the physical realm. And it means that we are still separate and very unhappy, because sex is not meant to be contained within the individual, but it is a bridge into the formation of social bodies. The declaration of love is the step outside yourself, beyond yourself, in which you admit this. That's why you have to declare this love.

Therefore the declaration of love is a phase of love itself. Therefore it is not a description of love as a naturalistic process would have to be described by some onlooker. But it is me in the phase of declaring. And therefore love itself has this one phase of being declared.

3

In the same sense, an event is only fully an event when it is declared, Sir. And the war is not fought before seventy years later it can be peacefully declared. And what we call "concluding peace" is nothing but the first word of this great song about the war. Because

we conclude peace so that we may lift this burden and begin to speak about it, because in the war, we are not on speaking terms, Sir.

You know that's all the whole story of war.

4

Love and war are the two great events, after all, in human history. And both have to be declared. War has to be declared and love has to be declared. And marriages have to be concluded, and peaces have to be concluded.

IV

1

And there is a great play, Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressid*, which I recommend to your attention, where Shakespeare, who is our master in all these things, speaks of the "married peace of states." Where instead of saying "the concluded," he calls them "the married." And therefore instead of "marriage," you could say "concluded". Love is concluded. That's marriage. And peace is married. You can have this interchange, according to Shakespeare, just as I tried to interchange here Jefferson and Marx.

2

And therefore, to me Thucydides is the man through whom the Peloponnesian War could make peace in the hearts of the Spartans and Athenians, and all the other partisans of Greece, could unite them. They could agree on this one issue.

And I assure you, Sir, there will not be peace on this globe unless somebody can write the history of these two world wars in such a way that the Russian, and the British, and the German, and the American will say, "That's it."

And that's exactly what John Brown's *Body* is written about. The end of Vincent Stephen Benét is "Don't argue. It's just there."

Have you read it?

(Yes.)

You remember?

3

So Vincent Stephen Benét would agree that he is part of the Civil War, the last. He is the concluding chapter. He concludes it, which had never been concluded, because the armistice of Appomattox was not the conclusion of a peace.

The United States have an unfortunate habit, as a purely naturalistic nation of immigrants, to say that when the shooting stops, the event is over. This 1865, it has happened this way; it has happened with the Philippines; it has happened with Cuba -- just Fidel Castro now and his relation to the United States; it has happened with Germany twice. The American people think history has not to be told -- "the event -- it is natural thing, the mute things speak for themselves."

They don't.

4

And it is so boastful. The Indian wars. Everything in this country is only written like Parkman's *History of the Missions*, written from one point of view. That's not history. That's still -- I wouldn't say "vainglorious boast," but it it is not the history. Because the history must be accepted by the warring parties.

Thucydides is an historian, because the Spartans and the Athenians, after reading the story -- the Corinthians, everybody -- could say, "This is it."

THIRD PART: THE HISTORY OF OUR CENTURY?

CHAPTER ONE: CLOUDS OF UNCONCLUDED PEACE

I

1

(Is this how Benét concludes the peace, as opposed to the end of the hostilities by the fact that ... its collective idea, that all sides saying, "This is it"?)

Ja. Haven't you read it?

(Yes.)

That's the last word. "It's just there," he says. I think that's the last line. Or "It's there."

If you think of the procession in Thucydides, exactly the same terms, this. "There's lying something what you said." This is where Benét formulates it about the Civil War. "It's here, lying before you, I'm will enable you to pick it up and to have it."

2

I think your generation has a tremendous task to fulfill in this country, to restore the power of the telling, of the saying of things.

Is today not an angry generation, or a lost generation, or a beat generation?

It is a generation that is destroying human speech for its proper purposes. Go to the logical semanticists. Who has taken a course with them?

They only know the indicatives. They never know the optative, or the subjunctive, or the imperative. They think speech consists of saying, "This is a book. Let's then analyze." I tried to tell you this is not speech. For this purpose to say, "This is a book," or "2 and 2 is 4," speech would have never been invented.

Speech has been invented to get a group out of the grave into the future, to say, "He is dead," or "They are dead and we are alive," or "This is the future," "God is coming," or whatever you express it. And it is this decision which the historian made, because he says, "Some things must never be fought about again."

3

The Civil War cannot return; you will admit that. But three years ago, there was great prospect that in our Little Rock, the Civil War would get started again. I mean this. People had forgotten all about it.

THE STORY OF THE GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA

The governor of Virginia laughed and said, "After all, it still seems now that we have won the Civil War."

And this backsliding is at this moment not yet quite overcome. I think the young generation in Virginia has just grown up with so many different influences that they no longer understand their old -- not quite.

4

THE STORY OF A STUDENT IN CHARLESTON

There was a speech given by a student in Charleston saying to his elders that they had never lived in the solid South. They lived in the liquid South.

But I think the solution has not been coming. I still think that the black man in the South has to get a senator in every one of the seven states. We might have to be restricted to one senator. That would be justice. And I don't see any other solution. They'll never go together. Never. The white men -- they will die for the last -- white supremacy is such an item with them.

It is not a question of segregation desecrated; it's white supremacy. They will not accept laws given by the black man in their legislature.

II

1

So I think the issue is absolutely irreconcilable. I don't believe in any gradual improvement there.

But you have to take other steps to restore justice. You just have to think, "What is the right of a black man in a state in which he is denied the rights of citizenship?" That's the situation. And the sooner they think about this, the better it is. They will not accept the testimony of a black man against a white man in court to this day. They just won't.

2

You know this.

You think of the Mississippi case, where everything was proven, and the man was acquitted. You remember? Who was the boy?

Terrible case, ... murder, man is acquitted. In no other country is this thinkable. It's a unique American institution.

3

So the funny thing is that Thucydides -- you speak about these speeches.

To Thucydides the speeches are simply a way of saying how he has understood the history and the war. What he puts in the mouth of these speakers, is instead of the bones, it's the blood running through the deeds. He wouldn't argue with you. Your question, he would not care. You think that the speech is a fact.

But I tell you: the speech is that what still rings in the historian's ears, of the event. It's a little different relation.

4

And believe one thing. Today there are two worlds. The world of the scientist, who says, "Here are objects, and I speak about them. And God is an object, and I speak about God. And wars are topics, and I speak about this war. And the Athenians are a topic of conversation; I speak about the Athenians."

But I have never believed this. As an historian and as a creature, I allow God to speak through me, and I allow the Athenians to speak through me. They make me speak. And the laws of this country makes me eloquent. I want to protect them, and I am made to speak.

And anybody who speaks about God is despicable. You cannot speak about God. And God is the power that makes you and me speak, Sir.

That's a different story. We speak, because we must speak. We must testify.

III

1

And all these modern definitions -- for example, of God -- are so ridiculous.

God is not the maker of the universe. In the first place, everybody knows that there is a God, because you speak to Him, and you listen to Him. And the power that makes us speak is the power that is the first in experience. And then we delve from this power that God makes us speak, that He's the spirit alive in you and me, that He also probably created the other things that do not speak.

It's the other way around. The article of the Holy Spirit is the first article of experience. Everybody wants to speak. And a child wants to become eloquent, and he wants to convince his elders; and the historian wants to make these dead sacrifices and victims speak so that they shall not have died in vain. "Lest we forget."

You know the "*Recessional*" by Kipling, do you? Who knows the "*Recessional*" by Rudyard Kipling? You bring it next time. Rudyard Kipling, "*Recessional*."

2

So pardon me for becoming always so passionate about this, but I know I'm fighting a whole world of prejudice of the Enlightenment.

The Enlightenment has built up this wall that we speak about things. And that's true of dead things. That's true of things who cannot speak. But people who have said something!

If I speak of my marriage of my parents, I can only testify to their love by having listened to what they say to each other, and what they have told their children. And then I can understand that they once long before my own days, they made love. It's the hardest thing for a child to understand, the pre-history of the parents.

3

And that's what the historian has to do. He has to penetrate before the state which he takes for granted. Into this moment, at which it didn't exist.

If a child can understand the engagement period of his parents, he is an historian.

Because he speaks of something, on which his own existence very much depends indeed, as having once not existed. And if two people have the power to understand what brought your two parents together, you would have no problems of psychoanalysis, because the problem of the unity of these people would outweigh by far all the repressions and all your Oedipus complexes and so on, all this nonsense what they tell you today.

4

Why is that today? Why does the psychoanalyst say you have to analyze the embryo for his traumas? Because they do not understand that the historical problem before the child is to understand the history of his parents. So he puts it into the embryo -- nine months in

the mother's womb. What has to be done by deliberate spiritual effort of the child to understand how his two parents got together and to marry each other. That's the first historical task of every human being: to penetrate before his birth.

But not before his birth into the sperm, and into the material something. The hormones. That's all nonsense. Perverse.

IV

1

And we live in this.

Now everything has been perverted into material nature. What you have to hear is the word spoken, and the letters exchanged between your parents. That's why every family is very lucky where such letters have been preserved, because when you can read about the days of your grandparents in their own letters, you live a life larger than if you only treat yourself as an individual whose embryonic existence as a fish in your mother's womb has to be analyzed by a hired psychoanalyst.

But you live in this world today. That's why I have to tell you.

2

It seems to me -- all these people project, instead of dealing with the history of their parents, they project themselves into geology, and into history of man for 500 million years backward; and they have all these fantasies.

THE STORY OF THIS JAPANESE PRINCE

I had to laugh. There is this boy -- this Japanese prince marrying this commoner. The papers in Los Angeles, in a city with a university can afford to write, "The first time in 2,690 years that this happens." Now the whole Japanese empire only exists for 1500 years. The rest is all mythology.

And typical of all mythological people, they always project and double the time that has elapsed.

And this paper accepts on face value this Japanese myth that the history of Japan goes back to 660 B.C. There's not a word of truth in this. It's a natural projection of unpurified minds to double the time that has elapsed to make it more interesting.

3

And it is much more difficult to read the history of the Peloponnesian War, of the Civil -- of the World War, too, at this moment, than to deal with these geological times. If you read the history of World War II, you are shocked by the omissions. What we have not done. And we are shocked by the bombs on Hiroshima, et cetera. But if you read the history of mankind, of ape man in 400 million years before, you have no responsibility. You are in nature.

4

And this is what goes on, on this campus all the time, I feel, that the difficulty is to get the unfinished business before you. That's history. Yes. Can you understand it?

The unfinished, the still-reverberating thing, that the harmony of which has not been yet caught by your ear.

There are so many disharmonies still hanging, suspended over you in the clouds, over this country, that have not been harmonized.

Unsolved, unconcluded peaces.

CHAPTER TWO: THE SONG OF THE WORLD WARS

I

1

So the historian is the doctor, is the healer of society, I assure you. He heals the conflicts by hearing them so ineradicably; still reverberating, that he has to speak of them. And by speaking of them in such a way that the whole makes itself heard, he makes the peace in his own day possible.

And then you understand then that for ancient historians, the speeches were his hearing device. By the speeches, he simply identified himself with the people who spoke at the time.

Perhaps this answers your question ...

(Hm.)

2

There is not this division of: here is a man making a speech, and here is the historian. But in the speech, the historian tries to express what he has heard these men saying. And so it's his own reverence for history that is expressed. He is not the master of his task there. But he is submitting to this tremendous burden of the historical facts that he can only get relief if he makes these people speak through him.

In this sense, you may say it's dramatic history, because he is the dramatist whose persons, walk up to you and speak in their own tongue what they have to say.

3

Now there are some elements about Thucydides. How does he write this history?

We talked about this. The funny fact distinguishing him from modern historians is that he's a contemporary. My friend Page Smith, here, Professor Smith, is now publishing an article in which he proves that the best history of the *Revolution War* was written by a contemporary.

(He talked about it.)

Ja. Very exciting, that even this law of Thucydidean writing of history is true today. And there is no science of history, because there is no accumulation. Every generation has to be brought into this same commotion, and emotion, and interest by a different means,

because the more you are removed from an event, the more difficult it is to prepare the ground in you, that you still see that it is vital, that you may have to go to war for it.

4

(Is it perhaps possible then that such a history as that of Winston Churchill would stand as the contemporary history of World War II?)

Ja, you know, I'm an admirer of Winston Churchill as a statesman. I'm not an admirer of him having written this last history. If you want to know what Churchill can do in history, read his *Marlborough*. That's a great book, the history of the Duke of Marlborough. And his whole heart is there. He is the younger son of the famous Churchill family, and this Duke of Marlborough was the target of much abuse by the Whig historians in Great Britain, Macaulay hated Marlborough. And Churchill simply obviously was intrigued by the task of rescuing this really very wicked ancestor.

And I feel that's a great book, that he has written a very beautiful book about his own youth, *A Roving Commission*. Has somebody read this book? He wrote it in a chasm of deep despair when there seemed to be absolutely no future for himself in 1931. *A Roving Commission*. That's an autobiography.

II

1

Now I invite you to read these books to show what refinement and subtlety he had at that time. Simply English writing and in humanity. These are like murals, frescoes, these new books. And his shortcoming, his lack of identity with the rest of the human race outside the British empire is most galling.

And the man is absolutely divided. On the one-hand side, he's really down on everybody who is not an Englishman. And the other hand, he's enough of an American -- after all, he's half-American -- to know better. And he has this other, this all-human ring. But I think in these last books, the peace is not established between his two natures.

And frankly to say that I feel that he has done better history writing. In his great moments of defeat in his life, he has reconquered himself by saying, "Well, if I cannot make people listen to me, I'll make them listen to the great voice of history."

And he has.

2

(Well, I was just grasping for some instance to illustrate the principle that perhaps the best history writing is by contemporaries.)

(But if not Churchill, whom might we look to for the history of the world wars, or at least of World War II?)

Well, I highly recommend the first volume of de Gaulle. It has been translated into English? Of course, I read it in French, but it I think it has come out in English. It's very fascinating, de Gaulle's memoirs of war.

*(Yes, they're in English.)
(When was Crusade in Europe written?)
(1948.)*

Ja. It's not a bad book. But it's not a good book, either. I'm told that he didn't write it. And I hate ghostwritten books. If somebody else writes it, this name should appear in it. It just isn't right.

Have you read it?

(No. I haven't. I was just wondering if it was written during the war or after it?)

Oh, after. There are very nice pieces in it.

(He has the feeling of the Russians' side)

Oh ja. No. He's at his best in the book. I have to admit that.

3

No. All I want to say is that it's a story of Mr. Eisenhower's role in the war, but it isn't really the story of the World War. He doesn't have...

(Doesn't he try to justify a lot of the things he had done....?)

Ja, quite. So it isn't *Crusade in Europe*, it is Mr. Eisenhower's part in the crusade in Europe. It's a modest book, an agreeable book. But it hasn't this reconciliatory effect that after you have read it, you are glad the thing was done, and has come to an end. It has nothing of the fate knocking at the door. No -- you don't feel that-- despite of the title -- you are not taken into the confidence of the great powers of darkness and light who are fighting in this incredible conflagration. You don't understand anything about the issues. The future is nothing.

4

(Well, in any case, there are still many contemporaries who are at work writing history. So that perhaps we may see yet a contemporary history produced.)

Ja, only let me add this one thing. We mustn't be impatient. I think it wouldn't be surprising if it would take two generations before this one song of humanity can be sung, because the task is so new that the whole world has gone to war. And suddenly we had to go twice, because people didn't even understand what had happened then the first time.

Certainly this country hadn't understood it; the Germans hadn't understood it; the British. Everybody was still thinking that it was the continuation of their own national destiny. Now we know -- or I think some people know that it was the end of all independence. And that this interdependence is really with us.

III

1

Therefore, you cannot wonder that it will take a singer who is already wakening up with this lightning inside of the interdependency, who has not gradually to be convinced of this, as all these people have.

THE STORY OF WINSTON CHURCHILL

And Churchill hasn't. Churchill has been backsliding before in his writing, before the war. And I do think the man had to do so much -- to digest his American mother, and to become purely English- -- well, as you understand, the problem being, after all, for the leading English statesman to make the people feel that he was not American -- and that I think he had always to narrow his comprehensiveness into the English pattern, by an effort. He had to remain British when, perhaps by his background, he had already the wider conception of an intercontinental mission.

2

And therefore, we need a man who comes, quite the contrary, from this... -- limited --. And unfolds, without this fear of -- after all --

when was he born? 1880 is it? 1878 -- in the times of the darkest nationalism, he goes to the Indian service. He goes to Egypt. Everywhere it's the British empire in which he wants to prove himself. His father was Randolph Churchill, one of the most unhappy, and most ingenious statesmen of Great Britain. And he has Miss Jerome for his mother.

And his mother behaved really very much like an American. As soon as the father died, she married a young journalist, ten years her younger -- typically of an American lady -- and disappears from the scene. And he's without any family background.

And poor - they also are the Churchills, this branch. They have nothing to do with the Duke of Marlborough family, and their fortunes. And he was very lucky. He married this

wonderful person. His wife was his great bliss. But he must make the English public always forget his mother, and that he may have some loyalties with this country.

3

So he can't be jingoistic enough. That's why Indian service. And he goes to the South African war, as a war correspondent; he's nearly shot dead there. Every scene of the British empire is for him, because he must stake out his claim to be contained within the British empire. This is the driving force of his life.

Ja.

4

Would somebody in the college library, there is a book by Polybius, that's the second historian of rank in antiquity. He lived from 201 B.C. to 120 -- this is estimated; we don't know for sure, but it must be about right -- 201 B.C. to 120 B.C. And in his thirty -- let me give you the exact place -- is the college library a standing library or is it a lending library? In the catalog it says "College Library."

(That's the undergraduate library.)

(You can borrow from - one week only.)

Well, so you won't take it out. But is it available? Can you go to the stack shelves?

(Yes.)

IV

1

Well, there is this man, Polybius. Loeb edition. In six volumes. There is the Greek and the English text. And I want you to read up the fragments of the 39th book. There are only a few fragments left. The whole history in forty volumes. And this fragment of the 39th volume I want you to read.

2

Then you will see what speeches have to do with history, because it is the strange thing. And in my own life, it has played quite a role in this country. So I think it makes it even more interesting. It's called -- "*Fragment on Scipio When He Conquers*" -- you can't miss it: "*Fragment on Scipio When He Conquers Carthage in 146.*"

The 39th book deals with this. It's a very short paragraph, but every one of you kindly will read this.

3

And you will find it in Loeb -- in the sixth volume, I suppose. These little volumes, and I think in the last volume. And don't take it out, but allow every member here of the seminar to read it on the spot, there. It's so short. It's one page.

4

I even recommend highly that you copy it, verbatim. Every one of you. It deserves it. Then I'll tell you the story which has played in this country after the Second World War.

So I'll make a real effort not to talk so much next time.

EIGHTH LECTURE: THE LAUGHTER OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE 1945

PART ONE: CRITICAL READING

CHAPTER ONE: THE RESPONSIBILITY OF TEACHING

I

1

...storytelling. Now that would be the first thing that the philosopher is the judge of the historian. And I think you first -- what I read --.

(You yourself are a philosopher of history, aren't you?)

-- Well, I'm very willing to tell you this, yes. This is very astute.

(Hegel and Spengler are the others.)

I hope I'm not. I hope I'm just trying to tell history. And I'm trying to tell you what historians do. It's not the same, as judging the histories told, for the systematic meaning and the order of things.

Well, we'll come to this. Ja, I'm glad you asked this question. \$64,000 question; only nobody pays me the \$64,000.

2

Here, we have to read. Here. Perhaps you begin to read this.

This is Mr. Collingwood who is dead by now. Was an English philosopher. And never dawned on him that he was involved in history himself, that he was a part of the history. He's a true philosopher of history.

There's no doubt about it that he tries to judge what historians do. And from what he called a "philosophical point of view" -- whatever that may be -- outside not only the history, but even in the business of history writing. He's neither in the field of historians, nor is he engagé, as people today say in existential philosophy, himself as the victim, or object, or member of the story that's going on.

Ja.

"Greek Conception of History's Nature and Value.

The ardor with which the Greeks pursued the ideal of an unchanging and eternal object of knowledge might easily mislead us as to their historical interests. It might, if we read them carelessly, make us think them uninterested in history, somewhat as Plato's attack on the poets might make an unintelligent reader fancy that Plato cared little for poetry.

In order to interpret such things correctly, we must remember that no competent thinker or writer wastes his time attacking a man of straw. An intense polemic against a certain doctrine is an infallible sign that the doctrine in question figures largely in the writer's environment, and even has a strong attraction for himself.

The Greek pursuit of the eternal was as eager as it was, precisely because the Greeks themselves had an unusually vivid sense of the temporal. They lived in a time when history was moving with extraordinary rapidity, and in a country where earthquake and erosion changed the face of the land with a violence hardly to be seen elsewhere. They saw all nature as a spectacle of incessant change, and human life as changing more violently than anything else. Unlike the Chinese, or the medieval civilization of Europe, whose conception of human society was anchored in the hope of retaining the chief features of a structure unchanged, they made it their first aim to base and reconcile themselves to the fact that such permanence is impossible.

This recognition of the necessity of change in human affairs gave to the Greeks a peculiar sensitiveness to history. Knowing that nothing in life can persist unchanged, they came habitually to ask themselves what exactly the changes had been which they knew must have come about in order to bring the present into existence. Their historical consciousness was thus not a consciousness of age-long tradition molding the life of one generation after another into a uniform pattern. It was a consciousness of violent, catastrophic changes from one state of things to its opposite: from smallness to greatness, from pride to abasement, from happiness to misery.

This was how they interpreted the general character of human life in their dramas. And this was how they narrated the particular parts of it in their history. The only thing that a shrewd and critical Greek like Herodotus would say about the divine power that ordains the course of history is that it is envious, and it is mischief-making, noise-making, or confusion-making.

(Greek words?)

Greek words. ...is the important word, it's the envy of the gods, that the gods cannot see perfect happiness among mortals without disturbing it.

3

Probably you know the story that Herodotus tells on this account; it's an important one, and always quoted.

THE STORY OF POLYCRATES

Polycrates of Samos was in perfect bliss, and he received the visit of the Egyptian king. And the king said to him, "My dear Polycrates, the gods have done too much for you. They will be envious. Do something to reconcile them to your bliss." And Polycrates was quite willing to listen to reason. And so he took the ring on his finger, which he prized very highly, and which was the symbol of his statescraft -- he sealed his laws with this ring -- and threw it into the sea.

And while the king of Egypt was still with him, the next day, a fisherman brought a fish, and the fish had in his mouth this ring, and so the king recovered the precious ring. Whereupon the king of Egypt took his departure in great haste and said -- "The gods had not received your sacrifice, and therefore you are doomed. I will have nothing to do with you."

And a short time later Polycrates was besieged, and deposed, and died in misery.

4

So this is the envy of the gods. And it goes through all Greek tragedy, and is quite serious.

THE STORY OF AN INSCRIPTION IN COCHEM

There is a castle on the Mosel River in Germany, built by a very rich banker. He had a wonderful wife; and he was very wealthy; and was healthy, and everything went well. And one day, his Dutch friend, friend of the firm, eloped with this wife. And so this man had the great courage, the bereaved one, the one whose wife had gone away from him. And you can read to this day, above the entrance to the castle of Cochem, on the Mosel River -- it's one of the most beautiful places in Europe -- "*Begehre nie*" -- does anybody know German? No, it makes no sense then to quote it in German first -- "Never ask for too great a fortune or for too beautiful a wife, because the heavens might concede you your wish for your punishment."

So you should never ask too great a bliss, because in their wrath, they might concede it to you and then you lose it.

II

1

So that's quite bold.

Certainly it doesn't go with the modern American tycoon's idea of tumbling from one place in Reno into another place in Mexico City. But this country doesn't know what tragedy is. It's not admitted in America that there is real tragedy. But this man, this Herr

vom Rath in Germany, had the courage like Polycrates, to know that if you come under God's judgment, it is without remission. There is no remission, easily. So that's the envy of the gods.

Go on.

2

"He was only repeating what every Greek knew: that the power of Zeus was manifested in the thunderbolt, that of Poseidon in the earthquake, that of Apollo in the pestilence, and that of Aphrodite in the passion that destroyed at once the pride of Phaedra and the chastity of Hippolytus.

It is true that these catastrophic changes..."

These are all, of course, dramas, Hippolytus and Phaedra. Who has read *Phaïdre*, at least, by Racine?

"It is true that these catastrophic changes in the condition of human life, which to the Greeks were the proper theme of history, were unintelligible. There could be no knowledge of them, no demonstrative, scientific knowledge. But all the same, history had for the Greeks a definite value. Plato himself played it down, that right opinion -- which is a sort of pseudo-knowledge that perception gives us of what changes -- was no less useful for the conduct of life than scientific knowledge, and the poets maintained their traditional place in Greek life as the teachers of sound principles, by showing that in the general pattern of these changes, certain antecedents normally led to certain consequence. Notably, an excess in any one direction led to a violent change into its own opposite. Why this was so, they could not tell. But they thought it a matter of observation that it was so, that people who became extremely rich or extremely powerful were thereby brought into special danger of being reduced to a condition of extreme poverty or weakness.

There is here no theory of causation. The thought does not resemble that of 17th-century inductive science, with its metaphysical basis in the axiom of cause and effect. The riches of Croesus are not the cause of his downfall. They are merely a symptom to the intelligent observer that something is happening in the rhythm of his life, which is likely to lead to a downfall. Still less is the downfall a punishment for anything that in an intelligible, moral sense could be called wrongdoing. When Amasis in Herodotus broke off his allegiance..."

That is the king of Egypt.

with Polycrates, he did it..."

It was the ring.

"...he did it simply on the grounds that Polycrates was too prosperous. The pendulum had swung too far one way and was -- likely to swing as far in the other.

Such examples have their value to the person who can make use of them, for he can use his own will to arrest these rhythms in his life before they reach the danger point; and check the thirst for power and wealth, instead of allowing them to drag him to excess.

Thus history has a value. Its teachings are useful for human life, simply because the rhythm of its changes is likely to repeat itself. Similar antecedents leading to similar consequence. The history of notable events is worth remembering in order to serve as a basis..."

Now listen well. This is all really what people today call "philosophy."

I have to tell you the truth. I think it's all awful what this man does.

Go on.

3

"The history of notable events is worth remembering in order to serve as a basis for prognostic judgment -- not demonstrable, but probable -- laying down not what will happen, but what is likely to happen, indicating the points of danger in rhythms now going on.

This conception of history was the very opposite of deterministic. But the Greeks regarded the course of history as flexible and open to salutary modification by the well-instructed human will. Nothing that happens is inevitable. The person who is about to be involved in a tragedy is actually overwhelmed by it, only because he is too blind to see his danger. If he saw it, he could guard against it.

Thus the Greeks had a lively-- and indeed, a naive -- sense of the power of man to control his own destiny, and thought of his power..."

4

The naïveté is all on the side of Mr. Collingwood, who has the idea that he can control his story. But this is the modern stuff that you get.

I'm just reading a book by a lady, which is real desert: *The Martyr Complex in American History*. This lady has the effrontery to look down on the martyr complex of all the people who have made this country great. And she, who will never be a martyr and never make a sacrifice, now writes a book, *The Martyr Complex*.

And this is what happens among you people. The destruction of the relationship between the people whom we owe our existence -- the soldiers and the martyrs -- and ourselves has reached the point where these people at their desk, who costs nothing to sit in judgment, laugh at these martyrs and say they have a martyr complex. So they say, "Jesus committed suicide," and "St. Stephen then has a martyr complex."

III

1

This is what we have reached. And this is the same superciliousness.

Here he says, "naïveté." What does he know what naïveté, is? He is naïve at his desk, thinking that he is outside of history.

The intellectuals in the Anglo-Saxon world all deserve to be hanged. The most destructive class of people I know. If I had something to say, I would close all the universities at once. Because they detach the human society from their victims and the people who make the sacrifices.

Give me any soldier or sailor, any man as compared to a Ph.D.

2

(You're an Anglo-Saxon intellectual.)

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY BEING AN INTELLECTUAL

I'm not. I'm a German intellectual. We at least knew that we had to stand upright for what we thought that you had to fight. This at least is since Luther the tradition of a Protestant, that their protest involved you, that we were part and parcel of the historical spectacle in putting down what we thought. That it was risky. That we were just part of the story.

This is at least was not forgotten.

3

This comes from the fact that the professors in Germany made the Reformation. Whereas in England, they were cowards in Oxford and Cambridge, and did not protest. And followed Henry VIII.

(Doesn't claiming distinctness from Anglo-Saxon heritage or claiming distinctness in German professorship put yourself outside the brotherhood of intellectuals -- brotherhood of --?)

I certainly do not belong -- do not want -- my next door farmer certainly is closer to my heart, or a member of my congregation than the next professor. Because -- cowards. They don't know what they do. They don't know that they are responsible for what they are saying.

This is just a fact. A missionary in England has the faith of a professor in Germany. A missionary -- is he not committed? He goes to India, that's how the British Commonwealth

has been built up, how the Pilgrim Fathers founded this country. That's the spirit. With those people, I feel at peace. You understand?

(Yes.)

4

Who knows? We are all benighted here. Or may be.

But at least we are willing to stand by our word and say, "I said it. Quote me on this". Where I find the academic profession constantly telling me, "Don't quote me on this."

IV

1

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY IN HIS OWN TOWN

Pardon me for being quite frank, but this is a terrible situation in which I find myself. In my own town, when the central school system was built, and the district schools were given up -- which I think are in the center of American democracy, that the children are educated not in big military institutions but at the place where they live. The farmers came to me to defend them against this inroad of the intellectuals in our town. So practically, I was a lonely wolf on the side of the farmers to try to stave off this orgy of modern education.

2

You see, that to teach is not to be outside life, looking at it, and talking about it. But it's a part of the process of letting the spirit run through the generations.

This is here lost with this idea of objectivity, that you only teach objective, let the children themselves pick and choose. Whatever I bring before a child for this, I remain responsible. The fiction that the child then chooses and makes a decision is all ridiculous.

THE STORY OF CABBAGE AND ASPARAGUS

But today the program is that you choose your courses. The twelve-year-old chooses his courses. The ten-year-old girl says whether she wants to take science or mathematics. How can she? It's all fiction, this free-will idea. Practically, by psychological tricks, they bring this little donkey, so that the child still can only choose between cabbage and asparagus, after all, and artichokes. The things that are offered in the school are very limited.

3

Now it appears that the child chooses this, between three items after all, which confine the selection to very definite issues. Wouldn't it be much better if the teacher would say, "This is the heritage which every child has to receive, and imperatively so"? Dictatorially so. Why don't we protect children from their own nonsense?

If they cannot know what it is. So we allow them to drop out of any such chosen subject after a year.

So they are the most unhappy people on earth, because nothing really enters them seriously. They have lifted everything a little bit, and never learned anything really. And this is called "education" in this country.

4

Where is your language? Which foreign language do you --?

(French.)

Do you read it?

(No.)

Now, I mean.

(Not outside the textbook, no.)

So it's perfectly meaningless. As long as you do not subscribe to a French journal, or read French literature, voluntarily weekly, is the whole language requirement should fall whole. It's all fictitious. That's one great item of waste.

Meanwhile, because the teacher will not stand up and say, "This is necessary". They will not take the responsibility of fighting for it.

Now, let's come on.

CHAPTER TWO: THE DOCTORS OF HUMAN MEMORY

I

1

"Thus the Greeks had a lively and indeed a naïve sense of the power of man to control his own destiny, and thought..."

Don't you think Mr. Collingwood has the same naïveté? He is even wanting to control the destiny of historians.

This whole naïveté -- like this lady with the martyr complex book -- she thinks the martyr is naïve. And she doesn't know how naïve she is to believe that we can live without other people protecting us with the investment of their lives, and this fortitude.

2

Whenever you read from an academic person the "naïveté," turn around and look at him, and see how naïve he or she is.

THE STORY OF ANY PRIMITIVE PEOPLE

Any primitive people are certainly less naïve -- know more the tragedy of life -- than the people I meet on this campus. And we call the primitives "naïve," and they know how tragic their life is. They know what blood guilt is, they know what warfare is, what vendetta is, et cetera. I've never seen a chieftain of an Indian tribe to be naïve. They know exactly that every good thing costs its price.

But we live in a fools' paradise -- we think we can have something for nothing, on the installment plan. And the credit card has never to be paid. The fools' paradise is here. This is the naïve society.

Come on.

3

"Thus the Greeks had a lively, and indeed a naïve sense of the power of man to control his own destiny, and thought of this power as limited only by the limitations of his knowledge. The fate that broods over human-..."

Don't you think that's just what modern man in Hollywood thinks? Only limited by the limitations of his knowledge. Or don't we control nature? And don't we think that's all we have to do?

Ja.

"The fate that broods over human life is from this Greek point of view, a destructive power only because man is blind to its workings. Granted, that he cannot understand these workings, he can yet have right opinions about them, and insofar as he acquires such opinions, he becomes able to put himself in a position where the blows of fate will miss him. On the other hand, valuable as the teachings of history are, their value is limited by the unintelligibility of its subject matter. And that is why Aristotle says that poetry is more scientific than history, for history is a mere collection of empirical facts, whereas poetry extracts from such facts a universal judgment.

History tells us that Croesus fell, and that -- Polycra- --?"

No, you bring it out yourself. I want first to hear you say it.

"Polycrates."

Yes.

4

"Now, poetry, according to Aristotle's idea of it, makes not a singular judgment, but the universal judgment that very rich men, as such, fall. Even this is in Aristotle's view, only a partially scientific judgment, for no one can see why rich men should fall. The universal cannot be so strictly demonstrated, but it approaches the status of a true universal, because we can use it as a major premise for a new ..., applying these generalizations to fresh cases. Thus poetry is for Aristotle the distilled essence of the teaching of history. In poetry, the lessons of history do not become any more intelligible. And they remain undemonstrated and therefore merely probable. But they become more compendious and therefore more useful. Such were..."

What is "compendious." Do you know what it means? What is a compendium?

(A gathering-together, a collection?)

Yes, but a compressed collection. "Compendium" is an abbreviated, a short, or condensed form. That's what we mean by "compendium." "Compendious" means condensed, really.

II

1

"Such was the way in which the Greeks conceived the nature and value of history. They could not, consistently with their general philosophical attitude, regard it as scientific. They had to consider it as, at bottom, not a science, but a mere aggregate of perception. What, then, was their conception of historical evidence?"

The answer is that, conformly with his view, they identified historical evidence with the reports of facts given by eyewitnesses of those facts. Evidence consists of eyewitnesses, narratives; and historical method consists of eliciting these."

(You want me to go on?)

I think we have to -- unfortunately. I wish we wouldn't have to. But in order to do justice to this gentleman, you will have to read two more pages, yes.

2

"Greek Historical Method and Its Limitations."

And I grant you, if you kindly pay attention to this -- we penetrate really into the strange relation in the last --. Since Mr. Descartes, many unfortunate things have happened to history. And this is all Cartesianism, running amok.

And therefore, I think you have a good example of what philosophers make of history.

3

"Quite clearly, it was in this way that Herodotus conceived of evidence and method. This does not mean that he uncritically believed whatever eyewitnesses told him. On the contrary, he is in practice highly critical of their narratives. And here again, he is typically Greek.

The Greeks as a whole were skilled in the practice of the law courts. And a Greek would find no difficulty in applying to historical testimony the same kind of criticism, which he was accustomed to direct upon witnesses in court.

The work of Herodotus or Thucydides depends in the main on the testimony of eyewitnesses with whom the historian had personal contact. And his skill as a researcher consisted in the fact that he must have cross-questioned an eyewitness on past events until he had called up in the informant's own mind an historical picture of those events far fuller and more coherent than any he could have volunteered for himself. The result of this process was to create in the informant's mind for the first time a genuine knowledge of the past events which he had perceived, but which, up till then, he had not knowledge.

This conception of the way in which a Greek historian collected his material makes it a very different thing from the way in which a modern historian may use printed memoirs. Instead of easygoing belief on the informant's part, that his prima facie collection was adequate to the facts, there could grow up in his mind a chastened and criticized recollection which has stood the fire of such questions as, 'Are you quite sure that you remember it just like that? Have you not now contradicted what you were saying yesterday? How do you reconcile your account of that event with the very different account given by So-and-So?'

This method of using the testimony of eyewitnesses is undoubtedly the method which underlies the extraordinary solidity and consistency of the narrative which Herodotus and Thucydides finally

wrote about fifth-century Greece. No other method deserving the name 'scientific' was available to the fifth-century historian.

But it had three limitations. First, it inevitably imposed on its users a shortness of historical perspective. The modern historian knows that if only he had the capacity, he could become the interpreter of the whole past of mankind. But whatever Greek historians might have thought of Plato's description of the philosopher as the spectator of all time, they would never have ventured to claim Plato's words as a description of themselves. Their method tied them on a tether whose length was the length of living memory. The only..."

4

Ah, here we now come to the first so wealthy word. Perhaps you take this down.

"That whatever Greek historians might have thought of Plato's description of the philosopher as a spectator as that of all time, they would never have ventured to claim Plato's words as a description of themselves. Their method tied them"-- funny, again, condescendingly expressed, quite wrongly, I think -- "their method tied them on a tether whose length was the length of living memory."

That's all we need. Here we can stop.

This is the only word of truth on these whole pages.

III

1

Historians continue living memory, Thesis Number 1. They continue living memory, what the people after the battle of Gettysburg told what the president wrote in his dispatch, what he mentioned in his speech, is then continued by the historian who gathers together all these people's living memories and tries to cure them from their contradictions.

So historians are doctors of human memory. They are the physicians who try to cure contradictory memories.

And the highest aim of an historian, as you can see from this - as in the case of Thucydides -- is to reconcile the Corinthian, and the Spartan, and the Athenian memory of the war, so that they can all recognize that he is right in building up, in enlarging their memory to the complete picture.

2

So if you will understand the writing of history as the curing the conflicts of living memory, you have the function of the historian for any group, and for any warring number of groups.

Conflicts of memory -- as we know now from psychology only too well -- constitute a trauma. Therefore humanity needs an office for procuring the traumas of conflicting memories.

So when the Americans and the English go to war in 1812, it is absolutely necessary that after twenty years people begin to make peace. They do this by writing the history in such a way so that both sides can agree that this is the history of the War of 1812. And as soon as such a history reaches this point of agreement between the warring parties, the war is over.

And not before.

3

That is, peaces are the continuation of war, until peace is concluded. And the great act of peace is not the treaty, but the great act is a tradition which unites both people.

THE STORY OF THE LESSON UNDERSTOOD BY THE ENGLISH

Today the independence of America can well be understood by the English, because their whole commonwealth has been saved by this experience. And they gave dominion status to Canada, and thereby saved their commonwealth. They would have never learned this lesson probably without the American independence.

Therefore today, after a hundred years, it is possible to write this history of the Revolution War in such a way that Englishman and an American can agree.

That takes time.

4

And that is what historians do. And on this they are working all the time.

So they are in a society just as muc as a doctor is with a baby. There is an illness, and without illness, the human mind is never going to work. We only become conscious when something is wrong. When we go happy-go-lucky, we live unconsciously. All the parts of our nature which are in order escape consciousness.

IV

1

The whole idea that consciousness is a bliss is nonsense. Consciousness is a necessity. We have to focus attention on these points of life where there is a handicap, where there is a frustration, where there is a block.

If you want to open a door, and it doesn't open automatically by radar, when you go in -- the famous eye-- you to do something to open this door. So you have to become very conscious that this door doesn't open.

The same is with the street light. As long as the lights are green, you just automatically drive along. You get this block of red, you have to become conscious. Now I have to stop. And if you dream, or listen to the radio while you are in the car and overlook this red sign, then the lack of consciousness is hurtful.

2

Again, the naïveté of the modern academic mind seems to me to think that we are expected to be conscious, and become more conscious, that when we die, we are all consciousness. And this is all non- sense.

Consciousness is only necessary where there is conflict. We need consciousness to focus attention.

That's what pain, for example, does. It makes us conscious of that part of our body for which we have to go to the doctor. As long as we have no pain, we are not conscious of our health.

Consciousness is always the compulsion to look in a specific direction, to do something to remove an obstacle.

3

Now between peoples the conflict of memories are a serious business.

As long as the Southern white and the Southern black man look at the Civil War with different eyes, they'll never agree. There can't be peace.

And that's the story to this day in the South that the history which the black man in the South and the white man agree upon, hasn't been written. *John Brown's Body* is the attempt by Stephen Benét to do just this. But I think he has not overcome the illiteracy of the black man in the South. That is, the black man just doesn't read Vincent Stephen Benét's book. If it would be recited publicly, if we had such an institution where people who do not read books still listen to Homer, so to speak, to our Homer, *John Brown's Body* by Vincent

Stephen Benét could serve the purpose, because it was certainly written with this great devotion to curing suffering memory.

4

That's why I think that the real historian of our era in this country is Vincent Stephen Benét. And that it is put in poetic form that must not faze you at all. That's all nonsense. How do we know in which form a future book has to be written? The style of a book changes constantly.

And do not be betrayed because one book is prose, and you say, "That's history," and the other is in verse, and then it isn't. If you want to achieve your end, any form that will achieve this end is the right form. And obviously for history the poetical form the epic form is certainly much more adequate than the prosaic form.

CHAPTER THREE: KNOWLEDGE AND ENGAGEMENT

I

1

Again, we are full of prejudice. Since history must be made into a science today therefore even the form must be as stultifying as this ridiculous scientific prose which people write today and think is the only way in which you can express truth.

The historian is then the physician or a healing process in society. He himself enters the process like pus enters a wound. The white blood corpuscles hurry to a place where there is an infection, and where the body has to become conscious of something has to be done. And that's where historians should hurry, where there are conflicting memories.

2

They go to this place. I will not even uphold that they are doctors. I don't think that I am outside society when I write the history of of conflict. But I am probably one of these blood corpuscles at this moment. I'm very much inclined to accuse my sociological and historical *confrères* of megalomania when they think that we are the doctors of society.

I am not a doctor of society because I am inside society in the body politic, and so I cannot be the doctor who would be outside.

But there are physiological processes of healing in a body. And I think the historian is one of these viruses or healing processes, and goes to the spot where the conflict is, and tries to add that amount of unity which limits the conflict first, and allows the whole body to live beyond it, like a scar that is healing.

3

And so Mr. Collingwood admits it as a negative thing. He says, "It tied them on a tether whose length was the length of living memory."

Now I would say that this strange expression, "tied them to the tether of living memory" is just their honor. As a doctor is not a zoologist, but is called in because a patient cries in pain and says, "Doctor, help me," so I feel this tether of living memory is just the honor of the physician in history.

4

This is the first thing I would like you to understand, that the relation of an historian to the society inside which he moves is one of pain and healing, of softening suffering. And

therefore his relation to his patient, when he bends over the body politic of a bleeding country and tries to comfort the members of this community, or to encourage them, or to explain to them, or whatever you enlighten them about their own past, is a service which connects him much more closely to this body politic than to his so-called colleagues in the history department. Any historian then is more closely related -- he's an excrescence, he is an organ of the body politic, and not of schools.

II

1

So once you transfer the place of the historian from the schools, organized departments of knowledge, to his response -- as in Benét's case, who was not appointed for history, but became the historian of the Civil War -- in this sense,

we are all self-appointed when we listen to the cry of an emergency, to an SOS and go there.

It isn't the police who has to rescue a man from a burglar. It can be his neighbor. And then the neighbor is the congruous policeman, the real police at this moment.

2

And this has been lost sight of, that history follows a vocation, a calling, an immediate emergency. There is a call. Somebody has to write this history.

So when Parkman decided to go on the Oregon Trail -- as you know, he was a weakling; he had poor eyesight; he could only read a few hours a day, he had to be read to; he was a physical wreck -- and when he decided, "Now just the same, I'm going to write the history of the white fathers in Canada, and of the Oregon Trail," he became the appointee of fate. And the professors of history in the various colleges of the land had absolutely no authority, compared to his original claim to be the historian of this western movement.

3

And so today, we read Parkman, and we don't read the contemporary professors of history in Harvard College. And Parkman never was a professor.

That has nothing to do with history. Philosophers are not those people who are made professors of philosophy. And historians are not the people who are appointed to teach history. These are original responses, and because they have been given, because there has been a Thucydides, we think we should get acquainted in our schools with this, and so the schools are derivative. There are professors of philosophy who tell you that there is a Thucydides and Herodotus, just as I tell you here. As a professor, I make you acquainted with historians.

4

Just as professors of philosophy in schools are very rarely philosophers themselves, but they report on what philosophers have thought.

THE STORY OF CARTESIUS

Cartesius - Descartes -- never was a professor of philosophy. He never taught. But he is the greatest philosopher of the latest three hundred years, just the same.

III

1

So as long as you do not re-establish the hierarchy of values, gentlemen, then an historian is a man with an intimate and direct relation to the people whose history he writes, and feels himself responsible either *for their rebirth, for their renaissance, or for their reconciliation with their neighboring enemies*, or whatever his story is, you have no way of placing the man. You will look for a place for him as an imitator of natural history, or as a mathematician, or a logician.

2

That's not the case. An historian emerges in any country, and where you have no writing.

THE STORY OF BULGARIANS AND SERBS

In Yugoslavia, you had always an old man who had to sing the story of the wars between the Bulgarians and the Serbs. And there were no schools, and they didn't have to write it. This was an oral achievement. And it was for many centuries and many ages. But every group has to have a treasurer of memory.

Just as you have a treasurer of gold and money, the historian is the treasurer of living memory. And since he sees that the currencies in this treasury are contradictory, and somehow debased, he will do something about curing the conflicts in this treasure.

3

And that's why Mr. Thucydides calls his own work "a treasure forever." He called it this. We read this, did we? And that's not a -

(I was going to say that we think then Thucydides satisfied more or less both parties in the war, and even though he was detached, he was --.)

But dramatically engaged. He was --.

(He could see the event clearly from both sides.)

Ja, and suffered. Through him, both voices became sympathetically understood. It isn't enough to say that he could see both sides. But he allowed both sides to enter his own heart; they penetrated into him.

I give voice to opposites, don't you think?

(Speeches...; I have noticed that.)

That is just why the speeches make the whole thing real.

(Wouldn't you say possibly one of the reasons for this was his banishment?)

The reason for -- we don't know.

(I mean, it might have helped him to --.)

Well, why the banishment was the reason for his history?

(Yes.)

4

Well, that has been debated. Whith whom did I talk about him?

THE STORY OF THUCYDIDES' BANISHMENT

We have too little to go by. He says, after all, that he wanted to write this history long before his banishment. In 431, he set out to take down. And therefore, he insists that the banishment has nothing to do with history. Now you are psychologizing and say it has.

But I won't commit myself, because we just have no material to go by. This is just all vague. If somebody who knows Greek well could try to see whether the speeches after his banishment are more passionate, a change in character, than before, then I would say perhaps that in the first years, his blood wasn't running so high than later, when, under the pressure of his banishment he himself tried to be saved, after all, to have a meaningful function.

As long as he was rich and general, this was an avocation. Then now it had to become his vocation, because nothing else was left. And perhaps a real investigator might feel that the later parts are more passionate, which would show an increase in heat. And this fever curve in his writing would indicate that he later became even more upset or more devoted to his task than before.

IV

1

(I might perhaps have a danger to psychologize too much, but it seems to me that he would be less identifying himself with the Athenians after the banishment, too, although identifying himself more with his cause of writing the history. Because before the banishment, he had too much invested. He had to serve as an Athenian, primarily.)

Ja, -- you say this, my dear man.

(It's only --)

I don't know. You say this. Perhaps he was detached before. Perhaps he had already so much interest in the harmony between all the Greeks living in Thrace -- there in the north that he felt it was just too bad that there was not a larger comprehensiveness.

So all this is --.

2

(It's sheer speculation. Perhaps a map for future study. But it might even be because he had this tendency before to see both sides, it might have even affected the episode during which he was involved, which led to his banishment.)

Well, this is going too far. That's pure speculation, and I think it's an insidious one, really. The only thing you have to go by is that there are not two parties, but more than two, that the whole fate of Greece is just involved in this fact that there are the Corcyreans in the north of Greece, and the Spartans, and the Athenians, and the Corinthians. There are four parties, my dear man.

So it is a polyphonic enterprise. It's not just dualistic. Therefore it is a much richer canvas than is usual. The Trojan War by Homer has two parties: the Trojans and the Greeks. But Thucydides has become the historian, because he has just taken on as many parties as there were involved in the war.

3

That is, the war dictated to him his method. There was a war in which there were later the Sicilians who have quite different interests again from the people on the mainland of Greece, and on the islands. And I feel therefore: a good man rises to the occasion, gentlemen. And it's no excuse, because of the World War, there were 25 or 49 warring nations that a man then limits himself to the German-Russian conflict, or the English-German conflict. If he is the historian of this event, he has to provide means to encompass it.

And therefore, to rise to the occasion in this case of Thucydides meant that he had to go beyond the already well-known epical tradition of reconciling two conflicting enemies; but he had to become polyphonic.

4

It's like a step from the piano into orchestra. The orchestration of the history is the great act of Thucydides. That's Number One.

Let's put down what --. Only to show you that the Greeks were constantly aware of the neighborhood of *history, rhetorics, jurisprudence* to life.

CHAPTER FOUR: WITNESS, CHRONICLER, HISTORIAN

I

1

THE STORY OF AN INSCRIPTION IN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S SCHOOL

In my school in Germany, there was written in our assembly hall in Greek letters, because we all had to know Greek - *episteme* And that means, "All knowledge, all kinds of knowledge, separated from engagement, from efficacious action, is scoundrel-like, is the thing of the scoundrel, and no wisdom goes with it."

So I have been brought up with this doctrine that knowledge is not tolerable, unless we are engaged in the health and the salvation of that part of the world for which we have knowledge.

Anybody who knows something becomes responsible.

2

A forester who knows about the forest must do something about forestry. That's why he knows about the forest. And the man who just knows about the forest and doesn't do anything about forestation is a scoundrel in my eyes. A scoundrel. And the mere knowledge without engagement is for scoundrels, is just robbery.

You can rob money, but you can also rob knowledge.

3

The dilettante for hobbies, that's all right. But I despise hobbies. We are not in this world to have hobbies. We are responsible. When we know something, we suddenly grow above the normal stature of man -- other peoples don't know -- and knowledge is responsibility.

If you know how a forest has to recover its existence, you are not Mr. Schweighäuser, you are not entitled to cut it all down. And Mr. Schweighäuser, the famous family in the north of Oregon and Washington state, they have everywhere now signs that they are responsible.

THE STORY OF SCHOOLS OF FORESTERS

In 1930, the Congress of the United States made a scathing report on their vicious destruction of the forest in the north, and now they have scientific forestation, and they

have schools of foresters, and in the hard way they learned the lesson that he who knows must feel responsible for the reproduction of the forest.

4

Knowledge involves responsibility. For it's the same thing.

We only know, because we are provoked to know.

The doctor -- that's why the research is there because we must teach. Because I must tell you history, therefore some research is necessary so that I purify what I tell you.

Teaching is the master of research. Forestation is the master of the knowledge of the forest. You have to turn around everything in this country at this moment, it's just an article of import - it is a complete misunderstanding -- knowledge is separated from responsibility, and teaching, even.

That's why teaching seems to me so very inadequate. But the teaching must go on. Living memory must go on. You have no living memory. I have to put it in to you.

II

1

So teaching is a subtle thing. In any moment, the older people must teach the young. Therefore scientific research comes in because I want to give you the best of the living memory I can come to.

And therefore, although I have to tell you something about the history of the United States, I may improve, I may tell the story a little bit better. But there is no science of history. But there is a necessity of teaching the living memory to people who are not alive, as you. You live in apartment houses, or in barracks, or in -- what do you know? You only know when an automobile runs. But what has gone on before, nobody told you so.

So you live in a stone desert of memory, and therefore, we make a special effort to reach you. And you have to be concentrated in big schools in order to replace what otherwise your father, and your mother, and your grandparents could have done to you.

2

And so research, gentlemen -- as the word says - re-search is the honor of a teacher who wants to do the best of teaching.

But the dogmatic precedence is with teaching. In a living society, teaching is necessary. Man must teach. If therefore they can improve on this teaching, by channels of research, because we don't want to clog your memory with falsities.

But as soon as you turn it around and say, "Not what we have researched is taught, but that which has to be taught must be searched for," you suddenly discover that to tell the story is the *a priori*, precedes the necessity of teaching history, precedes all the tools and instruments of a little better research.

3

The history of the Declaration of Independence has to be told long before the details are known of who had a cough, and who had diarrhea on the day in which it was signed. These little items which the people now try to bring out. That's all right if they bring it out. But I have to teach you this even before this doctor thesis has been written.

So history has to be told long before it has been analyzed and researched scientifically. All the time it has to be told. It cannot for one moment stop from being told. You cannot wait and say, "Fifty years from now we will know."

4

If this dawns on you that history is a necessity of a society for its survival, you suddenly give the historian back his real rank as a functionary of society. He's just as important and as necessary as the postmaster in Chicago.

Even more so. The postmaster exchanges the letters of the contemporaries. But we exchange the letters of the dead, bring them to you. I'm the postman of the past. I deliver the letters which your ancestors are writing to you, and admonishing you not to forget them.

That's a full expression: postmaster of the past, for an historian.

III

1

Now let's look at the philosopher of history. Before the historian, there are the events -- perhaps we should call it the "reports."

The great example is the Battle of Waterloo, because the great French writer, Henri Stendhal, Henri Beyle.

Have you heard of his name, Stendhal? Who has read the name Stendhal?

No?

(The novelist?)

Ja, the novelist.

(The Red and the Black.)

He has a famous description of the Battle of Waterloo.

No? It's the other way around. Stendhal. His real name was Beyle.

THE STORY OF THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO

Now Stendhal has given a description of the Battle of Waterloo, and it's a stroke of genius, because he shows that nobody who fought in the Battle of Waterloo, where Napoleon was defeated by the English and the Prussians, that in this Battle of Waterloo nobody knew quite what was going on. A horse was shot, and a mill caught fire, and the cavalry rode. And any number of things happened, but nobody knew quite clearly what was through several villages, and it had not even a name.

So the event, the conflict, the more it is a conflicting event, is nameless. And the victor has the privilege of giving the name to the battle.

2

So the first historian is the general.

That is, that this is the battle to be called "of Gettysburg," is already a part of the event, because before, it hasn't gotten the name "Battle of Gettysburg," it is just three days of fighting. And a witty, anti-Lincoln man has said that if they had called the battle not "Gettysburg," but "Cassville," the Gettysburg Address could never have made this impression, because "Cassville" is just such an impossible name for such a heroic battle.

3

Well, they have a point. The Germans and the continental troops at the Battle of Waterloo tried to call it "Belle Alliance," because there was a farm called Belle Alliance, which means "beautiful alliance." And they said, "Since this was a coalition which happily united, and we hope it will go on, this union between the Prussians, the Germans, the English, the Austrians, et cetera, and the Bavarians, let us call this Belle Alliance". And in German textbooks, the battle is called not "Waterloo," but "Belle Alliance."

But the French -- when the English won out, and Wellington, because he held at Waterloo, call it "Waterloo." But there is still a conflict even in this tradition, that the name of the battle is not identical in the continental textbooks and in the western textbooks.

4

Now, when the historian then takes over, he has events which he can test by counting the number of ammunition sold, of the cannons used. These are objective statements for which he doesn't have to even have eyewitnesses. He can just go to the reports: how many cannons entered this battlefield? And then he has the reports of the generals, what this man here calls constantly the "eyewitness report." And this is not true that they are the eyewitness, but they are participants. The wrong idea that this is an eyewitness -- a general is not a witness. He's done it. It's his own story. So he already is filled with the story.

If you tell what you have done, you cannot call yourself a witness. But just you tell the story. You narrate it. "You see, and then I fell into the water, and somebody drew me out." I wouldn't call this a witness, really. To narrate what has happened to oneself, or one's country, or one's hometown, or one's family -- that's not a witness.

So Mr. Collingwood makes this mistake, that he only knows from the judiciary that we are witnesses. But when I remember something, and I have to tell it somebody else, I'm not the witness. I'm the reporter, or I'm the teller.

To tell a tale is something quite different from being a witness in court.

IV

1

Thereforein the Battle of Waterloo, there is Blücher, there is Wellington, there is Napoleon, there are Napoleon's generals, there are the soldiers wounded, there are the letters they wrote home from the hospital. And these are not eyewitnesses. I think that cools again us into the scientific realm, into the refrigerator of zoological facts, observed by some onlooker. I am in it. I haven't looked at the battle. I have fought it. To say I'm a witness is just ridiculous. I wanted to win. I'm a partisan.

A witness is, after all, usually somebody who is able to be objective. But I do not demand from a man who has been defeated in battle that he should be objective. He should cry. He should weep. He should say, "I'm the most unhappy, unfortunate -- I'm miserable." That's what I want to hear from him. Then I can write later the history, because he has made me feel how he felt.

2

But this omission of feelings, it's a funny thing about historians. I'm only interested in -- if I want to write the history of a battle -- what people felt at this moment. They felt that the Heaven was falling upon the earth, that it was a catastrophe. It was the end of their world.

If you cannot see that Appomattox was the end of Robert Lee's life, he's not a witness of what went on in Appomattox.

3

But why don't they say this? Because in court, we are supposed to be detached. And the whole idea of Mr. Collingwood is to try to save history and to give it that little of scientific character which makes it stand in line with the mathematical, and chemical, and physical sciences. If this is the honor of history, to become a science, then I'd try to get witnesses, because they objectify this. But I need people who tell the tale, with all their ludicrous involvement, *pathetically weeping, laughing, sobbing, hysteric*.

Then comes the historian as the reconciliator, as I told you, of conflicting evidence. And he's only interesting the more necessary, the more conflicting the evidence is. So that the historian's role is aggrandized, is increasing in stature, the more conflict there is.

4

Therefore, it is not great honor to tell us the history of Santa Monica. There has been no civil war, as far as I know, before the oil well was begun in Santa Monica. Now there may be a civil war if they dig this oil well. And then it would be necessary to get a real historian to write the story of Santa Monica. Today a chronicler is enough.

The less conflict, the less you need the specific role of the historian.

Also, the same with a doctor. You can get along on Christian Science and on a midwife, as long as everything goes normally. And only when the thing is very serious, it's a conflict between mother and baby, it's very serious; you have to go to the hospital and get an operation.

SECOND PART: HISTORIAN AND PHILOSOPHER

CHAPTER ONE: THE BABY

I

1

And so I would say: between the chronicler, who is a midwife of past memory, and the doctor, there is this difference, that with the doctor, the conflict is so serious, that he has to know more than the usual thing to understand the conflict, and to compose it.

Now comes my philosopher. And gentlemen, how would you define a philosopher? I would say, what is your first degree of what that is, a philosopher? What's the difference between a theologian and a philosopher? Then that's perhaps the

(Well, a definition of a philosopher, a good one, would be: one who seeks the truth.)

It must have some content.

(Nature.)

Good, ja, ja. That is, the philosopher tries to treat everything outside himself, including his neighbors, his family, as a part of the world.

2

It's the wisdom of this world. That is, it's a tendency to say that everything outside my own brain is world, and has to fall into a system of cause and effect, or of connections, which I carry and balance on my head.

So a philosopher is like the stag who tries to have the whole world as his antlers.

3

Now this is an act, because a philosopher cannot treat his own wife and his children -- if he happens to be married -- or his parents as part of the world. They are part of himself. And an historian is on the opposite pole from a philosopher. A philosopher tries to transform even his own body, perhaps, into a part of the world. He tries to explain why his body also must die.

(The -- "I think, therefore I am"?)

Ja. Quite.

So if you think of reality in which we are immersed, standing here, sitting here in this room-- here is around us walls, there is a building, there is the campus, there is Los Angeles, there is the globe -- the tendency of philosophy would be to dissolve this square of obscurity and confusion in such a way that on one side there is human reason.

Even patriotism is just a part of the worldly process. Every group has patriotism, for example, he'll say.

4

And now Mr. Collingwood tries to ascribe, assign to historians the idea of useful knowledge that it can be used. And this is the first error.

I have tried to show you that a doctor, after all, is called in by the patient because the patient is in pain. And therefore he wants to get rid of his pain. And in the sense, peoples are in pain, because they have hereditary enmities. And they call in the historian, or the historian feels to be called up to cure this disease. And that's all he does. And with the achievement, he goes out of business.

So history is always dependent on customers. And it is rooted in pain, rooted in experience, rooted in demand.

Rooted in emergency.

II

1

All this is for the philosopher quite un-understandable.

And so what we read here from Mr. Collingwood's pen is an attempt to save history in the realm of technology. He wants to know how we could use the product of history in the future. And it is the same problem.

2

You know what the technologically minded man asked the mother -- no, the story is a little different.

THE STORY OF THE USE OF A NEWBORN CHILD

A man made a discovery, and the practical man said, "What's the use of your great discovery?" And the man was very angry, and you know the answer. "Sir, what's the use of a newborn child?"

That's the only answer you can give to these practical men, about any group-like spiritual action. A sermon is of no use. It's an expression of a liturgy of the Church. Nothing has use in the sense of the practical man.

3

If I discover that the earth retreats around the sun, the only answer is that's as beautiful as that there is a new baby. A baby has no use for anybody. It's just a burden. And yet it is the most wonderful thing in the world. It has its own justification.

God obviously created the world and put as its climax the baby. That's why we have Christianity worshiping the baby in the cradle.

4

Therefore all the other things can be used by the baby, but the baby cannot be used by anybody for any other purpose, but its own happiness and bliss. And all the attempts you make to find how useful you are in society will drive you into the arms of illness and mental decrepitude, because there is no use for you.

You are an end in yourself, and you are not a means. The mankind is God's playmate, but God doesn't use us.

But this is again the heresy of the philosopher, who must find for anything in the world, some practical application.

Flowers are just beautiful. And the girls are just pretty. And that's perfectly sufficient.

III

1

There you have to make up your mind. If you go with a philosopher, you allow yourself to be made a part of a system in which you function. And this is true that to a part, in order to be supported by society, you must work.

But that's not myself. That's only the earthly part of mine. With our body, and our earth, where we must eat, we must also give some work, and some sweat, and some toil, in order to make a living. But you can never define my whole existence by saying, "I'm a worker in the Socony Vacuum filling station". That's not myself. Because I'm just there employed for the time being. Tomorrow I do something else.

The temporary, in other words, the passing things are the technical things which I have to perform. But they never can encompass me.

2

And so the historian's task is something much more modest. It is not on the playing of usefulness.

Here is the world of things.

And here is the society of man.

And here is the process of creation.

And you may be ambivalent between creator and nature.

3

Now, you all know the baby that is created belongs, it is true, to society. It's a child of the family. And it belongs to the world of things because, when you put it on the scale, it weighs so many pounds. And therefore it's a part of this earthly system of gravity and expanse.

But this doesn't exhaust the smile of the baby. The baby is the end of creation. It's the most beautiful destiny of all things on this earth that such a beautiful baby should be born. All these things have to serve him, and society has to serve him. And woe to the parents who enclose this child and say, "We own it." You are just part and parcel of society.

4

This baby has a right to its own name.

It has a right to speak out against the society.

It can criticize society.

It can leave the society.

It can reform the society.

In other words, this baby is a child of God. That is, it has an immediate rank, and it is irreducible. You can never explain this newborn baby by anything that has gone on before.

Woe to you if you try!

And it can never be explained by anything for whose use it can be used.

That's why slavery is really impossible, why a newborn child cannot be enslaved just to serve on a plantation. You cannot enshrine a human being in known purposes, or in known groups. Because it may be his destination, to bring up this society as it exists, to be a rebel, be a reformer.

IV

1

THE STORY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON AN AMERICAN

George Washington never thought of himself as anything but a British gentleman. And there he was thrown upon, it was thrown upon himself to become an American. You mustn't think that he liked the idea. He was forced into this, gradually. And his enemies forged letters in his name -- the famous Randolph letters, published in 1778, in which they make him complain that he doesn't want to cease to be a Britisher, that he was a British gentleman, and that was all he wanted to do.

And you do not see what an agony it was for the man to have to cease to be a member of the existing society and order of things, and no longer be a subject of King George III. You naïvely assume that it was very agreeable to him. But it wasn't. It was most disagreeable. He hated the whole business.

But as a baby of God, he had to listen, to obey orders that came to him, outside this society of his, and outside, certainly, the world of things, of dead things which declared that Virginia after all was Elizabethan colony, and that everything there had to remain within the British realm.

2

You can hardly imagine how difficult it was for a man like Washington to outgrow his society and the nature of his environment. And his greatness is that he did. He became, out of a son of the British commonwealth, the father of this country. And why is he called the father of this country?

Because when he grew up, as a son, there was no such country. You can only become the father of this country if you are the first, in whom this country takes shape.

This newness of the historical is our belief in history in our era, of which Mr. Collingwood doesn't take any cognizance.

3

So history has to do with the newness of unwhole events.

That's the second thing.

The historian deals with conflicts, but he will only remember those conflicts which have brought into being a new kind of man, or in which man has asserted his right to re-create society, and to re-create nature.

This is the second element.

4

Now comes the third.

Mr. Thucydides, I told you, has immortalized the period, and he has insisted that the Peloponnesian War lasted from 431 to 403 or 404. And we all, ever since 2,300 years now, speak of the Peloponnesian War, although our only authority for this is Mr. Thucydides. And he has to fight the idea that this is not one war.

And I tried to tell you that he has the same problem today, that as long as the two world wars are not considered one catastrophe, we will not be able to agree on its solution. As long as you think that Hitler was a wicked man, or Roosevelt was a politician, and do not see that the emperor and Mr. Wilson were engaged in exactly the same conflict, you will not understand -- neither the Russian problem, by the way, with their rejection of czarism nor the American problem.

CHAPTER TWO: PHYLOGENETIC WARS

I

1

So the third thing then is: that historians, in order to solve conflicts, must delineate epochs, events of a certain length of time.

We owe to the historian the recognition of epochs.

That is, in the atomized time, where every second is different from every other second, the historian gives us the insight into continuity. But he does this from concrete epochs. He doesn't side with the philosophy of history, and say that all times are always changing, as Mr. Collingwood there says. But he's quite satisfied, Mr. Thucydides, to create this one unity, 431 to 404. And around this you can append other facts, perhaps.

Well, all we owe to Thucydides is nothing that went on in history before, or after, and the philosopher despises concrete times. He wants to abstract from time and space. He wants to have a system that is valid for all...

2

...and misled. That there has been this tremendous calling-back of the nations of the western world into one order.

And with the great sacrifice of the war, you will understand first that wars call the human race to order when any individual generation has gone astray. That's the first thing. Wars are visitations. And World Wars are phylogenetic.

We distinguish in zoology between ontogenetic, which is a problem ending my own nature, and phylogenetic, which is a problem of the constancy of the human race, through many generations. "Phylon" being the stem, or the tribe, or the unity through generations.

3

Now wars are phylogenetic, and they prove it by demanding the sacrifice of life of one generation in order to intertwine and connect the preceding and the later generations. And in any war, the people who die on the battlefield make the sacrifice so that their parents and their grandchildren may still see eye to eye. If they fail, the community is destroyed, as Troy. Their eyes -- they are defeated.

Victory means that this continuity, this unity between grandparents and grandchildren is re-established at the price of the physical life, the carnal existence of the middle generation. And whether everybody is slain among on the battlefield, or only one, makes

no difference. Anybody's death in battle, which is the essence of war -- that somebody is killed -- means that there is one man willing to connect the phylogenetic unity of an empire, a realm, a United States against the ontogenetic madness of pleasure-seeking society, as of the day, where people forget the unity and don't want to pay the penalty of this for this unity.

Therefore, ...

4

(Just on this topic, you asked me ... Rudyard Kipling's "Recessional," on the next page. It deals with just what you're saying. I'd like to read it.)

Glad to, wonderful. Of course, he knows this.

"The Question, 1916

*Brethren, how shall it fare with me,
when a war is laid aside,
if it be proven that I am he
for whom the world has died?*

*If it be proven that all my good,
and the greater good that I will make
were purchased me by a multitude
who suffered for my sake?*

*That I was delivered by mere mankind,
vowed to one sacrifice,
and not, as I hold them, battle-blind,
but dying with open eyes?*

*That they did not ask me to draw the sword,
when they stood to endure their lot,
that they only looked to me for a word,
and I answered them, 'I knew them not.'*

"And I answered, 'I knew them not.'" Ja.

*"If it be found, when the battle clears,
their death has set me free,
then how shall I live with myself through the years
which they have bought for me?"*

*Brethren, how must it fare with me,
or how am I justified,
if it be proven that I am he
for whom mankind has died?*

*If it be proven that I am he,
who, being questioned, deny."*

And it's an accusation of the United States. It's written in 1916, when the United States didn't want to enter the war.

II

1

So this poet is very poignant. Kipling had this in his heart all the time, because he was married to an American, and so he was deeply involved in this. It's really an incredible poem.

(...to the United States of America)

2

Well, I feel, when I read in the papers today-- and I may mention this, because I want you to say what you feel about it -- I can off and on read about the English debt to America, in the financial debt.

THE STORY OF ENGLAND AND AMERICA 1939

Now it is obvious that Mr. Roosevelt knew that this country should go to war right away in 1939, and was only restrained by political reasons of the domestic policy not to do this. It is also clear that if he had done so, Europe would not have been destroyed first. And it's certainly true that England bled white, to death, so that the Americans might come out of this war as the victor over all other countries; whereas the British lost India, and practically New Zealand, and Australia, and Canada to the United States.

3

Now I can hardly contain myself when I read then about these four billion dollars of a debt, when the United States, like a Shylock, waited till England had bled white, and then entered the war. And let the whole burden of the first three years be borne by the British.

This is never mentioned here.

But it was obvious to every statesman in the United States, that it was only the resistance of the British that has saved the United States. In 1939, gentlemen, in 1940, at the Stock Exchange in Wall Street, lectures were given about the fact that Hitler would now be in the United States six weeks later, and what would the Jewish bankers then in New York have to do?

This is all forgotten today.

4

But the shabbiness of this country, that allows newspaper writers today to speak of these few billion dollars in 1940, when the whole British Isles were pawned for the victory of the United States later, that's And that's how we to this day treat the foreign aid, as though these people were outside our responsibility.

That's why this poem, is exactly the right, because every Englishman who died then, died for the greater glory of America.

III

1

(Well, a lot of people think about the Treaty of Versailles, that th biggest blunder of the Treaty of Versailles was the reparation payment that Germany had to make.)

That was acknowledged finally.

(And -- ... caused them to think that)

But now it is even held against the British, which I think is more awful, because the solidarity of the British, their resistance was only meaningful if there was a United States who finally would come forward. The British would never win this war. Their resistance then in the *Blitz* was simply a delaying action.

So they already anticipated that the United States at one time would turn the scales.

2

So we are in the same boat as Thucydides.

If it can be done, that the people of the United States can be sold to the idea that they were in the war really in 1939, or in the days of Bill Mitchell already, and not just in 1941 after Pearl Harbor, history would be the World War history, and it would not just be the private history of how to convince the people of the United States that they should enter the war.

But the fictions in this country about the war are quite remarkable.

(Well, in 1936, Hitler wasn't sure that France and Germany would even go to war with him. That's why, when he moved into the Rhineland...)

Oh, he trembled. He thought they might --.

(...He told his tank commander that if he met any resistance, to move back. And the same with Czechoslovakia.)

Ja.

(He wasn't sure whether he'd meet any resistance.)

Ja.

(So when he didn't meet any, I guess he knew that he had a free hand. And he knew America wasn't going to enter, either.)

3

Well, Mr. Borah, who had then passed this terrible neutrality legislation in this country, who was in German pay. The senator, the chairman of the foreign policy committee.

(What was his name?)

Oh -- Louis Borah, Senator Borah.

(Voted against the treaty, one of the senators who voted against Wilson's treaty.)

4

(What was wrong with the law in Germany? To conquer all of Europe and unify it. Keep it --.)

Because they tried to colonialize it. This would be debatable if you had understood, if you could assume that he would give the others equality. He never meant to. I tell you, this is a very good question.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY IN THE PAULSKIRCHE

On the 13th of January of this year, I told you perhaps already, I was in Frankfurt attending a big meeting of 1500 people in the so-called Paulskirche. That is the center of democratic tradition in Germany, because the first German parliament met in this building. So it was quite a meeting.

And I defended my several theses there about the future of a peacetime society of worldwide character. And there was much give-and-take and discussion. And finally the Eric Johnston of the enterprise, I mean -- how do you call it?-- the manager, yes -- got up and said, "Gentlemen, here this man from America talks to you about a worldwide society. Be a little careful to -- and don't turn your back on this because after all we owe the world very much, because" -- and I heard this went out from his mouth for the first time -- "the Germans have tried to introduce --" oh, my sermon had been about the underdeveloped

countries, the colonials, the Africans, and so on. And he said, "Don't forget, ladies and gentlemen, that Germany from 1933 to 1945 has tried to treat its European neighbors once more as though they were colonies."

And that's why this was not a question of the unification of Europe, but it was really the brutal treatment of these Poles, and Czechs, and so, as though they were African Negroes, as though they were colonies to be exploited.

IV

1

And so, it was impossible to accept, for any human being, this solution.

THE STORY OF HITLER BEING A CZECH BY BIRTH

Hitler, in his very strange hatred and of probably his own ancestry, because I suppose that he was a Czech by birth; well, however that may be, he hated, from his Austrian-Hungarian tradition -- he was an Austrian-Hungarian and there the nationalities were all at war with each other. And so, feeling that he was on the German side, he simply wanted to put his foot on the Czech --.

2

(..had Europe been united in this federation, then it would have been permanent beyond Hitler's regime, or would have dissolved back into France, and Germany, and Italy, and Czechoslovakia and Austria. Because --.)

Assuming that he would have had greater wisdom, but then he would never have come to power, because the revenge of the German nationalism was after all the platform on which he was allowed to take over. And since he wanted to revenge the defeat of Germany in 1918, and promised this - I don't think that there was anybody who promised the unification of Europe -- reconciliation of France, and everybody -- would ever have been allowed to get into the government. And the French didn't want to know anything of the Germans, and the Italians were very megalomaniacs at that time. And the British were islanders.

3

So I think if you take away Hitler, you don't find a possibility after this Peace Treaty of Versailles, of any man coming forward with authority, and reconciling these enemies of the First World War in a nice confederacy.

The only people who could do this were the Americans.

That's why there is no future for any confederacy of Europe, if you omit the United States. The United States are the only country in which there live of descendants from all of these countries, Number 1. That makes America more akin to any one of these countries than there is France to Germany, or England to Germany, or Holland to Belgium, or Belgium to Czechoslovakia.

Among themselves, the Europeans are more divided than they are with relation to America.

4

The bonds between any one country in Europe and America are much stronger than the bonds between, let us say, Italy and France. Very simply, because six million Italians emigrated to America, but no six million Italians made good in France. A very simple reason. There are forty million Germans who came to this country. So it is very easy still to find unity or reconciliatory tones between Germans and Americans, obviously.

(There are more Norwegians in the United States than there are in Norway.)

(Forty million Germans; I think, the population is France only.)

Fourteen, 14 million Germans.

CHAPTER THREE: CREATION IS NOT A GENERALIZATION

I

1

(I'm just curious about one fact that might be off the subject. And that is, why the so-called democracies did not go to the Munich Pact with Hitler with clean hands, why they went there with dirty hands, and came back with dirty hands? By that I mean, the democracies, for their own safety, Britain and France, sold Czechoslovakia down the river, to stay in and buy time --.)

Well, my dear man. I still am not sure that the intellectuals of this country are not going to sell the two million people of Berlin down the river. They would like...

(That's the same --)

...exactly the same. We haven't seen the end of it.

(That will be coming up here on April 29th.)

The lackadasiacal attitude here of the educated people is, "Okay." What do they care? I'm very doubtful.

(It's something to think about.)

2

Well, one point then, let us settle for today. The problem of the philosopher is that he wants to generalize all times and all spaces. And the topic of the historian is to save one period, one certain time, and one certain area from oblivion, and he creates epoch as a creature.

Can you begin to think that perhaps seventy years or thirty years are just as much a reality which has to be given its proper character, its uniqueness, as if you consider a person.

3

The Thirty Years' War, or the War of Independence, or the Civil War cannot be reduced to four years in the abstract; but these five years from Fort Sumter to Appomattox are an event, one event. And just as you would admit that the redwood, and the rose, and the tulip are different creatures, and that we should honor them for being distinct creatures, I invite you to consider that man must save the times, the high times of history from being just dismissed as having the physical character of four times 365 days. The Civil War is not just any four times 365 days, but four times 365 days strung together in a unique pattern.

And it is this uniqueness which the historian *creates, or supports, or pronounces, or proclaims,* or whatever word you want to say for this. He stands for the unique character of the event which he re-creates, or which he reports, or which he makes into a treasure of mankind, in living memory.

4

Thucydides says, "I make this war a gold mine for all times."

That is, you can no longer say, "These are just 27 years of the past. What do I care for the past? All the past is dead". And I just count it in the counting-house, and say, "So many seconds, so many minutes, so many days, so many years."

This is how the physicist creates time.

The historian assigns to every time a unique character. And he says the Thirty Years' War, or the Hundred Years' War of the Roses in England, or the Hundred Years' War between France and England, these are events like the Trojan War, too, or like the Revolution War.

Valley Forge is not explained by saying it consisted of sixty years of suffering. It's "Valley Forge." And the name "Valley Forge" is the seal upon the fact that it can never be confused or mistaken for any other period in the history of mankind.

II

1

Therefore, you will now understand why I feel that the historians are threatened by the philosopher. Here. Here is the historian. And in front of him are just atoms of time. But he suddenly realizes, in sympathy with the suffering of the human race, that during 1860 and 1865, something was solved, something was done which made all these people move together -- and if he puts the seal under this event, this Civil War, or *John Brown's Body*, or whatever he does it, man will not have to repeat the performance.

Out of the travesty of disorder and anarchy, of chaotic time, of just living day by day, there emerges at one time this pyre. And the flames of this conflagration enlighten this historian. He's inflamed. He's really shot through with the meaning of this event. He says, "Don't forget the Civil War."

2

Perhaps now you'll read now "*The Recessional*."

Recessional--1897

*God of our fathers, known of old,
Lord of our far-flung battle line,
Beneath whose awful Hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine –
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget -- lest we forget!*

*The tumult and the shouting dies;
The captains and the kings depart:
Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget -- lest we forget!*

*Far called, our navies melt away,
On dune and headland sinks the fire;
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!
Judge of the nations, spare us yet,
Lest we forget -- lest we forget!*

*If, drunk with sight of power, we loose
Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe,
Such boastings as the Gentiles use,
Or lesser breeds without the Law –
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget – lest we forget!*

*For heathen heart that puts her trust
In reeking tube and iron shard,
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding, calls not Thee to guard,
For frantic boast and foolish word –
Thy mercy on Thy People, Lord!*

He rises here to real responsibility, this very neurologic man.

3

So the modesty of the historian is that he's perfectly satisfied of saving one little part of time from oblivion by giving its unique name: "Civil War," "Battle of Waterloo," or whatever it is. Once he has saved this one little color spot from the drabness of nothingness, of annihilation, there is hope that the whole history will begin to become transparent as the creation of very beautiful flowers of civilization, or whatever you call this.

4

And therefore, the historian is perfectly satisfied if he can give to one event this lasting character. If he is able to write a world history, or a whole century, all the better. But that's so much gravy. The historian has already fully served the community if he makes them put their foot down at one event and say, "We won't forget that." Then they're already emerging from the fog, and the mist of day-by-day living. They already get a memory. And as soon as they have got memory in one spot, then they can enlarge on this.

But you have first to hold onto one point, where you could emerge from casual, accidental living and say, "This was not an accident, that we occupy the Gold Rush of California, and the building of the railroad, and the statehood of California, we'll stand by that. California is a state and must remain a state."

III

1

Any one such memory saves us from this daydreaming in which most people indulge. If I go in to Los Angeles, I feel most people are daydreaming. They don't know at what time of history, in what hour of history they live. They try to live in a timeless disorder. They wouldn't know whether they live 1912, or 1959. They say, "What does it matter? I look up the calendar; the calendar tells me 1959."

That has no meaning. That it means after the two world wars, they wouldn't admit for a moment. They just live and have their appointment calendar, and it's just within the year that they get around.

But 1959 is not different to them from 1940 if you tell them tomorrow it's already 1975, they say, "All the better. Then we have saved a lot of time, and --." They play around with time. Because no year has its unique character.

A nation has very great difficulties.

2

THE STORY OF VETERAN'S DAY

I told you the tragedy of this country is that we have now Veteran's Day, which is a completely mythical day, which applies to any war, and has absolutely nothing to do with the achievements of the two world wars. When we had *Armistice Day*, it was at least a memory of the First World War. Now we are so modest, that since we have no peaces after two world wars, and just armistices, we call the 11th of November "*Veterans' Day*."

Now Veterans' Day can apply to the year against Great Britain in 1812. And it can apply to the Mexican War. It is just mythical war and peace rotating. But the Mexican War is not the World War; and the World War is not the Spanish-American War.

3

And this is the creation of the historian, to make them incomparable, and inconfusable. The creation of uniqueness of time is as important as the creation of God when He created animals and trees.

You take this for granted that the word "tree" is not all you have to say about a palm tree and an oak tree. And you leave to the oak and the palm their honor of being specific.

Now historians are specific. This great secret of creation is: *be specific*. Creation is not a generalization.

4

The philosopher, however, withdraws this seal of a special creature from the specific period, he wants to generalize. He wants to emerge all times into some -- what he calls "time and space abstraction." And therefore philosophers destroy history.

They destroy history.

They must dissolve the achievements of the historian. If the historian -- I'm not a painter -- but if a historian is making knots, and he adds that 1812 and 1941 are unique events, but the philosopher comes and unties these knots and says, "Oh well, this is a war, and this is a war, many wars". Therefore, I abstract from all your work you have done that was to make 1912 unique. I, the philosopher say, "What does it matter? This was a war. People are always foolish. They always seem to go to war". And so the philosopher will untie this knot and again, time will then just look, as a platitude, as a flat, *platt* plain.

And therefore, philosophers and historians are enemies. They do the opposite thing.

And therefore, I think a philosophy of history is impossible.

IV

1

(Could you speak about the relation between this tendency to abstract and be objective and what seems to be an ever-increasing tendency toward conformity?)

Wherever you philosophize, you create for the mind a unified universe, and you abstract from all differences, as you possibly can. One mind, everybody has a mind, so you have to agree to my system of thinking.

2

I start as an historian with the fact that there are children, and grownups, and old people, and silly people, and educated people. My problem is: how could they keep the peace despite the fact that they all have think differently? I'm not interested in the unity of reason. I'm interested in the colorfulness of people at different times, and in different places, and different races. And I wonder why God created so many different people.

But philosophers wonder that all men can be substituted for everybody else. This is to me the boredom of philosophy, that it has to annihilate the colors of men.

3

The salvation is, you can always beat a philosopher finally with his own arms.

Mankind is a species out of species. If you live right, at the end of your life you have become your own species. Any great man in history, or any great woman -- what we call a saint or a genius -- is a species which can never be repeated. Saint Francis can never live again.

And so if you want to save yourself from philosophy, keep in mind that man was created by God as a species out of species. That would be the Latin version of this. Man is that strange being whereas all the wolves belong to one species, in the human family every one of us is specific by his own name. And we are a family, a species, that consists of Lincolns, and George Washingtons, and Walt Whitmans, and therefore, every one of us is specific.

And your own task in life is to keep the solidarity with the human race, yes; but in it, become a species.

4

And that's what your tombstone must say. If the tombstone says, "Here lies a good man," it is meant that here lies an irreplaceable item, somebody who is unique, who can never be replaced, because he has left a good odor, and his aroma, and what his attitude to the world -- as a newborn baby is an end in itself.

("Now he belongs to the ages.")

Exactly. Exactly.

CHAPTER FOUR: WARNING AGAINST ARBITRARY FANATICISM

I

1

So the creation of uniqueness, gentlemen, is the task of history. The historian tries to save this uniqueness. He doesn't pretend that he makes the World War out of whole clothes. He says, "There it is." He believes it. He

*accepts,
acknowledges,
recognizes,
and makes recognizable*

God's creation inside history.

The philosopher, however, tries to dissolve this pattern and start from scratch, because he always wants to go to the moment at which history begins. He wants to see the elements out of which this world is woven.

Now you can dissolve any tapestry, and can say, "Well what is it? It's just on this loom." There -- how do you call the two things?

(It's warp and woof.)

2

And so you can dissolve any pattern of history, but dare you? May you? Can you dissolve the pattern of the United States and say, "We go back and start from scratch. And next time we go to the Antarctic and we don't go into the United States."

You can, if this is at an end. But then you condemn the United States to be a worthless something that is decadent and must die.

3

So philosophers always are grave diggers. The philosophy of history can always say, "Dismiss a number of events that seem unforgettable and unique and say it isn't worth it."

So Mr. Spengler writes *The Decline of the West*. Mr. Toynbee says, "23 civilizations have passed away." That is, he takes stock of things that have ceased to be. Whereas the historian tries to save what has happened from oblivion so that it can still function.

Grave digger, after all, and doctor are not quite the same. One may lead to the other, but then he's a poor doctor.

4

So there is enmity between the historian and the philosopher of history. The philosopher of history tries to bring out the elements out of which history started and to which it can be reduced. And the historian tries to save the creations out of these elements. The configurations, you may say -- that's perhaps the most realistic expression - or the constellations -- to which these elements have been brought.

II

1

An Englishman, Mr. Sansome, has explained this hostility between historian and philosopher in an interesting way in 1935. He is a chemist and you wouldn't expect -- a biologist, pardon me, a biologist, and he is a member of the great English society of -- how is it called? It is not called Society of Sciences --?

(Academy of Sciences.)

Academy of Science. Mr. Sansome. I wonder how you pronounce his name correctly. Sansome or San-sum-ee?

And he says, *"For so long, we have wondered what brings about change. Now, we have proven that change is going on all the time, perpetually, and therefore we begin to wonder what makes anything permanent. And so we have to change our whole system of questions."*

2

When philosophers would try to begin to understand how miraculous this is, that such a unique creation as the United States of America came into being, they will then join the historian in asking not the abstract question, "What dissolves 23 civilizations?" but "How do these support this civilization?" what the historian tries to do. In making it so valuable, so unique, that we'll stand by it, and say, "It still should be given a chance." If we only enter deep enough into the meaning of this body politic, we will find a new lease of life for this.

3

At this moment obviously the United States are faced with this very question: What is the future of the United States? Then you have to dig deep into its continental mission as a new world to get your courage up and say that we will live longer than the Russian

system. That takes an act of faith. And for this, we need to re-create the uniqueness of the achievement and understand it as deeply as possible in order to have our faith reinforced.

4

Now philosophers then, gentlemen, dismiss faith, and historians build it up.

History is always an article of faith. Because whenever you call any out of the millions of women your bride, that's an act of faith, that she should be the one and only one. And this is what the historian does. He clings to an event and says, "This is unique." God has not created abstractions.

Do not believe that God is not the most colorful. He created the sun, and the moon, and the constellations in Heaven, and every constellation is different. God is the enemy of abstractions. And where you have abstraction dominant, as you have in this country at this moment, there's no vitality.

III

1

And now you understand why I have understood very well what the philosophers try to do, and have followed as far as dead things are concerned. Philosophers are very necessary. I have to dismiss even from the construction of the United States those elements that are irrelevant.

THE STORY OF A SOCIALISTIC ENTERPRISE: THE RAILROADS

For example, I am always very angry when I hear you say that Americans are a capitalistic country. That's accidental. Obviously the United States are quite indifferent to any social system. This is a free country. And we can do one way or the other. The railroads were built obviously as a socialistic enterprise, because the states gave the capital to build them. Now do you call this a capitalistic country when the government pays for the building of a private enterprise?

That's all right, but it makes no sense to me. I call this a colonial system.

2

In colonies, there are many economic systems. And I think any country must be able to *contain, use, employ* any number of economic *means, or systems, or forms of organization*. As soon as you say, "America is a capitalistic country," I call the philosopher in and use him, to dissolve these elements and say that this wouldn't make the United States, then a unique creation. That's a passing thing, and accidental.

Only to show you that I have some use for philosophers, because the ingredients of American history should be sifted for what is the real contribution of the United States, and what is purely *vener, or cloak, or of passing*, and has nothing to do --.

3

I give you an example.

THE STORY OF MR. ELIOT MORISON

Mr. Morison, Mr. Samuel Eliot Morison, is a great historian in this country. And who has read a book of his?

(I'm reading his ...)

Well, we are personal friends. And so he one day confessed to me that he had to use a certain philosophy in order to free himself from all his Bostonian environment as a blue-blood Bostonian.

And he being very anti-Socialist indeed, I understood that this man used philosophy in order to find the pertinent things in his history. Being an historian, he wanted to rise above the accidental. He didn't want to identify the Lowells and the Cabots of Boston, with American history. And feeling that he was so dyed-in-the-wool Bostonian, he looked for some critical, philosophical approach which would take down certain things that seem to the native identical with the meaning of history, that God created Boston, the hub of the universe.

And I admired him for this honesty with which he used a radical system of philosophizing, in order to learn to be a better historian.

4

So in this sense, philosophy is the critical faculty of warning us against arbitrary fanaticism, or devotion. And in this negative sense, I think historians can use and will always use philosophy as a sifting process, so that they are warned against falling in love with accident, with things that have not brought about the results they want to celebrate, or they want to stabilize.

Sometimes the man who wore a blue cap is the leader, then everybody says a blue cap saved the country. A philosopher then can cure us by generalizing and saying, "Caps have nothing to do with patriotism."

IV

1

(Then the proper use of philosophy is meaningful to the historian.)

Ja. Ja.

Because we all inspire and expire. We all inhale and exhale. And the negative attitude: "Oh no, that's not very much," is just as necessary as the other: "That's terrific." Obviously we have to move in both directions, and we have always to dismiss that which doesn't deserve our admiration, or our allegiance, or our loyalty.

And that it means to philosophize. And philosophizing is like exhaling. But history is inhaling. Historians must inspire their readers. And philosophers must detach their readers. And so you can also make this pun, but puns are a little dangerous.

Historians attach us to life.

And philosophers detach us from life.

2

(The attempt of their objectivity is okay, as long as we have the historians to balance it.)

Quite. But they are elsewhere. You must not say that the philosopher of history makes history superfluous. The philosopher and the historian are just doing something quite different. The philosopher tries to submerge *the individual times, and places, and people* into some general system; *submerge*. And the historian tries to make *emerge* the really created mountains and plains of real people into consistent survival.

"Emersion" and "submersion" is quite a good word.

If I read a philosophy, everything is submerged under generalities. Nothing any longer is important.

3

(Well, wouldn't the philosopher would probably say, "I see, therefore I believe." And the historian does not necessarily have to see to believe; he has the faith, without having to see to believe. Did you mention that a couple of lectures back?)

Ja.

THIRD PART: POLYBIUS

CHAPTER ONE: SCIPIO

I

1

Perhaps we have still ten minutes for Mr. Polybius, because that's just an anecdote, it seems, but it shows you that this very sober and people have even held of him, a very poor writer -- as a writer, has real greatness as regard to the emergence of uniqueness. What's the story? Did you read this?

Why didn't you?

(I couldn't find it in the library.)

Who has read it? Well, you're a good girl. -- Now will you give to us? Read it out loud.

2

(Twenty-two, or a little bit of 21 which sort of introduces it more, which is down a little bit of that, prior to the part that you wanted us to emphasize?)

(The lead-in.)

Oh, yes, very necessary-- now the situation is -- 146 B.C. Rome has conquered Greece. Rome has conquered Carthage, the great enemy. And the queen of Carthage and the commanding general are surrendering and approaching Scipio while the city down is ablaze. And so it's a great scene. And next to him is situated Polybius, his teacher and friend, who has accompanied him to headquarters. And here he receives the surrender, Scipio.

Now go on.

3

"Turning around to me at once, and grasping my hand, Scipio said, 'A glorious moment, Polybius. But I have a dread foreboding that some day the same doom will be pronounced upon my own country.'

It would be difficult to mention an utterance more statesmanlike and more profound, for at the moment of our greatest triumph and of disaster to our enemies, to reflect on our own situation, and the possible reversal of circumstances and generally to bear in mind at the season of success the mutability of fortune, is like a great and perfect man. A man, in short, worthy to be remembered.

Scipio, when he looked upon the city as it was utterly perishing, and in the last throes of its complete destruction, is said to have shed tears and wept openly for his enemies. After being wrapped in thought for long, and realizing that all cities, nations, and authorities must, like men, meet their doom, that this happened to Ilium, once a prosperous city..."

That's Troy. Ilium.

"...to the empires of Assyria, Medea, and Persia, the greatest of their time, and to Macedonia itself, the brilliance of which was so recent, either deliberately or the verse escaping him, he said, 'A day will come when sacred Troy shall perish, and Priam and his people shall be slain.' And when Polybius, speaking with freedom to him -- for he was his teacher -- asked him what he meant by his words, they say that without any attempt at concealment, he named his own country for which he feared when he reflected on the fate of all things human. Polybius actually heard him, and recalled"

4

THE STORY OF 1945

Gentlemen, in 1945, this country was very much enraged, because the Germans had dared to offer resistance in the Battle of the Bulge, and at Christmas at Bastogne, and it was in -- you can hardly remember this. But while the Americans were really quite happy-go-lucky all the time before, this last moment of resistance seemed to spoil everything, and poison the mood. And people became more anti-German than they had ever been before. And so in the middle of '45 -- there was the Potsdam conference, and the soldiers were forbidden to speak to the Germans -- not only the German soldiers, but to the population, and they were ostracized as brutes. And it was obvious that the Americans were so engaged in fighting the war after it was over, that the new enemy, the Russians, remained invisible. And the Germans couldn't understand this. Every German told at that time, the Americans, "Why don't you turn around and fight the Russians with us?"

Well, the Americans were stultified. They still had to live for another five years in the hatred of the Germans, because the hatred against Germany, as I told you, did not develop in 1939. It didn't develop in 1941, but it did develop at the end of the war in 1945. And so the soul of man is not contemporary of the events very often. You can bring about quite a distemporanity, quite a discrepancy in the timing of human feelings, and in the timing of events.

II

1

So I invited Dorothy Thompson, who was at that time a very famous columnist in this country, and myself, and a man in the college who had been the chaplain and the founder of a new department there. So we three invited 35 colleagues of mine in the Dartmouth College to a meeting at my house, because I had the largest rooms. And Dorothy

Thompson came, as a politician, and the old man came as a clergyman, and I spoke as a former German, and an historian. And I simply read to them this anecdote of Scipio, that this man had at the moment of greatest triumph of Rome considered the inevitable onetime decline of Rome. And I went so far to say, "Now if you consider this, his tears obviously have made it possible that the Roman Empire went on for another five hundred years. Because the sobriety of a victor who can identify the vanquished with his own later fate, is much greater than that of the triumphant victor who only thinks that he cannot be reached, cannot be attained."

2

And therefore the Roman dignity which has been called "pietas," piety of Rome, shows in this fear of the envy of the gods. This is a through-going, ancient notion.

And we talked about it in the beginning, that the gods who give such a complete victory will only tolerate it if the victors remain *very sober, very debonair, very relaxed*, and do not stiffen and say, "Now we can do as we please."

And so I tried to convey to them the fact that the future of Rome was created by this insight of the victor into the relative character of the victory.

3

What happened was that these 35 gentlemen laughed. Laughed. They laughed.

And so the Americans dismissed the army. They had to go through this terrible Korean injustice, where people were called up again to the colors, who had fought for four years in the World War and whose family life was destroyed, because nobody had served in the meantime and been prepared.

I have seen this. I have three marriages that have been broken up, in my own friendship, because these young fliers were completely overtaxed in their strength, and they were just nervous wrecks when they came back from Korea. One of the greatest injustices in this country, that people had to go to war twice because there had been no substitution.

4

And so I think that these people, who were all educated people, were all teachers, could laugh at this representation floored me.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY NEVER BEEING THE SAME WITH THESE PEOPLE

I have never been the same with these people, to tell you the truth. I was through with them. The cynicism, or the indifference, or the flatness of their souls in such a situation -- it was after all, it was September '45, four weeks after the Japanese surrender; so everybody was still living high. But they only thought that we were pleading, and that they were after all the victors, and they felt very good, and they could do as they pleased, and nobody had to tell them anything.

And -

III

1

(When they heard these words of Polybius, I thought immediately of the 24th book of The Iliad, where Achilles can shed tears for Priam.)

Tears for Priam.

I only think Polybius is rated even much more prosaic than Thucydides, but in saving this story he has shown that he feels, that he creates the future by fully depicting this moment. This story is written obviously with great emphasis at the end. It's the end of the story. It's not the very last book. It's lost, unfortunately, the 40th book. This is the 38th or the 39th book?

(Thirty-eighth book.)

2

And I think every one of you should take it into your notes. It's a unique thing. And I think it still should be repeated and repeated again to the United States' people, that the victor is only saved if he can see his own fate in the light of the vanquished.

3

But then you will understand that historians are not philosophizing. But that they put us in your place.

The same as prayer does. People always ask me, "Why do we pray, what does it make sense?" Because I only know from prayer who I am. In the addressing of the creator, I know that I am a miserable creature, a passing thing. And I have to pray, because you can't tell me who I am, and you can't tell me who I am, because we all labor under misunderstanding. Nobody knows the other fellow. Only my maker can tell me who I am.

And so we only know in dialogue who we are. And in the same sense, here, the historian, in the dialogue between past and future, makes us see the future -- makes it transparent, because we can see it in moderation, in measure.

And just as people today dismiss prayer as ridiculous, when it's the only cure for a sick soul, so it is with history. If you philosophize on history, it's one drabness. All cats are gray at night, or black at night. But cats aren't black in reality. They have all kind of different colors.

4

And so man lives in very beautiful gardens of his own creation. And I would think that any country should be treated as such a garden of Eden, which we will lose as soon as we do not pay the price for supporting it, and you no longer honor the victims, the sacrifices that are made for us.

IV

1

Let me end with a good anecdote, because I think it should be told. It has to do with this -- you may not see it right away.

2

THE STORY OF MR. ELIOT AT NINETY

Mr. Eliot was the great president of Harvard University. And he made it a great university. And he had come to be ninety. So really retired already. But there was a meeting in 1919 in Boston about who had done more for the war effort, had made greater sacrifices: capital or labor? And the tycoons of Boston business and the trade union men got together in the city hall of Boston and discussed a whole evening: Who had made greater sacrifices for the victory, capital or labor? And at the end, the chairman of this boastful meeting -- of course: labor, you can imagine it; none of them could have done less but save the country.

And so the chairman said, "Now we have the great privilege that Mr. President Eliot has come over from Cambridge to be present. And since we have this privilege, I think I should now ask him, if he has a word to say to us."

It was ten o'clock in the evening. It was very stuffy in this whole room. And the witness who has told me the story said it was like opening a window. Because there stood this very old man, ninety -- erect, and only said, "I don't care for the sacrifices made by labor. I don't care for the sacrifices made by capital. I only care for the real sacrifices made by the brides, and mothers, and sisters of the men who have died."

That settled the whole question. The whole evening, was over.

3

And that's a similar story, I think, as Polybius. They could be put together.

4

So now we go into the abstract time.

CHAPTER TWO: WHAT TO READ NEXT

I

1

And what did we agree upon? What happens next time?

Did you speak of Caesar, or did we not speak of Caesar.

(We started Thucydides a couple of weeks ago.)

Who is studying American history? Well, shouldn't you bring an American historian? Should we now go into this, and look at an American historian? I don't care who. But can be Bancroft, or it can be Brown. Or whatever you have.

(Do you know Dr. Mallory? George Mallory?)

What has he written? I don't know his book.

(He's written American Democracy. I guess it's just a textbook, actually.)

I have a textbook at this moment unfortunately myself. So I want to do something higher.

2

(Couldn't we study one of your books? Aren't you an American historian? An historian of American history?)

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY BEING RECOGNIZED

This library doesn't recognize my existence.

(library.)

How many copies of the *Driving Power of Western Civilization* are there? Do you have any idea? Do you know?

(I think there were six copies.)

Oh, that's really too few.

3

(How about Sandburg?)

You know, this may sound prejudiced, but I think biographies are at this moment tending to dissolve the reverence for history. It's a long story, and you don't have to follow the whole argument, but I think that it is today an escape into biography, prevalent. And history is not biography simply. And you might discuss this.

This is perhaps our good topic: biography and history. How would this be? Would you care? I'm willing to start with Sandburg, with Lincoln. Who has read Sandburg's *Lincoln*?

The only man? Who has read Sandburg?

Now, what biography of any American have you read? - just let us ask around. Well, only if you remember it, is it important. Because it's living memory; not dead memory. What have you read?

(Thoreau.)

His own life? Autobiography?

(Oh, autobiography.)

No, any biography.

(No, I read several biographies of Henry David Thoreau.)

By whom?

(One was by J. B. Krutch, I think -- he I don't know if he was at Harvard -- Joseph Krutch, and --.)

Who has read a biography? Yes, you, Sir. Have you read a biography?

(Of any great American, Jefferson? Hamilton?)

Yes. It could even be Jefferson Davis.

(I was thinking of Thomas Jefferson.)

It's just not much of a life. The man is not very -- what's is the book you have read?

(Titled Thomas Jefferson.)

By?

(I don't remember.)

Then you haven't read it. No, I deny it. If you don't know the author. Who -- after all, gentlemen, this is really a test of your living memory. You have read a book and you don't know the author.

4

(Why is the author important?)

Your affection for the author is important, nothing else. He is not important. But we are made important by other people's love of us. Nobody is important, but your affection might save this man from the grave.

But it hasn't. Therefore, you didn't grant him resurrection. That's why. You only live in the hearts of our countrymen, my dear man, or other men. A question is illegitimate, why should you remember the man's name? Because that means that this book has begun to be important in your life. If it hasn't -- you dismiss it, and it's just as though you didn't read it.

(It's abstract. It's just another book on Jefferson.)

What?

(Just another book on Jefferson.)

Ja.

(Philosophy.)

III

1

Your contribution is your affection for the author. If you have teacher and student, the teacher must have faith that you will remember something in the future. I can bring no compulsion on you. So I act on faith. You act on hope that something I have known already may be worth your receiving. You act on hope.

We are however bound together by that much of affection which it is necessary that the hopeful and faithful can get together. My faith that this is necessary for you to know-- because otherwise this country will perish, and you are hope, that you may receive something of which you are ignorant, which may be worthwhile -- is tied together by the patience and forbearance we have for each other.

2

I call this "affection" with too emphatic a name, but it is. It is a certain degree of mutual forbearance, and you cannot listen to me if you are only hostile. Then you will not understand what I say.

Therefore, really, I mean it. The hope, faith, and love are elements of the problem of the process of knowing anything, my dear man. And the first thing, if you feel affection is that you ask for the name of the person who has given you pleasure.

And if you say, "he remains incognito," you have philosophized him away into the elements of life, but he hasn't reached you as an occasion to come to life yourself. Just as you want to be introduced to an interesting person.

3

Now, who else can testify? You want Sandburg, or what else?

(-- Also *Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin*, and *Benjamin Thomas' Lincoln*, and so forth.)

And you, Lady?

(Also *Benjamin Franklin*, and *Jonathan Edwards* by Perry Miller and McGiffert? And *Lincoln* by)

No wrinkles in your face!

(*Federalist Papers*.)

(*Channing*, a biography on him.)

On Ellery Channing? The historian or the Unitarian?

(*The Unitarian*.)

Well, what have you read, here?

(Well, as I said, you know, the same with Sandburg, and -- something....)

Well, so you must know what you're reading. No?

4

Well, have you read a life of Henry James, or William James? Or any such thing? No. Roosevelt? Have you read a life of Theodore Roosevelt?

(No.)

Now what's the cherry tree?

I'm interested, really -- because if we have five more meetings, and the topic, biography in history, is an important topic, and I think a fruitful topic. But then -- allow me -- do we have another five minutes, perhaps? --

(Yes.)

IV

1

-- to go into this. I'm not asking you to ridicule this, but I'm really trying to find out what we can do. And if there is no basis for discussion, we have to create it. Therefore I have to impose on you reading something.

And so would you kindly go to the library and read for the next week, *The Life of Pericles* by Plutarchus? That has some connection, after all, with our friend Thucydides. In many editions available, probably also available here in the paper binding. Look at it here, we may even find it here. Isn't it in here?

(*There is a paperbound edition of Plutarch's Lives, yes, Pericles is among them.*)

Well, I'm sure it is among them. But we'll go on and you read *Pericles* and *Cinna*. Who is *Cinna*? One Roman and one Greek together. I don't know who the Roman is. But you take Caesar and --.

(*Alexander and Caesar are contrasted, as I --.*)

2

No, I don't want Alexander. It's too complicated at this moment to make. But be prepared. We need something.

Now Plutarch's biographies are not what you would call biographies in the modern sense by a long shot. We may have to analyze this -- not to confuse the word "biography" in the ancient, pagan sense with what you call a life today.

But on the other hand, I would like every one of you to pick out an American biography which he wants to read within the next fortnight.

3

And so that will be my assignment. I don't care that it has to be identical. I don't think that's necessary. But I want every one of you to read fresh a new biography of an American person of the last two hundred years.

(What do you mean...?)

250 years.

(What do you mean a new biography?)

Well, a book you haven't read yet. One can be as old as Methuselah.

(When did Plutarch live?)

THE STORY OF PLUTARCH

He lived around the year 120 of our era. He was a Greek living in Boeotia, in Chaeronea, and being very prolific writer, and we owe him all kind of ethical investigations. And he had this bright idea of confronting always one Roman and one Greek statesman, philosopher, or person. And write therefore parallel biographies, pointing out -- that's just what distinguishes him from a modern biographer. He had a standard of biography, certain points: *descent, family, wealth, education* had to be mentioned. And he had to go by this very elaborate scheme, and fill it out, as you have first a scheme, and then put the things in.

4

Now what we call a biography is genetic. Christianity has brought in everywhere the element of time. We even call nature now, "natural history." That's a Christian expression. The ancients didn't know anything of natural history. They couldn't, because to them nature consisted of things as they are.

And that's all forgotten today. "Natural history" is simply a Christian term, because Christ is not in space, but in time. He's the morning star that rises over history.

But He's not the morning star that rises in the horizon as the star Venus. And this transformation of things in space in processes in time, that's the whole story of the Holy Ghost.

CHAPTER THREE: YOU CANNOT BE A GREEK

I

1

Now the Greeks were static. They looked at things. The Greeks were autonomous -- there was no world history. And everything was cyclical for this reason. And therefore, Plutarch is a pagan biographer. And everybody falls under the same pattern.

It is not how this man -- as we are interested in -- came to be something, but who he was, a descriptive thing.

2

And all this is forgotten today, because the boast of Americans is that they are purely Greek.

They are. Nobody can. You couldn't be a Greek even if you wanted to.

3

So that's why Plutarch has to be read with a grain of salt, because you couldn't approve, of such a biography, today. And if you read this, you will find out about this.

And if you compared then the story of Samuel, you will see how much the Jewish history is one of becoming, and the Greek story is one of being.

4

Now I wonder -- I recommend then to you that you buy this. This is not very expensive. It's \$1.50, I suppose.

(Thirty-five or 50 cents. Maybe it went up.)

(Mentor Pocket Book. You can get it in the bookstore.)

So everybody goes and buys it. All right. Wonderful.

And please come on with your perfect knowledge of the life of Pericles and Caesar.

NINTH LECTURE: WHAT IT MEANS TO SPEAK

PART ONE: TO FIND THE RIGHT TIME OF SPEECH

CHAPTER ONE: 1850

I

1

...teaching and experimentation. Because if you would learn in a laboratory to set up an experiment, so you learn here how to set up the problem of a source.

It is a masterpiece. It has never been done, to my knowledge, in such a masterful way, because the man preferred to show the secrets of knowledge and methodology instead of method, instead of coming forth with his own solution.

This doesn't exist. Otherwise you may learn something from a brilliant historian, but he always has an axe to grind. He has a thesis.

2

Now Mr. Momigliano has no thesis. And therefore as an educational experience, this is unique. And therefore, I want you to follow this man's arguments, and to weigh them, and say what your decision after this.

You have to make up your mind. He has not to.

3

So this is the problem. He puts all the evidence before you, weighs the evidence, shows you how to weigh evidence.

You have never done this. And you are children in this respect. This country is the most gullible nation in the world. You are taken in all by the latest news and the later news -- it may be as wrong as possible -- you still believe it, because it's the latest.

That's the worst thing an historiographer can do. You leave something -- we have this every day. You find a papyrus. Now these Dead Sea Scrolls. Worthless stuff. Jesus -- teacher of righteousness and so.

THE STORY OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Here is a monastery, you can call it the printing press of Jerusalem. That's the whole story of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

But what you read in the last years is just all humbug, because it's new. And since we all do newspaper writing, and even the historians of this country try to be like smart alecks, have catching titles. So they write books to catch your imagination. It has nothing to do with history, has nothing to do with truth.

4

And so Mr. Momigliano deserves very well of us, because he brings us back to our senses.

THE STORY OF SCRIPTORIUS RERUM AUGUSTI

Here is the last century before pagan Rome becomes Christian. It's the last century when the Roman emperors reside in Rome. Take this all down. It's all important for you. It's the last century in which the Christians are in the catacombs. And are persecuted. And the only or nearly the only history of radical source of this whole century is this strange book, the writers on the history of the *Scriptorius Rerum Augusti*.

Now that makes the book simply incredible -- it's the last pagan history, of the last century of paganism in Rome.

II

1

Every history written later falls into the hands of Christians, and becomes Church history. This is the last attempt of having a secular history.

And to tell you the truth -- I hope you will all go to the library and take out the Loeb edition -- or even buy it. I would advise you, it's worth your while to buy this volume, with the Latin text on one side, and the English text on the other. The only edition with an English version that exists. There is no special edition of an English text *per se*.

2

And Constantine then leads the children of Israel out of Egypt. He's celebrated as the new Moses.

And that's to be taken quite literally. If you look at this book, this collection of imperial biographies of the third century, you begin to understand the necessity of Christianity, the

necessity for Constantine to leave the old gods of Rome, who are completely impotent, and to leave the city to the pope. The pope got his power from the voluntary renunciation of the emperor, to part with the gods from the Capitoline Hill, and with whom he couldn't compete, and who were destroying his empire.

The whole thing is much more serious. For the last hundred years, in your school tradition, the coming of Christianity is either mechanized, as inevitable evolutionary process -- and so it has no value in it -- or it is always treated as the downfall of Christianity, because the Church became imperial and secular. That's the Protestant tradition.

So for the Roman Catholics today, it is just the invincible march, and costs nothing. And they all think that he came under his own steam. The Church conquered.

But Constantine made her conquer by ceding Rome to it.

3

And we will today take a very different view from the last century whose tradition has tainted and painted your mind because you are very obsolete, gentlemen. With all you have learned, you are two hundred years behind the truth. As it always is in high schools and schools of a country. They're always lagging -- what the real research today is interested in is the battle royal between paganism and Christianity, what a miracle it was that it did conquer.

4

Now if you want to understand therefore the exciting problem is: this history of the third century, of the century of the disintegration of the Roman Empire as a pagan empire has come to us in a book, which was obviously written in the Christian age, and which shows no vestiges of Christianity, but which seems to have been published either under Constantine or one of his successors. Or much later. That's a great debate.

Now it is nearly all we have in an historical form of this whole third century from pagan writers, from non-Christian writers. And the Christian writers are not dealing with the government of Rome at all. They are dealing with their own church problems, squabbles between heretics and so on, and the Orthodox Church.

II

1

So here is the complete shift of allegiance. The book is written in a time, or composed, or published -- we don't know. Who has read this paper already?

Well, you know, it's all open to doubt. But it is not simply, as if we would say, a book composed on the years 1750 to 1850. We ask whether it's written 1900 or 1950. It is infinitely more important and decisive, because it is the last pagan century, written in the first Christian time. By pagans. That's how it looks.

2

So it is fascinating, because one of the disturbing facts about antiquity is that there was absolutely no progress. Your whole dogma of progress, which is very childish, assumes that progress is in evolution.

Regress is just as much in evolution.

THE STORY OF SLAVERY IN THE SOUTH

This country is retrograde at this moment. It's not progressing at all. And why should it? The South retrograded, from 1830 to 1860 slavery was getting worse and worse, and not better and better. And that's why the Civil War was inevitable. It wasn't inevitable 1827, because at that time, slavery was perfectly mild. But thirty years later, it was not mild. It was cruel. It became worse.

3

Now this is the one thing your mind cannot catch:

that things, before they can get better, must get worse.

And therefore, Marcus Aurelius and Antoninus Pius, the caesars of the second century, were much better emperors than the emperors of the third century. And the emperors of the third century were just beasts. All warriors, soldiers. Constantly at war.

4

(How can you say slavery was not bad in 1820?)

Because at that time, the people in South Carolina, the gentlemen of South Carolina were concerned with dissolving it. So it wasn't so bad. If there was an outlook since, Mr. Hayne, the great opponent of Webster, in 1837 said, "We will abolish slavery." But nobody said this in 1854. There appeared a book, *Sociology for the South*, by Mr. Fitzhugh, one of the most scandalous documents of the human mind ever published, in which he wrote a sociology based on slavery. So that society could not exist without slavery.

I recommend this book highly.

III

1

It's not in the library. Shows you what a miserable library we have. We have no Plutarch -- and to speak of. All the important books are not in this library.

All my books are not in this library.

But I went down to get you some books on Plutarch. There's nothing there. It's a miserable library. And this book by Fitzhugh, one of the most important human documents, if for nothing else, *Sociology for the South* is not here.

2

It's one of the great scandals of the century. And it must be here, because this is the book in which the South took position and said, "That's the only way of life that is reasonable," slavery. That's quite an achievement. It appeared -- inspired by the Count de Gobineau, who two years before published his famous book on the inequality of the human race. And it's all in one moment.

3

After 1850, when Melville goes from *Moby Dick* to *Pierre*, that's a complete break in the spirit of the times. Deepest optimism up to 1850 -- Millerites, "the millennium is with us." Everybody is optimistic. And after 1850, black pessimism.

And again, that shows you how history really works. There was a desperate mood after 1850. And one of these desperate -expressions of desperation of this profound pessimism is this book by Fitzhugh, *Sociology for the South*. And Henry Adams is the last of these pessimists, and Brooks Adams, with the degradation of the democratic dogma, and *The Law of Decline* and -- how is it called?

(Civilization and Decay.)

And that begins all in 1850 and ends in the two world wars, because people began to smell.

4

But the average American, since he boycotted the movements of the educated class in this country, wasn't touched by this.

Now you are driven by this. Don't think that what the official mood of this lost generation, or angry generation is anything but the catching-up of the mass of the people with what

the educated people believed since 1850, that man was *hopeless, wicked, mass, mob, perverse, homosexual, murderer of his father, incestuous with his mother*. All the modern tenets, they were all developed in 1850.

But in this country, with the stream of immigrants, the upper classes could live their own mental life, and the masses of the newcomers were never interested.

Now you're just catching up with this.

IV

1

And therefore in this sense you are obsolete, because you are in this college, I find the official attitude is that of 1850, of Melville's *Pierre*. And I assure you, a man like Herman Melville wouldn't write such a book today. He would try to get us out of *Pierre and the Ambiguities*, if you know the book. Who knows *Pierre, or the Ambiguities*? It's the American classic. Nobody reads it? Who has read *Pierre*?

Nobody? Well, who has read Freud?

(Excerpts. Excerpts.)

Well, what have you read in psychoanalysis? You have heard it all, have you? Where do you get your information?

(Lectures.)

No -- probably by going to the analyst yourself.

2

Now really it is very strange how the sources of information of the most important issues of the time are of the most casual sort. Every one of you thinks he knows what psychoanalysis is.

THE STORY OF A VERY SERIOUS PSYCHOANALYST

I talked to a very serious psychoanalyst in this city on Sunday, and the man said that it is "just too bad that I have become popular. Nobody understands what we are doing, but everybody thinks they know what we are doing. And also dogmatically then says that things are as such as they have misunderstood us."

Was quite a quaint complaint of this man.

3

Well, I want to say -- gentlemen, the people who get their information in this callow way, as you do on the most important issues -- *religion, politics, ethics, sex, family*, just very casual what you pick up in *the newspaper, the radio, and television* -- you can always be sure that you are a hundred years behind the times. And if you would begin to believe me this, you would be able to educate yourself.

But since you believe that what's in the papers is newer than what's in the books, I cannot help you. You really think because this book was printed -- when was it written? Who has a textbook? -- 1948 -- so you think this is older than what's today in the *Examiner*. That's not true. Because the way the man looks at things in the paper has to have the lowest common denominator. Otherwise he wouldn't sell. And the lowest common denominator is always a hundred years, at least, behind the times.

4

I investigate this on a large scale, and that has to do with this historic problem of Mr. Momigliano. The reactionary character -- if these people were pagans who wrote this history of the third century, we cannot be surprised that they moved in categories, which were already superseded in the time at which they wrote.

And that is a part of the trouble of Mr. Momigliano, that the dating of a pagan writer is much more difficult than the dating of a Christian writer of that time, of Christianity marching.

CHAPTER TWO: THE OLD TEXTBOOKS

I

1

THE STORY OF THE BOOK OF MORMONS

Because the reactionary -- you can read today a book by a Mormon, and he still believes in the authenticity of the Book of Mormons. God help him, there's nothing to be said. He's not of 1959, certainly. Because Mr. Joseph Smith couldn't ... the two plates today. So anybody who believes in the authenticity of the *Book of Mormons* belongs to this strange era in American history where something was better than nothing. And when he had this vision in 1829, and he found gullible people to believe this.

And even there's a famous chemist in this country, Professor Eyring, who's an elder of the *Church of the Latter-Day Saints*, and -- you know it?

(His name sounded familiar to me.)

2

THE STORY OF FAMILY EYRING

Eyring, yes. Famous family. Three brothers born all in Mexico, who came to this country. From American parents, and were naturalized only when they were grownups, and have all played a great part in this country. One became a college president, and the other a university president, and the third, the leading chemist of this country. Eyring.

Now for a chemist, the Mormons may be good enough. And they have no brains. And I think all scientists are drawn to superstition. And so he's a Latter-Day Saint.

THE STORY OF CHURCH AS A SOCIAL AGENCY

He was asked about the Book of Mormons by a friend of mine. And he smiled it away. He said that was not to the point. To him, church was a social agency, and truth had nothing to do with it. As you find many people today, who think the Church is a social agency, and what is nice in this group. So the background of the church doesn't matter.

3

But seriously speaking, Mr. Eyring is a good test case to say today that you couldn't found a church today on the *Book of Mormons*. So a man who believes really in the authenticity of

the Book of Mormon only can be explained from the immigrant situation of 1829. And in this sense, it's dated. There are no Mormons as of today.

4

All professions, gentlemen, have such a date.

THE STORY OF ANATOMY

A doctor belongs to the 1600s, when anatomy was introduced in the modern style of medicine. The psychoanalyst tries to remedy this, and they take a new beginning with Freud. But all the physical doctors are against these psycho-somatic people, because they are based on the body. And this isolation of the body, as being something in itself, which is ridiculous, is Cartesian, and came into being in 1600. And medicine, as it is today in America, at least treated, belongs to the 16th century. It's an enlargement of the ideas of 1600.

And there's a battle royal now -- beginning with *Christian Science*, and now in psychoanalysis, and psychosomatosis, and what have you -- to get out of this.

II

1

THE STORY OF CANCER

You see it in the crisis about cancer. Cancer is not in the old sense a physical disease. It's a disease in which the soul lose its power over the body. And the body goes wild. It's a luxurious growth, as everybody knows. The physical doctors look into the body and try to explain the luxurious growth from the luxurious growth. So they spend hundreds of millions of dollars in lookin at the luxurious growth and saying, "Yes, it's --."

So, a hundred years from now this will look very stupid indeed. But explicable, because all medicine, as officially treated in this country, goes back to the year 1600, and the principles, the main ideas then held.

2

To give you another example of historical lag among the writers of texts, or science.

THE STORY OF ARISTOTLE IN THE UNIVERSITY IN PARIS

In 1100, the great University of Paris began to coalesce, and began to function, under Abaelard. You may have heard of Abaelard and Héloïse, the great pair of lovers. And Abaelard is the founder of scholasticism. And then came Thomas Aquinas, and that were the great people, and straight thinkers.

At the same time, when Abaelard was making his revolution and was excommunicated in the process -- all decent people have to be excommunicated before they are recognized -- so St. Thomas only escaped by one decade his being excommunicated, because in 1230 the pope forbade the study of Aristotle officially to the University of Paris. And in 1250, St. Thomas founded his whole book on the study of Aristotle. Twenty years had sufficed at that time to move the papacy to lift the ban. So if he had lived twenty years earlier, he would just have incurred the excommunication.

3

You must always know that

those sayings that are worthwhile are only by a hair's breadth away from hell.

Otherwise, they wouldn't be interesting. And it wouldn't be very risky to become a saint. It's always just by a hair's breadth that they are not excommunicated and condemned.

4

Now this is what I've tried to tell you about history, that it is such a risky affair, the human spirit.

III

1

And to tell you this lag of these writers, of whom Mr. Momigliano is writing, it's one of the exciting problems. And if you think in these terms, you will even get some help in explaining why these people, who wrote before Momigliano on that topic, have found no solution, because they hadn't looked into this situation of the lag.

What it means that a pagan writer in the Christian era has to write on the last pagan century, knowing that they came to an end, that it was all over.

You will not find in this detailed discussion that this viewpoint of mine has found adequate treatment. So I would enlarge on Mr. Momigliano's paper in this respect.

2

You always have in mind that the book couldn't have been written probably before Constantine at least granted toleration to the Christians -- probably after he moved to Constantinople, out of Rome. Perhaps after he even was baptized on his deathbed. Then you see how exciting it is to know how we see these emperors who preceded him, in which light.

3

But let me finish my medieval story.

THE STORY OF THE PROFESSOR

While Abaelard was founding the most modern school in the world at that time, the University of Paris, which was the great sanctification of controversialism, and based on the free opposition of opposite minds, of contrary minds. That's why it's so very funny -- it proves that there is no university in America -- except by name -- shows you that today it has become here a word of vituperation to say somebody is controversial. In Paris, you couldn't become a professor unless you were controversial. That was the basis of being a professor. He had to profess something.

If you profess something, there's somebody else who professes the opposite. Can't be helped. And to be a professor means to enter the battle royal of controversies. That's the university.

4

And that is Abaelard's invention. He invented the idea that a student should listen on the same topic to opposite opinions while he's studying, should be exposed to opposite view. That's the university.

That's why the Academy of Plato is not a university.

THE STORY OF PLATO'S ACADEMY

The university is a medieval invention. And all our literature is bunk here in this country of this popular brand. They tell you that Plato founded a university. He would have fought it. His opinion was law, and nobody had to say anything different from him. That wasn't permitted. You had to emigrate. Aristotle had to establish immediately his own school, because he didn't share all the opinions of the master. That was enough to excommunicate him.

IV

1

Now the great liberality of the Catholic era, of the Christianity is the Augustinian dogma, that we must have different minds, and the same faith. That is the idea of the university.

THE STORY OF THE SPECULUM

At the same time, however, while this great step was taken into liberalism: different opinions, but one heart and one soul, there appeared a book, *The Mirror* for the education of the people. This became the most popular encyclopedia through four hundred years. And while the Aristotelians in the Middle Ages made all kind of scientific discoveries, this book went from one edition to the next, through four hundred years. And until the Reformation, it was always the bestseller.

2

And so we know simply that underneath the educated, or the progressive group, there is always this backdrop of a conservative mass instruction which doesn't move.

And that's the case in this country very much, where people still believe in Darwinism as something that everybody has to believe evolution. All the data which get into your head today just as indisputable truth are given up at the center of these special sciences where they generate it. And you still believe them for the next two hundred years. Because our superintendents of schools have learned nothing, have been physical athletes, and don't care for the content of what they teach, anyway. They want to have registrations, and class.

And how can you expect that your school system functions when you have people who hate knowledge, as administrators?

3

So this is the strange situation you have in the *Scriptores Rerum Historia Augusti* -- something that is eternal. The remnants of an older world, which seemed, at least, and to have already cracked up on the top, but well, you may say it's a nostalgic memory, or it is a farewell address to the past, or it is accidental.

But however you see it, it is in a new world, the old world. And that is always a great spectacle. It would be, as if in 1850 Massachusetts, people would read the famous Bishop Burnet's *History of the Glorious Revolution* of the British, which included still the American colonies, and which made for the unity of the English-speaking nations.

So this is one example, something of the mood. In 1850, this would be a textbook in the American schools.

Then this would create something, do something. It would emphasize the past and would, hold people onto this unity of spirit.

4

And we have this in American tradition with the trip to Europe. All educated Americans did go through the 19th century to Rome and Europe in order to heal the breach of the *Declaration of Independence*. And your tourism today is the last wave of this attempt to get in touch with the pre-independent world.

CHAPTER THREE: LITERARY FORMS CHANGE

I

1

Now to be introduced to the Court of St. James, as here, the ladies of the swanky Americans wanted to be. You have heard of it. So they were so flooded in at the Court of St. James that they had to give it up last year. You may have heard that the queen of England was fed up in serving as a target for the American society. It was only given up because of the Americans. Because every Mr. Woodridge, or Mr. Aldrich, or Mr. Baldrige had his daughter. If he was the president of the Bank of New York, or City Bank, and he had to get an introduction to the Court of St. James, because there he touched ground, the pre-independence, the ground of colonial days, the European ground of what had been.

That's like reading, Burnet's *History of the Glorious Revolution*.

2

All books that you read, gentlemen, take you into a certain moment of time. You cannot escape from this. Your novels, too. And literature has always either a reactionary or a prophetic character.

I think this moment fiction is reactionary, all fiction. Whether it's *Lolita* by Mr. Nabokov, or whether it is Proust. The prophetic character today is more readily found in fields of social writings, than it is in the novel. Literature belongs to a past era.

Since the Russian Revolution, literature no longer has the same role of taking you into the future.

So beware.

3

A man in the 19th century, if he read *War and Peace* by Tolstoy, or *The Brothers Karamazov* by Dostoevsky, was taken ahead. And if you read these men, you still are taken ahead of time. But if you read today's literature, it has lost this character of prophecy.

Hemingway is a case in point. No future in him. Absolutely no future. Not prophetic.

There are many reasons. But God goes from one form of writing to another in order to reach us. And once a form has been used for a hundred years, it grows stale. You couldn't go on writing gospels, after the first four had been written. They tried it. There must have been perhaps 52 gospels written, all told. And the spirit didn't move in them.

So the Church said, "Only these four are genuine. All the rest is deteriorated," is obsolete, is imitation.

4

And again, in all your touching of historical books, you should ask yourself whether in that time, it was still the receptacle of the spirit.

And again, this book on the third century is such a perversion, and such a terrible book that it shows that by pagan history, man could no longer be led, or worked, or directed, or see anything with any meaning in history.

II

1

The forms then of literature, gentlemen, cannot be relied on always presenting the same values. The spirit exactly -- how does it go?-- blows as it listeth? or?

(Bloweth as it listeth.)

And you never are sure that because a book has a tempting title of a drama, that it is a drama in the sense of Shakespeare's dramas. It doesn't. The form is over. At this moment the same result of *Anthony and Cleopatra*, or *Hamlet* cannot be certainly attained by a play. It would have to have a different literary form. Just because in 1959, we already have *Hamlet*, and therefore, that which must play the role of *Hamlet* today, cannot be a second *Hamlet*. It cannot be a tragedy of the same style.

2

THE STORY OF A GREAT ITALIAN COMPOSER

A great Italian composer once was asked what he knew about the history of the spirit.

And he said, "I only know one thing: that the next step always is unpredictable, and incalculable, that it never looks like the previous one, that it always comes as a surprise from a corner towards which we have not looked."

And so I only want to tell you, if your ancestors read Hawthorne and Melville, they did something quite different than when you read Hemingway and Faulkner.

3

And once this begins to dawn on you, you cease to be dogmatic about your little boxes of your definitions: history is that, and literature is that. It is not that. At all times, you must be aware that the same label covers a different content.

And that's why I think your English departments are such seats of devastation, because they cling to this conviction that what is called a novel is a novel at anytime. And has the same function in the economy of your mental life, at any time.

It doesn't.

4

All this I think is not wanton, because it may whet your appetite for this strange, last century. It is as exciting as if you look into the *Dead Sea Scrolls* and see the decay of Judaism in the last century before Christ. Here is the same problem. It's the last century before our own era, before you don't know how much we are in our era.

I wished I could provide a text of these writers, at least of one or the other biography.

III

1

Has anybody taken out the volume from the library?

(*What volume?*)

With the text of the *Scriptores*. It's so expensive only to have it copied and distributed among you. When I came here, I was naïve enough to think that this library had everything. Nobody has taken out a text? The book itself.

Well, it shows your profound interest. From now on, you have to do the work, and I won't.

2

You are all familiar with the library. Under PA, in classics, on the third floor, you will find this. So in the recess now, you kindly will go there and try to get this volume of the Loeb edition. Look in the catalog: *Scriptores Rerum* -- that's the title-- and bring what you find. Or the Greek and Latin texts. I may still decide to have at least one biography mimeographed, so at least you can smell the thing.

3

At this moment, the emigration of the last pagan emperor, Constantine, to Constantinople, is suddenly in the blaze of light of research, that people have suddenly realized that the history of our own life today is much more dependent on the fact of 325, of the Council of Nicaea and the emperor becoming Christian, than on the life of these fishermen in Galilee three hundred years before. That you and I only are really immersed into the tradition of free men, and of all the things you take for granted -- that all men are equal, for example -- that all this has reached you only through this eye of the needle, when the Roman emperor turned Christian.

And that was only the point at which Christianity was able to educate you and me, and the teachers, and the students of the world over the century.

And so all of a sudden, the floodlight is shifting from the year 33 of our era to the year 333. And that's a complete change of interest, because if you read Gibbon, or if you read any history, this 300 that was just -- as I said - an evolutionary stage.

But it isn't. It is a break.

4

And hardly credible, when you go into this. And this is why I thought it was worth your while, even with all your language handicaps to hear one time about this greatest of historical breaks in our own tradition.

You can only compare it to the *Declaration of Independence*, and the development of American character after the Declaration. There were no Americans before. And then there suddenly, seventy years later, the Americans have a definite character, and there they are.

So you will -- you will kindly run over.

IV

1

Now who has a Pericles? Is a Pericles in this? In your volume? And with whom is he coupled?

(Isn't it Alexander?)

How could it? As a Greek, too. It's always a Roman and a Greek. Oh, children, children, children. Ignorance.

(Fabius.)

Who is Mr. Fabius? Who is Fabius, Sir?

(I don't know.)

Who is Fabius?

(He was in charge of the Roman armies against Hannibal ... had the delaying tactics ... place to place)

And so he got the nickname --?

(The Delayer.)

Cunctator. Yes, that's Fabius Cunctator.

2

Now it is a very strange idea of Plutarch, and it must have been quite despondent to find anything reasonable to put together: Pericles and Fabius. They have really absolutely nothing to do with each other. Because one dies in the moment where his country goes to ruin, and the other saves his country. So they point in exactly the opposite directions.

It just shows that Plutarch is a very superficial gentleman. Terribly superficial. That's the terrible thing about his biographies. They are very superficial.

3

How did you read it? The life. Did you read it? What about the famous eulogy of Pericles at the grave of the Athenians? What does Mr. Plutarch say about that?

Does he say anything? Does he mention? Have you the book in an English edition? Can you show me the place where he does it?

(I think he just said one sentence about it or something.)

Find it, please. He who finds it first gets an A. I'm not going to find it. But you have to find it now. Right away.

4

It will take a long time. You can stop the machine. They have now to read the whole thing for the first time.

CHAPTER FOUR: THUCYDIDES AND PLUTARCH ON PERICLES

I

1

(Didn't the Peloponnesian Wars begin around the time of the Battle at Samos? Is that one of the early battles?)

What do you mean by that? Why do you ask?

(Well, because the only reference I found that I thought alluded to the speech that Thucydides mentions was on page -- well, it says that in Commium Pericles spoke of the immortal soldier -- the life that soldiers gained was comparable to the gods. But Phil says that's not relevant.)

Well, no. You just give me the chapter.

(My book doesn't have chapters in it. I don't know how to direct you, Sir. The paragraph begins, "He has left nothing in writing behind him, except some decrees," and "There are but very few of his sayings recorded." And then Plutarch records some of the few sayings.)

2

Now you are quite right. It's in connection with the end of the Samian War. And what is the sentence?

("For, said he, we do not see them themselves, but only by the ... we pay them, and by benefits they do us. Attribute to them immortality; and the alike attributes belong also to those that die in the service of their country.")

Well, I don't think that there is just this quotation. But where is it said that he gave this harangue?

(It doesn't say that.)

Yes, in the ninth one, the Samians surrendering themselves ... up the town. Don't you have it?

(Yes.)

And then go on and ...

(The next paragraph says, "Since Thucydides..."--and I didn't know if this was Thucydides of Thrace.)

Yes, that's the historian.

(The same one. "...described the rule of Pericles as an aristocratical government." So I just connected those two paragraphs, and thought that --.)

Well, you are right, but I am right, too. You had a quotation, didn't you?

A literary quotation. But that's at a different place, isn't it?

What I have is this: "*Pericles, however, after the reduction of Samos, returning back to Athens, took care that those who died in the war should be honorably buried, and made a funeral harangue, as the custom is, in their commendation at their grave, for which he gained great admiration.*"

(What translation do you have?)

The oldest one.

(Thomas North.)

Right.

(I looked it up in another book. It said that in the golden age of translation -- that was the 16th century-- they said Plutarch was translated by Thomas North.)

3

Oh yes. That's a contemporary of Shakespeare. A little older. And Shakespeare read Plutarch, in the North translation. That's why it's very precious for us. Because Shakespeare got all his incidents from the *Plutarch's Lives*. That's why it is so very important.

But a hundred years later, Dryden was the head of a committee, and several translators got together and he wrote the introduction. That's probably his only contribution. And this is what I have here. And then it has been re-translated several times.

And I don't think this is very excellent. But they had to pay no royalties when they publish it. That's the only reason for an American publisher to publish it.

But the sentence is to be underlined. "*Made a funeral harangue, as the custom is, in their commendation at their grave for which he gained great admiration.*"

4

Has anybody Thucydides -- here? Probably no one.

(Yes, I have it.)

Now let's look up. At what occasion did Pericles make the speech according to Thucydides? Will you kindly look it up?

(Could you tell us the first sentence of that paragraph in which the quotation is used?)

Well, I can't ... Thucydides.

(No, I mean in the Plutarch, for which the --.)

Well, "the ninth months the Samians surrendering themselves and delivering up the town, Pericles pulled down their walls, seized their shipping --." As you said, then comes Thucydides. You had it.

(Yes, I have it, but it doesn't say that.)

And before, it's Ephorus, the historian, the paragraph before, tells us. Have you no index of names?

(Oh yes, I have the list of names.)

Well, then let's look up Ephorus.

Or Elpinike is even simpler. Elpinike, if she is in the index, because she comes on the stage right in the next sentence. Elpinike.

(No. Oh yes, yes.)

Well, let's look her up.

(Well, what page is ...)

(89.)

(...the last one.)

II

1

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S INDEX TO MR. VON TREITSCHKE

German History, very famous, by Mr. von Treitschke, it was five volumes, six hundred pages, by and large, each. And I was so disgusted that it had no index that I sat down and made the index myself. And offered it to the publisher. And he said they could do well, but without the index. But I felt that already at sixteen that a book without an index was just a scandalous affair. Was not a book at all.

2

Well, prove to me in the Thucydides that the Samian War hasn't gone on before this funeral speech. I don't find it. That's quite strange. In Thucydides, there is no connection between the Samian War and the funeral speech. And in the biography, there is. That's after all, very strange.

Do you find anything about the Samian War in Thucydides? That's we must look for. Look up "Samos."

(I don't have the book, but I remember that there is)

Is there?

(In the campaign.)

(Because that's where he mentions that Thucydides went over there, into the Samian War. He was one of the generals. Wasn't it? I'm not sure.)

Well, I would like you to find the place. Because Mr. Plutarch quotes Thucydides for this.

He says, "*Thucydides speaks not of the cruelty of Pericles towards the Samians.*" In other words, Thucydides mentions the Samian War. So I -- before ... to identify one funeral speech as given by Thucydides, and the funeral speech as mentioned by Plutarch, we have to be careful. There could be two. There have been many occasions of burying people. And we have to find out: is there only one speech?

3

This is a simple, historic expression. Pericles might have given the annual speech. The convocation address, as the president does. Or several inauguration addresses, as Lincoln. There's a first and a second. And before you say that one funeral speech, the one mentioned by Plutarch is identical with the one given in Thucydides, in full text, you have to watch out. We don't know.

And I don't know. I haven't gone into this specifically.

(He quoted himself that -- "Pericles, however, after the reduction of Samos, returning back to Athens, took care that those who died in war should be honorably buried, and made a funeral harangue, as the custom is.")

Well -- whether he was speaker more than once, that's not settled in your way. If it has a custom, there can be a different speaker each time.

(Didn't they give Pericles the first opportunity during the war to give the speech?)

Well, that's what we are asking. You have to try to find --.

(Well, I don't have my book, but I think I remember they gave him the honor of making the first oration)

(Well, here, at the same place, that says, "Are these actions then, Pericles, worthy of crowns and garlands, which have deprived us of many brave citizens, not in a war with the Phoenicians and Medes, such as my brother Simon made, but in destroying a city united to us, both in blood and friendship." That's Plutarch.)

(This translation has "allied" and "kindred" said.)

[overlapping conversations among the students]

4

Well, Plutarch follows this up after he has mentioned this famous speech with the strange line: *"Sometime after this, when the Peloponnesian War was about to break out --."* In other words, he places the funeral oration before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.

Now, anybody who reads Thucydides would be inclined to say it was inside the Peloponnesian War -- therefore Plutarch –

(That translation must be wrong, because according to this, it was after Samos was destroyed.)

What? Well, exactly. You misunderstand.

(Oh, that's right.)

III

1

This is really an interesting question. I don't know the answer. "Pericles, on his return"-- listen to this -- *"Pericles, on his return to Athens after the reduction of Samos, celebrated in a splendid manner the obsequies of his countrymen who fell in that war and pronounced himself the funeral oration, usual on such occasions. This gave him great applause."*

Now in my translation of the older style, it doesn't say it "gave him great applause," interestingly enough. But "It gained him great admiration." So that's typical of the modern style. "Applause" and "admiration." Admiration is an inner attitude; and applause is the noise you hear. Or whatever it is.

Ja, it's very interesting. The word is not "applause." It's of course "admiration." But for a modern American, it has to be noisy. Very -- applause.

2

So he got in. Here then comes the next paragraph, "*Some times after this, when the Peloponnesian War was about to break out --.*"

There is no doubt that the funeral oration happens before.

Now will you go back to Thucydides now and try to find a dating of the funeral oration, because it would shed some light on our friend Thucydides, on his power of even engulfing a thing of a different date into his canvas, because he wants to get it in, in order to be picked -- Pericles, no holds barred. Simply the funeral oration, Mr. Thucydides thinks, must be in.

So if it isn't the Peloponnesian War, it makes no difference.

(Maybe Plutarch here is a hundred years behind Thucydides in breaking up the Peloponnesian War into different -- maybe he means by the "Peloponnesian War" something different from ...)
(Samos is not in the translation).

3

We have to find when Thucydides mentions Samos. Is this Thucydides, Sir?

(This is -- no. This is Plutarch, but it's a different translation. And according to this, you get a different idea. "After this war was over" -- talking about the Samian War -- "the Peloponnesian War beginning to break out in full tide." From this, I infer that Samos was considered an initial stage of the Peloponnesian War.)

Exactly. It's all very exciting. Mine is quite different.

(No, this is right.)

I mean, my translation is quite different here. I read to you my translation. My translation says the Peloponnesian War had not yet started. And you say it's only full tide, which is quite right. Then it would be the beginning.

Now where is the word "Samian" in your index? You must find "Samos" in Thucydides. One of you had the Thucydides.

(I gave it to you. You still have it.)

And that's the only text on Thucydides we have here?

(The Modern Library Edition --.)

Yes, the Chapter 8 of the First Book has the break between Samos.

"In the sixth year of the truce, war broke out between Samos and Miletus over the question of Now the Miletians came to Athens and lodged protest against the Samians. There, ... was supported by various private individuals from Samos itself, who wished to set up there a different form of government. So the Athenians sailed to Samos with forty ships, and established a democracy there."

But that's -- "When the Athenians heard of this" -- also, the counter-revolution in Samos against the Athenians -- "they sailed against Samos with a fleet of sixty ships, under the command of Pericles and nine other commanders. The result was a victory for the Athenians."

Ja, that's so - in this Chapter 8 of Book I of Thucydides, the Samian War is very briefly given. And then, when we come to the funeral oration, that's just a little later. And it is perfectly possible to reconcile. "*First year of the war.*" This it is.

In the second book only, of Thucydides, the first year of the war is described. So that the Samian War is not made a part of -- that's our question: Is the Samian War a part of the Peloponnesian War? According to Thucydides, it is not. But according to your translation, it is, "in full tide."

(No, no. "*It was beginning to break out in full tide.*")

Well, what does --?

(No, because this translation says, "*After this war was over*" -- referring to the Samian War -- "*the Peloponnesian War, beginning to break out in full tide*" -- and so forth.)

4

There's no doubt that he makes a difference.

Chapter 8, I have given you the story shortly of the Samian War. Now it goes on to Chapter 9 of the first book in Thucydides. "*It was only a few years later that there took place the events already described.*" So there is a break of several years. And he doesn't make any attempt to attach the Samian War to the Peloponnesian War -- I cannot help feeling that the first year of the war, where the funeral oration is placed, cannot include the Samians.

But that's very contradictory.

IV

1

So will you kindly go -- and come back for the next time with information? You can read up a life of Pericles. In the various sources. There is the Cambridge History of Antiquity, and so they must settle the question. Because we really are at sea, because the funeral

oration only occurs in the second book of Thucydides, which is quite impossible if it would have anything to do with the Samians.

On the other hand, it is true that Plutarch praises the speech of Pericles as though it was given right after the Samian War, outside. It would do something for our judgment on Thucydides, if for rhetorical reasons, just to get this wonderful piece of eloquence into his canvas, he would have transposed the thing. I think that's important, really, for our whole judgment, how much he was an artist, and a Shakespearean writer, just having his canvas of *Anthony and Cleopatra* drawn according to aesthetic standards, or whether he was an historian trying to report chronologically the events as they happened.

2

(I would say that would be foolish of him, if he did anything like that. There would undoubtedly be people living in his time who would be able to detect the error.)

Well, I'm completely ignorant of the facts in this matter. And therefore I have no judgment. But you will admit that before saying anything, we would have just to try to find out.

So I charge you to read the life of Pericles by Plutarch once more, and to find if there is another such speech mentioned. Is there a second funeral oration mentioned, as written by Thucydides, perhaps?

(Thucydides says here ...oration mentioned in the first year of the Peloponnesian War? In the first year of the Peloponnesian War, that's when the --.)

Of course. There's no Because he says here, look here. Look. *"It was only a few years that there took place the events already described"* -- later. So this is a break. Then comes the funeral oration in the first year of the war. There's no doubt that for Pericles, the funeral oration was given after the first year of the Peloponnesian War. And there is no doubt that in Plutarch, the oration was given at the end of the Samian War. And that's not the same date.

(Thucydides made the date as, or when it occurred?)

Well, here, look here. He just talked about the Samian War, that Pericles goes there by ship and pulls down the walls, establishes a new government. And Plutarch then says of this that he was supposedly very cruel. And however, Plutarch goes on to say that Thucydides is silent about the special cruelty of Pericles, that this has been held against by dramatists, by Douris. But that one doesn't have to trust a man like Douris, because they exaggerate.

(Yes. I have that in mine, too. But I wondered, if Thucydides mentioned the actual time of the oration.)

3

Now I have come to this. After the Samian War has ended, and it is reduced—Samos – to obedience, we get in the first book -- and books after all mean something, because they mean breaks in continuity. At the end of the first book then, in Chapter 9, it says as follows:

"It was only a few years later" -- after the Samian reduction -- "that there took place the events already described here: affair of Corcyra, the affair of Potidaea, and the other occurrences, which served as causes for the war between Athens and Sparta."

So there is no doubt that there are several years between the reduction of Samos and the affairs that led to the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War. That's what Thucydides literally states. And he also says in Book II --.

(I was going -- it's not in this biography of Pericles. "After the Peloponnesian War began to break out in full tide," the next paragraph down, he mentioned where Pericles sends ships to Corcyra, and they arrive too late, because the war there was over. So maybe Plutarch is considering the causes as part of the war. He took what Thucydides has said and considers the causes and the beginning?)

Oh no, no, no. We are just asking when the funeral speech was made. And our friend Plutarch says, literally -- don't you have the place? You can't get out of this, that --. *"Pericles, however, after the reduction of Samos, returning back to Athens, took care that those who died in the war should be honorably buried, and made a funeral harangue, as the custom is, in their commendation at their grave, for which he gained great admiration."*

There is no doubt that these are the people killed in the Samian War.

4

(The question is now: this is the funeral oration that is the famous one -- the one subsequent to the Corcyran or the Corinthian campaign. This simply says, "...pronounced himself the funeral oration, usual on such occasions." This may just be another funeral oration which isn't the funeral oration, which we were referring to earlier.)

But since Plutarchus says, *"...for which he gained great admiration,"* there is the one speech that made him famous. If you have a customary address every year, all these addresses are not of the same Obviously Thucydides meant to bring to us the great oration of Thucydides. And Plutarch says, "The great oration, which gained him this admiration -- "was given after the end of the Samian War." And Thucydides said, "No. It was given in the first year of the war." Peloponnesian.

You can't get out of that.

SECOND PART: WHAT LANGUAGE DOES

CHAPTER ONE: CONSTANCY AND CHANGE

I

1

(Well, Plutarch doesn't say that was the great one. He says the)

Well, that's just a question of your translating. That's a participle in Greek. "He made a funeral harangue, as the custom is, in their commendation at their graves, for which he gained great admiration." "For which he gained great admiration," would be in Greek, "This oration producing great admiration." Therefore, it is the oration for which he is quoted. There's no doubt about it.

(Well, the reason I came up with that thought is because I read in this paragraph that the beginning of Plutarch's analysis says, "Pericles, however, took care not to make his person cheap among the people, and appeared among them only at interval. Nor did he speak on all points that were debated before them, but reserved himself – like the Salominian galley, as Critolaus says -- for greater occasions.")

You are quite right. I know this paragraph very well, because it shows his way of government.

But that has nothing to do with his being the annual speaker, and having a rich pay for more than one of these funeral orations. That's highly improbable. If then Plutarch would say, "It was one of the few orations which gained him great admiration," because he has read Thucydides, always think that the man writes after Thucydides has established his reputation. In the same paragraph, he quotes Thucydides.

So all you could do is only to try something about the Peloponnesian War in a later part of the biography of Plutarch, and tell me if you can find anything there.

Where is this on the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War? It comes later. That's the pestilence.

("He neither wept nor" Is that ...?)

Very tragic.

("He neither wept nor attended any funeral....")

Quite. Individual funeral. That means individual, private funeral. And then he breaks down because his son -- because, as so many things. It's quite misleading.

2

Biography in antiquity has nothing to do with what is called a "biography" today. And that's the first law. All pagan things -- pre-Christian things -- Plato included -- are quite different from what the name, the identical name, covers.

That's why today a university is not a platonic academy, because we invite controversies, and Plato excludes controversy. That's a very simple example that we cannot transpose our Christian tradition of a university, in which people live in one as one heart and soul, although they are quite different in opinion, that we must not carry this back into the ancient world.

Because we have used Greek words for everything. We use "psychology," "politics" -- these are all Greek terms.

3

THE STORY OF PLATO'S POLITEIA

Now you know that we translate, for example, Plato's book, *The State*, "politeia." That's a great misfortune. And in the last thirty years, the best classical scholars have tried to remedy this by showing that for Plato Athens was his church, as well. And since we have the separation of Church and state, when you read Plato, *The State*, you instinctively think that this is a book on a secular state.

It isn't at all. It's a religious book on the religion of the city. And therefore it can just as well be translated "The Church." It would be wrong, too, because it would be ... The ancient city was a church-state, or a state-church, or whatever you call it. But it certainly was not what we call a "state."

4

And Mr. Werner Jaeger, who is the man in classics at Harvard, has now devoted a whole book to the theology of Plato. Because he says, "But in antiquity, Plato was called The Theologian." That was his great honorary name. Plato "Theologus" was his nickname. And in your schools, since you are so completely secularized, you only pick up what you are interested in -- the forms of government, or what-not. But in Plato, the many forms -- aristocracy, monarchy -- are only explicable if the same gods ruled the city, regardless of who governs.

THE STORY OF AMERICA'S ONLY RELIGION

In this country, if you would abolish democracy, there would be nothing left, because America has as its only religion, democracy.

II

1

Therefore you are absolutely static, you are fixed; you are petrified. You have a rigid system of democracy, because the only tie that ties Americans together is democracy. There's no state religion.

But the Greeks could very well go from tyrants to democracy, to monarchy, because their religion remained unchanged. They were all in the same church.

2

So only to give you an example how this little word "state" simply doesn't mean the same in antiquity as it means today -- or "politics". "Politics" includes worship of the gods, and today it doesn't. When you say, "It's just politics," you mean it is nothing religious. Very typical.

When you said in Greek, "This is politics," this meant that you kneeled at the altar and slaughtered your daughter, Iphigenia, as Agamemnon did when he went to Troy. That's politics.

You can see the difference.

3

And so I warn you that "biography" is not biography.

THE STORY OF BIOGRAPHIES OF CHRIST, OF JESUS

And if we should be able to establish today and the next time why it isn't biography in our sense, you would also be able to finally understand that the Gospels never intended to be biographies of Christ, of Jesus. The whole hunt, the whole goose chase for the life of Jesus in the last 150 years is just a hoax. It is now dissolving at the center of theological study. People know by now that Jesus didn't want to have a biography. And that is His great merit, that He knew He couldn't have a biography. That's why He went to the Cross instead.

And the life of Jesus doesn't exist. It just doesn't exist, because He tried to get out of His time and not into His time. And a biography is how a man appears in his own time.

And we wouldn't care for Jesus if He had been a contemporary of Herod. You are not interested in Pontius Pilate, or in Herod; forgotten men. And the only reason why we think of Jesus was that He managed to have no biography in the usual sense of the Encyclopaedia Britannica.

4

And so the word "biography" has been so abused in the last 150 years that you have to know that as little as politics in Plato has anything to do with politics today, so the word "biographia" in Plutarch -- this has nothing to do with what you mean, when you read now the new, wonderful biography of Theodore Roosevelt by Mr. Putnam.

Has anybody seen this book? You should read it. Very great book. Good book.

(I didn't hear)

Putnam. The newest, just the first volume has appeared. But for a student of history, I think, that you must know what important books come out.

(Is it Samuel Putnam?)

I don't know his initials.

III

1

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY WRITING A BIOGRAPHY

So when I was a boy, your age, and finished the Gymnasium, I was a good student, so I received the book by Friedrich Leo on the style of ancient biography. And this was my bonus. This was my premium at the school, and so I know a little bit about Plutarch. From this day on, I had written myself a biography of an ancient writer -- we dedicated this to our school. That was the habit. And for this it was very fitting that my class teacher thought that the premium I should receive as a good student, should be on biography.

2

Now Mr. Leo was a professor in Göttingen at that time, and he has a very neat proof.

I wanted to bring the book to class. But unfortunately it is not in the library. That's why I was very angry when I came here, about this library.

He made this point that the ancients are completely geometrical, spacethinkers. All pagans are. They try to arrange things in space, just as geometers today.

Mr. Einstein says that time is the fourth dimension of space. That means that time is subdued to space. First is space, and then we put time into it. And that's against your and my living experience of life. And since they think in these terms, they first have the man; and then they have a list of qualities, which they distribute. One, birth; second, nobility; third, wealth; fourth, virtue; fifth, acts; seventh, pronouncement. And therefore, since this

is classified by one, two, three, four, that's not a biography in your and my sense of the word.

Your biography begins with what?

3

With birth. And it doesn't in Plutarch. It's not the important thing that man has a process, through which he grows and changes. The ancients want to show the constancy of a man's character. They characterize him.

A good biography in our sense of the word tries to show the transformation the man goes through.

And the constancy is the problem of ancient biography, and for us the change.

We are interested in the change that comes over Lincoln when he becomes president, or in the Douglas, just famous -- how do you call it?

(Debates.)

Debate. That he wasn't before, and now what he was after.

In this, the ancients simply didn't believe, because they had not conversion, *metanoia*, *growth*, *transformation*. All these terms which you now take for granted, like "evolution" are quite foreign to an ancient mind. They are all of Christian origin.

4

Mr. Darwin is unthinkable unless he's a Christian. He has inherited from Christianity the idea that interesting in you and me is our change: *of heart, of mind, of appearance, of opinion*. That's the important thing in life for you and me.

For an ancient, the important thing in life is what he is always, what he is, as rich he was created. The constancy, not the transformation, not the education of Henry Adams, or any such things.

These are all Christian themes. They are quite unknown in antiquity.

IV

1

And they are hated. And a Greek would tremble and if you told him this; this was for a slave. He could have to transfer his loyalties from one city to another. That's why an

ancient man, when he couldn't be a member of his city, he committed suicide, like Themistocles. And when a man in Europe didn't know how to live any longer, he came to America. That is, we are allowed to live into another loyalty; and in antiquity, you couldn't.

2

THE STORY OF THE FOUNDER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOGRAPHY

...and he was as schizophrenic as only I think educated people in this country can be. And when he founded these departments of biography, he tried to forget that he had been a Christian minister -- and a very good one, by the way, a very good preacher. And he took Plutarch as his model, for his department of biography. And to this day, they are giving courses in Dartmouth, on twelve famous men, of eight famous men in one course, and jumble them around. And since he wanted to keep in watertight compartments Plutarch and the Gospels, he wrote down, exactly in the Plutarchean sense for every of his heroes, these characters -- as I told you -- *birth, genealogy, temperament, behavior towards women* -- he was very much haunted by sex, this gentleman, and he was a widower; and he forbade himself to marry again, so all his thinking was on sex, so it interested him terribly whether these people behaved, or married a second time, or so. His best sentence, very ancient, very pagan, as though you could say of any man, what's his best utterance.

3

All these classifications are childish, because this means that you can know what a man says outside the temporal, the moment. But the hour decides on the value. There are many hours and you can then make the best utterances, if you have presence of mind. And they are just incomparable.

And you can never say of Lincoln that the Second Inaugural is better than the Gettysburg Address. They both fit the occasion. That's all you can say of a human word.

4

THE STORY OF "ONE OF YOUR BEST FRIENDS"

And whenever you have this terrible idea of "better," you know that you have a pagan. If you receive a letter, the man says that you are one his best friends, tear it up, send it back, and say, "So I'm not your friend, am I?" All these qualifications, "one of your best friends," is Greek. Perfectly valueless, because you have lost the impotent, because you are classified. "One of my best friends" means that I am nobody, for whom you express your real, personal relationship which always would be Christian.

The Lord could not say to John, "I like you better than Peter". They are Apostles. There the story ends. And then there are individual relations which are absolutely untransferrable.

CHAPTER TWO: WARNING AGAINST CLASSIFICATION

I

1

This is one of the most offensive utterances I always receive in America where just this pagan influence of the liberal arts college has allowed even women to write such ... as "You are one of my best friends," or "It's one of the nicest things I have ever seen in my life," or "I have experienced in my life." That's quite -- it's just style. Everybody writes these letters.

I don't think that a simple person, a folksy person would say such a thing. It's hypocritical. Just hypocritical. Commits you to absolutely nothing. You do not coin your phrase for the occasion. It's a ready-made phrase; you cannot be caught. You haven't said it's the best; but you haven't said it's the worst. You've just said, "One of the best." Absolutely non-committal. It's a classification. And personal relations are dying from classification. If you hear that somebody says, "He's one of my best friends," mistrust the man. Then you are just an acquaintance.

2

(Would Heraclitus be an exception to this?)

THE STORY OF HERACLITUS

I've written a whole book on this, for this reason, on Heraclitus. Heraclitus has the great word. Whenever you meet Plato, you have this classification. "The divine." Many things can be divine. This is divine, this is divine. Then there's no God. And Heraclitus was so angry with this whole dilution of "one of my best gods," that he said, "I will never say 'the divine.' But I will say 'Zeus.'" That's one of his phrases which haven't come to us -- one of the fragments. It's a very great saying. He wanted to have the unique name. Zeus is "Zeus," and he's not "one of my best gods."

And how funny that is, as soon as you transfer it to "one of my best gods."

For a set of china, where twelve teacups are all the same, you can say, "This is one of the twelve teacups of my best service." But then this is the best china, as a whole. And the members of this set, they are all the same.

3

But whenever you classify, you are Greek; and whenever you name, you are Jewish or Christian.

And you cannot get out of this. We are all Greeks and Jews at the same time. And if you could only learn that Christianity is the holding onto this fact, that whenever we have to classify, we are deadening a relation.

This is a table, because this table is dead. And for my satisfaction, when I go home, you are "one of my students." But you will admit that then I have not yet known you. You are just beginning to come to life. That's a preparation of a relation that is so definite that I know who you are. And as long as you are just "one of my students," you are in the antechamber of human relations, and it doesn't say much. And it's noncommittal, and you pass out again of the picture, when the term is over.

4

THE STORY OF MR. HINTZ

But yesterday, I suddenly was stopped on campus by a car. Out jumps a man, and he says, "Mintz." And Margrit says to me, "Who is this man?" And I said, "Oh, that's Mr. Mintz. He graduated in 1937. He helped me to get my friend Riel out of Germany by his affidavit."

Well, he beamed all over the face. He hadn't expected me to know after 22 years -- we hadn't seen each other for 22 years -- his one action by which we became personal friends. I had asked him -- his father wrote the affidavit for this friend of mine who was persecuted by the Nazis. And for his father it was a great thing. It was an Orthodox Jew, and he was asked to do this for a Gentile. And he said that much at that time, that he had never done such a thing before, and it was pretty much a shame that he should suddenly -- he hadn't cared for the Gentiles. But he did.

And so I only want to say: this man Mintz, when I quoted him for the one immortal deed, by which he has stuck in my mind, beamed radiant, because I did not classify him as "one of my students." I did not introduce him to my wife as, "Oh, that's one of my students at Dartmouth." But I said, "That's the man who rescued our friend Riel in Germany." So we were real friends at that moment. And I hadn't seen the man for 22 years. And I was surprised that he had recognized me, and I was very proud that I recognized him! Because he certainly had changed. He's a professor here now at the university.

Only to show you what it means to personalize. If I had only said, "He -- oh, he must be a student of mine," it would have been a let-down.

II

1

But I warn you against this -- this is epidemics in this country, now. "It's one of the finest books I've ever read." Throw it in the wastepaper basket, if it's only one the finest books. It has to be the book that you had to read at that moment. Then it's a good book. It just came when I needed this book. That's a description, perhaps, it's only a formal description. But

it at least gives the book the character of hitting you at the time when you were ready to be hit by this book, and by none other.

And most of you live, in this sepulcher described by Plato, the cave. That's it. The cave is the world of classes, and definitions, and concepts.

2

And when I read a man saying that the word pictures, the man has no speech. Word pictures are all general concepts. The uniqueness of a poem cannot ever be called a "word picture," because a word picture consists then of a number of words set together, but an impression gained by you, made on by you-- or anything living - on me, creates a new speech. All these words take on new meanings by my trying to articulate an impression that is unique.

That's what a poem is. Not the word picture putting together green, and red, and blue, but from a new light, creating a new rainbow. Out of the whole, the parts -- I explained -- are not out of the parts, the whole is composed. And you all try to compose your human relations out of these generalities, "one of my best friends," "one of the nicest persons I ever met."

Mistrust yourself. It's impotent. You cannot make love that way. You can't tell your girl that she's one of the nicest girls you have ever slept with. As soon as you classify, I hope, she'll say, "Thank you."

3

I hope I'm right, ladies. If a girl is not unique, then -- well.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY BEING SO UNUSUAL

My Dartmouth boys, they are all athletes; and they have no brain, and they have no speech. But at least they have one sentence by which they admit that they should have speech. And you know the phrase, too. They say, "You are so unusual".

Now "unusual" is the minimum of personal speech, because classifying speech is usual. And so, when you begin, that's the basic, there's a threshold of events, between persons that you say, "This is unusual," because at that moment, you begin to speak to a person. You should always speak in an unusual fashion to any living being, because it's the first and only time that you and she meets. That's a new situation.

4

So the word "unusual" in Dartmouth is the saving grace. These athletes don't say much, but at least they say sighingly, "You are so unusual." And these poor girls have to put up with this scarcity of spiritual means. You should ask for more.

So will you kindly now go to the library. We meet again at quarter ...

CHAPTER THREE: THE WHOLE LANGUAGE

I

1

...nobody will throw any dirt there.

Now, that's a purely physical reaction. People won't throw things, like dogs, into a radiantly white corner. So this man is not treating his labor force as people, but he's treating them as dogs. Which is all right, because as far as we are in this physical atmosphere, I think we should be treated behavioristically as people who can be influenced by light, by shade, and so on. There's no harm done.

And so in an employment office, people are handed around more or less as things. Because one knows their characteristics, that they can be classified. You have classified ads, which is the same thing. And part of us, you and I -- as far as we are finally to be laid into the coffin, we are things. We are physical entities. We weigh 155 pounds, and we are 5 feet 5 high, and so on and so forth. And therefore, all these newspaper reports on you and me -- blue eyes and green hair -- they are that part of our anatomy which can be classified. And there is a lot in us which is classified.

2

Now comes, however, "when we see eye to eye," as we say. I must name you. I must give you a name. I must say, "Mister," or I must say, "John," and tap you on the shoulder. That is, equals. Must see eye to eye. That's not trying to handle you, not trying to manage you. But we grow into each other by seeing eye to eye. We form a dual or a trilog. "Where two or three are gathered in His name," there he is amidst it, there is a common spirit, here in this classroom. I must look at you.

I must not only treat you, you will understand. But I must entreat you. And I can only entreat you to do something by looking at you and by making our eyes correspond.

And that's a new layer of language, as soon as we speak man to man, I treat you as my equal. I treat you as alive, and that's why they put the names behind the -- how do you call it, in the banking, the Post Office, behind the --? and say, "Mr. Smith, clerk", so that you treat him as a person, and are not tempted to treat him as an automat. You understand.

3

So this whole language -- there's a whole language which our dictionaries omit; it's a language of proper names. And it is degraded today, because people in this country, as you know, only feel at ease when they can call a 70-year-old lady "Sweetheart," tap her on the shoulder or "Girl." An this seeing eye to eye is with us such a natural that it has no

degrees. But I think it's a problem when living eye to eye is to see degrees of authority, and of dignity, and to call your mother "Mother," and not just "Sweetheart."

4

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S SISTERS

In my own family, there was a tremendous rift when my sisters decided to call their parents with their first names. And I decided that they had to remain my father and mother, and I have never called my father and mother till their dying day with anything else but with their title. And I would have felt falling from grace if I just suddenly began to call them by their first name.

And I think you have an underdeveloped speech here already between people, because you have to call everybody "Johnny," and "Helen," and "Billy." And that's a very one-sided -- it's a nursery, speech. And you never grow up in your relations to other human beings, because it only begins to be difficult when you speak to the prime minister or the president of the United States, and tell him the truth, although you call him "Mr. President".

II

1

I always have the hunch that an American feels that anybody whom he calls "Mr." he can lie to. He is only cordial with a man whom he calls by his first name. Then he is at ease. And then the man has the moral requirement of a partner. But as soon as a man is a foreigner, he cannot make any demands on your morality.

This is very strange, but you behave differently, and with regard to your frankness to people whom you call by your first name, and those whom you do not call by a first name. And in society, the greatest achievement would be, if you would tell the pope the truth, in an audience. That's not so simple. ...somebody like him.

2

(But at the same time, you don't call him by his first name.)

That's what I mean, because it is much more different -- don't you understand what I'm trying? I'm just saying this. It's no merit if you can tell the truth to Johnny. But it is highly difficult to tell the truth to somebody whom you call "Mr. Archbishop," or "Your Grace," or "Your Highness." Then you begin to lie. Because you do not see eye to eye.

3

I only want to bring out then that there is a tremendous wealth of speech. Take the hospital -- or the dentist chair, the authority of the dentist, or of the doctor is very often such that the people take lying down all their prescriptions, never daring to say, "But that's not for me". "You mistake me. I cannot stand this operation."

THE STORY OF A FRIEND TOO OLD FOR BEING CHLOROFORMED

I have seen a friend who knew that he couldn't be chloroformed, that he was too old for this. And he didn't dare to say anything. The doctors decided -- had to be operated upon; and he lost his mind by the anesthesia operation. It wasn't for him to undergo such a treatment. And it took him months and months to recover, because he just had not dared to say anything to these great professors.

4

So I feel that people who do tell the truth to Johnny and Billy will hesitate to tell the truth to Professor Such-and-Such, and Doctor Such-and-Such. I wonder if Mr. Eisenhower tells the truth to Dr. White. The great man who saved his life, the heart specialist.

It's very difficult. Watch your step. Ask yourself to whom you tell the truth, what you really think. And blush, because all your examination papers are pious lies.

As far as I can determine. This country, it is not reckoned disgraceful to make confession of opinions in your examination paper, which you only write because you think I want that to hear -- or to read. And that didn't exist in any other country. It can only come from your moral weakness that you do not owe me the truth.

(How do you know that that's the case?)

I have found out.

III

1

(How?)

Not with you, personally, but I have found out with students, that they will tell me that they'll write down anything they think the man wants to read. And they'll think that is not personal. They are not attached to what they're writing. That's an examination paper. "I write exactly what this man hopes to read."

So your relations between professor and student in this country are completely corrupt, because you don't owe your professor the truth. And you don't think you do, because of this stupid examination paper -- that's why the examinations have to be destroyed in this country, because they are making for hypocrisy.

You are all mendacious, Sir.

(Don't you know such people?)

(Well, sure, I do. I said, no, not in this case. I think I can write anything. I think it depends on the professor.)

How do you know? That's a poor professor. He's

(Well, as far as I know, you do not think I could write almost anything. But --.)

It is a scandal. When teaching is demoralized, when the devil has entered the relation between student and teacher, then there is nothing to be hoped for in a community. And this is rampant in this country. And nobody mentions it, even.

(In many ways, don't you think it's the professors who are destroyed by this system as well, I mean? They --.)

Of course they are.

(It encourages them to hear themselves --.)

Repeated.

2

Well, then there is a third thing. -- When you and I --.

(No, I wanted to ask a question. Where could you show me a teacher that you could express your opinions, and he'll grade you on your opinion and not parroting back what he has given you?)

Oh, I know three in this college alone. And I know very few. I know perhaps a dozen men. Of the others, I wouldn't even say "yes" or "no." I don't know how they work. But I know of three for certain that they would be delighted to "A" you just for a contradiction.

(Well, I'll give you an example. I have a course right now. The first test, I put my opinion down. I got a D. The second test, I gave what the teacher said; I got a B.)

Well, what's the third paper?

(Well, we have the final coming up. What are you going to do? You have to graduate.)

Pardon me. The D may just be as well deserved when you just contradict without giving any material, and knowing nothing. Just spitting out an opinion is not a paper. So I will not follow your suggestion right away, because I don't know what the paper -- it can be D, just the same, although you did contradict the man. It's not meritorious just to contradict.

(Well, I read a book on the subject by a man that he disagrees with. And I followed the other man's argument. And I thought the other man's argument was good, because he is always contradicting the man in class, and so that interested me to read the other man's argument. And I liked the other man's argument.)

Well, did you know at least his own argument?

(Well, I thought I did. I --.)

Well, did you -- did he, I think that any teacher, when you weigh argument, and show that you know both sides of the case, will not ever penalize you for not taking his side.

(Well.)

3

But of course -- ... the other argument, he says, "Well, you are ignorant of my own -- and I have taught you, after all, so please, you didn't come to class."

(I think everyone is responsible at least to show the professor that he understands what's being dispensed)

That's the minimum. So what you bring up is inconclusive, because I haven't seen your paper -- how much it comprehended the teacher's view.

He has a perfect right to ask that you first state what is to be said on his side. We are all --.

(Well, in an hour, in answering two questions, you don't have time to express his viewpoint, when he asks you a question. You just don't have the time. I mean, you can't --.)

Just take amphetamines.

(Well, it sounds easy when you're sitting there, and --.)

Well, I've always allowed my students to bring all their books to class. I have never cared, because I have wanted them to show judgment. And I'm afraid, there is plenty of time. I don't believe you that two questions cannot be answered in an hour to satisfaction. I don't know your questions. But in general, I feel that our examinations would be liberal in the time span given. And if the student really would know But since he is only out -- "What do I have to say in order to satisfy him?" he never enjoys the exam. I try to make my exams -- you may recall this, an occasion in which -- that you

4

What?

(That's true. I found a great deal of suffering in the first one or two exams. But then it became more enjoyable. But I find that the better I know the subject, the less time it takes to answer it than --. If you know it well, then you compress. You can say it in very few words, and then go on, enjoy the rest of paper and in posing alternatives, or elaborating some thoughts you've had yourself.)

The thing is so dangerous, today, the ... of the campus; and they look so very innocent. And this inner break between the loyalty to the teacher and the loyalty to the truth is not an issue. You must become aware that we always speak on three levels.

We speak of things; then we classify. And as far as the world goes by, you have to classify. You say, "A thousand cars just went by." You don't care who is in this car. It's a thousand car. These are motorists. And in this sense, you treat them at this moment what we call "world." The man of the world will always say, "He's one of my best friends." That's noncommittal. Then you find out he has no best friends. He has no friends. He is just a man of the world.

As soon as you begin to define and use definitions, you deal with the world, the outside world. You are here, and you objectify. Whether you say "objectify" or "classify," that doesn't make any difference.

IV

1

Now I want to wake you up to the fact that you do something when you speak, that you decide that this is the part of the outer world, and you have the right to speak of me as a short fellow.

I'm short. That's my physical quality. Therefore, you classify me under the small people, and not the tall ones.

That's all right. I have no objection to this. But it makes me a part of the outer world of appearances, of phenomena. And as long as you think this is all, you are in world, a child of the world. Then you are a member of society. And here we identify. As soon as we see eye to eye -- you find me in mourning, or you find me sick -- you must express what we call "sympathy."

2

Now "sympathy" means to be a colleague, to be a comrade, to be on the same level - companionship, partnership -- whatever you have, the group. That is, identify. That is, you and I stand on the same level, and here we are in society, of men.

And here we are in the world of things.

And here, we are in the world of authority, of the gods. So we meet here in the name of history. You cannot help admitting that the only point of conduct we have at first is that you want to study history. So you take 198, section 3. And therefore, the basis of our agreement is that there is above our crown of our heads an admission that history has the power to draw us together. And therefore this is not a story of our identification, but of command, of authority.

3

This authority may be science, or in the physical field, it is sports, and your coach has authority to tell you how to play the game. And sports is the god, or the little Newman, the little authority at this moment. While you are out there, across the street, sport is an authority, or is the authority to which the coach refers when he gives orders. And you are very glad to comply, because there is complete agreement that for this moment you are trying to train your muscles.

4

And since there is agreement of what should be done, I call this a "command," which you do not like. But all real importance in serious life is led under commands. You have to do it. And you are hateful of commands and of authority.

The overthrow of authority is the constant attempt of American public life to show that you have no authority. It's a child's game. You are always under authority. Then independence is your god, or self-reliance is your god. In the name of self-reliance, you are ruled.

CHAPTER FOUR: GODS, MEN, WORLD

I

1

So nobody can open his mouth without deciding this three-partition, this three-pronged fork.

You open your mouth at this moment, you say something to me. It can be done on a personal level, of sympathy with my toothache. I look pale, you say, "You don't feel well."

*You can do this, because we are just human beings then.
You can meet in the name of Plutarch and history.*

And any sentence you say is then dictated by the respect for the activity which we both at this moment are asked to pursue.

2

That's a command: history -- that directs our activity here. That's why I could send this gentleman to the library; and he did go. And he didn't feel that I was abusing my authority, because he admitted that he wanted to study history. And a student of history must find the sources. And so he went.

And so at any moment, you have to decide when you meet a person: do you meet under a higher authority?

*Soldiers in an army.
Citizens of a state.
Students of a science.
Sportsmen for a game.*

And then there will be a tacit agreement that at this moment, this authority, this god-- I have called it "god"; the Greeks called it "god" -- will direct us, and will keep us together, and will select what we have to say to each other.

3

In a good game of whist the god of the game, the spirit of the game directs us what to say. At bridge, you mustn't talk nonsense; otherwise you hurt the game. You have to be silent, when the cards are distributed; you cannot talk politics. That's excluded. Bridge players have nothing at that moment but the bridge. Or at chess, you mustn't talk at all. The game cannot be played in chess, if people begin to talk.

You know how strict it is when people are allowed to look at a game of chess. The third man who looks on is not allowed to say a word. He cannot even cough, and express his displeasure or his excitement. Why?

Because he knows what is expected of him, is to attend to this game. And the god of the game is in authority.

4

Now if you only would see that at every moment you decide which part of the reality here, you can treat as things, which part of the reality you can treat as companions and partners, and which part of the reality in which you stand is demanding your opinions, your loyalty, your selection -- you would know that

to speak means to divide the reality into gods, men, and world.

You can treat your dog as your society, and talk to him. And many people do, much better with cats and dogs. All the old spinsters do this. And their dog is their brother, and a sister, and sweetheart and what-not.

So we are completely able, or the art collectors, they can deal with a piece of canvas in this admiring way. That it is much more than a thing. It's revelation, they say. And they personify it, this piece of art.

II

1

And in every moment you open your mouth -- you must know this, because has been completely forgotten -- before you say, "Oh, this is black here," you make the decision that you want to describe this as a thing. You have made a decision that you have the right.

If you meet a new person, and she looks very black, you cannot say, "But you look black". Then she would feel insulted, because she expects you to see eye to eye to her, and to speak about something in common. And once you begin to tell her, "But you look black," she feels that this is an insult, because she is treated as a piece of the world, and then you have no right to talk to her.

2

So it's very simple. Anybody or anything you treat as belonging to the world, you have the right to speak of them. In this, here, you are allowed to speak to them. We speak of things as though they were absent. And we speak to people.

3

And now the third thing, which is completely denied in this country, even by the ministers, is: we speak out of our gods. They dictate.

Any what we call "divine," or "God is the power that makes you and me speak," and to select the words that are fitting the occasion.

So if you would see that all speech is dictated, out of some decision you have made —

"Now we are good sports,"

"Now we are students of history,"

"Now we are in the Church,"

"Now we are in politics" —

you would know that all the time we are moving under an authority. All the time. You say, "We are at home now," and you put on your slippers. And you get out of the formality of the behavior on the street. You change the authority which dictates your speech, your utterance, your expressions.

4

This is completely lost.

We speak always under an authority.

We always try to speak to other people.

You write letters to our friends. That's why people need friends.

We have to speak to people who whom we can identify ourselves.

And we always have to speak of things.

III

1

You cannot speak of God. That's already an impiety.

And you cannot speak of living people in their absence differently than you talk to them to their face. That's gossip and slander. You can say anything of a person after you have told the same thing to her face. That's the condition of transforming gossip into human conversation.

There's no harm done if you say to a person to her face, "You are a niggard," or "miser," or "wicked." Then you can say also to the neighbor, "She's really wicked." But you can't say it before. If you say to your neighbor: the third person is wicked; if you never tell the person who is wicked to her face, you begin to go schizophrenic. You split.

2

So, better to say to nobody about a third person something unless you have the moral courage also to tell the person to her face.

And our whole society is constantly disintegrating, because we all take the liberty of telling other people what we think of somebody, and never telling them.

And it's the hardest thing to tell the truth to a colleague. I can assure you. It's very difficult.

3

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY AND THE CORRUPTION OF OUR SCHOOLS

I was so put out by the corruption of our schools, that I left the schools three times in my life -- four times. Just in order to screw up my courage to tell them what I thought of them; I had to get out of this. Now I feel I have the right to say it inside, too, because I said it loud enough.

4

So will you kindly observe this strange triplicity of all human utterance?

We all the time make the decision: what we think should belong to our living group; what should belong to the world of mere world, what we call "world"; and what should be our -- I don't even dare to use the word "gods," but our commanding, directing forces, the forces under which we make this decision now to divide this world of ours into dead things and living beings.

Here are the dead things.

Here are the living,

and the gods are the power who decide between life and death.

IV

1

The best education, as you know, on such a campus as of today is in the athletic field. There the coaches have the right to make you go through real sacrifices. They can really rough-handle you, and we can't. And so there is discipline. And -- why?

Because they can tell you that all your superfluous fat has to go, that this is dead matter. In order to come out right you have just to keep a diet, and sleep enough, and do not drink before the next match, and so on. So the coach is empowered to remind you what is your life of the future, and what is the dead weight which has to go, and has to be left behind.

2

And so any divine power, any inspiration makes this decision between what is life and what is death. What is dead, and it should be left behind; and what is life and should be carried into the future. And as I said, you can study this best in a football coach, and what he is allowed at this campus to do with his football men. He just is allowed to completely transform them into different beings.

And that explains the admiration in which this guy was held, this shoddy creature. Here, the last one you had here.

3

As long as you do not know this mystery of the crown of your head, which is under authority -- wherever you enter a room, you by and large know

*whether you are here to a cocktail party,
whether you are to enter a classroom,
whether this is an examination,
whether this an election booth,
whether this is a courtroom,
this is a hospital,*

and you behave accordingly. That is, you say the things that belong in this. And the power to know where you are, that's the divine order of our lives. And it always comes to this that part of the world are we ourselves, written large.

You identify yourself with America's history, I hope, to that extent that her miseries are your miseries, and her illnesses are your illnesses, and her victories are your victories, and her defeats are your defeats.

4

Wherever you do this, where you really share the sentiment and the unhappiness and the happiness, you see eye to eye. And where you try to manipulate -- "manipulate" comes from the word "main" -- "manus" in Latin, it means "manage" -- the same thing. It comes from "handling." And only things can be handled.

THIRD PART: WE LEARN TO SPEAK TODAY

CHAPTER ONE: COURAGE

I

1

And as far as you try to handle men, you try to get out of them their thing-character, their character of being material parts of the world, who follow certain strains of gravity, and laziness, and zest, and ambition, and competition; and you can handle them. Because they just respond to your little stimuli, and just what they try now in our psychology experiments. That they try -- how fast the retina of your eye reacts, or Mr. Pavlov sees that the spittle is gathering in your mouth when you are told that the sausage is near. And in this sense, we are things, because we are predictable.

2

Everything in this world of things we try to make predictable.

When we shoot a satellite to the moon, it is a great victory. We can predict that he will reach the moon in so many seconds. Then we have managed the satellite. We have handled it right. And it is a triumph of co-operation to do this, when you have five parts of such a satellite to be shot into space. Everything is full of admiration, because these things have been manipulated right. We have talked of them, in their absence, and described them to perfection.

3

So everything here is predictable, which means -- when something is predictable, that you do not have to talk to the thing. Because we predict what the thing is doing. The thing is dead, and we have the life of the thing in us. We know more about its future behavior than the dead thing itself. So the man whom you call "predictable" is dead, for all practical purposes.

As far as politicians handle us as predictable, we are treated as raw material.

4

THE STORY OF AMERICAN STAMPS

I have heard the nice story about the American stamps. Jefferson was on the 3-cent stamp, so the Democratic Party wanted to have the 4-cent stamp, for mail. So half a year before they brought this before Congress, they put Jefferson on the 4-cent stamp. Nothing said.

So when then the new law went through -- the Democratic president, Jefferson was on every letter stamp. Very good politics. And then a friend of mine wrote to them and said, "Was this done on purpose?"

And they said, of course "Pure accident -- purely accidental."

They had managed this. If they had changed the picture of the president at the same time as they upped the fare, there would have been an explosion. So they treated us, as we deserve it, too, as children.

(But observe. The new 1-cent stamp has Lincoln, and you have to put the 1-cent stamp with all the old 3-cent letters to make the 4.)

Well, now he's on the 4-cent stamp. The Republicans change it again. Oh, that's very clever change. And if we say, "Just politics," we mean just this, that we are manipulated.

II

1

So now Mr. Plutarch and all the pagans do not have this tripartition of speaking. They knew nothing about it.

The ideal of the Greeks was to have the divine reason of men; and all rationalists today have the same. "My reason is God, and the world is the world." And "You, too, are just treated as an object of my understanding". They don't know of identification, and they don't know -- but they are in authority as scientists, as rationalists. Their reason is God, and all the rest is manageable. That's called in this country "objectivity."

2

But you ought to know that "world," "God," and "man" are already in existence in your own consciousness, in the working of your spirit before you open your mouth, because you choose at every moment whom to call "God"; whom to call "partner," and "comrade"; and what to call "thing."

And every moment world and God, and man are methods of approaching or dividing reality. They are not things, as you naïvely say -- God is not a thing.

But God is a direction, the direction into you.

3

*(The rearrangement?)
(Catching up.)*

Ah-ha. Now come back to your book.

(Well, ...by....)

It's wonderful to have all this big volume.

There is a second copy in the college library, I think, of this, because they have a whole collection of Loeb. This very nice biologist, Loeb, created this endowment for having this book collection. And what would be a way of -- if I take this here to the secretariat --.

(We just got it for the day, because I told them I could bring it back today.)

Pardon me? You put it on reserve?

(No. We took it out on our reg card, on the promise that we would return that today. But you can probably get it through the department, by just calling them up. Because it's "restricted use," it says.)

Where did you find it? In the college library?

(In the regular stacks.)

Well, I would like to put it at your disposal, in the most practical manner. And I think it is too late to have copies made of all -- would only be possible of a few pages. It's too expensive. So you can read this -- and shall I put it on reserve, downstairs? I'll put it under 198, under my name. So you all can find it. And I advise -- you have, after all, fully three weeks -- a little more. So that at least you get an impression of what these people are saying.

[miscellaneous overlapping student comments]

4

Well -- do I have to know your name in order to make them find out about it? I suppose, because that hasn't been --.

(Otherwise they'll start charging him)

(Well, I could take it back)

We go together, perhaps. Do you have a moment's time? or are in a hurry. We could go now. That's what I mean. We go right after class, together. Thank you very much.

Now, this is for the paper. But the second thing is -- oh yes, another. Who has learned Latin? You have?

(I had Latin three years ago. But)

You don't wish to make any use of it? Of Latin?

(Oh no, I'll try and)

What?

(I'll try speaking)

Rationalist.

III

1

Now, would you try to find between Fabius and Pericles, and -- this is your work for the next week, the assignment -- the parallels in the form of the biography? I told you that this 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 5, 6, was dictating Plutarch's ethical approach to biography, that the man was classified as to his behavior and --.

(Unfortunately Fabius is not in this paperback volume which everyone has. Are there enough copies of the other?)

... of these editions. A man writes parallel lives, you cannot cut out the one bias or the other.

Is it really true?

(Yes. It's not in there. It's not in the Harvard Classics, either, he says.)

(No, it certainly isn't.)

Well -- ... what?

(It's in the Great Book.)

It is?

(Yeah.)

(It's not even in the Harvard Classics.)

2

Now, why don't you read then Caesar in comparison. After all, that's very interesting and in itself. And it poses exactly the same problem, the division of --.

(Caesar isn't here, either, in this paperback version.)

(Could we take one of these --?)

(Yes, it is.)

As a model.

3

Well, Alexander's too rich; it's not so simple. Why don't you take Solon? Solon.

Well, take one second. Alexander is too diffuse, the world conqueror, there are too many facts that obscure -- just too many things to report that this order of simple qualities disappears, it's such an ocean of facts to be reported. Hence I feel this is a little too difficult.

But Solon and Caesar will do.

4

There's another thing about Plutarch which I like to mention.

Plutarch writes under the good emperors. But he begins already to write under Nero and Domitian, the wicked ones. So he does not mention any person later than Caesar. And the tragedy of the Roman world was that people preferred to be driven into antiquarianism, and to deal with people of former ages more than of their own age for fear to say anything against which the powers that be would dislike.

IV

1

And that is the constant threat for free speech, that people in Russia - *Doctor Zhivago* is so outstanding, because it's the one book that is dealing of our own times. And that makes it a great book. I think otherwise it isn't a great book. But it has the courage to speak out about the present, under a dictatorship. And the temptation under any form of government, is for the literary and the intellectual to escape.

And I think Mr. Hawthorne is a case in point, with his *Scarlet Letter*, and so. That was too difficult for him to describe anything contemporary. And so he made his reputation, really, by escaping into another time in which he was very truthful. But it's a different thing.

2

And Plutarch is therefore, you must know, that he is already a Greek, who leisurely deals with a past that for him is safe, secure. And to find this already in antiquity is a good

lesson, object lesson for our own temptation. If you want to be frank, it is safer to be frank about two hundred years ago.

3

And so never overestimate your own courage when you pass judgments on the founders, or on King George, or something. That is, if you haven't first passed judgment on the present day, and then you do not know if you really are allowed to pass judgment on the past.

I think one of the necessities of the historian is to be involved in the present by some decided action or participation, because otherwise he will not be able to understand his own judgments about the past.

You are all in this quandary, that historians -- if they want to be historians -- have to participate in the future and in the present, because otherwise they will make judgments that cost them too little, about the past.

4

The degree of danger in which we make a judgment educates us to refine our judgment. And I feel that most American historians writing on European affairs are so very *blasé*, and they know all about Louis XIV. Terrible man. And George III. Because they never come in a position to tell anybody like Louis XIV or George III something to their face. And so they are not qualified to judge. This costs nothing. That's too far away. That's not refined enough. You haven't really entered into the spirit of their day.

CHAPTER TWO: FACE-TO-FACE WITH THE MIGHTIES OF TODAY

I

1

And well, Fidel Castro, now. These newspapermen say we have totally forgotten that their fathers once rebelled against George III. And since they do not put themselves into the shoes of a man who throws out Batista, they have no right to talk to this man: "Are you a Communist?" This is just fatal.

These newspapermen are hiding in a great security of cold definitions of their status. And they have no right to talk to this man. Should be forbidden. There has made a terrible impression on me, the treatment of this man in this country. It is a scandal, and it has to do with history.

2

Mr. Crane Brinton is a case in point. He's a real rascal, a real scoundrel. He's insolent about all the people outside, because he's quite impotent with regard to his own time. And so he passes wonderful judgments about the past. Where he gives vent to his passions, because he wants to be courageous. And so he's courageous in a phantom fight.

And beware of such historians.

3

The great historian will always be engaged in his own time, and therefore have learned to weigh his words. Because he will have living opponents, and living companions; and therefore he will have learned what you can say about people in the hot battle of life.

How can you be just to Pericles, who lived four hundred years before Plutarchus, if you don't say a word against the bloody tyrant Nero or Domitian in your own time? You don't even say of a man -- even the word "cruel," or "benign," or "ungracious," or all the etiquettes about the character of a man mean nothing to me when I only see that an historian applies them to people a thousand years back. And he'll never say a word, about anybody who lives in his own time, in a responsible fashion.

4

We learn to speak among the living, and the historian must transfer the judgments passed among the living to the past, but not just have this liberty -- that's a kind of libertinage, today. That's why most historians today are very different from the historians a hundred years ago.

II

1

An historian a hundred years ago built up the nation.

Bancroft built up the United States, Cabot Lodge, or whomever you take, who wrote history of the American people. They were involved in the story as of this moment. When they said something about Benedict Arnold, they knew what treason was.

But today, Benedict Arnold is just dismissed as a traitor. You think that's so simple. Benedict Arnold was not just a traitor. It was a very complex situation between Loyalists and Revolutionaries. And if you have seen today people trying to do right between the world and the United States -- between nationalism and your obligation as a citizen of the world.

2

If you look at Robert Oppenheim, he didn't want to break with his Communist friends in France. And for this he was hounded out of the Atomic Commission. Now this man has a right to write history of Galileo. He knows what the revocation of the scientific truth, may mean or not mean.

3

But otherwise, most people who write history in this country write with a complete safety, that they never have to tell this anybody who is alive.

And so we get, a new code for the historian.

The historian should not pass any judgments on dead people, on past events, unless he has learned how to make those judgments on living events.

Distrust him.

(He has to depend always for his history on the record made by people who were themselves involved in their own time.)

True, but in order to have them reverberate in his inner mind, he must be able to identify themselves with experiences of his own.

(That's why I would mistrust him, if he hasn't learned from his own documents, what it means to be involved in one's time.)

Ja, exactly. The documents themselves wouldn't tell him. That's what I mean. The report or -- I don't think they would.

4

Alcibiades is just called a "traitor" here. No, he died from this balderdash. Alcibiades "traitor." You call this "dictator." The legislator of Sparta a dictator! That doesn't say anything. What you mean by "dictator" is something -- somebody who abolishes the liberties of a people. Here, is the founder of a state, is called a dictator.

It's just like George Washington, a dictator. Alexander, a conqueror. Alexander carried out the dreams from Homer to Aristotle, of Greece. And such a man is not a conqueror. He's a disciple of Aristotle, after all.

III

1

All these terms just show you all these people are blatant -- radio broadcasters. They have no responsibility for any of the terms they use there. They have never been face-to-face with the mighty of the earth today.

2

You must come to despise this kind of journalism. That's what it is. Headline painting. It's an attempt to write history with mere headline.

I wonder why they don't call Alexander "murderer," because he slew his friend.

3

Let's give it up, the direction.

Will you kindly come ... me? So you try to have either Solon or Caesar. Or best would be Fabius, because that's the easiest, the clearest comparison.

And try to find the order and the list of qualities which Plutarch thinks he must give in order to write a biography.

4

You will also observe certainly that chronology is not his intention. He doesn't want to write an evolutionary, educational history of the soul of the man. But he wants to characterize him, and to define him, to classify him as a type.

TENTH LECTURE: THE CRISIS OF AMERICAN FUTURE

FIRST PART: THERE ARE NO SYNONYMS

CHAPTER ONE: EDUCATION BY FEAR?

I

1

...to a larger unit, I mean, that's not through the international languages, through first Latin and Greek, then French and English, and German. Believe me that the one moderating influence on nationalism has been the fact that everybody had to talk one other language at least.

And at this moment the only really nationalistic country is America. Because it's the only country in which an educated person takes it for granted that he can stay within his own language. That's an ostrich.

2

I mean this very seriously. There is no liberal arts education in this country at this moment, because you don't learn any other language. I mean this in every respect; that's very serious.

The one drawback for the unity of the world is the nationalism of the United States. This is the most chauvinistic, and jingoistic, and die-hard country I know in the whole world, because you simply assume that everybody else has to learn your language.

And since you have given up the classical tradition, and you have given up the European tradition, where is the third? Now you learn perhaps Russian or Chinese. I don't know.

Well, I don't accept you as educated people, with all your degrees. You can be Ph.D.

3

THE STORY OF BARBARISM

I asked a gentleman who invited me for a lecture, and said, "Do you read German?" He said, "Oh, well, for my Ph.D., I had of course to know some German, but I forgot it all." "Well," I said, "so you also are a barbarian." "Yes," he said, "I am one."

This is barbarism. Absolute barbarism. And it is incredible that you aren't ashamed of yourself, to say that you go to a liberal arts college, where all the words are of Latin origin. You don't care. You don't understand these words.

4

Here, I have two books on Plutarch. How can I cope with them? One is written in German, and one is written in French. You can't report on them. You can't read Plutarch in Greek. You can't read the books on him in German and French. There are no books in English. It's just this porridge, *Everyman's Library*, which is no good for anything, because it's just as all these translations; they're just forgeries.

Popularizations for idiots.

II

1

Nobody tells you these words, because they are all here in the same boat. One person has to tell you, "You don't improve yourself," but you must then allow at least certain institutions to develop other standards. And you get on the board of education, or the school board and for the rest of your life you have to do something about this.

You are lost generation, beat generation, angry generation. I don't care what you are. But certainly you're no use for the fellowship of the human race.

2

You have to have one other language. This is the duty of hospitality. Hospitality is not just giving sandwiches to a beggar at the door.

But hospitality means to make room for somebody other than yourself in your heart.

Formerly it was French. When an American invited any European, they always could communicate through this polite language of the courts. And in the 19th century, Americans -- take Fenimore Cooper, or take Emerson, or take any man -- they could speak French. Of course, he couldn't decide -- they read Greek and Latin.

3

THE STORY OF GEORGE TEMPLETON STRONG

I just yesterday read the diary of a famous man, George Templeton Strong, a lawyer in New York who kept a diary for 35 years. It's now one of the most famous sources for 19th-

century American history. He lived in New York, was trustee of Columbia, but nothing extraordinary; just a lawyer. And his diary just says that every day he reads one Greek tragedy in Greek. He just jots it down as a thing of course. It's not mentioned as any thing of a specialty. But that's his nourishment.

Now this man lives in a wider world. But you read *The Examiner* or *The Bruin*, or all this stuff. You don't know how narrow-minded you are. This I call "narrow-minded" to expose yourself only to the things written in one language.

Nobody can be educated within the circle of one language.

It's not an accident that the Bible has to be translated in one thousand seventeen different languages. That makes it is an important book.

4

Here, I brought you, a German, and an English, and a French text. And I thought some one of you might be willing to report it. One, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 -- here twelve -- a dozen apostate apostles.

I tell you: higher education stands and falls with the language requirement. And since it has been dropped, I don't know what's going to happen. I would say the next requirement is that you have to live for a year abroad, and that nobody could be a student unless he has been at least fifteen months in another country. This way you may substitute for the language departments. But before, I wouldn't say you are educated.

I give me my dear books. So I wanted to read this with you. It's hopeless.

III

1

Here, Mr. Chamberlain has lived in Denmark at the international house. You know very well this plight?

(Yes, in fact, I'm on the board of a program that takes students abroad for a year, so that they can study abroad and get credit for a year's work. And in fact the cost is less than staying here in the University of California at Los Angeles.)

(What city is that in, Phil?)

(It's in any of the Scandinavian countries, Holland, or even possibly in Germany.)

(Stanford University has opened a campus in Germany for sixty students, and they're now opening another one in Italy, and another one in Spain. Whittier College over here has just opened a campus in Copenhagen.)

Ja. These may be the only way.

2

THE STORY OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS IN THE UNITED STATES

The educational process of these United States for the first time in your generation complies with the instincts of the immigrants themselves, these large groups of immigrants. The first education in Harvard, 1636, was for the top man, for the future clergy of this country. So they had no fears of being called "immigrant." They were the salt of the earth. They were the aristocracy -- if you use this word. The elite, the leading class. Therefore they just did what they thought was right. But everybody else in this country, being second, thir generation-- or first generation even more so -- has to turn its back on Europe, and wants to forget his language. Because the less he speaks Italian, or Spanish, the more he becomes an American.

And I know it from my own family, when we came to this country. The fear of being rediscovered, as having still any tinctures hanging around them of the former language. I intervened myself in a family where the parents came from Czechoslovakia, and German was their mother tongue. And they insisted that their boy should talk English at home.

And I intervened and said, "Don't make him do this. He wants to speak English, because he is afraid that people hold it against him that he is an immigrant, a newcomer. And so he wants to go native, and therefore, allow him to forget his German. He'll recover. He'll learn later a second time, without this fear."

3

And you must understand that our school system at this moment has, for the first time, given way to this natural dread of the second-generation Americans to be rediscovered by their grandmother to have talked German, or Italian, or Polish at home. And so the masses of the people who have been reached by public education, have written the law, the ticket.

But that's an anti movement. It's a dread -- anything dictated by fear is not very very good. Anxiety and anguish are narrow.

"Anguish" means "narrow". Age of Anxiety means that the throat is choked. And it is a choked education which you have in this country today. Giving in to this turning-away from any non-American factual background, which is so strong in ninety percent of the American nation. And this has written the law.

4

But you must conquer this. You must face this in your own background, in your neighbor's background, your friends' background and say, "Yes, all right, that's the first reaction. We want to be native Americans, 110 percent."

But that has nothing to do with your ambition to get an education. If you want to get the privilege of an education, fear is not a good basis.

IV

1

And I feel that all American education today is based on fear.

Fear, not imposing on the children.

Fear, not making them dislike school.

Fear of not reminding them of their background.

Fear of reminding the Americans that they are a composite of Europeans and Asiatics.

All this is fear. The whole American education is based on fear. The whole system. All the unpleasant things cannot be mentioned. All the difficult things cannot be mentioned, the same with the desegregation issue. Or the decision of the Supreme Court -- all based on fear.

We cannot admit that there are problems.

2

That's not a way of handling all these problems. That's why the Supreme Court will never solve the desegregation problem.

The first thing would be to give the vote to these unfortunate people, and then let them develop their own schools and invite white people to go there. That's probably the moral solution. Have such excellent schools, and if they gain the vote, they can have better schools than the white people. Then it will be the fashion to go to a good Negro school.

You can only win not by fear, but by going ahead, always beyond that which is today.

And especially in education.

3

I have to talk to the Parents' Teacher Association next week, and I'm going to tell them that their whole system is based on fear.

THE STORY OF A BOY WHO IS DISTRACTED

I have a boy here in my friendship, in this town, who is distracted. And he's intelligent, but he cannot follow any train of thought at the age of thirteen for more than five minutes.

Then he'll forget it. And so the parents very reasonably went to the teacher and said, "You have to insist. You have to trip him up. He cannot get away with this." "Oh," the teacher said. "I can't do this. He might begin to dislike school."

4

This -- with the dread that is hanging over our whole school system. And it's the same with this university. They fear that you may dislike it, so they emphasize beauty, and physical education, and all the requirements you should undergo

What's an education based on fear?

CHAPTER TWO: CAREERS OF CHANGING

I

1

(Dr. Huessy, you said last time that you studied under von Treitschke when you were sixteen. Was it von Treitschke?)

Ja.

(That was that Heinrich von Treitschke?)

Yes.

(I wanted to know if it was the same man that was the German nationalist.)

Well, he was a tragic figure. It's a long story, I'm glad to talk to you about him.

2

THE STORY OF HEINRICH VON TREITSCHKE

He went to pieces really over this issue. He had to -- but the others wouldn't be interested. They haven't read --. He was much more liberal than you would think. He came from a completely liberal -- and very generous man, he was, in his actions. Very tragic figure; he was deaf. It hedged him in more and more as time went on. Of course, he became more secluded, and only heard himself, shouted. And he had --

well, it goes too far. I think the others would be less --. But I'm glad to talk to you about it.

So let's go back to our translated biographies.

3

How about your own findings about Fabius? Do you find any similarity in the structure of the Fabius and the Pericles? This was my request from --.

(I thought that we had a choice of Caesar and Solon.)

Because you didn't have the Fabius. I understand, yes. Who was the other fellow? Caesar? And Solon. Yes. Well, did you read the Solon? Did you find any similarity between this treatment of the Solon and the Pericles?

What I'm inviting you is, when a man today writes a biography and when a man in Greece wrote a biography, they had two very different purposes. Because the prophetic element of history, the rapid movement through time -- what you call "dynamic," it's not a very good and profound expression, but which tries to translate into secular terms the religious idea of *destiny, of occasion, of calling, of being asked to develop what you are* -- what you have been meant for in this world...

...but out of which we had to escape in order to become His real creature.

This whole notion is quite foreign to the Greeks, who, quite the contrary, assumed a man when he's born is what he is.

So the dynamic idea is a strictly biblical idea, and is quite foreign to the Greeks. A man is what he is. And Lincoln when he was born, nobody could have said who he was. He had to discover this, and he had to explode the shell, the inconspicuous shell. And finally the butterfly comes out of the larva.

4

This is your idea of life, I hope. And if you trace back yourself to the qualities in a test, then you can only be what you already are. But you can never become what you never have been.

II

1

Now all the great careers in this country are careers of changing.

THE STORY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

You can take George Washington. He's the most static, and most undynamic person in the world, but he became from an English gentleman the first American president, and the father of this country. And it cost him tremendous pains, because for the first half of his life, he would have preferred to be an English gentleman. This was a much more natural ambition for a man like George Washington. And to make himself dependent on the rabble in this country, was a very difficult decision for him. And it came very painfully. And to identify himself with the people in these colonies, which in his youngest days, he looked down upon.

There was no democracy when he was born. And men were not all born equal and free. It was very far from his mind, such an idea. In England, you were either well-bred, or you weren't. And if you read any novel in the 18th century of Samuel Johnson's life history or so, contemporary with George Washington, obviously the thing was you distinguished. It takes three generations to make a gentleman. And you had to wait until you could become

one. You couldn't make yourself. The idea of the self-made man is absolutely foreign to the English tradition. You cannot be self-made, because you have just missed the first half of your life in this respect. Somebody else has to send you to Eton and Rugby, and Oxford and Cambridge.

2

THE STORY OF LAWYERS, MINISTERS, DOCTORS IN AMERICA

And it's very hard for you to understand this, but you must think that in 1800 and 1780, the people became lawyers, and ministers, and doctors on their own, without going to a university in this country. Three-quarters of the people here, who even called themselves "professionals" later at best were apprentices somewhere in a private relation to some doctor or some lawyer. They read the law-- it wasn't taught. They never saw a college. They never saw a university, because there were no universities in this country. And it was quite exceptional that a man would go across the sea and study. And so even the so-called "professional class" in this country, down to 1900, you could become a lawyer in this country and have never gone through a law school - you must think of this - let alone through a college. You must know such biographies in great numbers.

3

Therefore, for George Washington, the idea of a gentleman -- I only mention this to show you that even the most static, and most stable, and most stolid, you may even say solid man in this country, like George Washington, underwent a tremendous education here for sloughing off one nature and acquiring a new one.

And this is all non-Plutarch -- non-ancient. And I don't think that you could find any place in Plutarch where even the least idea of evolution in a man's life is traceable.

And evolution is a strictly Christian idea.

4

And that's why I always have thought it's so very funny that the Darwinians think this is an anti-Christian idea, anti-biblical idea, just an imitation of the biblical idea that man is in becoming...

THE STORY OF CHARLES DARWIN AND THE BIBLE

...I have never understood why Mr. Charles Darwin and the Bible have ever been thought of as contradicting each other. It's exactly the same story, and it is anti-Greek; it is anti-Roman. The pagans had not the idea that anybody could be anything but who he was. There you are -- like trees, and animals -- you were a Greek, you were a Roman, you were

an Athenian. And if you have ceased to be an Athenian, you had to commit suicide, like Themistocles, who was exiled. When it comes to the decision of a war between Persia and Athens, he ends his life, because this cannot be done.

III

1

To give you the comparison.

THE STORY OF COUNT MOLTKE

You know the name Moltke, perhaps, in German history, the great general. Well, his descendants have been my friends and students. And when Hitler came, the heir of the title, the Count Moltke, had three brothers. And he said to these brothers, "Now, you go abroad. This is the end of Germany. And I have inherited the title, and the estate, and therefore I cannot get out." And so he was executed by the Nazis. He accepted this as his due, because he is the great hero of the resistance -- because, he said, "Since I have enjoyed the good of this tradition, I also have to accept the bad of this tradition. I'm stymied." But his brother, who lives in Philadelphia, fought on the American side in this last war against his fatherland.

That's possible in a Christian era, because nationalism is only second to your real loyalty. And in Greece, this would have been impossible. You understand, that's the whole difference between our era and paganism.

2

(Well, there was the Athenian general that lost the battle at Syracuse, and was banished. And he went over to the Spartan side -- I forget his name.)

(You mean Alcibiades.)

Alcibiades. Now you read the front page there? Who has this front page? What is the subscription of the -- ?

(Traitor.)

He is siding with the Greek idea.

But my friend Moltke is not a traitor. He's not a traitor. He has given the slip to a pagan tyranny. So he's not a traitor. Nobody would ever have thought of calling this Mr. von Moltke in Philadelphia a traitor. It's an open story.

Treason is always underhanded, is a break in character.

3

So I think -- here America is now back to paganism. That's the difference. Traitors have always existed. But it's a blemish on their character which cannot be wiped out. Such mishaps do occur. But as long as it is crime, you admit then it is negated.

Whereas in George Washington's case, from the English point of view he was a traitor. But that's not his definition. It's just the digestion of the aspect of treachery, then which is the problem of life. But it is not treason, when you act openly, in full risk, by giving the slip to one allegiance saying, "I forgo this."

That's not treason.

I think the study of George Washington and Alcibiades is very instructive.

(I think the study of Alcibiades and --.)

4

Benedict Arnold is a traitor and Washington is not. That's very interesting. Why? Why is that so?

Because of the *Declaration of Independence*, "When in the course of events..." this is an idea, this never occurred in antiquity, that the course of events transforms men.

IV

1

(Alcibiades even was treacherous while in Sparta. He became)

Oh no, it's very serious that you should see this. Antiquity, China, Mexico -- all gentile civilizations.

And I think that's the impoverishment of Mr. Toynbee's whole vision. He cannot distinguish the Christian era from the non-Christian era. He muddles this, or confuses it. There is some definite limit to our secular engulfment.

In Christianity there is freedom.

(I guess we also have to take into consideration that whose viewpoint looking at him as a traitor. Like your friend from Germany, maybe the people over there or his friends might consider him traitorous.)

I don't think so. They might not understand him. They might stand aghast that a man has this in him. This resistance.

But no.

2

(Well, in the Civil War did they consider brothers that fought against each other?)

Well, Robert E. Lee was not a traitor, was he?

(No, but brothers who had fought with each other consider -- ?)

Not a traitor. They would weep. It's not the same thing. All these things are very painful. Of course, in this country, life must be always must be "keep smiling." Life is tragic. That's something quite different.

The Cross is tragic. Jesus had to die on the Cross. That's a tragedy. But it is nothing of treason. He didn't betray His people. From the point of view, He was condemned for high treason.

But you don't accept that. That's the whole problem of Christianity. He betrayed the Jewish tradition of the Messiah. Of course, He did. No doubt about it, that He was guilty according to the Jewish law. Have you ever considered that? He had to be condemned.

3

(Judas was the big traitor.)

We say Judas is the traitor. That's the difference. That's the whole reversal. You must understand that a completely new humanity has entered the field with Christianity. This kind of men have not existed before. It's a new creation.

Your whole lack of education comes from the fact that you live now in the fifty years which have tried to desegregate the Christian era, and say there is no such thing as a Christian era. There are civilizations.

Well, gentlemen, if you are just in an American civilization, I certainly don't wish to live in any one part of God created me, God help me, and if there are five continents, that doesn't alter the fact that I cannot live as a member of one continent. He created Heaven and earth; that's the first sentence we learn. Doesn't this mean that we are part of His creation, that if we are parts of His creation, no one country can constrain myself?

Otherwise how can missionaries go out into the world? That's why missions today are no longer understood in this world.

4

The isolationism has gotten the upper hand, mentally, of you. You talk big about aiding other countries, but the whole structure of education in this country is nearly making it impossible for aiming at anything more than becoming an American.

That's not enough. You're going pagan at this moment. That's exactly, that's why Plato and Aristotle must no longer be read in colleges, and so on. They're doing harm, because it's pure-blooded paganism without this criticism, which Christianity applied to the ancients over the last hundreds of years, knowing that people were first brought up as Christians; then in addition, they read Plato, looking back into something through a mirror, or through glasses.

Now you learn anthropology from Margaret Mead, and you learn Greek from Mr. Durants -- and you never hear what Christianity stands for, and so you are sunk.

CHAPTER THREE: DRESSES AND DISHWASHING

I

1

Paganism is on the advance in this country. The churches invent holidays, like Joseph the *Worker's Day*, and Mr. Eisenhower invents *Law Day*. That's just as in Athens. They did the same. That's mythical, has nothing anymore to do with any function of the Church. It's just arbitrary.

2

All the institutions which try to give you the Christian era now function in a nationalistic way. Missions are giving up. They are withdrawn.

In China, there are no missions anymore. And as long as the missions represented the American faith and the unanimity of the human race, you could still despite the flag in the churches here -- the American flag over the altar, or in front of the altar -- you could still believe that Christianity was preached here.

But with the missions cut off, practically, and abandoned, and no longer popular in this country, there is nothing in American Christianity, which is really holding out against your idea -- it's the Mormon ideal that only the Americans are Christians. All others are wicked. They are Communist, or nationalist. And the only good people in the world are the Americans.

Well, that's exactly what the Greeks did.

3

With this word "democracy," you have broken faith with all the other countries who believe that political forms are not important, that you can have a monarchy and just be as much a child of God as when you are a democrat. You have this substitute.

The American democracy is the only religion that is at this moment recognized by the American people.

That's pure paganism.

Christianity says all political organizations are temporary, are second-rate.

They are not the real thing. They come and go.

They are good in their time, for their age, and you must be loyal. That's why Paul says that you have to obey the powers that be. It just comes from God. That's historically -- but it is nothing you must put your faith in, because the political power there can be very wicked indeed, can become a despot. And you have to sacrifice your life in order to renew it.

4

But I think it has all to do with each other. It's this dread; first it was, "I must be 150 percent American," then you abolish all the means by which the schools and the education remind you that you cannot be 150 percent American in the Christian era. And after you have cut down all the measures, the guarantees, which would keep this ship of state within the human race, then you no longer imbibe this spirit.

THE STORY OF ONE YEAR SPENT ABROAD

I have advocated, as some of you may know, that everybody needs to spend one year abroad in order to replace this language requirement, by affirming his faith, that he belongs to a wider society than just the local one.

II

1

Well, let's go back to the traitor, the world of traitors.

Can you give me some? What you should have done, I didn't want to spell it out, because I thought you should have done it yourself. You're so lazy, you won't do it.

So you should write down -- point by point, chapter after chapter -- the sequence in which Solon and Pericles are treated. And you would find out an interesting scheme, which Plutarch simply follows in every biography. And then you would see immediately that these are qualities which he dispenses. And it is not a biography in our sense of the word.

Could we do this? Let's look it up now, and go to the Pericles. Did anybody make such a scheme, perhaps? Would anybody be good enough to volunteer? Did you?

(I left it at home.)

Oh. How do you recall?

(I don't remember. His first one was a genealogy)

2

Now you all take a sheet, let us try to reconstrue this. This is really worthwhile, because it gives you a foil.

You will understand that really, when we go to the pagan world, they may create systems and pictures, and whenever you speak of your own language as mental pictures, you are a pagan. That's a typically pagan word today, to speak of "mental pictures". And a man who's under the impact of the spirit would never call his language "mental picture" -- I do not paint "mental pictures."

Speech is dramatic, and commanding, and imperious. It's certainly not picturesque. That's a by-product. And certainly not painting pictures, because I want to move you. And I don't want to stabilize you. But in front of a picture, you stand, or you sit.

(I just read a very interesting article by a Herbert Palmer, in Beverly Hills. The title goes something like, "Counteracting -- The Pictorial Influences in Education." It shows the idolatry of the picture. And it isn't only of photographs and of audio-visual aids, but also of the attempt, even in language, to create strong visual --.)

Whenever you hear a noun used instead of a verb, you are going pagan.

That's very interesting. The child must be educated through verbs, because a child will only understand anything that's told to him really, existentially, when it has done or failed to do what the verb implies. If you say, "Stand," or "Understand," to a child, and it has to stand for an hour until it's tired, it knows what standing means. But if you say "standpoint," the child learns this word by heart, whether in English, or in a foreign language that he learns, it is nothing.

And so it is with "Dress."

3

A dress is something for vanity. When you talk of three hundred dresses in your drawer, there's one thing that's missing, usually. And if you demand from a child to dress, and follow this whole process of dressing, until the child understands what it means to dress, it will also develop the sense what is necessary in dress, and what is vain.

But it is only by dressing that you can draw the line between idiotic dressing and good dressing, and right dressing, and vainglorious dressing. And so the three hundred dresses can only be prevented by the imperative, "Dress," by which a child is told that our humanity gives us liberty under dress.

4

Why do we dress, gentlemen? So that we may gain time.

The physical being is just who he is. Whether you are in *lust, love, hunger, illness*, the dress conceals this. All these minor movements of your body are concealed so that the main stations of your life can be lived by you.

The dress allows you to treat your life as a unity. If we would go naked, we would completely be overtaken by the moment. Even a baby is dressed so that it has time to grow and become a full-fledged being. If it was just an animal, it would be sold as the slaves were on the slave market, naked. Because they were just sold for what they were worth at this moment. Weight, and width, and so on.

III

1

And watch out. We are moving again in paganism, because in any description of a man, it is immediately said, "Five feet 7, and tall, and 145 pounds, and a brunette," and so on. This is unheard-of. Infamous. That's not the person.

The person is some person who is protected against all these momentary, passing stages of his life, because the dress and the name make a unity, give him a biography to this person. She can outgrow any one of these phases. That's what the dress does. Distinguish between the lasting, the permanent in you, and the passing.

2

And therefore, a child must learn to dress. But it must not be shown, as they are in all these wicked suburbs today, all the dresses his mother has, or her mother has. Like the domestic servants mutually boast of the many dresses the lady has, the boss has. They take each other to each other, drawers and drawers and chests, and say, "Oh, my lady has many corsets."

That's a total misunderstanding.

3

THE STORY OF CHILDREN ABSOLUTELY CORRUPTED

I know children who are absolutely corrupted already, because they do show each other the number of their dresses. And they have not learned to concentrate on the process of dressing. That's the great honor of humanity. Thereby you become a political being, and a future voter, and a future president, that you dress right.

But today, you all want to go naked, because dressing means nothing to you, in this naturalistic world. Jean-Jacques Rousseau has conquered your mind. You all think that to

be naked would be the ideal state. It would condemn you never to be able to slough off your present state and become somebody different.

And that's why old age has no honor. In old age, the dress has found expression in the spirit of this man, and his body no longer matters.

4

So why? Because the imperative, "Dress," would be dynamic, would teach the child how much it takes, or how little, how precise dressing is. As soon as you speak of "Dress," you get the plural. And the difference in education between pluralism and singleness of purpose is that singleness of purpose educates, and pluralism -- many dresses distracts, confuses.

All of you are intellectual stammerers and stutterers, because you think three hundred is better than one. But obviously, if you put on one dress right, it's much more important than to have three hundred dresses.

IV

1

(Another striking example comes to mind.

A professor very recently was explaining the idea of operational definition. And he had the gall to give as an example: a child always -- he said this is a very childish concept, the operational definition, because if you ask any child, "What is?" to define something, such as a spoon, he will always give you an operational definition, because he'll tell you, "Well, a spoon is for eating." And children tend to do this; they tend to explain things in terms of its function, and in terms of what it does. The action. So a dress is for putting on. And he was ridiculing this. Being a good Aristotelian, he wanted to classify either in terms --.)

That's how you destroy mankind. The devil has gotten the upper hand in school. You are in hell.

2

If you want to understand the thing, cling to this expression: Children are liturgical.

That is, they want to execute, enact, and they want to be allowed by this execution to participate in society.

And therefore, in the liturgy, the thing that the intellectual pious, or the intellectual stoic - or whatever you are -- doesn't understand is for the child the most important: the fact that the priest in the Catholic Mass has to wipe off the chalice and to clean it. Water it -- and

then clean it. Use it -- the towel - that everything has to be put back again strikes the modern adult as childish.

And he thinks the Mass is ridiculed by this very prosaic act that something is dirty, and something has to be cleansed again. Dishwashing.

But for a child, this is a tremendous discovery, this cycle, this rotation of actions, by which an act is finished.

You and I, you go to the restaurant, and you make their dishes dirty. And you never think that in making it dirty, there is already included the necessity of cleaning it again. So that he who makes it dirty also must wash it up.

That's what the priest is doing.

3

THE STORY OF UNDERSTANDING THE MEANING OF MASS

And to me, the only way in which I can today build up an understanding of the meaning of Mass, is not the secrets that go on, on the altar, but the fact that in front of the faithful, the priest has to clean up this mess, by admitting that we are earthly, by admitting that we are creatures. We are of this earth. And therefore the whole process has to be sanctified and not just the one by which we enjoy ourselves, eating and drinking.

But the same with the dishwashing. And that's just as important, and should just be honored as the taking out of the dishes, and putting on a wonderful linen, and adorning the table.

And in this country -- we are quite good-natured -- the guests do go out and help, doing the dishes, in recognizing this liturgical cycle.

4

And so we are much better people in fact than our mental instruction. I think the schools are lagging behind the real fact of life, because it's a great fact that guests in this country wash the dishes. That isn't done in Europe, where you have servants. Or at least allegedly servants. The poor woman has to do it afterwards. Here, we go out -- after all, you do - and help them wash the dishes.

Well, there you are on the right track, because the all the acts that belong to the noun, "dishes," or "food," or "meal," are enacted by you. And as long as...

...observe, it takes to act out one social action, you are on the same side, because the definition "meal," will not mean anything to you, except operational --

Phil, you are wonderful, this example. The meal can only be defined by operations. It should not be defined by anything else. It just is.

CHAPTER FOUR: ONE THING BEGETS THE OTHER

I

1

That's why all the tribes of antiquity, the primitives, are so superior to us, because they have more verbs than nouns.

THE STORY OF THE GOTHIC NEW TESTAMENT

I went into this. The Greek New Testament was translated into the Gothic language by the famous Woffinger Bible. And people have counted the stem-verbs used in the Greek, and the stem verbs, the original verbs like "go," "dress," "march" in Gothic. And there are 25 percent more original verbs in Gothic than in Greek.

Now Greek is the richest language we have of our Indo-European languages, we thought. It's very rich. But it cannot hold the candle to this much older, and allegedly primitive language of the Goths, who had no writing. It's the first book which was put in writing in Gothic in 400 of our era. And they have 25 percent more verbs.

2

But just gone. They have the word "cut." They didn't have the word "sect," "sectarianism," "sectioning," "dissecting", "section", "sects." We have no made many nouns out of this one word, "sect," which means "to cut" in Latin. So we are bounding in nouns. But we become concrete.

THE STORY OF THE NOVEL "CONCRETE"

The Russians have a famous novel, by Gladkov which I recommend very much to you. It's called *Concrete*, and it shows how the personal life in Russia is smothered, and people become part of concrete.

But I feel that's exactly what's happening in this country. The modern mass and corporation life makes man into concrete. And the expression of this, that we try to teach your children nouns.

You must never do this.

3

We need to *learn to listen, to obey, to hear* -- that is, to imbibe a language, which after all is the spoken word, which you can only learn as an auditor, it takes seven years. A child has only learned to speak after it has obeyed sufficiently long to know what it costs to carry out one order. Because the meaning of any verb is -

you say, "It rains." Now the child must have experienced all the consequences of rain:

that you get wet;
that the seed begins to grow;
that you have to close the windows;
and you have to put on a raincoat;
and that you have to dry this raincoat again afterwards;
that the rain passes;
that it comes either unannounced, or announced.

This all has to do with the word "Rain -- It rains." The word "rain" is an abstraction, although you think it is not.

4

The only act that the child must learn to understand is "It rains". It must experience that after rain, there comes sunshine before it can understand this proverb, saying, "silver lining," et cetera. "It rains" therefore rules all the experiences connected with rain, including the noun --"rain"-- as with "dress".

II

1

THE STORY OF INTRODUCING PRAYER

My wife wanted to introduce prayer to our boy in an understandable way. So she took him to the kitchen, and prepared a special cake. And he was allowed to bake it. And since this was quite extraordinary, with the raisins and the plums, and everything used, and the icing, he was very excited. And so in this excitement, she took the occasion, and said, "Now let's thank". And there was never a prayer before.

Now in this excitement, he found it only natural that something special had happened, and you had to praise the Lord. And from then on, he had experience in the act that prayer was not something silly put on from the outside as a ritual. But it was liturgical in this excitement, it burst forth as the logical consequence of the acts in which he had been involved. It followed.

Like in rain, you have to put on the raincoat, you make the special dish, and you have to do something special about your excitement, that you have succeeded.

2

We are sick and dead, because every one thing is defined out in Aristotelianism, by itself. That's impossible. Don't believe it for a minute. Every thing you allegedly know, is a moment in time, experienced in a sequence of events.

THE STORY OF THE WORD "THING"

The very word "thing" - may I tell you this? -- is originally meaning "time" and not "thing." It didn't mean "chair," but it meant "now."

You are all killed by the word "thing." You even call God a thing. You think that He likes this? That's blasphemy.

But I have seen it discussed: "What is God?" As soon as you say, "What is God?" you blaspheme. You can only ask "Who is God?" "What is man?" You can't ask this question. You can only ask "Who is man?"

It's a very interesting fact; in the Bible, there is in the New Testament somewhere the question, "Who is this man?" "Who is --."

("... *Thou*" or "*What is man ...*")

3

Oh, towards God we are dust. We are "what." That's quite correct.

I've written a whole book on this, so where to say "What?" and where to say "Who?"

No, there is in the New Testament the question "Who?" "Who is that man?" And the King James Version and Luther, both in English and German, fall from grace and translate it -- although it says in Greek, "Who?" -- "What is this man?"

Then you never get the right answer. If you ask not "Who is this man?" but "What is this man?" you already fall into thingness, into deadness, into neutrality, into description.

You don't see it as a moment in history, of this hour. He is now who -- the speaker of the hour. "Who is the president of the United States?" means "Who is allowed to put his name under the laws which are binding to you and me?"

4

Well, what I'm trying to say at this moment is that to learn a language does not consist of learning three hundred words, or thousands words.

Basic English is again, such an act of real paganism -- because it takes years to understand the processes suggested, I may say, by the one verb. The consequences of any one verb involve you in the whole process of creation, where there is winter, there is summer; where there is rain, there is sunshine. But you have to experience this by the act, by the actuality with which they follow each other and beget each other.

III

1

In politics, you will always see that rabble-rousing in the long run leads to another opposite rabble-rousing. You get McCarthy, and then you get the opposite swing of the pendulum. That is, anybody who is only educated by nouns, will always believe in what happens at this moment.

And it is only experience which shows you the limitations that all these verbs are processes that exhaust themselves and beget their very opposite, that you can be taught, that you can experience anything.

A child that hasn't yet learned the opposite of every word that it is told obviously is still misunderstanding obedience.

2

THE STORY OF OBEDIENCE

There's a tragic case of a neighbor of mine had a wonderful boy of four or five years. And the child was brought up very obediently, and ran against an electric wire, because the father had taught him to obey, but the child had never seen the relativity of an angry command that the father could counteract, it was too late. The child was terribly hurt, because the father in vain tried to stop the child, running towards him. The child hadn't yet experienced the limited meaning of every one command that a command wasn't absolute.

This again can only be learned by experience.

3

THE STORYX OF EDUCATIONAL CAMPS

I have tried to run educational camps in which

*work would beget discussion;
discussion would beget art;
art would beget eating;
and eating would beget sleeping.*

That is, what you need today is to see that there is not art by itself, and sports by themselves, and politics by themselves. But when a group is together, you have to have drama in the evening, or singing, because one thing begets the other.

4

As soon as we would see this again, education would become a process, instead of being a thing with credits and marks, to be put away on your diploma. That is not the story. But one thing begets the other.

*Because we sleep, we want to get up.
Because we get up, we want to work.
Because we work, we want to think.
Because we think, we want to discuss.
Because we discuss, we want to explain.*

On it goes. Every one department of life begets the other department.

And that can only be done if you see these are verbs. If you say, "Get up," you also imply, that twelve hours later, you must hear in your ear the command, "Go to bed." One and the other are reciprocal.

And this is destroyed in our whole system of thinking today, that one thing doesn't beget the other. But it's just an enumeration of possibilities, as we call them. Opportunities.

(Smorgasbord.)

Yes, exactly. Department store. In your mind the life is a department store, while it is a marching order.

IV

1

Now let's go back to Plutarch. There is much more to be said about this. But the Greeks moved in the direction from the verbs towards the nouns. And I think we are today obliged to move back from the nouns towards the verbs.

That is why at this moment, the Greeks -- I think at this moment, they don't help us. I was brought up on Greek, and saturated with it, I can only tell you. But Aristotle and Plato certainly today are enemies of education.

2

With the washing of the sacred vessels, the cup and the plate in the church, from there can start it, and make the child see how inescapable, inexorable, the circulation, the movement is, once you enter the social order.

You wouldn't have any juvenile delinquents if you would bring up the children on imperatives, and not on nouns. We produce these juvenile delinquents every day in reams. A teacher who ridicules a child by operational definitions, throws out this child out of its own reality.

(Well, of course he was a bachelor.)

When you hear a man say, "Define your terms," just laugh him in the face. We have to speak. And afterwards, somebody else can define our terms. But when a mother says to the child, "Dress," it is absolutely unnecessary that she can define what it means to dress. She only has to insist that the child dresses. That's all there is to it.

Speech is all first-rate, and not second-rate. I never can define my terms. I hope I cannot. Because the language, that's the very thing. There is no other word "Get up." As soon as I can synonymize it, it has no longer any unique character.

3

You can only define when you assume that for every word there are synonyms. And I assure you, there is no synonym for your proper name. You are just this one unique sequence. And if you allow yourself to believe that your name can have a synonym, you cannot be loved. Because you expect that one woman will say that you are the only one.

And all our self-realization, all our incarnation in this world depends on this fact that there are no synonyms.

I think that's the greatest heresy, all this Aristotelianism -- again, I've written a whole chapter on this -- there are no synonyms. And if ever your mother, or your father, or your

friend has shouted at you with your own and very name, especially in great danger, you know that there are no synonyms for all the important language. For indifferent things, where you can use a spoon as well as a fork, well, then --. The deader the things are, the more synonyms.

You can have a refrigerator, you can have an natural-ice plant. But even there you call one thing a "refrigerator," and the other you call the "icebox."

I think you can catch every modern heresy by seeing that this man thinks that there is for everything a synonym. But then language wouldn't be a creation.

There are no synonyms.

4

THE STORY OF AN OLD ITALIAN ART HISTORIAN

An old historian of art wrote a book on Italian art, and being an Italian himself, a famous man in Italy, he said that a peasant in Tuscany didn't know what a synonym was, that every word had its unique use. And that's why he spoke such wonderful Italian, because there couldn't be an inappropriate word. That was just impossible. Every word stood for what it said, and you could not replace it by any other word.

SECOND PART: TO RISK ONE'S LIFE

CHAPTER ONE: MOVIE STAR AND MADONNA

I

1

And that's education.

And you are all made mental paralytics, because you are taught that for everything, there are many synonyms. That's sloppy. There is for every truth that is really filling you, only one way of saying it.

That we call eloquence. An eloquent word is the one word that has to be said at this moment, and nothing else. The rest is rhetorics and oratory. That's found like a nightgown, slovenly.

2

THE STORY OF GREAT POETRY

But you feel in all great poetry: if a man writes to his sweetheart a poem, it can only be said at this moment, in this pain that they are in, or in this despair, in this one way to comfort the heart. And there is no other way. You cannot transcribe a poem into synonyms. It has ceased to be what it is.

And in all ways of life, people know -

THE STORY OF THE INSERTED COMMA

I have a friend in my neighborhood. She's a lawyer, a great lawyer. And they sent her from New York a will written by the richest woman in town, in Woodstock, Vermont. There's a town where retired rich people live. And the lady was 95 of age, so it was quite an event. And the estate was of \$50 or \$60 million. And so her will had to be fireproof. And this New York office -- by the famous firm, sent it to the local lawyer. She was an assistant lawyer, this woman lawyer, to correct it, or to criticize it, make amendments. And she sent back that she would like to have a comma inserted in two places. That was all she had to say.

And they wrote back and said they were very interested in her remarks. But they felt that in such an important document, it should be understood without commas. And they had managed now following her suggestion, the comma wouldn't make any difference, because the will had to come out in a unique and unmistakable fashion, and you couldn't depend on comma -- on interpunctuation. That was too mediocre. If the judge should then

have to base his criterion on the comma, and interpreted it one way or the other. It had to be much more unambiguous than just to be decided by commas, one way or the other.

3

And I think that's a very wonderful story, because it shows you the power of language, even in a legal document, that this is nothing to be tampered with. You cannot replace any one term there, or any one sentence by any synonym. It has to be said in this one way in which it will make sense and law.

And try to write your letters this way and you will become very eloquent indeed.

You will always find that when there is no way out, man does his best.

As soon as you give a man leeway and say he can do it in ten ways, he'll never do it well. It's always for the excellency one way of doing it. And that makes a document an outstanding document. That makes the Gettysburg Address a real Gettysburg Address, that you feel that couldn't have been said in any other way than just this.

4

So no synonyms.

II

1

Now the Greeks were always, being Aristotelians, on the way out, tried this, but the name of the hero is the unique thing. Prometheus is still Prometheus. Pericles is still Pericles. They can be compared with each other, but still there is an unrelinquishable category by which the named characters cannot be transferred into Camillus. You just can't.

Let's go now back.

2

You had some -- Sir. You have something?

(Well, I was thinking -- before even the genealogy, Plutarch talks about of a virtue, and I can probably show us that these men were very concerned with reason as a --.)

Quite right. Yes. I think the introduction to the Pericles deserves your greatest care and attention. You are absolutely right, because it is an attempt to classify under these philosophical terms and categories. That's Greek.

Now what are his tenets there? This introduction is very strange.

What is his general denominator? Isn't there a hierarchy of values in the first chapter? What are they? What is his hierarchy?

(Well, first of all, knowledge, and the virtue of knowledge should not be a pursuit of knowledge just for knowledge's sake, but knowledge pursued as a means for some further end, perhaps happiness.)

3

Well, isn't there a whole hierarchy? what's the first story? Here. And then however there is a whole climax. These are the story of the apes. What does he say?

There's a hierarchy for observation. The highest is not then what we -- here, ...children, and the next is virtues. And if you go excellently, this would have A, and this would have B, and this would have C. Isn't that right? As I read it.

The whole chapter is, after all -- what is his whole reasoning about the first chapter? What does King Phillip say? Because we have to insert here still another A-1. Isn't that very strange that his introduction to Pericles -- we should be warned that it's neither apes which we see and admire, nor children, nor just arts. There is a complete contempt of the Muses.

What does King Phillip say to his son?

It's a very great saying, gentlemen. For you it's very hard to understand. What does he say to Alexander? "Are you not ashamed to be so good at play?"

(Just what I was saying. "I would not have changed his ... sing so loudly.")

I know it as singing. Singing is playing.

4

THE STORY OF TALLULAH BANKHEAD

When I learned that Tallulah Bankhead was the daughter of the speaker of the House of Congress, I pitied the father. I thought she had stepped down. In this country, now, where you have movie stars setting the pace for this country, you live in an absolutely bastardized world, because the imitators make law.

But to be an actor is not the same as to be president. And it's very hard for you to understand that even the Greeks were very religious people, very austere people, and that Pericles, as an actor, just couldn't be measured in the same way. This is for you very hard to understand, because all your standards come from the stage. A movie actress has today the court of the nation. She is the Court of St. James.

(A courtesan.)

Of course, a courtesan -- it has been said. And you must know -- this is very charming.

III

1

It's very serious, gentlemen. Men have no standards of behavior, because the serious man Mr. Kennedy is now treated as though he was a movie star. That is, the people mention those features in his appearance which would befit Elizabeth Taylor. And you are meant to elect him president because he looks like a good movie actor.

That's a complete perversion.

Everything stands on its head at this moment in this country, because they have the limelight. But you will still understand that a father might prefer to have a daughter marry a good man and having five children than to go to Hollywood. And that he throws up his hands in despair as soon as she appears in Hollywood, since she's hasn't disgraced herself, but she has just made her life more miserable and more dangerous, at least.

2

Now this is the expression in Plutarch.

In play-acting is no virtue. There may be knowledge, there may be skill, there may be in this perfection of the artisan, of the craftsman in a stage play, but it's not virtue.

Because to play Hamlet is less virtuous than to act Hamlet out in life.

3

That shows you that an ape is naked, and is of the moment. The child is already dressed. The actor and the artisan -- the craftsman is dealt with the commodity, the goods he delivers, the furnished. But the virtuous man is contained in his whole life from birth to death. And there is nothing outside, no commodity he produces, no dress he wears, and no natural body heat he represents in the zoological garden.

And this climax is quite instructive. I have rated A-1 and A-2, because A-1 in humanity is concentration on single acts, on commodities, or on plays. You play, you sing; and you are -- for the song you deliver you are paid -- "gainfully employed". But you are left out. But now he means by "virtue" the whole person is more than anything he can deliver.

4

THE STORY OF THE ARTS

And the arts and the commodities we produce are of the moment. You go to a play -- never forget this -- the poor actor who has to deliver Hamlet within three hours in the evening is only condensing in a form of a pill, in a semblance, the real life that goes on for fifty years. Obviously the life of fifty years is more difficult to live than the delivering the good in one evening. That's a small edition. Or not even a small edition. It's a -- how would you call it? -- an abbreviation, semblance of the life.

And the poor man, most actors are melancholic, because on the stage they have to be cheerful, so they have to take it out somewhere. So they are melancholic.

IV

1

THE STORY OF A PSYCHIATRIST IN HOLLYWOOD

And you know the story of the psychiatrist here in Hollywood, when somebody came and said he was so melancholic. And the psychiatrist said, "Well, then go to the play tonight. You'll laugh your head off." And he says, "Yes. I'm the comedian."

(A few lines later, after he mentions this comment that Philip made to his little boy, he discusses the fact that you are being nothing but a slave to anything which is so mechanical employment, and therefore the sign of inattention to something which is much more noble, within your own self, rather than aiding or being assisted other things in order to be a success.)

Ja, well. The strange, static character of the Greek comes out, that he tries to define this greatness by a static concept, and not by the biography. I would express it, saying a whole life, seventy years, the phases, or the chapters of your development, or whatever you call it. The Greeks cannot say this, but they try to put over -

let's read this today. Will you read it? "If a man..." Will you read it out loud?

"If a man applies himself to servile or mechanical employment, his empathy in noticing the proof of his inattention to his nobler studies."

Go on. Go ahead.

"No young man of high birth or liberal sentiment, who would, upon seeing the statue of Jupiter at ..., desire to be"

2

Well, the Latin is Fabius and the Greek is Faibias, and I don't at this moment here He is so famous that you simply have to comply with what is usual. How did he?

("Fabius" is the usual sound.)

Fabius, in the old Latin tradition.

"Or in the sight of the Juno and oracles to be Polycleitus, or wish to be Anachrion or Thimitus or Archilotus --?"

Archilochus.

"Archilochus, though he ... great poem. For though a work may be agreeable ... for the authors not the necessary consequence. We may therefore conclude that things of this kind, which excite not a spirit of emulation or produce any strong impulse or desire to imitate them, are of little use to the beholders.

But virtue has its peculiar properties, that at the same time as we admire her conduct, we long to copy the example. The goods of fortune we wish to enjoy, the virtue we desire to practice. The former we are glad to receive from others; the latter we are ambitious that others should receive from us. The beauty of goodness has an attractive power. It kindles us at once an act of principle, it forms our manners and influences our desires. Not only when represented in a living example, but even in an historical description."

3

I think there's a terribly important notion, which in our modern ethics are not even mentioned. America is sick with morality and ethics. I don't believe that ethics is a course, or thinking. I've always all my life defied it.

Christianity came into the world to show that life had to be fruitful, and not ethical.

What is fruitful, what deserves to bear fruit that we shall decide. It can be inconspicuous. But if it is fruitful, it's important. Fruitful mothers are inconspicuous. Movie stars are not fruitful. They have to adopt children. And I mean this.

This modern fashion that you all have to be so slim is just a attempt to make the sterile woman the type, instead of the fruitful woman. And it's terrible. Women must have hips, but they are not allowed to have hips. They all have to look like boys in this country, because you have the movie star ideal.

It's a wrong ideal of beauty. Because it is of the moment, and not of the race, not of the continuity of humanity. And a Madonna has to give you the feeling that she may have children.

4

Well, this is all movie-star business; and here in Los Angeles, you should be the first to shake it off, because you are here at the source, and you can look through all this.

CHAPTER TWO: ETHICS AND VIRTUE

I

1

Now virtue in the Greek sense then means -- even the word "attractive" and "imitation" is too poor -- to produce sequence, to have consequences. And this is terribly important that Plutarch should say, "At least my heroes produce offspring, spiritual offspring". "They are irresistible".

2

Whereas if I look at at the statue of Athene, I feel helpless. I'll never be able to make an Athene, but if I read the life of a great man, I know that although I am not placed in the same position -- the decisions he has to make, *the hardship, the power, of courage, and virtue*, they are identical. It's very hard even to find the word -- I think the word "fruitful" is still or "fecund" -- although even the word "fruitful" would not tell you that you are the man who bears the fruit. "Fruitful" is still so abstract.

But any reader of a biography is expected, to get going, to be moved, as we say.

Now to be moved is not sentimental. But it means literally to be moved, that is, to be transformed, to be changed into somebody who hadn't been before, because he didn't even know that this existed, this type of humanity.

3

So we learn by biography, according to Plutarch. I think that's very important. That's the best of the Greek spirit. We are moved upon a highway of life, where you keep going, as on a freeway, where you have to go thirty miles an hour, and you cannot just sit by and drink. Have to keep going. It is this mobilization of your energy which Plutarch here says is the meaning of his biography.

4

So he does admit from this point of view a concerted effort of mankind, an accumulation of effort. Although once you are set going, everything in the Greek mind is more or less then pagan. He does admit -- and this is the funny thing: the tremendous power of the Greeks is in education. They still think that the influence of somebody else -- that's the one thing they will admit that can transform you.

II

1

That's why education is their obsession. The beauty, the love of the master, the love of Socrates makes Plato. And there you have to do them justice. This is the best part of them.

For the rest, I couldn't agree. But with this enthusiasm for the example for a young man, they went overboard. That's why the friendship between men is their one overbearing passion, to the point of homosexuality.

But the first thing is emulation.

2

Never use the word "imitation." That's aping. The translation is wrong, young lady. You should understand. You cannot imitate virtue. In the sense that you take something external and copy it. And the word "copy" that she uses, again, very misleading. "Virtue" means literally "power."

You don't know this, but "virtuous" is much more a process in Latin and Greek than it is in our language. Virtue in Greek is the power to act justly.

3

THE STORY OF LYING

And I once was asked to write an article *on lying, on mendacity, hypocrisy*. And I said it's a question of power, and not of morals. Most people lie because they are so weak to tell the truth at this moment. It's not a question that they wouldn't like to tell the truth, but they don't have the power to tell the truth. It's a question of strength.

This was the meaning also of virtue. To be veracious means to be very strong, to be unafraid. Because what does it help you? You know that you should tell the truth, but you just haven't the strength in a party to break up there the polite form by telling an unpleasant truth. And so you may not positively lie, but you allow another man's lie to stand up.

And if you think how many lies are told at any cocktail party, it's just unbelievable. Or untruths, to put it mildly. Because people are drunk, and therefore they don't have the moral strength to tell the truth.

4

(Is this something Aristotle meant when he said to act on virtue is an activity of the soul, and --?)

That our danger is, that we treat ethics, the ethical qualities, as mere binding qualities, and not as processes.

III

1

(Would you explain that a little more? I'm kind of lost on this difference between ethics and virtue. I don't see a sharp distinction to make here, because of --)

Well -- today the modern ethics course.

THE STORY OF ETHICS

I have a colleague who teaches at Riverside, and he has written a book on ethics. And I argued the point, time and again. He used to be my colleague out -- east. And he is an Aristotelian. And he thinks that he can define justice; and he can define goodness; and he can define all these things.

And the American hankering for such a nice dictionary of ethics is very great. And I think it has ruined the American character. Destroyed the American character. And all *soldiers, and adventurers, explorers, inventors, and pioneers* had to break away from this because action comes first. You are engaged in a certain network, you can't take out a book on ethics and find out whether you should shoot a horse thief in Wyoming. There is no such list of actions, one or the other.

2

It's innomine. It's without name in every moment where you have to decide.

You cannot act by definitions. This is my whole objection against ethics. It's a primary discovery of what you have to do now, and must be remain undefined. They can define it afterwards what you have done. But you have to do it, and not looking up in a book how this is defined.

3

THE STORY OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

My topic yesterday in class about this difference between our standing by our commitments to the destruction of Europe in the First World War by giving up the Austrian-Hungarian empire, giving up the Ottoman empire, then we had to stand by our commitment, and cannot go home and say, "We have done nothing. Good-bye," as we did. Instead, we replaced it by an ethical concept of the *League of Nations*, which was an abstract

concept taken from the book of good behavior, and had nothing to do with our real involvement, and our actual commitment in certain places, and in certain actions.

Where we had destroyed the political structure of a whole continent, we had to make sure that there could be another structure. This was our commitment. But it was a definite commitment to these acts, but not a definable abstract commitment to virtue as a nice behavior in the vacuum.

4

This was yesterday's topic in my class. Did anybody attend except you, Phil? Well, you don't --.

All American politics are destroyed by this ethical concept of "peace-loving" and "We'll never attack." And all this.

(Lone Rangerism. Do a good deed and run away.)

THE STORY OF AN OLD LADY IN FRANKFURT

Was an old lady in Frankfurt, in Germany. When I had a terrible fight there, she always said -- I had tried really to do something difficult, but not, I thought, not necessary.

She said, "Do no good, lest nothing bad arises from it". She says the do-gooders are always producing terrible results, because they intend to do good. But that's not the way to act.

IV

1

What? Would you?

(Harry Truman said his grandfather once told him a story that whenever you're in church, and you hear a whole bunch of "Amens" coming from one of the corners, he says you'd better go home and lock your stock in. That was in a speech here.)

Well, he knows it, obviously.

2

If the writer, the historian, does not look up to *legislators, and soldiers, and explorers, and creators, and priests*, he is lost. But if he wants to have this -- "all men are born equal and free," but the functions in society are not all equal, and to be the leader of man in battle must be admitted by the biographer to be more honorable, more difficult than to write a

book. And today, there is a complete confusion, and that's why I think the intellectual doesn't find his place in society, because we are told that the actor in Hollywood is better than the composer.

Or more important -- you find this very often in the last thirty years, at least, you had a worship of the conductor instead of the composer. Who was this man with "*Fantasia*" --?

(Shostakovich. I mean, Stokowski.)

Such a madman was valued higher than the composers who had written the music which he produced. Oh, what is a conductor?

And in this country, all the producers, as the word says, ranking above the scriptwriter, the producer is the man. The conductor is the man. The actor is the man here. And I think that therefore the man who really is the creative genius always had to emigrate from this country and find this recognition in Europe.

3

I read you this sentence by Herman Melville. He has said we prefer now ... themes for authors, instead of promoting our authors in this country.

And that's probably true. But you must understand that this again, a Barnum & Bailey is more important than Jenny Lind. And Jenny Lind is more important than Schubert whose songs she sang in this country. You have heard of Jenny Lind, perhaps. She was the first artist to produce on a large scale in this country.

4

And so you have in Plutarch this strange humility that he admits that writing the life of such a man is the easier task, compared to living it. And this scale of values is, in all of us today threatened.

CHAPTER THREE: SERVICEABLE?

I

1

THE STORY OF GOODSPEED

Here's a man called Goodspeed. He's the greatest liberal theologian of the New Testament in this country. And he can't get over the fact that Jesus didn't write a book. And so in his mind, John, and Luke, and so, are far superior to Jesus, who didn't write. And he goes so far to prove that He obviously only didn't write, because He never learned how to write and read. So he was illiterate.

So that's the outcome of this wonderful idea that if a man can write and read, he would prefer to write a book than found a religion. And Jesus wouldn't have been

2

THE STORY OF THE IMITATION OF CHRIST

Jesus if He had cared to write a book, because it would have shown lack of faith. If you have to write a book, then you don't believe -- the life, as Plutarch says, will be so powerful, that everybody has to imitate Christ. However, 1300 years later, there was written a book, *The Imitation of Christ*, in which it was just shown that you couldn't escape the imprint of this life, and you wouldn't like to follow in the footsteps of the master. It's a condition that He didn't write a book. Because His real faith could only shine if He relied on this imprint of His life, and didn't propagate it programatically by a theory of what you should do.

3

THE STORY OF THE GREATEST ACT OF FAITH OF JESUS

So this country is standing on its head today. The greatest achievement, the greatest act of faith of Jesus was that He didn't put His ideas in a book, but left it to the Apostles and the evangelists and said, "That will come later." He had only three years to live, and He couldn't spend any moment of this in going to a desk and using ink. He had to write it in blood, sweat, and tears.

4

And there you have this wrong scale of values. Mr. Goodspeed poses here as the great authority in this country. And so all the Apostles are better off than Jesus in his mind,

because they write letters, and He doesn't. It's wonderful. It's very hard in this modern world of yours -- and so I find that most biographers in this country think they are bigger than the life they write down. Because the intellect is today running amok.

You really think that the use of ink is better than the use of blood. That's a second-rate performance, I'm sorry to say. I wish it wasn't. But here, I have to write books. Well, that's imperfection, not a perfection.

II

1

So this scale of values is important. All antiquity has never doubted that kings, and prophets, and priests are above the onlooker who tries to define it. And they knew that definition was second to operation, that to act was more than to define the act.

And this is today all so strange. The actor today is the star, then comes the producer, then comes the director, and finally there is the poor scriptwriter who is kept a prisoner for two years. He has a little cell, and occasionally they'll ask him, "What do you think?"

THE STORY OF THE BEETHOVEN MOVIE SCRIPTWRITER

Here, the scriptwriter, a lady -- quite successful in Hollywood. And she was asked to write a Beethoven movie. And she came, and she told us the whole interview. There were three of these tycoons. And they said, about deafness, how this would be played up. And "Now, when he became deaf," they said, "this is a great moment."

"Yes," she said. "But he was deaf twenty years earlier." And so they gave him chapter and verse. And with every one point, it was so that they were just absolutely ignorant of the true life story of Beethoven. And she knew it all. She's a very educated woman. And so they said, "We're sorry. You know too much. You can't write the movie."

2

And you told me the story of Bill Mitchell?

THE STORY OF BILL MITCHELL

Well, Bill Mitchell took a battleship, and an airplane and proved that the battleship, the dreadnought was just obsolete, because it could be sunk by one bomb, as it was in World War II. And they didn't believe him. The whole brass of the Navy was up in arms against the man who would disprove the beauty of their dreadnoughts. They lived, after all, by bigness.

So the movie had to be shot here in Hollywood. And the producer insisted that Bill Mitchell had to intoxicate himself for this experiment, because he would be so excited, and that would show his excitement that he got drunk on whisky first. And they said, "But he didn't. And that's his greatness, that he was absolutely sober," and that he exposed himself to this -- this was after all the climax of his career. It was live or die, do or die. And this idiot of the producer, insisted on this alcoholic excess, which did - it was inserted -- did weaken the whole point. So the man left in a huff, the author. And was left aside, and they took over, and spoiled the whole thing by inserting this lie, this -- what never had happened.

3

But this is how things are done today, that the nearer you come to the public, the more authoritarian the person becomes and he decides.

And so we misread all biography.

THE STORY OF SHAKESPEARE THE POET

They always tell you that Shakespeare was such an experienced stagehand and an actor, that's why his plays are so wonderful. It's obviously an absolute lie, because every one of his plays was three times too long for the time -- two hours allotted to a play in the Globe Theater in London. And he was so enthusiastic, and so much a poet, that he first wrote thousands of lines. Then they all had to be left out. So in practice he was much more a poet than an actor. And overwhelmed by his creation. If you take *Antony and Cleopatra*, it would have filled three evenings, if it had been acted out as he wrote it.

4

Just to show you how even the past is reinterpreted from all point of view.

"O practical man," Shakespeare knew success. And so he just was so successful compared to Marlowe and Ben Jonson, because he knew the stage. Well, he didn't. The stage was a handicap to him.

So even the past is misread. And I think most people take naturally that Mr. Plutarch, writing on fifty lives would feel superior to any one of the lives lived. But he didn't. He admits here that it is better to be one Pericles than to be one Plutarch.

III

1

Shall we read on from there? Please.

What is your translation of the sentence on the "between them most useful and serviceable to the interests of their country"? What does your text say?

("... for this reason....")

What? It's the same text, which means that most --? I'm interested in the word "useful" and "serviceable."

(No, no, no.)

They are the important, because virtue is something we can't help imitating, he says, fruitful. But he has another viewpoint. The use of these men to their countries, which is after all something quite different than their relation to the reader. What is it? What is the expression? "Useful and serviceable"? You have a different translation, haven't you?

"Useful" is a little bit like utilitarianism, and I'm always --. Human beings - just summarizing their role to "use" is always dangerous. "What's the use of a newborn child?"

(How many paragraphs is that, in?)

(Is that just before the genealogy?)

It's before the genealogy.

(Just before it. Well, the sentence I have before that, the immediate one, is: "Whether we are right in our judgment, were it not for the immediacy")

Then the sentence before; the one sentence before.

(Well, there's more than a sentence from the beginning of a new paragraph. I'll start at the beginning. "For this reason, we choose to proceed in writing the lives of great men and have imposed this ...life of Pericles and of Fabius Maximus who carried on the war against Hannibal.")

That's the same translation we have here. Is it all identical?

(No "useful" or --.)

(This is not. No. His words deviate. "Men who resemble each other in many virtues, particularly in justice and moderation, and who effectively serve their respective commonwealths, and patiently endure the injurious and capricious treatment they receive from their colleagues and their countrymen.")

Well, I --.

(Well, Dr. Huessy, the Dryden translation has "useful and serviceable." It goes on. The part where Hannibal, where the column breaks -- after Hannibal, says, "Men alike, as in their other virtues and ...parts, ... and demeanored. And their capacity to the cross-grain ... all through, which made both of them useful and serviceable to the interests of their countrymen.")

(Well, that's Dryden's translation. Well, this isn't.)

Well, that's just what I'm trying to find out. I haven't yet found a substitute. I would like to know if everybody else translated this "useful." You have the same text?

(I have nothing. It's incomplete. It's nothing.)

(They didn't have that, because they didn't treat it both -- they didn't the comparative there. They cut it out.)

Och! Oh! Isn't this forgery? You know -- and they don't even tell you. They were not even dots.

(... in the introduction -- I just put the dots in here for him. I just put them in myself, too. But in the introduction, the author says --.)

Traitor!

(He says in the introduction --.)

Traitor. Write to him a letter: "Traitor."

2

Now it is important for you to know: here is a virtuous man; and here is the offspring. That's the reader. And there he uses very strong language. But then he suddenly has another frame of reference. And there I would like to have the Greek expression -- unfortunately didn't bring the Greek text.

We have only one Plutarch in this library. It's a very poor library. You have to insist -- tell everybody that the library of the University of California is a miserable library. There should be at least twenty Plutarchs, if you want There are so many editions that are published. Should all be here. The one Greek text is loaned. And so I have none. And that's not right.

A man like Plutarch is one of the most popular writers, and all these different editions should be there. ... commentary. It isn't. It's just an example of how haphazardous this library has been brought together. It's very late, and so it hasn't been able to find many different editions.

3

But I found out the most famous book on the South, by Fitzhugh, *Sociology for the South*, 1854, doesn't exist in this library. It's just scandalous. That's the greatest self-indictment of the South ever produced. It's the great glorification of slavery. In 1854 it was produced. You cannot understand the South without this apogee of its tenacity, of its stubbornness.

We don't have it. When I told this to my colleagues in American history, they didn't believe me. But it leaked out that they never had read the book.

4

There are obviously two quite different directions of a biography. As long as you don't have a class of writers and literature of a nation, the memory of a great man in his own city, or in his own nation, will be cut up like Washington's Birthday. That has nothing to do with learned biographies on George Washington. A grateful country keeps his memory because of his services to his country.

Now the Plutarch position, coming after a hundred years of despotism of Rome over all the cities of Greece, has a different idea. Fruitfulness is direct in the reader. He is imitating him. He is evoking virtues. And it has nothing to do with the succession within the one country, that this is Athens. As a non-Athenian now, you read Pericles with the same power of assimilation as though he was the father of the country. And here is the remnant of the pre-Roman, Greek tradition. He says "serviceable to this country," that was of course the reason why the Athenians would worship Pericles.

IV

1

So there are two reasons for biographical monumentalization.

You erect a monument -- a grateful people to the man who made you, the people.

But you read biography in Plutarch already on this much wider scale, that you are provoked, when this man is evoked, to walk with him through life, and he's a trailblazer of your own virtue. And you cannot locate Plutarch in his own time -- in 110 A.D., where he does write, without seeing that he has these two values. Inside one's own frame of reference, where one lives, the hero is "serviceable," as he calls it.

I don't think the word "useful" is a Greek word. That's why I wanted to hunt up this term. Here he uses the word "serviceable." But he's serviceable, regardless of his fruitfulness. But here he has offspring. He produces results in the heart of the reader, regardless of their living in the same frame of reference.

2

And you have to distinguish in literature these two functions.

The primary function of memory is to remember.

This is a very beautiful word. It's not a pun. The English language has changed the Latin term "re-memorare" which should be "re-memorize" into a "re-remembering," making the man a member of society in which we live again. Or anything we remember. It's a very strange "re" in this; that's arbitrarily put in. It has nothing to do with the Latin term "memory."

And yet we use it, and you should exalt it to its full meaning. The people who invented "remembering" didn't know what we could do with it. And you must make George Washington again member of the American community, by remembering him. And as soon as he becomes a member again, he functions again, and he is the father of this country.

And I think it's a very beautiful vivification of memory. That "to remember" means to make that which we remember a part and parcel of the reality in which we live.

3

It is very helpful, because that's why we have to remember, lest we have to -- Santayana has this great saying: *men who remember the past don't have to repeat it*. Because this living member re-presents, keeps the present. Therefore it is still there. Otherwise, if it is forgotten, the act has to be performed anew.

So I invite you to change your mind about the value of the word "remembrance". It is a tremendous power to make, a living member of your inner community again.

4

It struck me as a very strange -- where do you look up the story of such a word? Which is the book, the treasure where you find the story of the book -- like "remembrance" and "remember"?

(The Thesaurus?)

Where you go to?

You go down to the reading room and say, "I would like to know whether this is all nonsense, what I'm hearing here about "remembering"? It's a very strange word. The "re-" is inexplicable. Well, which is the book where -- the authority on all the story of the English words? Where do you look this up? You can't go to the Webster, because he doesn't give the history of the word. Which book gives the history? Bears out what I'm saying about the "re-" and so on is not all nonsense. Where do you find this? You have to work with this. And you will derive great pleasure of doing so.

Well, it's the great Oxford Dictionary in ten volumes, which came out in the middle of the 19th century, and which traces all the history of all these words by giving you the quotations, chapter and verse, how the word was used first, and how it was used in

middle, and how it was used at the end. It is unfortunately too old now to serve all the good purposes.

CHAPTER FOUR: POET AND HISTORIAN

I

1

THE STORY OF THE OXFORD DICTIONARY

But the first dictionary who did this was the Grimm of the fairy tales. The German Dictionary. And then the Oxford Dictionary is an imitation of this for the English language. But it's most valuable, because you get the living history of every word there, step by step, all its shades of meaning. It can be a deep secret, but all the poets use this dictionary, because it gives them all the suggestions, all the assonances, all the shades and variations.

THE STORY OF GABRIELE D'ANNUNCIO

Gabriel d'Annuncio wrote his greatest poem first from the famous *Dictionario de la Tusca*, the great Italian dictionary, by getting all the shades of meaning there, and then following it simply as poetry. Because the ramifications of a word, that's what the poet is after. A mathematician wants to have one sense for a word. Any poet must worship and conjure up all the different meanings of the same word. That's his suggestiveness.

2

And you know that's why we have no poetry in America, because you think you have to define your terms. But poetry means that the word has grown through thousands of years, all the shades of meaning. And the more you can evoke in your poetry, in one word, the more poetical the use of the word is. If it alludes to all kinds of shades of meaning, then the word is used poetically. Never use a word as defined.

That's why the Oxford Dictionary should replace in your reading the Webster, because the Webster defines. That's the surface meaning. The poetical meaning is always in geological layers of thousands of years.

3

There is no poetry, except in this belief that the poet is at the growing point of this word at this moment, and uses it in his next living avatar. The word has a story, and the poet discovers the last, next meaning of the word, just as the historian -- as I told you -- is the last chapter of the history himself.

In the poet, the words work; in the historian the events work.

You can compare a poet to an historian.

4

The poet is the life of the language as of this moment. And since he is the growing point, where the sap is running, he is not interested in the cross-section of the world, flattening it out, but he is interested in the stream, and in him it bubbles up. That's the poet.

And the historian, in him the history, the events themselves bubble up. And so you can compare the two very well. A historian is all the better the more all the implications of this event, the origins, the causes, the relations are there. That's what Thucydides did by going to the roots of the story.

And today you are all so flat, because you have philosophical poetry, and rational history; and that is, the words and the events are just used in their latest surface sense, but not in their -- what's the opposite of cross-section? Length-section?

No, no. In geometry. Here you have a river. Now this is a cross-section. You take the bed of the river. But what would be the -- you see, such a section?

(Transverse-section.)

Well, is that the word? Transverse-section?

(We don't have an opposite to "cross-section" in our vocabulary.)

You don't say "transsection"?

(We don't have its opposite. We don't have ... in things that aren't in cross-sections.)

(It's "with the grain," you might say.)

(Or "lineal.")

Well, "lineal" is very poor.

(In terms of a tree.)

Yes, exactly.

(Instead of a cross-section of a tree, you could say "with the grain." This would work with wood. But that's sometimes used.)

Our modern mind, our rational mind is just a cross-sectional mind, and thinks he can afford to cross-sect everything -- language, history, and so -- as of this moment. And I assure you that poets and historians are transverse-sectionists. They try to restore the flow.

Mathematical thinking is always cross-sectional, geometrical thinking. And historical thinking is always transverse thinking. And that's why they can't understand each other.

II

1

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S ALTER EGO GEORG MÜLLER

And something interesting happened two days ago. I got a long review by a man; and a friend of mine sent me the publication- -- this happened in Germany, so I hadn't been aware of this debate going on. My alter ego over there, a man who has always tried to publicize and popularize my doctrine, saw this review, and wrote an answer. And so I got at the same time the critical review of my historical writings, and the answer of my friend objecting to this man, the review. And it was quite funny.

2

The issue was the following: the man who wrote the review only has the idea that you can either be objective, or you can be subjective. Now all my life, I have said this is a cross-sectionists' attitude. Here is the subjective, and here is the objective attitude. But I am in the transverse attitude. I am projected into the future, and I have already been trajected from the past. I am my father's son, and I am my children's father, and therefore I look at everything in this streamlined fashion.

And so the review ran on this case that I was the most colossal subjectivist there had ever been, and he admired this, but he was an objectivist.

3

And then my friend wrote in, as I said, "But this is impossible. You can't use the term 'subjective' for a man who has just divided reality into past and future, and says that the future compels him to look at the past in such- and-such a way and admits it. And so I am divided into prejective, and trajective attitude."

And this is his reply. And he used very strong language against the man.

4

But it is only interesting that in your mind, coming all from Cartesius and Benjamin Franklin you have dogmatized that the only two acts possible for the human mind are either subjective or objective. You really believe it.

III

1

Now Plutarch and I are neither objective nor subjective, but we hope that the past can come to life in the future. And that has nothing to do with objectivity and subjectivity. But it has to do with past, where we have lived, trajected the abyss of time, and the preject, where we are thrown into the future and have to live. And both are imperatives, and verbs.

The object and the subject are nouns for people; here they stand. And they can move and they don't move. Usually they don't move. They just sit and talk, or look, or sit before a mirror; or sit at a seat and listen to a lecture. And this is the academic attitude. In academic -- here in this room we are either objective or subjective.

2

But what I'm trying to talk to you about is that we are in a stream of events, where it is up to you what we remember; what of the past is a part and parcel of ourselves, as a living member; and what we corporate, or what we create, or what we allow to happen, as inevitably supplementing that which is at this moment, and is not enough, it doesn't suffice. And the lacunae have to be filled up because we are thrown into the future, to be projected into the future, and to be trajected is my attitude.

And I can prove it to you.

3

All the people who are either objective or subjective -- what do they do according to psychoanalysis? They project. If you analyze what these so-called objective sciences do, they project into the past all their own passions.

Mr. Charles Beard, being a Marxian, had to project his material, economic obsessions into the fathers of the revolution, so he wrote *The Economic Interpretation of History*, as you know, and of American history, and proved to his own satisfaction, that it was all just landowners who wrote the *Declaration of Independence*. And now then there have been written books disproving it again. You may have heard of this debate that's going on now. Mr. MacDonald wrote a very marvelous book in which he just proved that there was just no point in this. They never thought of it.

4

You will always find that people who do not admit their concern with the future and the past must project. Projection is the curse of the mathematicians and the subjectivists. Mr.

Einstein projects a dead universe, he already knows from the beginning that the universe consists of electrons and things dead.

But I don't know this. I suppose, at least, that I'm alive. And that as little as a glacier explains the one flower that you find at the foot of the glacier amidst millions of stones, just as little all these mathematical laws explain my or your existence, because we are alive, and the universe of Mr. Einstein is totally dead. And Mr. Einstein after all isn't quite so dead. He creates something new.

Where does this come from? He never can explain this. It's all nonsense. But he projects.

IV

1

And the word "projection" then is an important discovery to show the limitations of this, what you call "objective science," or what I call "Cartesianism," where it is assumed that we live in a dead universe as machines ourselves.

Projection is the curse of the objectivists. They all project. I don't have to project anything. I admit my place in the bill. And I say what I want. I can be open about my desires, my necessities, my urges. I haven't to project anything into a dream world.

2

(I proposed this term "with the grain," because it has reverberations, poetic overtones of the organic, the tree.)

Delighted.

("With the grain," and then you can say, "It's against the grain," this cross-section.)

Ja, then everybody wakes up to the fact that there's violence, because "against the grain" does violence to the growth of the tree.

(With no sap running sideways.)

The physics is always cross-section. That's its meaning. The nature is already complete.

3

Now I live with the deep feeling of the incompleteness of the story. We are just in creation. We don't know yet who we are to be. Do you know who you are going to be tomorrow? I don't.

Mr. Einstein didn't know when he was born that he would be the inventor of the problem of relativity. That was his discovery. That was absolutely new.

And the physicist can never explain the physicist. That's absolutely beyond himself. He cannot explain any one of the physicists, because he cannot explain that anything new can happen in the world. From his system of nature, the new is excluded.

4

But I have no such prejudices. I can write the history of mathematics; I can write the history of physics. Because I can show that the man, in order to rescue himself from death and annihilation, had just to discover new, absolutely unheard-of ways and attempts, and risks his life for them, and dies in the process.

THIRD PART: THE NEXT STEP

CHAPTER ONE: REMEMBER

I

1

There you have sacrifice. You have freedom.

And where a man can sacrifice himself for a new, untried thing, he is creative. He is part and parcel of the divine power that creates the universe.

Every mother that gives life to a child, knowingly, instead of using preventive measures, knows that she is able to produce a new race, a better man, at the risk of her life.

Sacrifice means divinity. Divinity means creation.

We use the word "divinity" in order to express this power that the world isn't finished yet.

Where you have God, you have unfinished business.

2

And where you have God, you have the limitation of our insight.

If we try to judge the complete universe from what is already there, we must misjudge it. You cannot judge the full-grown man from the embryo in the mother's womb.

That's what all the physicists try to do. They try to derive the complete story from the antecedents.

You can only write the complete story from the end backward.

3

You write the biography of Lincoln, because he has proved to be a great man. But people here tell you this today that they write the biography from the beginning forward, projection. They want to forget. They repress the reason why they write this biography of Lincoln.

The reason is that they are impressed by the dead. They are impressed by the end of the story, but they never admit it. They write the books -- Mr. Sandburg never can finish the whole thing, because he gets stuck in the prairie years and so on and so forth. But why

does he write it? Because he and his readers are already united in the experience of the greatness of Lincoln, from the very beginning.

4

Very strange. You are all hipped on this physicists' attitude.

And that's why America at this moment is snowed under, and is a dead country. Physics means to treat man as dead, to be explained from the causes. And history means to treat a man from his destiny. And to find up the beginnings of the future life already in the past.

II

1

Why do we sit here, Sir?

It only makes sense because you are responsible that all the future that already got started in Pericles must not be destroyed and omitted by you. The future has already begun yesterday. The good future, the vital future has now its mainsprings already somewhere in the past. Like a tree has its roots somewhere in the past so we study history lest some part of the future, that already started a thousand years ago, be omitted.

Why do you learn to write? Because writing after all was invented 1500 years ago -- 3,500 years ago, 3,000 years ago. It's obsolete. So old!

No. The final thing that all men should be able to be literate, was invented there. So you have to learn it.

2

I don't understand your relation to past and future at all. I'm always overcome by your calculating method that you think the past is something that went before you.

The past is that which makes demands on you not to obstruct its growth into the future.

You are the hurdle to be taken by history. Since you are ignorant that the good things of life have already been planted, you take down the redwoods that stand there, and not know that they already belong to the final creation of man. You are the hindrance of history. And as long as you think that history is taught to you, for you, so that you get something out of it, you cannot learn history.

3

History means to get you out of the way of obstruction.

Because as long as you are not immersed into this stream of history, you will act as a block against it. You have to turn it all around. History is not written for you, gentlemen. But you are thrown into history so that you may be dissolved in your stubbornness, and become a part and parcel of the stream, where you, before, have been an ice block.

4

The freshet -- you know what a freshet is when the ice breaks in the spring. Now the freshet has to reach you. You have to be melted into the stream of history.

III

1

There are no other ways of getting you out of of your attitude of sitting on your fannies and look at history. The problem of the history teaching is not the events that happened, but you are the problem. Because "problem" means threshold, some stumbling block in the way. And the history cannot go on if all the newborn children remain ignorant of what has gone on before.

You have to join the procession. And history is told you in order to make you join the procession. Which all again means that history consists of imperatives: "Remember." Remember.

That is, allow these parts of the past to become members of the living history.

2

And so I at least can justify myself as being consistent, since all teaching in my conviction consists of imperatives, and not of nouns. I carried it to this length to tell you that to learn history means to get oneself moving, to be moved, in the most literal sense of the word. And I'm so glad -- this Mr. Plutarch agrees with me, because that's what he says. That it is irresistible. And the historian will be judged of course by his shortcomings. If I cannot move you, I've missed my profession.

But history is not there to deliver facts, but to make you chain the facts into fiats.

3

You know that "fact" is a perfect participle, and the word "fiat" is the same verb as "let it be." *Fiat*, God said, "Let there be light" and then light became a fact. That's how the Bible is written. "*Let there be light, and and there was light.*"

But if you would translate it literally, it would say, "Let there be light," and the answer is, "and light became a fact". "Let there be water, and water became a fact." "Let there be men, and men became a fact." That is, *fiat* becomes fact.

That's the theory of the Bible, and that's the story of all history, turning the other way around, that we read again into the facts their fiats.

You have understood any historical event if you understand that what looks at you as a fact at one time only was a *fiat*, and had not yet happened. The transformation of facts into fiats is the goal of history.

4

(Looking backwards in history. Is that what we do?)

Yes, admittedly. We live in this place, 1959. Now what else could we do? It's all projection if you say that you begin really in the Stone Age.

You don't. Here we are, and we want to remember the Stone Age. That is, we want to see how much of the Stone Age facts have still to reach us as fiats. They spoke; well, we have to speak, too. So in this sense, we have great admiration for the Stone Age men.

They sacrificed bulls. We won't. So that's a fact that we left. We try to explain, but we will leave it a fact.

IV

1

Now D. H. Lawrence wrote a book, *The Woman That Rode Away* -- who has read this novel? -- in which he said we must reintroduce human sacrifice. The Stone Age must come back in full flower. And it's a very majestic novel. *The Woman That Rode Away*. I recommend it highly to you, because it shows you the future that threatens the human race. I take it very seriously.

He says we Americans will be the first to reintroduce human sacrifice. In 1500 they introduced slavery, because they regenerated Rome and Greece. Slavery is nothing but Renaissance. Nobody in 1500 thought of slavery; but then Plato was read, and there was so much slavery taken for granted, so that they said, "Let's try slavery."

2

Slavery is just an accompaniment of the Renaissance of Greece and Rome. And now we have human sacrifice, because you all become anthropologists, and you all read Margaret Mead; and you read Malinowski; and you read Frazer, *The Golden Bough*; and you read *The King Must Die*. And you become very cruel.

THE STORY OF THE KING MUST DIE

Who has read *The King Must Die*? That's the newest novel on human sacrifice.

Haven't you heard of the book? Oh, it's a best-seller. It's on Theseus, the Athenian. Oh, it's all over the place, because it's so obscene.

It's as bad as Mr. Nabokov.

And it's all wicked, and very bad, infamous book, but it's accepted. My friends here all talk about it in high terms. You will hear of it.

Well, the great importance of it is that it takes human sacrifice for something very nice. All the time people are sacrificed, there in this old Athenian and Cretan day.

3

Well, I'm afraid Lawrence anticipated that the bored and schizophrenic American will only find his salvation in human sacrifice.

Like the Loeb brothers, just to find out how people behave when they are murdered. And cruelty and violence are the essential ingredients of the American scene. When you are so bored, as ninety percent of the American people are at this moment, violence is the only cure. Perversion to violence and other people's death.

4

(Isn't that what the Greeks were supposed to have done with their God of wine, Bacchus, that they would intoxicate themselves --.)

Oh yes. Ja, but still, the Renaissance first only took Pericles and the Age of Pericles, then the Peloponnesian War, and Homer; there is no human sacrifice. The Dionysian is older. And there is a layer in Greece which you wouldn't call "Greek" anymore, but just "Mediterranean," or wholesale, and Assyrian, and Egyptian, where there is human sacrifice.

So within "Greek" today, only those most ancient elements today become interesting -- like Dionysus -- which have in common this human sacrifice with all the other Asiatic, and

Thracian traditions. But when the Renaissance came in 1500, we looked away from those layers, and we were only interested, in the later Greeks -- the philosophers, and the poets, and the artists, and the statesmen.

THE STORY OF THE NAVAJO INDIANS

You're quite right, in our society we have the Navajo Indians. They have their rain dances, and their snake dances, but they also have memory of witchcraft and human sacrifice. Of course, they have.

So in two hundred years, you will have human sacrifices in this country. No doubt about it. We are marching into this direction, because you are so bored.

Boredom is always introducing the vices of the past.

CHAPTER TWO: BOREDOM AND CRUELTY

I

1

(... historians say we're going to sacrifice these things to?)

Vitality, your vitality. Just as you have Vitamin A today. Everything is today vitamins. You just look around. The idol of our time is vitality.

THE STORY OF KRAFT PROCESSED CHEES

This is an impotent country, so it worships vitality. Where you have no creativity, and no fruitfulness, everything is sterile, and cellophane wraps, where you have no dirt, where you have pasteurized milk, where you have no cheese, but you have Kraft processed cheese, where nothing is allowed to live.

2

What's a cheese that doesn't crawl? You buy cheese here; it's not cheese. You buy milk; and it's not milk. And you buy bread; and it's not bread. It's all phantom. And everybody reflects this sterility in his own life.

And since you have this cellophane civilization here, where nothing can germinate, human sacrifice replaces it. If you aren't fruitful, you try to get vitality.

3

THE STORY OF THE SWEDISH NATION TURNING CHRISTIAN

Tell you a story. Do you know how the Swedes became Christian? In 1070, the Swedish nation turned Christian. That's rather late, as you can see. Not so long ago. And so it took them 1,070 years before the Swedes abolished human sacrifice. And how did it look? Exactly as in the days of Abraham.

The king Erik aged. And he had seven sons. And so he took his first son, when he felt old age coming, and sacrificed him to get vitality back into his loins. Well, he aged just the same, and got the gout; and he sacrificed his second son. And then he sacrificed his third son. And when there was only the seventh left, the people rebelled, killed the old man, made the seventh son king, and asked him to become a Christian, because it meant the abolition of human sacrifice.

That's what Christianity meant.

Christianity abolishes human sacrifice. Christ is the last human victim.

4

Any Christian tradition. There again you have the break of the Christian era with the past. Human sacrifice was given up. That happened in 1070; and was literally done so that the king might be more fruitful, more vital. He dispossessed the life of his son and tried to project, this boy's energy into his own veins. This was taken quite literally.

II

1

Now D. H. Lawrence thinks the same will happen to the American businessman. He's so empty, and so sterile that he will sacrifice life to get back vitality.

Boredom and cruelty are two sides of the same thing. If you can understand this, you can solve the American riddle.

2

THE STORY OF THE BORED PERSON

An interested person can be merciful and forgo all cruelty. But a bored person, he wants to be shot back into reality. And that has to come from the outside, because in him that has been suppressed, the stream of life. He looks at everything objectively. It's just what I said. And he is not propelled into any direction. He doesn't have to reach any goal. He hasn't to reach the next shore. He's not static. You cannot drown another man, even when swimming. You just have to keep afloat yourself. But put a man on land, looking at other people, that he tries to experiment with them, and puts the needle into their calf, and they jump. He's experimenting then.

Any man who experiences life, Sir, cannot experiment.

And every bored person tries to experiment with the frog. And pulls out its leg -- you know little boys who are bored. They are very cruel. They take out nests, and - .

3

Cruelty and boredom always go together. When education gets boring, watch out. Then something frightful is bound to happen. Then you get juvenile delinquency. What else can you get?

When the school bores the children, they must commit murder. No help. Can't be helped.

4

So I think this first chapter of Plutarch should stay in your minds. And has Solon such an introduction, too?

(Solon is saying something about money.)

Well, let's then read next time. But I wish you would try -- please, do this for me, and in writing analyze the sequence of the chapters and with regard to their content, you may use nouns.

(On Pericles, or --?)

III

1

(How many more meetings do we have?)

Three. Isn't that right? What do you mean? You wish to go over to some other topic. Why do you ask?

(I wondered whether this should be considered, whether we should think --.)

Well, any proposition? We have meandered here, because I wanted to follow your suggestion that we gave up the study of the Bible and went over to this. So well, I think this was quite useful. And serviceable.

(It's really funny because we were talking about those two words.)

That's why I'm using it, Lady.

(But are we going to give time for the American historian, that we want to deal with? That you were going to deal with, you said, an American historian. Did you not say at the last meeting for us to think about an American historian?)

Ja. Did you?

(No.)

Well, this is an old

(What did you think about?)

(Sandburg.)

2

Well, I had thought of Vicent Stephen Benét. But I don't accept biography in itself as historiography. Today everything in this country is transformed into biography, because people have no categories for the real history. And I think history is destroyed in the long run by having only biography.

I will not fail you if you say Sandburg. It's all right with me. But you ought to know what you're doing.

3

People who no longer have a relation to the history -- that is, to the fulfillment of certain tasks of the human race in building up more and more solidarity -- that's the task of history from the very beginning, the creation of solidarity of the human race, which analysts don't have. Everything goes by itself; every animal dies and lives by itself. It has no consciousness of past and future for this reason.

Because the more past and future we develop, the more we must construe a society in which we bear each other's burden.

Now that's history. As soon as you isolate this by biography, you can see that it particularizes so much that the flow of the centuries is broken up. So that's why I'm personally not that much interested in biography.

And Sandburg hasn't written a history. He has only written a biography.

4

(Did you want to discuss these --?)

Benét has written the history, at least, of the Civil War, in *John Brown's Body*.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY WRITING BIOGRAPHIES

And if you still insist that biography after all is a relevant topic -- I've written biographies myself -- but I always, by the way did it with the left hand, as in a rush, because I felt I was indulging in the fashion of the time, and my task should be to assure the continuity, and not this particularizing. And I have a bad conscience about it, biography. Everybody tells you biography, but they're completely disconnected.

IV

1

(What I would personally love to hear you make some comments about Hegel.)

Ja, but these people cannot read it. I'm perfectly willing to do this, but would this be a need in their own mind? They are not burned up either by Marx or by Hegel. So if you aren't burned up by something, it's no use talking about it. By what are you burned up?

What aspect of American or history is today to you the stumbling block, a hardship, a difficulty? Tell me. The future of America, future in America, past of America?

I don't know. You are indifferent.

2

(How about the change from Jeffersonian democracy to the kind of Jacksonian democracy, to what we have today.)

(The change from probably idealism to materialism.)

(The difference between Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy and how we are really now today.)

Well, I give you - neither

(That's why I said, to compare it with those two.)

Well, this is just, I said these would be my --.

(I would second this.)

...that's your problem. But Benét stops at the Civil War, after all. And that has nothing to do with your problem of democracy, really not, because he is still describing the individual farmer and the economy is still individualistic. And so it is still a Jeffersonian democracy. Every man his mule, and --.

Well, we have still five minutes for a vote. You can have a plebiscite.

3

There is only one difficulty. It is not in a paper.

In what edition did you have it?

(It's not in paperback. It's just in a hardcover edition. That's the only one they have in the bookstore. The only one they have here on the campus.)

Well, I'm all for it. Read it right through from beginning to end in the last four weeks, so you haven't done this now? Who has read it?

(I didn't read)

I think that it is the way in which history should be written. It's very conscientious. A remembering of the Civil War.

(You always say to tell the story of the Civil War. But he has written the history of the Civil War. But we don't go further.... That's why we raise the point.)

Are you bringing your texts back? I will not go back on my assignment of the order of things in the Pericles.

4

I shall receive tomorrow from the library the volume of my German premium.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S BOOK BINDER

I told you that I was given as a boy his book on Plutarch and his biography. And it was in the bindery, and they said I couldn't have it before August first. And then I raised hell, and said that you had to learn something. And so they were kind enough to send to the book binder and get it, this one book from there, before August first. And tomorrow, they promised me, I could have it. So I want not to let them down, and after I have made so much trouble with the library to get the book, I want to report on the book's content next time.

And you bring me the.... And also bring Benét and then we'll start right with the second half, next time with the Benét.

CHAPTER THREE: NOVUS ORDO SECLORUM

I

1

(I'd like to ask my fellow class members whether anybody else is as concerned as I am, with what I feel is the real challenge which Marx poses to us in his interpretation of history, and whether we can't find at least be concerned enough to deal with him as an historiographer.)

Well, these people here, to tell you the truth, my dear Phil, they have no relation to history. It doesn't burn them up. They don't think they are led or misled by history.

You all think that you are outside history. Just look at history. You don't know that you are swept away by tremendous tides of pseudo-history, your little mythical existence.

2

They don't know that there are such stumbling blocks to the real history of mankind. You are nice, well-meaning, nice, innocent boys. As long as you do not see your original sin, that you are stumbling blocks -- that's the meaning of original sin, that you have fallen by the wayside, and you are not part and parcel of the historical process at this moment.

(You say we are outside of American history, but --.)

(... to discuss this problem? Why can't we go on to the problems of the American man, or how we look at our founding forefathers, and what they actually were in reality?)

Oh.

(I mean, why go to Marx? I know he's great, and you can go to Hegel, or anyone. Why don't we simply know so little of these men; why don't we go to somebody we think we know?)

Oh, do -- as I said. I see your difficulties. Sometimes, my dear man, by moral mood -- ...a new beacon standing far out in the sea, you get more ... than the

(...to go into Marxism is --.)

(Well, it's a question of past and future, too; because Marxism is an historical philosophy, which we're going to meet down the stream a little further. And I'm quite in agreement with - our founding forefathers had something to say to meet Marx downstream, but I think that -- but the two at least --.)

(... one integrate both of them, rather than separating them into antagonistic forces, rather than seeing them both in certain ways. I think that's a very good suggestion.)

(Maybe one period could be spared to them, for the two.)

(As well as its thoughts. I mean, that's ... critical analysis of --.)

3

Well, then I would ask you a question. I want to respond to your question. But I would then put the question in a narrow fashion. And I would say, "What was the future promised by the founders of this country?"

Because I feel that the sense of future has been lost in the last thirty years in this country. The American no longer feel sure of their future. And not as a whole. They are trembling and they think, "If the Russians treat me right, if they can out-produce the Americans, that would mean the end of America -- the question: Is that true? Is that the future promised in 1783 to the American people, that can be finished by the Russians?"

4

THE STORY OF HOW THE RUSSIANS WERE TREATED

What I really feel is the fervor at this moment in this country is that beginning with the condescension with which the Russians were treated in 1929 and 1933, a nice little brother now finally having a democracy too, and a revolution; when this ended in 1945, and the Russians marched into Poland and showed that they had very different ideas indeed, there came a great disgust with the press, and dismay, and finally the Americans - they thought of throwing the bomb over Moscow, and finishing once for all with the terrible people.

And at this moment, when the Sputnik came, people began to say, "Well, is it possible that somebody else is carrying the ball? We don't seem to be any longer carrying the ball."

II

1

This, I think, is the deepest feeling of dismay in this country, that the time span covered by the vision of the founding fathers suddenly seems to have come to an end, that the future at this moment doesn't go on uncontestedly to this country.

Whereas in 1900, there was absolutely not question that the future was in America. The future of the whole world was in America.

Now with the Russian onslaught, people in this country suddenly say, "Well, we never thought that we were limited; we thought we were unlimited." The whole future, the infinite future was with them. But if they were right, in 1975, we may have to acknowledge a competitor, and we won't do that. We can't do that. This would mean that we are a finite nation, just one, and not the one and only.

And I think that is your historical crisis of the historical consciousness. Wouldn't you agree? Is there something to it?

2

So the thing is quite subtle. I'm all for the American approach. But you must allow me to note this break in the good conscience of America. There is at this moment a faltering. The question hasn't been our future, we thought so naïvely, as absolutely secured, that we were carrying the torch in the march of the nations. And now there is another man who says, "I'll take the torch from your hands." He hasn't yet done it. But since he promises to do it, there's some gnashing of teeth, and some trembling.

And that is the Marxian "anti" vision.

3

The American vision, and the Marxian vision in this certain manner do.

THE STORY OF THE DOLLAR BILL

Look at your dollar bills. I have no dollar in my pocket. What does it say?

You have a dollar bill? What does it say? What's the text?

No, the other side. What does it say?

(*"In God We Trust."*)
(*And a New Order -- something.*)

Now the question is: has this new order exhausted itself, or is it still new? You take this a little more seriously, my dear man, as you used to do. It says *Novus -- Annuit coeptis*. God nodded at our beginnings. That's what it says. You don't know this? And they allowed you to go to college? That's really striking.

(*"One out of many." I know that one.*)

4

Done. You are all wrong. You have heard this. Everything is hazy in this country. It's all smog, long before there was any smog. Intellectual smog has produced the other smog. *Novus ordo --?* Can you read this? I'm not interested in that one. I'm interested in this one. *Novus ordo --?*

(*"Seclorum."*)

What is "Seclorum"?

(*Is it "God"?*)

No, no. It's very secular. The word has to do with secular, "seclorum."

It's hard to believe that students of a university, of the age of twenty and more, do not know what is printed on the dollar note of their own country. It's very remarkable. Quite an achievement.

You live a mythical existence. Absolutely mythical. You are in a fairy tale.

III

1

Why should I teach you anything about Plutarch if you can't even read a dollar?

(Towards the sun?)

No -- they still were Christians, so they didn't say "Society" -- a noun, a thing. But times - - saecula are the "*siècle*" in French. These are the centuries, the ages. And the question is, how many of these centuries?

Marx would say the bourgeois century is over. *Annus -- annuit coeptis*.

(What does that mean?)

I wonder. Oh, it's boring, Sir. I shall become cruel. You bore me, so I must become cruel.

2

Here should really be the new ... the little...., the more complete.

"*God nodded at our beginnings, and now there begins a new order of the ages,*" of the century, a new chronology, a new era.

"Era" contains many centuries. Sixteenth, 17th, 18th century are all contained in one era. And the *novus ordo seclorum* -- that's a very bold expression -- time is ordered from now on, with the viewpoint that the *Declaration of Independence* is a decisive new start in the history of the human race.

THE STORY OF VERY PROUD, VERY ARROGANT

Very proud, and very arrogant statement, to tell you the truth. Two and-a-half million people making this after they have been chased out three hundred Loyalists out of this country, the best citizens. There they were, this rabble in arms, saying that they started a whole new order of centuries. Quite some conceit.

And that's your question before the house: Is it still true? And you have to ask: What was started -- what was so new? And has it any future, and does it all end in ice cream?

3

It is the question before the house: is this dollar note going to be printed tomorrow? On an inflated dollar note?

Certainly if you get inflation, the novus order is going under in shame and debasement.

The funny thing is that they did not say, "*Novus ordo saeculi*," "of the age, a new century beginning." "Saeculum" is "century." *Siècle* in French. You must have known the word. "*Fin de siècle*," the end of the age.

But that he used the plural.

4

Now the Roman tradition had it that the Etruscans, the educators of the old Romans, from whom they learned the calendar, and the priesthood, and their religion, and --.

(Even the numerals. They're not Roman numerals. They're Etruscan numerals.)

Ja, ja, you're absolutely right. Tarquinius was an Etruscan. The town Tarquinia contains the most beautiful Etruscan tombs from which Tarquinius got his name, the last king of Rome.

IV

1

THE STORY OF THE ETRUSCAN SAECULA

Well, this idea is an Etruscan idea. The Etruscans said that their state would last ten saecula. And a saeculum was formed by the relationship of the birthday of one man, who was the oldest in the community in his own generation, and the death of the man who was born the day before this man died.

A very strange idea. Two human beings -- let us say, one being born in 1780, going to be ninety; this would bring you up to 1870. In 1870 then, one day before his death, or on his dying day, a child is born, or many children are born, in fact --and the one who reaches then the greatest length of age comes ninety again, and he would die in 1960. So then the Etruscans would say, "God has ordained this to be one saeculum." That's His creation. He has allowed two men to look into each other's eyes, and thereby connect the times, the ancestor and the grandchild.

And so from 1780 to 1960, they would have an organic saeculum, because they didn't think in decades, and in mechanical geometry, but life was created here now. And so the Etruscans had a changeable idea of a saeculum.

And the Romans accepted this. And "saeculum" in their days was not our abstract reckoning: 1800 -- 1900. They think man was not to be geometrized. They had to observe the facts of human life, they felt. And so the measure for man had to be taken out of man's real life, and not out of this abstraction of a yard, and a foot, and an inch, which I think very wise.

2

All the Greeks tried this. Heraclitus tried this, and the Athenian constitution. They tried to find the measurement in men. The proper measurement of time and of space, by the way, too.

3

And you do not know how abstract you are when you believe in these miles, and in these centuries. That's all abstraction. Why a hundred? That's just a bridge. And to say "19th century" obviously is a great superstition. Why should anybody born in 1780 not have the same features of a creature born in 1920?

The Etruscans said, "Of course. If they can look at each other -- one of them, at least, they impart to each other that what makes a human being, our face."

When we face each other, we beget each other.

4

Well, this is only to show you that all this is implied in this very strange idea -- that's an Etruscan idea, that ten-steps century -- or, I don't know -- nine; I don't know the number, and how they reason it out-- would be the story of Etruria. That's the old Tuscany, Florence.

And so "*Ordo seclorum*" meant the togetherness of more than one age of man. And an order in which there would be one purpose, and one act of faith, and one devotion.

And this is the American claim, of whose existence you even haven't known. Very strange.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE AMERICAN EXPERIMENT

I

1

And I think this claim is more important than Abraham Lincoln. And you are quite mistaken to try to understand American history from Abraham Lincoln. It's impossible.

That's why I'm a little hazy about Mr. Sandburg. That's an exaggeration. The American experiment and the American ... obviously is Christoph Columbus, and the Pilgrim Fathers, and the Irish immigration. And it is a much longer story than this, than Mr. Lincoln can explain to you.

2

THE STORY OF LINCOLN DEFEATING SECESSION

He is one president of the United States, and a very great president. But he is not the whole destiny of the "*ordo seclorum*" of America. Mr. Lincoln cannot explain to you why we are at this moment occupied in Berlin, and in Guam, and in the Philippines. Obviously the destiny of America is a much more of a global character as Lincoln ever thought who was very happy when he could neutralize the South, and get it back into the Union.

So he is after all a reactionary who defeats secession.

3

And pardon me for using this strange word for him. But I want you only to understand that "*ordo seclorum*" is infinitely more ambitious than what our Civil War did. The Civil War made it possible again to get back into this *ordo seclorum*. If the secession had happened, the *ordo seclorum* would have been destroyed.

4

We have to go.

(Well, we don't have to. I don't have to.)

Well, but you have a right to claim that this is all over.

All right. The *ordo seclorum* is all over.

ELEVENTH LECTURE: THREE AND FOUR AGAINST THE GREEK MIND

FIRST PART: THE GREEK ACHIEVEMENT

CHAPTER ONE: SHAME

I

1

-- what does he mean by my saying that the Greeks did not define virtues, but just to -- I don't recall that.

(Well, you just said they just talked. They didn't define, like we do, in the dictionary.)

(--- word meant, when they defined a word, it was in terms of a verb action, and that we ... to substitute a noun as a definition of something, rather than an experience.)

THE STORY OF THE CHEMICAL ELEMENTS

I went to the 39 in Haines Hall, where Mr. Bryan, or Byron or whatever the man yesterday spoke, and there was hanging this tremendous map on the chemical elements. You know the list of Mendeleev's series. And where you have reduced there the element to its name and the specific weight, that would be the idea, the final form of a defining, because it's reduced to a common denominator, a specific weight. The only difference is the numeral in which it stands, and then the name by which we recognize it. That's reduced to a formula "C"- "E"- "U" and whatever.

2

So that is the tendency, the trend of scientific definition: to brush aside all associations which the average layman has when he comes in touch with a rose. He says it's fragrant. When a botanist comes in touch with a rose, he has classified it away, and all the niceties and amenities about roses and the poetical flavor is gone.

3

Now you can however also define an element by what it does. And you can say, "Water is the most important of the elements." As Pindar's famous first ode on the Olympic Games, begins: "The best is water." And then only comes gold; because water is more needed to our life, it's nearest to life, really, of all the processes in nature.

And so for California, I think it's a good quotation, from the first line in Pindar's poetry is: "The best is water." And this is anti-scientific, because it is a quality. It's a quality which is only personally to be realized.

Still more, however, are you close to the process of experience if you say, "The water rushes." The water, that's what you perceive is the act. And you know nothing more than: "Something is moving".

And so the verb is the impression, and is empirical; and the definition is scholastic. And you are today inclined to reverse the order and think that the scientific definition is empirical.

4

And all Americans, as far as I know them today confuse experiment and experience. And I have tried to shield you against this error.

Empiricism is through actions, through processes. And all science works only experimentally. That is, you cannot experiment without first having defined what you take into the experiment. There is no experimentation without definition, because you say, "I omit this, and I admit this into the experiment."

All experiments are staged through a theory. You want to prove a theory through an experiment. And all the "experimental physics" is based on theoretical physics. You cannot run an experiment as empirical.

Every American has his loose bottom in his brain, that he confuses experience and experiment. So you don't know that all you live in a second-hand world of theory to which you think that life is the experiment.

II

1

But experience is this side of theory, before you have any time to theorize, you are engulfed with *something rushing, something thundering, something raining, something loving, something hating, certainly always threatening you*, or caressing you, or doing something to yourself, before you had any emergence of your reflective organs, and before the mirror of consciousness, saying, "Oh, that's nothing but."

You can also say that you reach still then the first sense of wonder, the ... which the Greek philosophers held to be the center of philosophy, to be astonished. To be so astounded, that you hardly know what to say, and you have to take a deep breath before you can articulate what you experience.

2

Now that's not the attitude of the experimental American, who is here, detached, and says, "Well, don't get excited"; "I don't care"; "That's probably nothing but a bug". It's "nothing but."

And you can always divide humanity.

The Russians are still in the age of the Greeks, and they still speak also such a Greek language of seven cases, and a tremendous word wealth. Because with them, they are astounded all the time.

And your whole education in this country is "Never be excited."

Now not to be excited means "Never be astounded." "Never be astounded" means "Unable to experience."

And all girls in this country are so terribly threatened by frigidity, because they can't be astounded. It's all experimental. Sex is experimental. If it's experimental, you are already outside of it. Because you have set it up, and observe it. So everybody is his own observer in this country. And the impotency of the American manhood is based on this: "Life is just an experiment."

Gentlemen, if life is an experiment, you are outside of it.

3

The Quakers and the Puritans, when they came to this country, they said, "We are God's experiment." And they use the word "experiment" in a religious sense, where you were the metal in the crucible.

And this has brought on the American confusion. All your language is secularized Bible. And you don't know this. And therefore, the word "experiment," like "happiness," is a translation of "salvation". Originally everybody in this country was allowed to pursue his own salvation. And when the revolution came, people wanted to use a general term, so that no church would feel hurt. So they said, "the pursuit of happiness."

And if you do not read behind "happiness" the word "salvation," you do not understand the meaning of happiness in America. It has never had this notion in England. The pursuit of happiness -- un-understandable in Europe. It's blasphemy there.

We in Germany, if we hear "pursuit of happiness," we think that you are lascivious epicureans. Nobody can work out his happiness; you can only work out your own salvation. But happiness is nothing but an American version of salvation.

4

And so the same is true of experiment.

The Puritans in the 17th century in this country said that we were God's mighty experiment. God experimenting with us is something quite different when we are experimenting with life.

And so you are all confused because the religious notion of experiment, and this chemist's notion of experiment, run into one in your mind. And most of all, you are terribly hurt, yourself, because you feel obliged to experiment with life.

III

1

THE STORY OF AN AMERICAN STUDENT COMING TO HEIDELBERG

If the ladies forgive me, but you remember in "*History Must be Told*," in the "*Shame*" lecture, the story of the American student who comes to Heidelberg, and shocks the whole town because he makes love to various nice German girls, and has the effrontery wherever the heart of heart is reached, to put on the gramophone and have all the noises recorded and then shows this later to his German friends.

And when I came to Heidelberg five years ago, they said they had never seen such profligacy. They knew something about debauchees, and they know something of insolence, and shamelessness, but this deprivation of Americans was unknown in Europe.

You have to know this. Just because this man took it upon himself to experiment with love, instead of experiencing it.

2

And this is the reputation of Americans in the world, gentlemen, of the women even more -- absolute shamelessness. Because they understand that you can experiment with your own soul, life, body et cetera.

You cannot.

And this is the story with this perversion -- that's why I tried to warn you that an experience notes, acts, processes.

3

Mr. Whitehead, the great English philosopher, when he came to this country -- and taught still in the last years of his life in Harvard -- wrote this book, *Process and Reality*, in which he tried to describe to you the cosmos inside which we move still, as a surprising experience, as something that must astound you every minute. You must be astounded that I speak to you, that you can understand it.

But most students sit in my class and define me. And say, "This is an interesting man," or "He's stimulating." That's already breaking the spell of the immediate encounter.

4

That's why the word "encounter" today has this much -- vogue, because people try to find the way back to immediate experience. "Encounter your" "Encounter with God," Martin Buber's saying, et cetera.

Well, it's is a rather helpless re-discovery of the most original relation of life, meeting life. It's nothing special, encounter. It's the first thing. But you have perverted all the sequences of the processes of life. To you, the mirror of reflection is the first, and then the acts come out of this.

So you are all abstract. You don't treat me as me, whom you meet here. But first say, "He is a human being."

IV

1

Gentlemen, that's deteriorating my impression on you. Perhaps I am not a human being. Perhaps I'm a devilish being, or a divine human being. I'm disinclined to accept your notion that I'm just a human being.

I'm not just a human being. "He's nothing but a human being." You can always say, "We are all but human." In this very moment, the experience of the encounter is destroyed because you say, "It's nothing but." And you all do this.

2

That's here the low-brow style, of dismissing everything of rank, everything of importance, every superior humanity must be -- "Well, he's just a human being."

Well, of course, he has to eat, and to sleep, and do all the other functions. But does this contain a man? And you are so satisfied when you can prove of every man his weight in the paper, and she has brown hair, and she weighs -- she's five feet five. And you have the

lady. All these physical connotations which you add today in the papers to the description of a man photographing Mr. Dulles' intestines. Is this Mr. Dulles?

And this wouldn't be bad, gentlemen, if you would not hurt your posterity - children that would come out of such alliances are impotent. They have no power, because they haven't come from a complete union and fusion of two people. But they have been planned.

3

THE STORY OF THE MADE CHILD

I have a friend who said me, "This child we made on March 19th."

Now do you think that's something? Of course, they all have to go to the psychoanalyst. What does the psychoanalyst? Talks the reflection and all these people, once more. Thinking that two minus give plus. See, the reflective mind of the patient, and the over-reflection of the psychoanalyst then shall restore innocence. Really.

You all live minus times minus -- in the hope that this will be plus. Well, why don't you stay here, in the plus realm of experience, and of wonder?

4

All you have to do in the word "education," here: preserve the sense of wonder with the children. That's all that's needed. If you destroy this by telling the child, "Oh, that's easy. Can tell you all about this two minutes," it's murder. You have murdered the spirit.

And it is committed every day in all our schools.

CHAPTER TWO: WONDER AND ASTONISHMENT

I

1

THE STORY OF THE HALF-COLUMN

And it's spreading. I read *The Listener* this morning, the English BBC paper, which is after all one of the better things of the human spirit still at this moment. But there was half a column on Greece. And it said in half a column everything about the Greeks. "The Greeks as They Were," it was called, or something. And it was a masterpiece of condensation, but it was all tin-canned. After you had read this half-column, the Greeks no longer existed. You carried them away, in a two-penny, on a two-penny stamp.

2

And this shouldn't exist. The one item out of Greece, which makes you wonder, that's how you have to represent the Greeks to a child, or to a student, or to yourself. And not by compressing everything.

But everybody here thinks to present the Greeks in two minutes is more meritorious than to present them in ten minutes; and to present them in ten minutes is more meritorious than to present them sixty minutes; and so on it goes. You think really that shorter is better. So the sense of wonder diminishes in your mental profession. Because the real sense of wonder is what?

Infinite has the quality of infinity. You never come to an end with the wonderment.

The very word "wonder" is the English version of "miracle." And "to wonder" is to change, to transform. And that's quite important for you -- so that you should reclaim the connection between the baton of the sorcerer, the wand and the wonder. This is the same root. And in German it has a very important role of "*Verwandlung*," which means "metamorphosis."

3

Now for the Greeks, and for the Germans -- and I think for the Russians the same thing -- the wonder is that we change, that we must be transformed. This is our sense of wonder. Man is never the same. Every day he must be transformed by the encounter.

And this is your biographical problem, too, this sense of Prospero's wand, which he puts down at the end of *The Tempest*, transforms, metamorphoses. That's the Latin -- "transforms." Also the simple word "mutation" is the same.

4

Now as you know, our biologists, in their strange experimental passion, have left God one loophole. They call what they cannot explain a "mutation." And if you study the word "mutation," it just means these are the spots where we cannot reason, where we have no arithmetic. The points where you still have to wonder, that you didn't foresee, the behavior of the genes, of your genetics' game.

II

1

THE STORY OF A GENETICIST

I have a friend who's a geneticist; well, he's simply a madman. I think they are all insane, these heredity people. Because at all decisive points, they have to say, "Oh, that's a mutation"-- formerly they said, "That's the divine providence," "That's an act of God." Now they call it "mutation."

But if you study the word "mutation," it means absolutely nothing. It is no explanation whatsoever, and all decisive steps in the history of life on this earth, they call "mutation." Exactly as the Bible says, "a new act of creation." And they call it "mutation"; and mutation means transformation. And it evokes a sense of wonder that we suddenly see something is no longer the same.

2

THE STORY OF MUTATION

So there was a reptile, and now there is a quadruped, a mammal. "That's mutation." Laugh at these people. They're just silly asses. To hide the secret of creation under a new word which they never translate, and never tell you that "mutation" just means "a new act of creation." That's all it means.

The old thing doesn't work out mechanically anymore, so a new start. That's called "mutation" in this country. And nobody laughs. This is so funny. But you all sit down, and they even bind these books on heredity. I did it myself to sample it. It is just good for the wastepaper basket.

3

Because where you and I in biography, for example, want to know who made Lincoln, which act of God produced out of this man with the poor digestion, and a poor skin, and ugliness, and illegitimate child, et cetera -- who made him into an angel of God, with a message for centuries to come?

That's a question of history.

4

And therefore, we, gentlemen, are closer to the real problem of history than all these naturalists. And you try to explain men from natural science, but I think they only tell you that the scientists are hangovers -- hangers-on to our problem of transformation, and try to see in nature those changes which start us thinking when we meet people.

III

1

Yesterday you met a man. Today he's blustering. Yesterday he was depressed. You wonder what did it.

And with some people, it's money.

With some people it's glory.

With some people it's love.

With some people it's success,

with some people it's conversion.

So these great transformations of man may discover change. And what we do with the change in nature only was discovered in parallel to your and my encounter where we discover suddenly: well, the man of yesterday was a boy, and today that's a man.

That's experience.

2

So all real experiences are made between people, gentlemen. And all natural science, empiricism, or experimentation is applying certain notions we have of our experience in real life between people, and say, "Perhaps in nature, it's similar. Perhaps nature also undergoes shocks, and transformations, and so we boil with the water, and see it bubbling up." And this you only do after you have experienced the heartbeat of a foaming passion, as we say, "boiling passion."

If you analyze all the words which we use in chemistry, they all come from human experience, from "fury," and so on. "It boils furiously".

I just got a recipe yesterday that I should take, to prepare this tea, furiously boiling water. But what fury is, you only know from the heart, and no way in the world outside ever to define "fury." So if you have to take furiously boiling water, the first you have to experience great wrath and anger.

There are no furies in the outer world. They are all furies of vengeance.

3

Once you understand the relation of empiricism, and experimentation, you become again the universal man. And you look down at your social habitat of America as a purely passing state of your soul.

Nations are ways of bewitching men into a shell of accident.

No German can go to Heaven if he's just a German. No Jew can go to Heaven if he's just a Jew. It's impossible. You have always to be more than what you are.

This is your problem of your transportation, or your transformation, or your mutation, and you get this by a sense of wonder, because every morning, a new sense of wonder gets you out of your hard shell, of a "Hm, I don't care".

I could kill a child who says, "I don't care," because it has killed itself already. I have a right to feel that I could kill this brat, because this brat, by saying, "I don't care," has killed itself.

4

Tell you a story.

THE STORY OF ELSA BRANDSTRÖM

The Angel of Siberia was a Swedish woman, the daughter of the Swedish ambassador to St. Petersburg in the First World War. And a very great woman she was. Elsa Brandström was her name. Many routes, many streets in Europe are called now after her today. Because she went out to Siberia and took care of all the prisoners of war who were located in eastern Siberia, and of course suffered very much. And so after the war, she married a friend of mine in Germany. And he had to leave Germany, because he was a socialist when Hitler came, and became a professor at Harvard, and he's still there, of education, by the way. Yes.

And Elsa Brandström so couldn't help being this magnanimous and generous person again. And they had a baby, a child. And this child grew up, and so they invited one day a group of American children for the birthday party of their daughter. And they had ice cream. And Mrs. Brandström passed around the ice cream, and said, "Don't you like a little more?" And the children said with this imitable American accent, "I don't care. I don't care. I don't care." She burst into tears and said, "But you must care."

She was a woman who had seen all this misery in Siberia, but she felt even ice cream could only be acceptable and was only meaningful if people did care.

IV

1

Wherever you have a person who says, "I don't care," you know that she or he is in trouble. They will not be up to the requirements of living. They will have to substitute for this some psychological treatment. And that's why you all rush to the analyst, or to some other wisecrack who has to restore, or to make up for your loss of vitality.

THE STORY OF BLACK SORCERY

And the loss of vitality, this is the spirit first, gentlemen. What you say is what your vitality, and not what your muscles, and your blood do. You all are now in black sorcery, you take vitamins, and you took whole grain, and you take all these niceties, and orange juice all day long. You take far too much of these things. And you have to, because you try to build the body up without the spirit.

That's impossible.

2

The sense of wonder is the growing point of humanity. If you wake every morning in astonishment, you will be healthy, because you can assimilate, you can change, you can be transformed, you stretch out for something bigger than you have been before.

The sense of wonder is the growing point of the human soul.

And you think weight is it, and the waistline is it, and the diet is, and slimness -- ridiculous. That's why you all look under a sunlamp so miserable. You can have all the nice colors of the world; everybody knows that you are bored and dead inside, before age.

3

This then is the first experience of the real man. We are centered in our growing point; that's the sense of wonder. Because there we stretch out for change, for being ready to become somebody different.

And really I recommend to you. There should be a discussion on this campus between biologists and historians on the ridiculous invention of the word "mutation". The biologist says, "I have eighty facts that are mechanical. And then I have one fact: I call this a 'mutation.' And there I stop. I capitulate".

We historians, we are honest. We say, "We have eighty facts of transformation, of mutation. There we begin. One word of love can change the whole world."

What's the famous line, "*One smile of --*" or "*God makes the whole creation new*" or what is it? There's an English verse to this. No?

4

So we begin where they give off. We begin with the miracle.

And a historian who is not shocked into writing history by something miraculous shouldn't write history. That's our starting point, that there is some miraculous transformation, like the *Peloponnesian War*. We begin with the sense of wonder, and he is the real historian who keeps his readers under the spell of this sense of wonder right through.

And this is *John's Brown's Body* by Vincent Stephen Benét, that you keep the sense of wonder from beginning to end. This is the whole merit of the story, that you never dismiss it and say, "Oh, that's nothing but."

And this is unheard-of in this country, and so he had to put it into verse. In other countries, such a history can be written in prose, because we still allow an historian to shock you into a sense of astonishment.

CHAPTER THREE: OUR INDIVIDUAL PREHISTORY

I

1

Now this in America has only occurred in the last fifty years. You live in a completely changed country. In 1900, America was in no way different in its approach to poetry, life.

If you read Emily Dickinson, she's just as astounded as any other human being every morning about every butterfly. Have you read her? Wouldn't you agree? Every quatrain in her has the same ring of infinite surprise, infinite sense of wonder.

THE STORY OF THE CATASTROPHE OF PRAGMATISM

And so don't believe what you are made into today is anything but the result of pragmatism, the result of cutting the anchorage of Europe, deliberately; since 1910 has been done by Mr. John Dewey, and the Teachers College, New York, and all the influences you now realize, come from: the child has no right to the sense of wonder. Everything is immediately explained. "Don't be surprised". Why should you? "It's nothing but."

2

So newspaper clippings are assigned -- puns, \$64,000 question, quiz kids -- they are all giving you a superiority complex. Because a quiz kid is ruined for life, I would say. To be allowed to ask a child questions and pay it for knowing this nonsense, which they ask. Give them the question.

But that's their relation to reality.

The relation of human beings to life is not question and answer. That's the curse of your misunderstanding of the Socratic method.

The real relation is by learning by heart, the songs of the past, for example.

And no question and answer. Question and answer is only possible when you are stymied. When do you ask from the street, your neighbor, where the next house stands? In which case? When would you stop a passenger and have to ask him a question?

(When you're lost.)

When you're lost, when you are ignorant. Life is this side of question and answer, because it's just flowing, it's functioning. And you only ask when you become self-conscious and say, "Well, I may be mistaken. Is this the house?"

3

Any stranger must ask for the road. Any foreigner must ask for the name of a thing.

The question always means that you are outside life. Anybody who asks is already flat on his fannies. He has fallen down.

That's the fall of the Bible. The question-and-answer situation is this, the experimental situation, the reflective. And innocence is where you do not ask the question, but where you listen. And where you believe.

4

Now how can you get into the swing of reality if children are allowed to ask -- they may ask, but never answer their questions.

THE STORY OF CHILDREN'S QUESTIONS

One of the curses of America is that children's questions are answered. One out of ten questions of a child must be answered, because it's concerned. The other is just a way getting interested, of getting into the swing of things. The child knows very well that it is not inside the process of reality, and so by the question, it wants to, like the foreigner, to find its way into this maze of life.

But you do this child a much greater favor if you commission it at this very moment. When the child asks a question, you may sure that it has lost its way. And so it sits back, and instead of joining the fray, it tries to take stock of it. But it is always happy if you break the spell, forget about the question, and say, "You'd better put on your hat and go out for a walk in the --" or whatever you have to say to the child to free it from its questioning state.

II

1

I think that's one of your misunderstandings, because you think history begins with questions. History does not begin with questions, but it begins with the sense of wonder, that you live inside history. That there is something that has gone on before what? And you want to be told.

At the very moment somebody tells you, you have no special questions any further to ask.

Well, how did this all come about?

When you write a life of a single man, you take him already out of the context of history. Biography is late.

When Homer was in love with Achilles, he had to tell the whole story of the Trojan War. He couldn't write a life of Achilles. Biography is taking the carpet of history and dissolve it into its elements. And all biography is already second to history.

2

You first have the story of the World War, then you can write the life of Mr. Eisenhower. You can never compose the Second World War out of the biography of Sparta, and Eisenhower, and Vandenberg, and Patton, and Hitler. All the lives together never would give you any picture of the Second World War. But after you know the Second World War, you can say Churchill, and you can say Roosevelt. And you can distribute the roles in the drama.

This brings me now to my proposition today -- every life of a single human being -- it is analysis of an historical event in which these people play roles. So -- how do you call the people in a drama? Actors, or roles, or what have you? persons?

(Actors.)

Biography is separating the individual actors of the drama, of history.

It's an analysis of Julius Caesar, instead of seeing the play, Julius Caesar, acted in which Brutus and the others counteract Caesar.

3

This may show you why the word "encounter" today is rediscovered. The deep feeling that by analysis of individuals, you never get into reality.

So Mr. Buber says "Encounter is really the creation of the agent, the various agents."

And the "encounter" is today the word for "drama."

Now in Plutarch, there is a so-called comparison between the Greek and the Roman hero of biographies. And this rhetoric trick means that Plutarch replaces the dialogue of real life between Pericles and his adversaries by his mental reflection on the two, which he puts on an artificial state. And everywhere the Greek reflection still is so much bound by dramatic, dialogical experience that you have in Plato, the fiction of dialogue, at least; and you have in Plutarch, this remnant of the respect for reality that the heroes have at least to be compared in his mind.

But the true biography is that you make the man himself correspond and talk with his friends and enemies who make him.

4

So the best biography today is not the isolated biography of one man, but it would be, for example, the life of the William James family. And Mr. Matthiessen in this country has undertaken this. It's a great step forward in the art of writing biography. He suddenly saw that Henry James and William James, and their father produced each other constantly, provoked each other, give each other. And so he tried to recapture the real drama of this story of the James family.

I think he didn't succeed. I always want to write the books myself. It's a much greater drama than even Mr. Matthiessen realized. And I've been engaged in this for two decades now, feeling that we will not recapture this sense of wonder in biography, if we isolate the individual agent.

III

1

And so Plutarch and the Greeks have handed us over a very dangerous heritage.

I think that the modern biography destroys your sense of history. If you take a man's birth, and his antecedents, and you take his life, and you take his after-life, the history comprises three generations. Here he is inactive, and you can even say "passive." Here he is active, and here he is effective.

Or ineffective. If he is a failure, he's ineffective. That's the same. You can write the life of a prig, or of a playboy, or Gloria Vanderbilt or what-not.

2

So biography belongs to three chapters of history.

Every life should be treated when you treat the manners of the time in which you are born. The topic would not be you, because you would make such a little snowflake inside the blizzard of your youth. There was a society moving, and you were part and parcel of it. You were on the receiving side. So the agent of your own youth, and your own antecedents before your parents get married is not yourself.

All attempts to make the hero the hero of his youth are ridiculous.

3

And the old tribes knew this, and so the youth of the hero is always shrouded in mystery. You have heard in anthropology, perhaps, this problem of the youth of the hero. And where was Oedipus, before he came to Thebes?

And there is a whole literature today about the youth of the hero, the antecedents of the man in history. Where did he come from? And the reason is that he's not the agent of this prehistory. He's prehistorical to his history.

And if you only would wake up to the fact that you are not able to speak of prehistory among primitive men, as long as you haven't discovered that you have a prehistorical existence, in which you are not the eye of your history, in which you are made.

There is much prehistory in all of us. The hour hasn't come, yet, where we get ourselves under control.

4

The biologist calls, we are lived. We are lived. The life processes flood through us.

Don't be ashamed of this. Know that you are just as much prehistorical as historical. This is the tension, this is the polarity. With every responsible decision you change the relation between the eggshell and the egg.

But most of you are still very much in the shell. And again, the American notion is "Oh no, the shell is also me." Don't believe this. Your eggshell is not yourselves. That was produced by your antecedents around you.

Most of you are held in the view of the world, I cannot see you, yet. I see much more about your so-called background, which is your eggshell.

IV

1

So that's why true history is dissolved by a too one-sided idea of biography that this life is emanating backward into the womb of time. And so we get psychoanalysis of the embryo. The true prehistory of mine is the marriage of my parents, how they became one. And that's their history; not mine.

And therefore it would transcend the limits of a pure biography, which only speaks of me. I have to make other people the dramatists, the agents of the drama, in order to get to my prehistory. I have been the result of other people's responsible actions and experiences. And since people hate to admit this -- you live in an era of guinea-pig thinking -- everybody today traces his biography to his genes, or to his physical, to the embryo in the mother.

2

Actually they do analyze this now. It's a complete confusion. It has nothing to do. We know nothing about it. We shall never know. But it's very important whether these parents ever got married, or just said so.

If there was a real fusion of two hearts, if they became one body, then you will not be a decadent.

People who marry experimentally have children without heart, and without passion. They are very intelligent children, but usually very cruel children.

3

Cruelty is also hereditary. It comes not by genes, but by the degree of fusion of the two beings who have produced you. If they are in love, the result is simplicity. And if they are not in love, you are split.

4

So now you see, that's why biography is very late. It's always a warning: when biographies are written, history is usually in a mudhole. It's stuck.

Because real humility is that the individual cannot be told without his prehistory, and without his posterity, and therefore it is only in extraordinary cases, that we have to concentrate on the individual against the tapestry of the historical life.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE GREEK MIND

I

1

And as I said, the comparison in Plutarch is the last remnant of this deep feeling that you cannot tell the secret of one person without holding him up against another, that the comparison, the so-called "*synkresis*" in Plutarch is the redeeming grace by which he begs your pardon for having isolated the hero. So he puts him back into some context, at least.

It's an artificial context of virtues versus vices, and so on. But at least he is there with somebody else.

2

And this comparison of the Greeks is the essential Greek solution. We have learned from the Greeks to compare. All comparative law, comparative linguistics -- the comparison was the highest element of salvation in the Greek world.

And it isn't very high. But we have learned from the Greeks to compare, and to replace real life by comparison of my own mind, which is the bystander looking at two comparing them, although they belong one to Rome and to Greece.

And if you read Homer, the comparison between Hector and Achilles, the comparison between Troy and the Greeks, that's his great invention. That's called "humanism."

3

Humanism is not what you think, to be nice.

But humanism is the power to take two people outside their environment and to compare them as to their third qualities, regardless of their historical context.

And in Plutarch, Homer is exaggerated. Every two -- one Roman and one Greek -- are shown in the same light as Achilles and Hector. But you can see the limitations of comparison. There the content is omitted. The contents is left outside.

4

So the onlooker's mind replaces the topsoil in which the heroes really are rooted and lead their lives.

And all philosophers do this. What you call the Greek mind -- and you have to learn today that the Greek mind is only one-half of your spiritual heritage: without a blend of the Biblical and the Greek heritage, you are all absolutely lost, because you all end in chasing the tail of the cat, which is comparison; because you can compare forever, and never know anything absolute.

II

1

It's very nice to compare Alexander to Caesar, and Caesar to Alexander. But whether you want to dominate the world, that's not solved by this comparison of two people who try to dominate the world. The direction of your life is not given by comparing two people who got lost in the woods. That they are lost in the woods, or they didn't get lost in the woods, you have to know from another source.

The destiny of men, gentlemen, is never explained by comparison.

2

(Is that what you mean, when you say that humanists take the two individuals out of their context?)

Ja. He just resigns himself: this is how they were.

Now, so I would say today in all your literature on Plutarch, you will never find the *synkresis*, the comparison on your end taken seriously.

3

And I would say that this is the umbilical cord by which Plutarch remained a devout spirit of Greek tradition. Had he not compared Camillus or whoever it is in this case, Fabius Maximus and Pericles -- he would have posed as a superball, as Emil Ludwig or some of these scoundrels of today. And godless people who take it upon themselves to create and dismiss theories according to their will.

It's the comparison which keeps the Greeks in line. That they are surrounded by civilizations that seem to explain each other, to illuminate each other, and to enlighten each other.

4

And here in this country, where you have the harbor of New York, and of San Francisco, and you nearly perish by comparison, because to compare means to sterilize the influence of somebody within your own environment.

(The lost Puritan.)

Ja, exactly, exactly.

III

1

THE STORY OF GERMANY THE VERY DEAD COUNTRY AT THIS MOMENT

Well, I tell you. Germany is a very dead country at this moment. I was invited to teach there in 1950. Went to the University of Göttingen. And I had a terrible experience. I was quite famous in Germany for my work in adult education. And the professor of adult education in Göttingen was an old friend, and I may even say, a student and disciple of mine. He was six years or seven years younger, and in our young days that made a difference. You are thirty and the other man is 22, it makes a difference. If you are seventy and the man is sixty, it makes no difference.

So he had learned a lot - never denied this. And so he invited me to his lecture course on adult education. He was very ambitious, and went off on political campaign speeches at that time, and left to me his class. So I made a great point in giving the very best I had to say in adult education in the great, the disappearance of spiritual authority in Germany -- with Bismarck, and Hindenburg, and Hitler. Everybody shown up as fakes.

I asked the simple question, in whom to put one's trust. And how could education proceed without any leading lights, without having any points of reference in the past? And that's the situation in Germany at this moment.

2

And I had two hundred people in this class, and so I got going. And it was so that I felt I had given this man an opportunity to work with these people, and to lead them. And so when he came back -- his assistant had attended my lectures and had taken them down in shorthand -- I said it's very important that you should just now join, at the point at which I have moved them. They suddenly see that they themselves are in a unique position without ancestry, without any spiritual ancestors. And this is a very dangerous position. They have no values to go by. And it's only the admission of this terrible vacuum which can save them.

And so I was very anxious. And after all, we had been collaborators. And I said, "Now please, would you kindly step into my shoes now, and continue?" He didn't listen to what I had to say. And he said, "Oh no, I have just thought on my journey what I would do. I would now make a speech characterizing you, giving a sketch on your character." So I said, "Oh, my obituary. This is not why I got up here, so that you can now depict me, and just take me out of commerce".

3

What he did was, to hang me up as a picture on the wall, instead of entering this process of wonder which I had tried to start in them. He immediately objectified me, took me out of context, and he thought it was a great compliment. He thought he was flattering me.

And of course, I preferred life to death. I said I'm not interested in my after-life. You make me into some posthumous specter of myself.

And he did -- he's completely dead, and his wife is dying from this death of the man, for years, now. And she is an invalid, only because he has lost his soul.

4

This is always very simple. If you once have lived a little, the human tragedy is always the same. When in this man, the sense of wonder has been destroyed in favor of his knowing everything. And instead of meeting me in an encounter, and joining me, and marching forward at the head of this army of - after all, two hundred listeners are not a small capital of humanity. He stopped them short, and said, "Oh, look at this man, he's such-and-such".

IV

1

And the funny thing is, that being completely Greek, he thought he gave me a compliment, by acting as my Plutarch.

And this was forbidden.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S SOZIOLOGIE

This happened now again with my Soziologie, the big universal history. A man has now published a long article very complimentary. But I'm as dead as a dodo, because he compares me with a great writer of the 18th century. That's all I can get. Instead of saying you can learn something from me, act accordingly, I am out of the ocean; I'm just as low as I'm beneaped. Left stranded. Terrible.

And you all do this.

2

It has become a habit now, with objectifying a person instead of encountering him and marching along with him.

The greatest favor you do a human being is to forget who he is and to take him up on what he says.

You can see this.

3

Well, I have something more to say about this strange Greek behavior of all of you. If you have these three generations, these three chapters in every man's life, I can tell you that there are to this day three modes of treating a human life.

The Greek, the Egyptian, and the ecclesiastical.

I would use then two strange expressions to shake you out of your sleepiness. What has the Church to say about a man's life? When you read -- who would be the people the Church is interested in?

The saints, ja. They are not very interested in the sinners, but the saints.

Well, what event connects a saint with the Church, with the memory of the Church?

(Martyrdom.)

Yes, martyrdom, his death.

So you find that the people, the names of a saint are mentioned in the calendar of the Church by his death, and you know it's even today demanded from a saint, if he wants to be canonized, that something is proved about the time after his death. What has to be proven in the Roman Church? It may strike you as very odd, but it's important to think about it. What the advocate of the saint, in the trial in Rome, whether he should be declared a saint? What has to be approved? You know it?

At his tomb, something has to happen.

(A miracle?)

4

Quite. So in a strange and estranged way, the Roman Church has still the idea that man is a transformer.

We are transformed in our youth, prehistorically and after life. Our after-life consists in our power to transform.

Don't be stymied by the word "miracle". If I can't do miracles, I'm not an historian. We all, as loving people, transform. You transform your bridegroom, as a fiancée. You have to. That's your business. He must become a different human being.

SECOND PART: OUR TRIUNE EXISTENCE

CHAPTER ONE: REPRESENTATION

I

1

But unfortunately, in our modern world, miracles are pooh-poohed, and we only have them at the grave; and therefore, you think miracles are just out.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S LIFE FULL OF MIRACLES

I assure you that they are not out. My whole life has been only lived on miracles, and on nothing else.

Whether you call them miracles or not, I don't care. But certainly it has not been lived experimentally. I can tell you that. And that's why I still think I'm quite healthy, and quite vigorous because I've never allowed myself to stand before the mirror and take stock of my reflections and base my life on my own ideas. I've tried to listen to the commands that come to a man when he has to obey orders. That's the only way in which you can keep sound.

2

So in life we have the Greek problem of a man's actions. Or acts. Or "action" is perhaps better. And so -- not miracles, but action.

And you are all action-drunk. You want to do something about it, and so on. So no miracles, but actions -- over-actions.

3

Now there is an Egyptian tradition, and you can read it every day in the paper, that the life of a man hasn't to be explained by his actions, and hasn't to be explained by his after-life, but by what?

(The stars?)

Ja, the horoscope. His horoscope. And please don't laugh. It's just as important for you to regenerate in you the sense of wonder about the star as the sense of wonder about the miracles.

You have to find the new expressions for this, but it is simply true that there is a constellation when you are born.

4

Think of Lincoln and the constellation of this country, which made him just the given man. A man not in the Church, but still imbued with the whole biblical wisdom, so that he was able to write the *Second Inaugural*. A mere barbarian couldn't do this. Mr. Knowland couldn't have become president, because he is not shot through with the language of the Bible. But you read any word of Lincoln, and it is there.

And I tried to tell you in my class, in 180, about Herman Melville, that he was the last who still spoke Bible and Shakespeare in every line he wrote, so he could become Herman Melville.

II

1

So -- the horoscope.

Now here you have the three elements of real biography.

The constellation under which you are born: don't deny it. We are all in this sense horoscopal, because our environment, gives us certain opportunities, and others, it doesn't. There's nothing, it's just not to be changed. We are born into a world: will you deny that it exists, that it has already its own purposes, its own forms, its own ways of moving and determining you?

And so the sooner you get together *the Egyptian, the Greek, and the ecclesiastical*, the more you can see that the biblical approach tries to comprehend all three. What I would call the "biblical." What we saw in the story of Samuel and his mother. His mother is his horoscope, his constellation. She devotes him to the sanctuary. She goes there in her great agony. And that's all done before he is responsible for this.

2

So that's why I feel the first book of Samuel is the key to our modern understanding of the Bible, more than the book of Genesis. You can rebuild from biography history again. If you only complete the history, and see that the miracle of Samuel is then the production of this tension of David and Nathan. That the fact that he calls him "Saul," and abdicates the thing -- "Saul will now hear the commands of the Lord" --although this comes to nought, the fact that he, Samuel, creates Saul, enables later this dualism of Church and state in Israel, of prophecy and kingship.

3

And this is his antecedent. This is his miracle.

And there is a miracle. I tried to show you that the role of prophets in Israel -- you remember, we talked here about it? -- is miraculous. They have never existed before, because of Samuel and his mother's faith. Eli couldn't have done it, because he had these reprobate sons; that they have been completely decayed.

4

So please, this will be a lifetime job.

Your generation has to reconquer the unity of the horoscope and the constellation of the time when you are born, and your respect for it.

You can't brush it aside and say, "environment". It's more complicated. It's your mother. And you have your own actions. And you have the after-effects. The productivity, the fecundity of your life in others.

And this is usually beyond our own notion, as it shows later, beyond our preconceived notions of what we are doing, we do things that we do not even know what we are doing.

III

1

(But can't you comment a little bit more on the difference between the kind of horoscope you first mentioned, namely the kind we see in the daily newspapers, and what you mean here. Because I think there's a difference.)

Well, isn't it too early? Mustn't I first make you wonder about the fact that we are born in a constellation?

You want me to say now two things at once.

2

I'm not superstitious. I don't believe in horoscopes. You understand that. This I haven't to tell you at this moment. But I have to wake you up to the fact that in the horoscope there is left in a crude manner a separate approach to life, which does not put all the emphasis on the existence between birth and death. But it warns you to say that there is an equally essential element in this. That's all I tried to say.

And so at this moment, you have to swallow this hard word "horoscope," as you have to swallow this word "miracle."

Please invent better expressions in your own vocabulary for these terms. But make an effort to see yourself treated as a Trinitarian texture. There are three elements in your own life.

And don't be unhappy about it, because fortunately your parents and antecedents' generation loved you, and were your equals. They were your brothers, they were your sisters in time. That's why I at this moment do not shrink from the word "horoscope," because the constellation is already the product of human hearts. They did marry, and they did found a society, and a state. And you can recognize -

the attitude toward the past is recognition.

3

It's the greatest thing if a son can understand, that his father did act just the same as he does now.

That's more difficult than for a father to recognize that his son will act just the same as he does. That most fathers are quite willing to do. But you are happy as soon as you understand that thirty years ago, you would have acted as your father has. And proud is the man who can.

And it is very painful if you discover the weakness in your father where you say "No, I'm sorry. He went wrong. I have to make up for this." But this both do. You are your father's judge, and you are your father's brother. You are your judge in as far as you must not repeat his performance. And you are his brother in as far as you rediscover his plight and your plight, regardless of the lapse of time are the same plight.

4

(I was already jumping forward to Hamlet: "There is a destiny that shakes")

Well, I'm all for it. But you can do this, just the same. I have first to make you digest two things you have excluded really from your little mind.

Pardon me for saying this, because it's a little mind that tries to put everything on the individual. It makes you small.

IV

1

If you try to justify your existence only in terms of your own consciousness -- and that's the disease of this country at this moment, that you identify your existence with your consciousness. But consciousness is only there where we have to act. Your whole existence is not based on consciousness. It's only one-third of life that is based on consciousness.

Fruitfulness is destroyed by consciousness. And gratitude is destroyed by consciousness.

Or tradition -- or whatever you call your representative character, that you are a representative of this country, or of your family, or of a talent, or whatever it is, is destroyed by consciousness.

2

You are not a good Presbyterian representative of what a Presbyterian should be by consciousness. But you just are the good Presbyterian or you are whatever you are: a Mormon, or a good woman, or a student. Recognition makes us representative.

So there is an interaction between recognition, which is backward-looking, and representation which is -- and here you have my word for the horoscope, my dear. Then we become representative, then we are doing this because we have recognized. That's an interaction between gratitude and character.

I become representative after I have recognized what I had to inherit, and what I have to remake present again. Because what does "represent" mean? To make present again in my own generation.

3

Now here you have the relation of seed and fruit. And now I don't know what we can use there in a spiritual, deliberate, and explicit situation: recognition and representation.

(Pollination.)

No, no. Your father, or the founding fathers of this country you recognize, so you become a representative American, because you can hardly become an American without recognizing first whom you represent. That's an interaction you can see.

4

So we now have to find terms which do not use the syllable "re," but would have to use the syllable "pre." P-r-e, because obviously you are the precursor, the precedent, and the

others follow through it. The syllable "pre-" -- the antedating, you must become an antecedent.

Here, in this case, you appropriate your antecedents by recognizing them. These are the antecedents.

CHAPTER TWO: HEIR, MAN, FOUNDER

I

1

I had this on the blackboard before. And this "posterity" I may say is your own life.

Well, we say "life," the conscious life. What the Greeks call the "ethos," our word "ethics" comes from this -- "*ethos*" means character. And Plutarch is full of ethos. He tries to give the ethos of the hero. And that is an attempt to place him in space. To abstract from the chronological course of events, and to outline, as this friend of mine, who put me as a picture on the wall.

This is the Greek idea, that you can depict this man as a lasting character in his actions, regardless of what went on before, and regardless of what follows.

2

... I need an expression - "saintliness" has completely gone out of commerce. It's a useless word, but if we have antecedents, we could here use again the word "precedent." And what is the consequence -- the people who live by precedent, how would you call them? whose life is formed and stylized by the fact that they can live by precedent?

(Orthodox?)

That's not a good term in your ears. It's not a recommendation today. Everybody today is proud of being a heretic. Well, who wants to be orthodox? I want to be orthodox, but I'm the only person I've met who thinks, when he hears the word "orthodox," of anything but the Orthodox Greek Church. We all have to try to be orthodox, but I don't think that you can use this term to ring a bell -- "orthodox"?

(It does to me.)

It does. Good. I'm glad to hear this. Who still feels that one should be orthodox?

You don't.

(No, well, it depends on orthodox -- you have to select.)

3

Well, but give me a word that expresses the same reverence, for the fear to deviate from the revealed path of righteousness. This is what we are trying to establish between two generations, here. That's the important life.

Whereby has George Washington's life to be told? Or even Daniel Webster's life?

I read a very beautiful justification of Webster the other day, against "Ichabod," you know. We had "Ichabod" here. Well, they said, "*Everything can be forgiven Daniel Webster, because of his tenderness for the whole nation, for all Americans, that the South was in his heart, really.*"

The word "tenderness" really made an impression on me, that that was his American orthodoxy that he was tender, that he cared for carrying all the others with him. There was no brutality in the man, in his spirit. He wanted to be so comprehensive, so compassionate. And this was his justification.

Not that he was right, not that he was orthodox. But that he was comprehensive, or compassionate. And that he sacrificed. I thought the word "tenderness" surprised me. And I learned it. I offer it to you --.

4

But I don't know -- what you would say of Jesus and the Church. The fruitfulness, as the result of a mental attitude inside the man who forgoes too much consciousness, too much vanity, too much purpose, too much deliberate planning, for allowing things to grow.

(Isn't there a Greek word "athos" means "the spirit of the times," replace your "precedent.")

That would be wonderful if we could give "ethos" this meaning. It has it in Greek. "Ethos" means "kind."

(No, no, no. There was a word "athos," "a-t-h-o-s, I thought there was a word there.)

I understand what you're saying.

(..spirit. I remember hearing that there was a Greek term that means the "spirit of the times.")

Kairos, you mean. Kairos.

(That may be it.)

(Athos is the promontory where the monastery is located.)

Oh, Athos. That's A-t-h-o-s. You don't mean this. Athos is just --.

(No, no, no.)

No, he means ethos, e-t-h-o-s.

(I don't know I'm getting trouble here with the semantic difficulties. But the idea is the "spirit of the times," rather than "precedent.")

That's kairos. That's Tillich's favorite expression, kairos. It's a very important word. "Khronos" means just time. "Chronology" means just the reckoning, computation of time. "Kairos" means occasion, to sense the sense of the time.

(The moment.)

The moment, yes. "Kairos" is the sense of timing, I have translate it this way, the sense for timing. Is this what you mean?

(Well, you're trying to establish here three specific sections. One here is precedence.)

II

1

Well I only wanted to have the syllable "pre-", yes, precedent, yes. It means the full risk. The precedent is undecided yet. One doesn't know the outcome. Even at court, the precedent is -- when not yet established, while you are before the court. I drop the word "precedent." Go to the thing itself. You try to decide in your own terms. Please do.

(Initiative?)

No, you say it once more. You have a Greek word in mind, which expresses what?

(The spirit of the times.)

2

Well, to tell you the truth, I really think the word "kairos" is the word.

You have heard of Paul Tillich, perhaps. He is the theologian now in Harvard. And forty years ago, he founded a yearbook called "*Kairos*," to which I have contributed myself. So I'm quite familiar with the whole story. And he said that the problem of the Holy Spirit was the problem of timing, of knowing when to move, and that every moment had its own grace, "*gratia*" in the Latin sense. The grace of God is depending on the time - there is in Shakespeare the famous line, what you have to take the moment by the forelock. Otherwise it will never come back.

"*There is a tide in the affairs of men.*" That's Shakespeare, too.

*(Which, if taken at the flood, leads on.)*³

³ *Brutus:*

There is a tide in the affairs of men.
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life

Tide, ja. Not "time." Right. Isn't that your problem?

(Now I'm lost.)

3

Well, I want to find you after all, it's important. Wherever you have today the term "time," you hit on the important problem of our time. Because our time has lost the sense of timing.

Thursday evening, I am going to speak in Riverside on history, and the sense of time in an age of technology. And I want to show why in our time the sense for time is destroyed. So you are hitting on the most important question of our time.

(Well, I'm getting the impression, that you are developing a cycle of things.)

Oh, no, but --.

(Not one that's not complete in itself, but it's an evolutionary thing.)

4

Well, I want to say something very simple, then.

When a child opens its eyes to life, it is embedded in three spirits of three ages. And we are all three-agers, and not teen-agers. You can only redeem a teen-ager by educating him to the three ages.

And that's why this country is in a bad way, because it has concentrated on action, and on on consciousness, and concentrated on will, and concentrated on reason. And therefore, the teen-ager who is yet unable to will, and unable to reason is completely lost, because he has lost the honor of being the fruit of antecedents; and he's never told that it isn't the deficiency of his will that he has to suffer from, but the great hope that he will be fruitful.

That all his austerity, all his shortcomings, all his abstemiousness -- that he mustn't go to the brothel, that he mustn't use narcotics -- is there, because he will have the honor of being the ancestor of a great race. If you cannot make the third age and the first age potent in this boy's life -- or in this girl's life -- then he must compare himself to the willful great executive of fifty with vice president or president. And he feels -- never do that; that's too far away. And therefore it's too big. And therefore he just goes to pieces. He says, "I don't

Is bound in shallows and in miseries.
 On such a full sea are we now afloat,
 And we must take the current when it serves,
 Or lose our ventures. Julius Caesar IV, 3, 218-224

care". He says -- "Then I'll have to go to prison, to a reformatory," or what-not. It's too far away.

III

1

If you only compare the little baby to the big shot, the tycoon, the baby will remain a baby. As they do now. Ninety percent of Americans want to remain babies till they are seventy. They are afraid.

But as soon as you see that there are three mountain peaks in your life, that you are just as great as representative of past, as a seed of the future, that you are in your own right on a pedestal of being admired by your contemporaries, then this whole thing becomes a process, and it becomes possible.

And I'm not then a non-entity at this moment -- while I'm not yet the tycoon -- but I'm just as important, because I have to represent, I have to recognize all the good people.

2

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S SON

I can't tell you the expression of bliss and vitality which my son had on his face when he was ten and he was asked who his father was. And he beamed all over his face, and said, "My father is there to govern me." And you saw what a burden was taken from his heart, because he didn't have to govern himself, but I had to govern him.

Now this is impossible in America. A child wouldn't say that. And as long as it can't say this, this is a very unhappy creature.

(Is that not somewhat the relationship that the Puritans had to God?)

Of course.

3

So this triune business, gentlemen, don't take it as a luxury. It means that no one phase of our existence is the whole thing. And as soon as you compare then the perfect man of one stage, with the imperfect, the imperfect will break down and just give up.

And that's what you have today, that one-half of these people just give up the race, because they are only told that their honor is in being individuals, *self-conscious, willful, planning, rational, impassionate, superior*, or what-not.

But half of my life I'm a child. And I want to remain one. But only one-third. And as soon as you say, "You must remain a child of man, and you must be a man, and you must be a father"-- or a mother, for that matter. And if you distribute this, it becomes a process in which everybody at every moment has still an important role to play. He's not just an agent, but he's also the fruit, and he's representative in this respect. And he's just as beautiful without acting.

(It's beginning to come through a little bit.)

Not much. Please contradict me.

(I have no desire to contradict you. But I don't understand exactly what you're driving at.)

4

Well, I'm driving at the fact that the Greek type of biography is impossible for us today. We want to have these three different elements represented in a life.

*The life's fruitfulness,
and the life's transformation
and the life's activity, certainly,
and the life's constellation,*

or what did we have?

Well, its being the result and its being the fruit -- the seed. And the transformation between these three, that's the achievement of any human life, and that this combination -- one man wakes up to himself at nineteen and the other wakes up to himself at fortyfive. So therefore, once you have these three elements in you, *the child, the man, and the founder* -- I like to call the child not the "child" but the "heir."

But with the modern inheritance taxes, there is so little to inherit that you don't respect it. But you are an heir, certainly, h-e-i-r. We all are heirs and heiresses. And it's terrible that the papers only call a rich person an heiress.

IV

1

If you discover what makes an heir, is the recognition of his relation to the testator. What makes a man or a wife a woman, taking their fate into their own hands, becoming self-reliant -- and what makes however, a founder -- doing things because they have to be done. The acknowledgment of demands, that do not care in the least for your happiness, but which make you happy because you are in the gap in the armor of the human race, which only you can mend, because you only understand that there is such a gap. And you let the chips fly where they may.

Any grownup person is only healthy if this is his main concern.

2

THE STORY OF THE DOCTOR IN ENGLAND

I always tell a very simple story to this effect -- I went to a doctor in England and I was in great pain. And my doctor in Breslau had given me the address of this man -- and that's in Silesia -- and said, if I had to go to Oxford to lecture there -- and so as you arrive, after seasickness, you are low, and you have more pains than you probably have. And I went to this doctor. Dr. Sachs was his name. He lived in these doctor's quarters where there is one doctor next to the other, as the Anglo-Saxons do it. All the lawyers in one street. All the doctors on one street. Very funny arrangement. And so he said, "You are a scholar, and you must lecture at Oxford." "Yes," I said. "But I'm feeling poor."

He said, "I'll tell you. Officers in the services and scholars, in my experience, go nuts if they are under medical treatment for more than a fortnight. It is your business to forget yourself and to think of others. And that's why you are a scholar. That's what a military man has to do. So if you are asked to concentrate on yourself, on my treatment too long, that will harm you. Have your pains, and lecture. And that's better than anything I can do for you."

And here was a man, who was a founder instead of a doctor.

A doctor is an active man who does what the profession demands. He was able to drop his profession, and not to write a bill and not to medicate, but to think of the future, of myself, really in terms quite absent from my silly weakness, of trying to get a cane to walk with, from him.

3

And I have never seen a greater act of love. That is what love does, to emancipate the person you love from your own self.

But I don't know if you realize that this man overstepped the boundary of his professional ethics and became a full-fledged man, because he provided liberty for me from himself. He freed me from my superstitions that it always had to be a doctor. He became my Christian Scientist at that moment. Which is tremendous -- and every doctor today is asked to do today just that.

That's why medical ethics aren't enough. Somebody has to tell the doctor, "Stop with your medicine. Send the patient home and say, 'Become well under your own steam,'" - in cases. Not always, you understand.

4

This liberty today is the problem of all specialists. And this is always not doing one's own will, but surrendering to a higher will. Don't you see that this man surrendered to a situation in encountering me, which had nothing to do with his shingle, "Dr. Sachs, Internal Medicine."

CHAPTER THREE: TRIUNE

I

1

And this overstepping your self-consciousness is your relation to the future, is your fruitfulness. If you could formulate this, this is why I'm asking for the term: what did this man do at this moment?

This is greatness.

If you can see that this is greatness, you suddenly are in the real creative history of the human race.

All the acts we have to remember are those acts where a man forgot himself.

Will you take this down? It's the best solution of history I can offer you. All the acts we have to remember are those acts in which a man forgot his self-interest.

2

You don't have to remember the acts where a man looked out for himself. Heavens! That's ceded. The Bible said they have their reward.

But the reward you owe the people is to recognize that they did something beyond their self-interest.

And that's all fatherhood. A father -- it's against his interest. He wants to sleep with every woman. But in fatherhood, he forgoes this privilege, and recognizes that he has to stick to one woman. And that's his dignity. The children of this woman make him stay with her. And therefore fatherhood had in all former days this tremendous importance that you attribute to a father that he does not act within the realm of his self-interest.

3

Take a farmer who wants to give his son his farm, and one day discovers he shouldn't. The son must be left free to become a minister or a poet. In this very moment, the father steps outside the realm of his own interest, and forgets himself and his interest, in love to his son. That's a great moment. It's the greatest moment in the history of the family.

4

And you can see that in biography and history, there are very few such important moments. Life doesn't consist of 24 hours. The decision, that he will help his son to become something that is against his own interest -- to leave his farm to his heir, that's the one historical action in his whole life. All the others count for nothing. That he eats well, drinks well, and so on, that's not historical. That's all just biological. The historical is always this one -- you can take this down --

the historical is always this one step where a man decides to be representative, or to be germinative,

or how -- I'm just looking for a word; it's not a good word, either, but I mean -- instead of looking out for himself.

II

1

So that he becomes a triune.

Gentlemen, the Trinity is not written in Heaven only, that God is in three persons. It is your own experience that you are in three persons.

Father, Son and Holy Spirit -- that's the daily experience of every human being, because every moment you either recognize, or you decide, or you sow. Or are sown.

This is even better than "sow." We don't sow, but we are sown.

2

And that's our great honor. And that's why life is so astonishing, because the mixture, the admixture of these three elements is every day one's own free decision. That's why no day is like the other.

This doctor -- before I came to him, had no idea that he had to become a hero in my eyes. But he did. And he has forgotten it. He never thought much of it. But I proclaim his glory now for -- how long ago is this? -- 1927 it had to be. Imagine! And now I'm still speaking of it. That's how many years?

(Thirty-two years.)

3

Ja. So I wish you would help me to find this, if you will, this interlacing of the three generations seems to me our answer to the Greek, Plutarchean biography, where everything is contained within the consciousness of the man. And the antecedents are only given to lead him up to his own consciousness. He uses it up.

4

The Greeks have this naturalistic idea. Here is the chicken, the chicken eats up the eggshells, and then it is sold. And we look at it, and admire it greatly, and then it dies. Or is slaughtered, or what-not. That's the Plutarchean biography. And that's most unsatisfactory for you and me.

Or perhaps it isn't.

Plutarch to me is rudimentary. It's one way. And he saves the context, as I said, by comparisons. He has this shelf on which he compares the different bottles. But it is all at a standstill; it's all just viewed from outside.

III

1

All Greeks are, in this sense, voyeurs. They look at things. Your world -- *Look, View, See*, are all Greek -- or the preponderance of the eye sense.

*But with the past, we are connected by obedience,
and with the future, we are connected by smell, by scent, by flair.*

2

This man Sachs didn't find anything in his books to tell me this. He could only sense that he would do me wrong if he treated me. That's flair. He -- hesensed my problem, or you say he had a "hunch" -- that's not quite as good, but you may use it.

And all your important actions are done at the full risk that what we see tells against the decision. Here the man saw me in his office, after all. And I was the patient, and he was the doctor, who didn't expect him to be anything but the doctor. And I had to be his patient.

So to have the sense to say, "This man must not become a patient" is revolutionary. It takes me -- and him, too -- out of the environment, which is there to be, in itself to operate on us. And he uproots this context, and says, "I meet you in a free encounter. I'll look at you as who you should be outside this waiting room and this office." And so he saved me.

3

If you can learn to discern in every day, every one of us is demanded to make these distinctions. All of you are triune. And the more you become a specialist - for you it is easy to grasp it. For a man who is busy, in his office -- take an executive in industry, it becomes more difficult, to remain to these three worlds. Much more difficult.

A man of fifty is usually completely afraid to miss his own self-importance. And one more appendicitis to a surgeon is very easily considered a success, whereas obviously the surgeon should also be like my doctor, and say, "I won't operate". And you should gauge the reputation of a surgeon by the question: How many operations has he declined? instead of saying, "Oh, he does three hundred a month".

This shouldn't be a recommendation.

4

So my dear -- this word "horoscope" has one great connection with your question, Sir. It means the view of the seasons, "*horos-*," and of the god Horus in Egypt -- that's probably where it comes from, "*horo-scope*." So it means this -- to view the spirit of the time as it already exists at the birth.

And so the word "horoscope" at least is better than recognition and so on, perhaps. There is some time-sense in it expressed.

IV

1

If you would feel in the word "recognition" the same relation to the given conditions of history, then you can drop the word "horoscope". But otherwise I would hold it up to you as a warning that it means that God has created the world before we were born, and that we can be in alignment and approval, that we don't have to be a rebel against everything that has gone on before, that we even can't. This idea of rebel is purified by this idea that long before we are born, history already had a direction, had a meaning, and therefore imparts something to us, which we have perhaps to single out - but we are not this -- the world doesn't begin with us.

(How about "heritage"?)

It has been abused. It doesn't --. Yes, I --.

2

Now here is my boys' present. Perhaps you take down this title. I want also to proclaim its glory forever.

Friedrich Leo, like the lion -- came out in Leipzig in 1901, and it is called *The Greek-Roman Biography in Its Literary Form*. And I think the title conveys to you a whole way of thinking which you should adopt, that biography is a great problem. It destroys history.

And today we have too much biography and too little history. People all take this way out. The historians write one biography after another. Because they are all faithless, and godless. Modern agnosticism.

3

It's much easier to describe a man just for his consciousness and for his actions. And there is no miracle then performed. The entry into the stream of history is omitted. The saving grace for any mere biography comes then from three attitudes of the historian, of the biographer.

One is the encounter with friends and enemies in his own life. If you print the letters, not only written by your hero, but the answers that he receives, that would be the real biography with regard *to the present time, to his own life, to his own presence*. And so I think the modern biographies are completely obsolete, because they do not publish the answers to the letters the man himself writes. You have the letters. And very often his letters. But what do you know of the man if you do not read the answers?

Because you do not recognize how these people make him, how they force him, how they shape him. And so a good biography would be dialogical and symphonical, with regard to contemporaries. You must listen to the contemporaries speaking to this man before you understand his responses, as Mr. Toynbee calls this.

(The counterpoint.)

Ja, ja. The counterpoint.

4

With regard to the antecedents, recognition covers his religious heritage, as you say. Because that's in the deepest sense, what the binding forces really do. What binds us to the whole stream of history.

So a man's religion is a very serious part of his biography, not in the sense of his conscious philosophy of life, but about the things he wouldn't overstep.

CHAPTER FOUR: RELIGION

I

1

THE STORY OF RUSKIN

Take Ruskin, and his mother complex. He was unable even to marry, because he couldn't consummate a marriage as long as his mother lived. And she lived to be 91, and then he was 52, and was for late to him to marry. So he was married for ten years, but his wife could claim in court that he had never had her as his wife, because his mother was still alive, and so he thought it was obscene to marry.

Tragic case.

Charles Ruskin is the greatest case in the Anglo-Saxon life.

2

But I can't tell you how many famous men in the 19th century have been impotent in their own marriage, consummate their marriage. For moral or for reasons, or for mother complexes, or for what-not. That is,

self-consciousness makes impotent.

No -- ever forget this, that this is very strange. And religious taboos, too. And love is self-forgetful. And people who have been told that they always must have ethical standards, and must always know what they are doing are very lame ducks. Because self is paralyzed by consciousness. It isolates. You cannot lose yourself if you constantly want to know what you're doing. And if you're always willful.

3

These are very serious questions.

So the word "religion" will have to be translated, I'm sure. I've tried to translate it into this interaction of recognition and representation. If you want to do the two things together, it would be religion.

But I have spared you the single word.

Where is my chalk?

4

So we have here in the widest sense: recognition, representation. That's our religion. Where you are represented –

THE STORY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN QUOTING THE BIBLE

Abraham Lincoln is representative, and he recognizes. And that's his whole religion. He never belonged to a church, but you cannot deny that he is a religious. And it comes out in every word he quotes, in every word he says, what he recognizes is the biblical tradition, and the American tradition. He's not only the three scores and ten, that our forefathers did such-and-such, but he also says, "If the"-- how is it in the Second Inaugural?-- "If as the Bible" -- he doesn't say, "As the Bible says" - he has a grander way of quoting the Bible. But he does quote the Bible.

II

1

I give you a better word, perhaps for "religion"; that's "authority." What are the authorities you recognize? That's your religion.

And what is the authority you represent? That's your active religion.

When you can say in the name of a god, "Do this," to your child, you are in authority, representative of Him, and you yourself recognize, that's the authority again.

And in authority, recognition and representation are unified.

2

(Al and I are wondering whether one metaphor in music wouldn't be the overture?)

For what? For the relation of this and this?

(In the first. Page 1, here. The antecedent.)

Something warns me against that.

(It's the combination of things to come.)

But there is no sacrifice involved. The father sacrifices his self. He forgets himself. The doctor sacrifices his doctoring. There is nothing of the kind in overture. Quite the contrary. It's a holding up, it's an advertisement, or in the good sense, it's a program of the whole.

(Often is complete in itself, or it stands out, detached from)

But it has not this going underground in order that the next may come up and be visible, this --.

3

Goethe has expressed it in a strange way, which may show you how old existentialism is. He has said,

"We have to place ourselves into non-existence in order to come into existence."

That is the forgetting of self.

THE STORY OF THE EXISTENTIALISTS

And the existentialists today are so funny, because they want to have existence without non-existence.

We can only discover the miracle of our personal, individual existence if we know that we come into existence after we have sloughed off the accidents of our already- existence. What I seem to be at this moment I have to sacrifice if I want to attain that which my heart is yearning to become.

4

(Heidegger would be an exception to that, wouldn't he? Except that he links it -- more metaphysical.)

Oh yes, yes. But the French -- Sartre, and so on. They want to have existence without non-existence. But the problem of the existentialist is, the sacrifice of all the accidental forms of my existence, to go as far as necessary to non-existence.

THE STORY OF JESUS CEASING TO BE A JEW

Jesus had to cease to be a Jew, which was His whole problem of His life: "How do I do this, without violating the law?" So only by becoming its victim. And the Crucifixion is only the last step of His ceasing to be under Jewish jurisdiction. And the Christians have always held that His contribution was that He spared any later this whole road, because He took it all upon Himself to live out this last phase of the law, at the period of the temple. And by taking it all upon Himself, He freed all the others who had not to undergo the same duplicity of two allegiances.

III

1

It's a question of all questions that you understand that self is sterile, is only contained between birth and death.

Our selves are not immortal. We are mortal. "Self" is another word for being mortal.

Now however we come from far away. We are the children of Adam and Eve. And we are the children of God. That means that long ago we were necessary thoughts. We had to come into this world to do what is needed.

That is more than self-made. By recognition and representation, we are in authority, just as Jesus taught in the temple at twelve, already, like a man who was in authority.

And the same is true about the future. When we strip ourselves from the masks of society, for the sake of the future -- at this moment we bear fruit, because self cannot inherit the future.

2

Your son cannot have anything to do with your mere self. This is not the inheritance you can give to him. You must not want him to inherit your wrinkles, and your manners, and all the mortal parts, your conceit, your conception -- what you can be defined as.

What you must give him is the spirit. This is only where you free yourself from self. And for this I am still looking for the expression. But it means that we ourselves become authorities. But it's not the best word. But it has something --.

This is, by and large, the relation, that we become authorities only after our death. Authority, self, and authority: that's I think the road we travel. But at least this is not wrong.

I don't say it's the best.

3

(It's like a sinus wave in physics.)

Explain, please.

(A sinus wave, it goes up and down.)

What is a sign wave?

(It's a graphic portrayal of a cycle, but I don't think it's --.)

(Yes, but it can be linear, and that's what this --.)

(Yes, but it's only linear in a graphic sense, but the graph represents a cycle. So that in this sense of the word --.)

(But this is definitely a cycle.)

Ja, it is, but --.

(And it's linear. So I think a sine wave would --.

(Explain it. Put it on the board.)

Ja, I wish I learn something here please.

(I doubt if I could teach it to you.)

(Well, now this is a challenge.)

Wipe it all off.

(Be yourself, then you can be)

(Well, this I remember mostly from high school physics. It' really this: now when your authority may be here, and your self may be here; I mean this again become authority and then self as a cycle - linear. Oh yes, of course.)

Would you call this "sign"? I'm jus looking for the German term. Of course, I learned my physics in Germany. But I taught physics in this country for two years. And -- now -- wait a minute. But I never ran into the expression "sign ware."

I mean, I just --.

(Wave. Sine wave.)

Oh, not wave. Wave. Oh yes.

(Impulse.)

I'm only put off by the word "sinus." Wave -- if you had just said "wave," I would have understood. But sinus wave....)

[overlapping comments by students]

When I taught physics here, I didn't have to use the term.

(How would this be like in a heartbeat, the systole and diastole.)

Ja, very good. That's

4

But you see, the miracle of transformation, of metamorphosis, takes place here. You who have been self become authority, and you see, that one becomes one's own opposite number is the mystery of your own existence.

(There's an interesting supplement to this, in the operation of the electric motor, because the magnet passes through the plus and negative on those corresponding waves, so that the plus would be the authoritative, and the negative would be the self-forgetting.)

Would be the self- --?

(Self-forgetting.)

And where is the self?

*(The self ... when you pass the line. Halfway in between, the polarity is balanced.)
(This isn't applied to everybody. I mean how --?)*

Doesn't it?

*(That is the line.)
(I mean, does it now, though? I mean, take a slight, a slight --.)*

IV

1

Take it or leave it. This is the question of your own free allegiance. Obviously that's your relation. Everybody -- you must understand that there will always, and always has been: all the religions of the world simultaneously in existence. There is no history of religion. At any one moment, people have taken this mystery which contains us -- in part or in whole.

What I would claim of my faith is only that it is the most comprehensive. But you can get stuck in the Stoics' attitude in saying, "self". You can root in the fatalistic attitude, it's all constellation. It's all horoscope.

And you can take it in the Latter-Day Saints, and the Jehovah's Witnesses, and it's all the Last Day of Judgment. It's all just the future. Nothing what you do now is important, and nothing what has gone on before is important. That is, I must leave to you the emphasis on this cycle. I can only try to feel that it's comprehensive. You have to make your choices inside of this.

2

All religions seem to me to be related to each other not in any evolutionary way, but in this way, but the most comprehensive, and then there are these subdivisions. And some are satisfied with this little residuum.

3

There, for example, the rebel. He says, "Well, I must be myself." All right. That's part of every religion. As one faith.

I have worked on this in larger detail. It's not just meaningless. There are these shades of comprehensiveness. You can say "authority"; you can say "inheritance"; you can say "seed, fruitfulness"; you can say "self-expression; "genius" ; and you say something, but you say it within a context in which all these things are within one economy, one budget.

People will always exist who deny this budget, this economy, and say, "It's all disorder, and I'm just living out my own self. And I know nothing else." So that's why I cannot answer your question. It's your decision.

In this sense we are all free to decide how much of this mystery matters to you.

4

(Well then this is a mystery, you would say, Paul speaking about Ephesians?)

Exactly, exactly. He's full of this. That's where I learned it.

(This would be the)

And you may understand that while the Gospels are contemporary with the great biographies of antiquity, Plutarch, and the Latin, who wrote the life of the Caesars, came at an end of history, for the feeling of the ancients with the Roman Empire, history had come to an end. The times were fulfilled, and now everything became cyclical. So they filled out biography out of the context of history as the thing that's still interesting.

That's still enough surprising, sensational that you concentrate on the individual.

THIRD PART: TOUCHING THE CROSS OF REALITY

CHAPTER ONE: THANK YOU, YES, NO AND PLEASE

I

1

And against this, the Gospel is written in Greek against pagan Greek all the time. This is this paradox of the new biblical language in Greek, that elements had to be introduced, like the word "Gospel," itself, "*euangelion*," which the Greeks didn't understand.

The Greeks had lived by news. The Gospel says, "In this sense, the news is not better than the old." Sensation is not any better than itself. If it isn't part of the economy of salvation, if you do not wish to become authority yourself, your self is no good. The yardstick of a man's self-consciousness and a man's self-expression obviously is his fruitfulness. "By their fruits ye shall know them," the Gospel says.

The Greek says, "By your showiness, by the phenomenal character of yourself, you should show it to them."

2

Hitler is a case in point, who says, "I'm phenomenal, I'm colossal."

And at the beginning of history was the man who burned the temple of Ephesus in order to become famous. And it was a short-cut. An atomic explosion is always the simplest way of becoming famous.

(But you're not supposed to mention his name.)

Well, this the others decided, yes, yes; you are quite right. And they didn't get away with it. He managed to get into the records of history.

3

(It reminds me of the philanthropists who donate so much money, and have their names put on all those libraries, ...dedicate.)

Exactly, exactly. Well, why we have this building mania here in this country. People overbuild in order to get their name there, and then they have nothing to run the building. The whole problem of our endowments today is that the percentage that goes into building is far too high. So no salaries for the people who live there, because the people want to have the big building visible and showy for their posterity. And that's of course fruitless.

I'm sure all the educational reforms which are needed in this country cost very little money. But the quest will be for larger buildings.

It's fantastic.

(I noticed a headline in The Bruin yesterday pertaining to the fact that the student response for living in the new, big hall over there is very low.)

Wonderful! Wonderful. Wonderful.

(Hooray! Perhaps there's some hope, yet.)

4

So I think we are back really to the economy of the human spirit, because the Roman biography reached its zenith at the very moment when the Greek and Roman history came to an end.

II

1

(What do you mean by, "Biography is always late"? In that sense?)

Ja, because it is unraveling, this unity. I think the eminent historical people are quite unconscious of their importance. They are put on the spot, and they are just forced to act. The more they are put on the spot, the more they have to rise to the occasion. And they never knew that they could do it.

THE STORY OF TRUMAN

Like Truman. He's an historical person. His biography is absolutely meaningless. But his act as a president are not.

(... greatness shows much later than the act itself.)

2

(What's the difference between a man that's able to mark an era, to mark the end of it, so that it doesn't have to be repeated, say, like Whittier; and a man who marks the era, and becomes totally involved in it, like, say, Hemingway or F. Scott Fitzgerald. Or in a more critical sense, like T.S. Eliot, who marks the sterility of the 20th century? How do you distinguish the validity of one? One is like Whittier as contributing, and the other is contributing nothing, except a fashionable

novel, like Hemingway. How do you make the distinction? What do you look for? Both of them mark an era.)

Well, I think the quiet recognition is lacking in Hemingway. He is not thankful.

THE STORY OF FORBIDDING TO SAY "THANK YOU"

There has been a movement in Holland, I was told a few days ago, which may help to explain to you the incredible situation in which we live -- where a great scholar brought up his children forbidding them to say "thank you," ever. Now if you don't teach a child to say "thank you," you deprive it really - it's the root word, of recognition to say "thank you." And you know how he argued? He said, "It spoils the giver. The giver must give it without any expectation of gratitude." And so instead of looking to his child, and educating his child, he was the judge of the man who gave the child a present. And he wanted to save this man, so it was his business. And thinking of the giver, he abolished the relation of the child to the things he received.

So if you tell a child it has nothing to be thankful for -- you ruin this child. He took over the rebel thought into the youth of the child. So never should there be any experience of having received anything unasked, and as a gift. As a being showered really with gifts from the past.

3

THE STORY OF MISS JACOBS

I had a woman friend, the mother of a great, very famous man, Miss Jacobs of whom I'm talking. And she was very bitter, and her son was very sick, and her husband died. And I said to her, "You can only be saved if you are able to say still 'thank you' for what you have received. And you have received tremendous gifts. You have this famous son". And she couldn't. And she died in absolute despair, at least. The word "thank you" was not in her vocabulary in a great sense, of recognizing what was given her.

And so this Dutch scholar just fights with the death.

4

But there has been no fashion in the last fifty years, that hasn't come. And so in this sense, I think Hemingway was in danger of leaving the sinus wave of -

III

1

(Well, I was just thinking on the three different ideas here that are all connected. The first, maybe we could say, is "thank you"; and the second, as you said before, when this child said, "I don't care"; this could maybe be the second phase, here. And the third, instead of saying "Thank you," or "I don't care," you're giving the ice cream to somebody.)

THE STORY OF THANK YOU, YES, NO AND PLEASE

Well, I have written the four root words of all human language, in a biographical, or existential sense, in a real sense. Every day you have to appropriate or to balance "thank you," "yes," "no," and "please."

In this you're a giver. "Accept this, please". There you try to be fruitful.

"Thank you," you are yourself the recipient.

"Yes" and "no," you cut out what is dead and what is living. You affirm -- you say "yes" to the laws of your countr or whatever it is, to your environment.

And "no" you distinguish yourself by not adjusting totally to your environment.

2

So this is what I call "*the cross of our real existence*". It consists every day in "thank you," "please," "yes," and "no."

"Yes" and "no" are words of space, and "please" and "thank you" are words of time. Because "thank you" puts you into a chain of events that went on, before you had made a decision, comes to you. And "please" is thinking of the future.

You can also say, "I am invited here," and "I invite." Every father invites his children. And therefore, these four root words, I think they are the kernels of education, of the educational problem.

(*Acceptance and invitation.*)

Ja.

(RSVP -- *répondez s'il vous plait.*)

Ja.

3

And the Plutarch I would say is cutting out these two words. He doesn't dwell on "thank you" and "please." He takes these more or less for granted.

And the biography of the secular type is only affirming what the man stands for and what he has been opposed to. He's partisan, he takes sides. So a "yes" and "no" is for myself. But with "please," I enter the future, and by "thank you" I join the past.

4

Now didn't we decide to devote to --? Ja. The *John Brown's Body* has all these four elements. In this sense, it is a fully human document. It has the four relations. This verse is full of acceptance, and full of invitation.

Just as much it is partisan, there is the South, and there is the north, and there is

The "yes" and "no" is our involvement in the tragedy of the day. But it isn't all just a daily affair. You recognize something eternal, and you recognize something that we must acquire forever.

IV

1

And I still think that in this sense, Thucydides has this invitation, this attempt to make the posterity live on behalf of this event, as heirs of this event. That's his great emphasis.

That's why he's more than a Plutarch.

2

Who has read *John Brown's Body* already? Well, would you give me some example where you would say that here the man is at his best? Would you be willing to pick out something?

(Where the man is at his very best?)

Ja.

(Well, I think a situation where he had -- I can't pronounce that fellow's name-- Ellis or Eilis -- their hope for the future, where he starts out or he says that he will start on his search for her, he's trying to regain the past after the interlude of the war is over, I think he reaches his very highest there, where he has to start out on a new life.)

Can you find the place?

(It's almost near the end, here. No, it's a few pages from the end. Oh, here it is. The build-up on this -- in case you haven't read it -- this is a young soldier, who, during the war was captured by the Confederates, and then he escaped. Was hurt, went into the forest. Was discovered by this young girl. He had his convalescence; they had an affair of course, they fell in love -- and then he went back to the war. And in the interlude, they lost contact with each other. And now she is starting to search for him, or he is going to start and search for her. And so here, this is the last -- I don't know which it is you want me to read, but --.)

How many pages is this? Because I think they should read it, but I wonder if we should wait for the next time, so everybody can look at it. Perhaps this is wiser. We could stop here.

(Well, it's about three pages long. But they wouldn't get the whole picture until they --.)

So we should wait.

3

(One point we might mention at the very opening: Invocation.)

That's a tremendous thing.

(Even the first words, just the title "Invocation" to put us into the spirit.)

(Well, I don't think that's the spirit of it. I think that shows the actual decay, as far as the ... is concerned.)

(No. The very first --.)

(Oh, you mean the -- oh, I see. I was thinking of the second part.)

You have no copy, Sir? Kindly provide ..., because you are lost if you don't. I think you should have a text, too.

4

Now listen. We are running a little -- let us do this next time. And we'll read the first -- you'll read it yourself. Because you are quite right. In this *Invocation*, I would like you to see more than a formality, because the modern historian and biographer had no invocation, and I think that's why we don't care.

Homer has an invocation, and all the ancients had invocations. And today this is thought of as stilted. You have the prologue in Shakespeare sometimes, which is another form of invocation, of course.

CHAPTER TWO: RESPECT FOR POETRY

I

1

And perhaps if you would study the Invocation, best thing would be to learn it by heart. I mean this.

Poetry is not really read; it has to be learned by heart, and spoken.

And you are very far from all poetic life, because you don't learn by heart. Poetry is just meant to be vibrating inside of us. It is not something to be read. And that's the death of modern poetry.

2

And so perhaps you do read it. Do me the favor, and take the Invocation very seriously. You will discover that the Invocation is -- well, how should I say? -- it's that moment in which authority and invitation -- because "invocation" is also "invitation" -- meet, where these three phases of our human spirit are unified.

3

Well -- I don't wish to anticipate anything. Read it yourself, read the *Invocation*, and we'll read it together next time.

THE STORY OF THE RESPECT FOR POETRY

And the respect for poetry, or the recognition that something is poetry, is that you can read it innumerable times. Never believe that a poem can be read once. Then it is a very poor poem. A poem must be quoted for the rest of your life, if it is a real poem.

There are degrees of poetry. But as long as you think that a poem, after having been read, has done its duty, you have declared it is not a poem.

4

All poets want to illuminate permanently a situation where they have been our mouthpiece, or have been privileged to say for you and me, what occurs eternally in a human heart. And -- "*To be or not to be*" is not something to be read, obviously, but to be quoted. And modern man is absolutely just self, and dead, and sick, because he is not filled with poetry.

That's why the poet's only dignity is that you quote him that he lives in you.

II

1

And you should not -- here, Sir. You all here; well, he doesn't look at me -- learn things by heart. It's the only way in which you can live up to the life of the country in which you live.

2

It is same with singing. Everybody in this country sings doggerels and hits. But they are only the weekday affair compared to the solemn hymns of the holiday. You all live lopsided, because you will still sing all this trash, which is always the reflection, or the other side, of the solemnity. The solemn song and the trash -- I am not down on the hit at all. And there must be these doggerels, and there must be these cheap songs. But only because there are expensive songs.

3

So the balance is completely destroyed here in this low-brow country of yours, because you think it is enough to be low-brow, but low-brow is only valuable as long as there is high-brow. And without the balance, the low-brow is just weeds.

And so in your memory, you have innumerable trash.

But if you analyze what you have in your memory to counter-balance the trash -- the schools have denied you the honor of having the real flowers of poetry. And you only have the weeds. And you have to sow into your own memory real poetry, real verse.

Whether it's the Psalms, or whether it's hymns, or whether it's Shakespeare, or whether it's Keats, I don't care. But the main thing is that you learn to distinguish between flowers and weeds.

4

And it is all full of weeds in you, because nobody can live without song, or without music.

Therefore, you do keep all the silly songs. Because it just means that your field is a plowed field and wants to be cultivated and planted with something. And you say, "No, I'm free, independent," in come the weeds.

And since nobody can live without song, you all have the trash songs in your mind, and the hits. That's all right, as long as you know they are the cheapness that goes with the expensive things. Where you have genuine things, you also have false things -- or substitute things.

III

1

So please read the *Invocation*, and learn it by heart.

THE STORY OF THE BALLAD OF THE WHITE HORSE

Greatest success of my life in this country has been that we ran a camp, and I did succeed in making 120 men of 20 to 25 learn by heart "*The Ballad of the White Horse*" by Chesterton. And they still live by this.

And that's great poetry.

2

It's just as great as *John Brown's Body*. For English consumptions it has the same importance as the *John Brown's Body*. You haven't even heard of it, I suppose. It's the only modern English great poem, "*The Ballad of the White Horse*." It's the story of King Alfred. And the Times of London printed the verses of this every day during the Blitz, because it was the one poem that aroused the English to their own hour of glory.

3

So this I feel, *John Brown's Body* has the same --

TWELFTH LECTURE: THE FEAT OF BENÉT'S JOHN BROWN'S BODY

PART ONE: THE INVOCATION TO JOHN BROWN'S BODY BY STEPHEN VINCENT BENÉT

CHAPTER ONE: INVOCATION

I

1

*"American muse, whose strong and diverse heart
So many men have tried to understand
But only made it smaller with their art,
Because you are as various as your land,*

*As mountainous-deep, as flowered with blue rivers,
Thirsty with deserts, buried under snows,
As native as the shape of Navajo quivers,
And native, too, as the sea-voyaged rose.*

*Swift runner, never captured or subdued,
Seven-branched elk beside the mountain stream,
That half a hundred hunters have pursued
But never matched their bullets with the dream,*

*Where the great huntsmen failed, I set my sorry
And mortal snare for your immortal quarry.*

*You are the buffalo-ghost, the broncho-ghost
With dollar-silver in your saddle-horn,
The cowboys riding in from Painted Post,
The Indian arrow in the Indian corn,*

*And you are the clipped velvet of the lawns
Where Shropshire grows from Massachusetts sods,
The grey Maine rocks and the war-painted dawns
That break above the Garden of the Gods.*

*The prairie-schooner -- schooners crawling toward the ore
And the cheap car, parked by the station-door.*

*Where the skyscrapers lift their foggy plumes
Of stranded smoke out of a stony mouth
You are that high stone, and its arrogant fumes,
And you are ruined gardens in the South*

*And bleak New England farms, so winter-white
Even their roofs look lonely, and the deep
The middle grainland, where the wind of night
Is like all blind earth sighing in her sleep.*

*A friend, an enemy, a sacred hag
With two tied oceans in her medicine-bag.*

*They tried to fit you with an English song
And clip your speech into the English tale.
But even from the first, the words went wrong,
The catbird pecked away the nightingale.*

*The homesick men begot high-cheekboned things,
Whose wit was whittled with a different sound
And Thames and all the rivers of the kings
Ran into Mississippi and were drowned.*

*They planted England with a stubborn trust.
But the cleft dust was never English dust.*

*Stepchild of every exile from content
And all the disavouched, hard-bitten pack
Shipped overseas to steal a continent
With neither shirts nor honor to their back.*

*Pimping grandee and rump-faced regicide,
Apple-cheeked younkers from a windmill-square,
Puritans stubborn as the nails of Pride,
Rakes from Versailles and thieves from County Clare,*

*The black-robed priests who broke their hearts in vain
To make you God and France, or God and Spain.*

*These were your lovers in your buckskin-youth.
And each one married with a dream so proud
He never knew it could not be the truth
And that he coupled with a girl of cloud.*

*And now to see you is more difficult yet
Except as an immensity of wheel
Made up of wheels, oiled with inhuman sweat
And glittering with the heat of ladled steel.*

*And these you are, and each is partly you,
And none is false, and none is wholly true.*

*So how to see you as you really are,
So how to suck the pure, distillate, stored
Essence of essence from the hidden star,
And make it pierce like a riposting sword.*

For, as we hunt you down..."

2

Now I wonder that there isn't an exclamation mark. Because this is what I feel it should be read: "So how to see you as you really are!" Isn't that right? "So how to suck --" isn't it despair, and exclamation? Isn't it strange that there should be a period at the end? That's why I feel, it's just --.

Go on.

*For, as we hunt you down, you must escape
And we pursue a shadow of our own
That can be caught in a magician's cape,
But has the flatness of a painted stone.*

*Never the running stag, the gull at wing,
The pure elixir, the American thing.*

*And yet, at moments when the wind was hot
With something..."*

"When the mind --."

(Oh, excuse me.)

"And yet, at moments..."

In Los Angeles the wind is hot. But in other parts of the country, the mind.

*"And yet, at moments when the mind was hot
With something fierier than joy or grief,
When each known spot was an eternal spot
And every leaf was an immortal leaf,*

*I think that I have seen you, not as one,
But clad in diverse semblances and powers,
Always the same, as light falls from the sun,
And always different, as the differing hours.*

*Yet, though each altered garment that you wore
The naked body, shaking the heart's core.*

*All day the snow fell on that Eastern town
With its soft, pelting, little, endless sigh
Of infinite flakes that brought the tall sky down..."*

3

And that again, may I remind you, these two lines are very strangely built:

*"I think that I have seen you, not as one,
But clad in diverse semblances and powers,
Always the same, as light falls from the sun,
And always different, as the differing hours."*

There should not be a period.

*"Yet, through each altered garment that you wore,
The naked body..."*

that means, that I have seen you.

So I think the interpunctuation is completely wrong. Can you follow here?

Well. You understand? It's very unsatisfactory, this --.

He died in the process. And he may not have revised this. But I think one obscene But I think it's completely misleading, the interpunctuation.

"I think that I have seen you --" now the breath has to go on till "the heart's core."

4

And also these six lines of course are built in a very artistic way, that these are six verses, and there is a solid form. And therefore, the whole meaning is that the breath must not fall down as the differing hours. But then you must hold onto it, and go to *heart's core*.

Very strange why this interpunctuation is - all this time, I wonder if he put it in himself.

(... somebody else did?)

II

1

Well, it is certainly highly misleading.

Well, all these modern deviltries of telling children only to read by eye, and not to speak, is only one element of the complete indifference today to the fact that this is speech – poetry -- and not the written word. And as long as you believe that poetry can be printed, all this happens. And the language dies in the process. This is just unbelievable.

No poet who would have been tape-recorded could afford this. It's scandalous. Because interpunctuation is simply a marking of your breath. And therefore there is no interpunctuation, as you are taught -- all this is nonsense by grammarians. Every man has his own breath, and his interpunctuation should be -- if he's a real stylist -- his own. And all these rules are nothing.

2

THE STORY OF INTERPUNCTUATION

I told you the story of the lawyer and his will? Well he said, "There should be no interpunctuation. A will must be read regardless of interpunctuation, and must force its rhythm so on you so that there can be no quibbling. A wrong comma, that must not lead to a trial, to a litigation.

And everywhere here you have the law. Then you have the language of command in the army, or wherever it is. And here you have poetry. And today, it is all leaden. All leaden - absolutely arbitrary. I cannot understand how it is possible that this is printed in this way. Imagine -- to make a period after "hours"! When the whole sentence has the meaning that you that is the naked body -?

Or does anybody differ?

3

So that even today, when we buy a book of poetry, the fact that it is printed and registered with literature is already in itself apt to destroy the power of the poetry. You must know that you live today in a garbage can of civilization. That's what you do. Everything that surrounds you is already deadening life. You mustn't think that this country of America lives on 35 degrees of Fahrenheit, suspended animation.

And this is why the *Invocation* strikes you as most unnatural, because this has to be spoken. And it has not to be spoken about something, but to the higher powers that enable us to speak.

Now go on.

4

So it has already become totally un-natural. But we'll see that it's just the other way around. This is the most natural way of speaking, and that you should speak prose, that's ridiculous.

(I don't think the period means that you always stop. At least in current use. I think the period is a weaker form of punctuation.)

What's then the strongest? After all, the danger is duplicated, because it's not only the period, but even the verse is set off. If the two later verses were following directly -- but since there is this break in the print -

(Yes, that's right.)

So it makes it even period, plus paragraph. That is quite hard.

(Not in all forms, though, is it set up this way. I think the tampering has been with -- let's see --)

Who -- does anybody ...?

(There's another style of writing this, so that there's Nobody has --.)

Well, I wish to -- well, it isn't here. Has anybody another print?

(Who doesn't have this kind, 195- --?)

But where are the six verse printed in one?

(I've seen one where it's --)

It would be much reasonable.

(-- line after line without any break between.)

Yes, I have such an edition myself. You're quite right. So you see how beautification can ruin anything, well --.

(It's mathematized here.)

No, it's just -- not ... -- money. Wealth is always a danger of taste. If they have more paper, and they have more space, make a luxury edition -- the sense drops out.

III

1

But this lack of respect for the poetry today is quite widely traded?

THE STORY OF CHAPTER AND VERSE IN THE BIBLE

Look how our Bibles are printed. They are with this same disgusting bad taste, gentlemen. As you know all the chapters and verses are late inventions. They crowd in this Bible, making it quite impossible to appreciate it, because it's cut up into verses in the middle of the word. We don't even resent it, because everybody goes to sleep in reading the Bible anyway. It makes no difference. You cannot discover that the Bible is a decent book, because it's printed in this ridiculous manner. You should protest -- all your Bibles are perfectly unreadable for a reasonable person. You just carry this on, because it makes no difference. The laity goes to sleep anyway, and the preacher only takes out six verses, anyway, and can say then, "Verse 1 to 7". And so to him it's just pecking like a chicken her feed.

2

You live in such an unreal world.

This world of literature, if I could only smash it, all the courses you have to take in English and so on! They destroy absolutely your sense of life. It's all on a bush, a sheet of paper.

Now go on. Where are we?

*"All day the snow fell on that Eastern town
With its soft, pelting, little, endless sigh,
Of infinite flakes that brought the tall sky down
Till I could put my hands in the white sky*

*And taste cold scraps of Heaven on my tongue
And walk in such a changed and luminous light
As gods inhabit when the gods are young.
All day it fell. And when the gathered night*

*Was a blue shadow cast by a pale glow
I saw you then, snow-image, bird of the snow.*

*And I have seen and heard you in the dry
Close-huddled furnace of the city street
When the parched moon was planted in the sky
And the limp air hung dead against the heat.*

*I saw you rise, red as that rusty plant,
Dizzied with lights, half-mad with senseless sound,
Enormous metal, shaking to the chant
Of a triphammer striking iron ground.*

*Enormous power, ugly to the fool,
And beautiful as a well-handled tool.*

These and --.

3

Now, careful. Don't waste this so completely.

*"Enormous power, ugly to the fool,
And beautiful" -- then you must read the "as" as an "if".*

("As beautiful as a well-handled tool.")

Isn't this the condition of its improvement? It's either for the fool, as I read it, "ugly," or it's beautiful as a well-handled tool. So you have to bring this out a little bit.

("These, and the memory of that...")

Again, I feel that the comma is misleading. "Enormous power, ugly" -- there should be a halting of the breath. There should be the period. I would print it: "Enormous power, ugly" -- comma. Or some hyphens. You see how interpunctuation is really wanting in delicacy. The comma before is too strong, "And beautiful as a well-handled tool."

4

*"These, and the memory of that windy day
On the bare hills, beyond the last barbed wire,
When all the orange poppies bloomed one way
As if a breath would blow them into fire,*

*I keep forever, like the sea-lion's tusk
The broken sailor brings away to land,
But when he touches it, he smells the musk,
And the whole sea lies hollow in his hand.*

*So, from a hundred visions, I make one,
And out of darkness build my mocking sun.*

*And should that task seem fruitless in the eyes
Of those a different magic sets apart
To see through the ice-crystal of the wise
No nation but the nation that is Art,*

*Their words are just. But when the birchbark-call
Is shaken with the sound that hunters make
The moose comes plunging through the forest-wall
Although the rifle waits beside the lake.*

*Art has no nations -- but the mortal sky
Lingers like gold in immortality.*

This flesh was seeded from no..."

This is his decisive -- very, very difficult, but very important. Will you go on and read again?

(These last two sentences?)

No, no. "Art has no nation."

IV

1

This is all very difficult to read, really, because "no nation but the nation that is Art,/Their words are just." And then he recalls it, "Art has no nations -- but the mortal sky/Lingers like gold in immortality. This flesh," and there should begin, this -- who did this? You?

This should go this way: "immortality" leads immediately on, in one breath, to "This flesh," because the break is in "Art has no nations." And here begins, however, his apology, "but the mortal sky lingers like gold in immortality. This flesh was seeded..."

*"This flesh was seeded from no foreign grain
But Pennsylvania and Kentucky wheat,
And it has soaked in California rain
And five years' tempered in New England sleet*

*To strive at last, against an alien proof
And by the changes of an alien moon,
To build again that blue, American roof
Over a half-forgotten battle tune*

*And call unsurely, from a haunted ground,
Armies of shadows and the shadow-sound.*

*In your Long House there is an attic-place
Full of dead epics and machines that rust,
And there, occasionally, with casual face,
You come awhile to stir the sleepy dust;*

*Neither in pride nor mercy, but in vast
Indifference at so many gifts unsought,
The yellowed satins, smelling of the past,
And all the loot the lucky pirates brought.*

*I only bring a cup of silver air,
Yet, in your casualness, receive it there.*

*Receive the dream too haughty for the breast,
Receive the words that should have walked as bold
As the storm walks along the mountain-crest
And are like beggars whining in the cold.*

*The maimed presumption, the unskillful skill,
The patchwork colors, fading from the first,
And all the fire that fretted at the will
With such a barren ecstasy of thirst.*

*Receive them all--and should you choose to touch them
With one slant ray of quick, American light,
Even the dust will have no power to smutch them,
Even the worst will glitter in the night.*

*If not -- the dry bones littered by the way
May still point giants toward their golden prey.*

(He closed...)

2

No, no. Do you understand what he means by

*"To strive at last, against an alien proof/
And by the changes of an alien moon,
To build again...?"*

What does he mean with these two lines? Does anybody know? Very important, very American. Whole tragedy of the American intelligentsia.

(The break from England ...)

Who is meant by these two lines?

(Europe.)

What?

(The tendency of the American intellectuals...)

But the fact about the --.

(...educated in Europe. I was struck by the fact that all the intellectuals -- I think it was ten thousand Americans got their doctorate in Europe in the 19th century, at the same time Wagner was proposing to come to the United States to write the great American opera based out of the ethnic materials here, and --)

You are absolutely right, but this is much more concrete than you realize. It's very hard to read poetry, gentlemen, and to understand it. So you don't, obviously.

3

This has nothing to do with ten thousand deaths. It has only to do with Vincent Stephen Benét.

(Well, isn't he saying that he's attempting to write this poem without regard to the forms --.)

No. In France! He's living in France while he writes it. This is the tragedy of American poets. He's living in Neuilly-sur-Seine. Isn't this preface signed "Neuilly-sur-Seine"? It used to be.

Again, these editions are all falsified, because nobody is publisher, and his decision -- do not assume that anybody reads anymore. It's just --. Can't you see it? Then you shouldn't be here. It's all nonsense - the introduction...

(It is signed.)

...between -- between. This is killed. "Neuilly-sur-Seine."

4

Now these are the two lines by which he sees the irony of his own fate, that while he's writing the American epic, he's writing this against an "alien proof by the changes of an alien moon." Can't you see this? This is Neuilly-sur-Seine.

But you can't read. He excuses himself. He says, "I'm Pennsylvania, I'm Kentucky." It's all the poet. And has "soaked in California's rain/and five years tempered in sleet/To strive at last," and as though he suddenly wants to say, "I admit. I'm writing this against the alien proof that is against the test of a French or European poetry". And "by the changes of an alien moon." This is --.

(Well, it's just what I said.)

No, you spoke of ten thousand intellectuals, but you didn't say this is "I, Vincent Stephen Benét, am writing the American epics on French soil."

(Well, I didn't say that.)

CHAPTER TWO: THE AMERICA OF STEPHEN VINCENT BENÉT

I

1

This is not education. But that's the act of writing this poem. It's much more particular. This is the particular situation of this verse, written at this moment.

(But he's not writing it from the point of view of a Frenchman.)

He doesn't say so. But "alien" he calls it. Who says "from the point of view of a Frenchman?" I haven't said one word --.

(No, my point really was that it was the fashion to go abroad.)

Ja, but this doesn't help us in settling --. This was the problem of Henry James -- William James always, when he was in America, he had to go to Europe; when he was in Europe, he had to go to America. He always took a return -- he's just barely landing there, back he went. They were all recoiling, constantly, like on a pool table.

2

But I think it's terribly important. This I think is the greatest American poem in existence about American history. It's the epic of America. And it had to be written in Neuilly-sur-Seine. And that's part of America.

And that's why at this moment Mr. Herter is in Geneva negotiating about Berlin. You must understand that this is all one and the same thing. First it is in the mind, and now it's in the political body and the geography of America. Now this homeland has to be defended for -- geographically. First, it was only in the mind of the people.

3

Well, the same is true of the first American poet with which I want you to become acquainted. And I go over in the recess and get you this.

Has anybody heard of Joel Barlow? I mentioned him to you in class.

(We discussed him in)

THE STORY OF JOEL BARLOW

Ja, well. Perhaps you put down his dates: 1754 to 1812. And quite useful to compare him, because his first poem is "*The Vision of Columbus*." He later enlarged this into *The Columbiad*, twenty years later. But the first was better, as it is with the poem. Usually the first is the best.

He was in Yale, and later he became expatriate in France. He was ten years our diplomatic agent and he freed the Americans held by the Bay of Tripolis. And that is his great merit. And he died very honorably on the expedition of Napoleon from Russia, on the retreat; perished from the exposure there, and the cold, the famous Beresina.

4

(I don't think I understand really, now, what you did mean, when you said it had to be written in France. "The poem had to be written in France." Why did it have to be written in France?)

I didn't say -- it was written in France. It had been written. Not "had to be written." I didn't say "had to be." It's just a fact.

II

1

Now the important thing is that Barlow and this Benét deserve to be opposed to each other, because, as you now may realize, the greatness of the Vincent Benét poem is that he begins in the West. He begins with Navajo, and he comes to New England in reverse. And therefore, there is a completely new tone.

The tiresome attitude of all American literature in America and ways of thinking, is that they first begin in New England or Boston, and New York, and then they count up the 48 states until they arrive in Alaska.

And I can't hear all this. It's an attempt -- you find innumerable, well-meaning, unpoetical things of enumeration. It's one of the tragedies of America that quantity has invaded poetry through this enumeration of the plains, and the mountains, and then we come to the Rockies, and finally we come to Sacramento. And I would just then say "sacrament." I mean, "sacr" -- this is destructive of all American thinking. The enumeration, because that's quantity, that's the supermarket, the catalog. And the catalog is destroying poetry more in this country, because of its bigness and its size.

2

Now Benét very artistically, we read this; you go back. In the second quatrain he already has the opposite. "...buried under snows,/As native as the shape of Navajo quivers." And

though he begins with the Rockies, and then with the buffalo-ghost, and the broncho-ghost, the Indian arrows, the Indian corn, and then he only goes back. And that's the whole revolution, for which you aren't even yet prepared. You still think of yourself as the West. And as coming later.

Now of course, Benét feels that America will not be independent as long as it counts its fate only from the east towards the west. It has not this center of gravity in its own, final organization.

3

And therefore, I feel the poetry is revolutionary. You have heard of Turner's "frontier thesis." Now this steps far over this. This is a new period.

Poetry is always prophetic, and the historians -- it will take them thirty or forty years, before you can become a professor with such heretic views, that you begin the story in California and say, "That's what it was all coming to. All the rest is preparation".

So whereas Turner only sees the moving frontier, Benét already sees after this event what's America. And therefore it begins in the West. You cannot understand when you start in Los Angeles, and not over there.

4

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S MOUNTAIN CLIMB IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

I felt the same when I made my mountain climb in British Columbia, that now I finally arrived in America, because this is virgin territory. And this is my last act of immigration, when I did some first ascents in British Columbia. Then one is really chest-to-chest with the secret of this independent continent.

It perhaps should never have been discovered which certainly is difficult and inhospitable really. It is a second; it is not an accident. It has been most retarded.

THE STORY OF AMERICA AS A SECOND THOUGHT OF OUR CREATOR

If you think of America, it has been more retarded than Africa, less populated. There is much more life going on in Africa down to 1800 than in this country. The numbers of people living here. If you read the description of the misery of the Indians here in California, a few hundred -- a few thousand at best, living over this vast stretch of land in the most miserable and unambitious conditions, you feel that America in itself was a neglected, and a second thought of our creator. Breaking loose from the land mass of the rest of the world, and swimming somewhere into the unknown.

III

1

Therefore, it is a great event in the history of America that Vincent Stephen Benét begins in the West and puts all the influences from Europe in the second place. And this will make itself felt as years go on. He will be remembered as a turning point.

"*Vision of Columbus*" is the first American poem. And Stephen Vincent Benét, I take it, is the first response from the other side. Walking from California, yes, and finally writing in a deep immersion, but taking with him the complete vision of America.

And it's very important: the Civil War, with its bleeding wounds, after all, in the South and North, of the eastern part of the states, the old -- by centering in the West, in California and in the Rockies with his first lines, he has the Archimedean point to pull us out of the tragedy, because this is what survives. North and South doesn't exist here as a memory.

2

And so everything -- in order to write the epic of the Civil War, you could either go back to this "*art pour art*," as he says, have a general idea that art is supernational, or as he answers this, "No, I will not do this." He is in France, after all: the dogma of the "*l'art pour l'art's sake*" was created. And he fights it in a very -- or he doesn't fight it, but he lets it stand and say, "It's not my way."

3

Now that's why I told you, we have to read this again. It's a very, very complicated and difficult vision. Here. You have it?

Read this again, will you? "I saw it rise." Here. Read this once more, and very carefully. And now you must see this is a tremendous breakthrough. It's an event in American history.

4

And as I said, poetry is far in advance of the prose, if it is real poetry. And therefore it will take probably fifty years before the people in the English course in literature discover this.

IV

1

*"I saw you rise, red as that rusty plant,
Dizzied with lights, half-mad with senseless sound,
Enormous metal, shaking to the chant
Of the triphammer striking iron ground.*

*Enormous power, ugly to the fool,
And beautiful as a well-handled tool.*

*These, and the memory of that windy day,
On the bare hills, beyond the last barbed wire,
When all the orange poppies bloomed one way
As if a breath would blow them into fire,*

*I keep forever, like a sea lion's tusk
The broken sailor brings away to land,
And when he touches it, he smells the musk,
And the whole sea lies hollow in his hand.*

*So from a hundred visions, I make one,
And out of darkness build my mocking sun."*

2

Again, may I say: America for any vision that has future is itself a ship; and all its gigantic situation between the two oceans, you do not live on a firm land, on a *terra firma* -- as the old people, the old nations. Since you are moving constantly -- you are always rocking the boat -- it is much more correct to call America itself a "vast, gigantic ship, sailing".

And the destiny of America in this new world is one of movement. I told you this about the slang that was a movement through time of the language, and not through space. It was not dialect in valleys and mountains, but the whole people moving, every year a different word.

3

And the same is true about the stream of immigrants: first generation, second generation, third generation, fourth generation means that everything here is staggered in time.

Now you only move in time as long as space is a projection of the time element. And America is nothing but a projection of a migration of peoples, of the experience of generations in movement.

4

And this is here caught -- and so he has the boldness to say, "America is like the sea." And so he gets out of the earth, the continent, the digging-in into some area, with walls, and trenches, and pieces of land, as the old people who entrenched themselves after all, in castles, for example, in walls. And he says -- like a sea, "I have the sea in the palm of my hand."

The metaphor itself is incredibly bold.

CHAPTER THREE: AN EVENT IN AMERICAN HISTORY

I

1

Who has read Homer? The imagination of Homer is in his metaphors, in his parables, in his comparisons.

And so you must take comparisons of rank terribly seriously. You only think that's a little beautifying. Quite the contrary. The deepest word of a poem is simply, instead of saying, "as," or if he has to say it somewhat longer to express what he really means. And so this quatrain, read this again. "I keep forever..." It's a very strange metaphor.

*"I keep forever, like the sea-lion's tusk
The broken sailor brings away to land,
But when he touches it, he smells the musk
And the whole sea lies hollow in his hand."*

So he has the courage to say that the whole sea is in his hand -- this is really something -- so out of hundred visions, I make one.

2

(Is this his realism, or naturalism, or --.)

Oh be ashamed, in this context to ask for stupidities.

(Or is that romanticism ...?)

I could shoot you! Breaking up our understanding at this moment with these abstractions.

I don't know what romanticism is. And naturalism. I have never met these ladies. What has this to do with your experience of this poem, Sir?

Nobody in this country can read directly. Everybody has these little labels: 25 cents, romanticism; 50 cents, realism. Isn't this sad?

How old are you, Sir? Aren't you young? Can these words no longer reach you without these slogans, which kill all your feeling and all your interest in this? Don't you see that by saying "realism," you have destroyed even the possibility of your understanding this poem?

3

What is realism? The invention of some professor for an examination!

Has Mr. Benét anything to do with this? Every decent breath of life cut through all these cobwebs of these notions. Do you think they exist, realism and naturalism? But every American, you think that the abstractions are more real than this line of poetry, and I assure you, the opposite is true.

This line is real, and the word "realism" is not real. This has been written with blood. And the other is just a notion which you carry around. Dear me -- what is more real? The fruit juice which is there on the bottle, or the sign, "fruit juices" in the supermarket?

There is perhaps something that is between juices, and fruit, and water, and so.

4

Every real thing oversteps the mark of your generalization. No generalization is correct. It always is overlapping. But you can't be helped. This whole nation is abstract. And that's why it's so boring. Why everybody in this country is bored.

Abstractions bore. You can only go on fire if you forget all your abstractions and get deep in with this. As soon as you first think, "Well, is this romanticism?" you have lost every right to say that you have ever read this poem. You lie if you say you have read it. You can't read it, because it's always through the spectacles of these general notions.

And they kill the spirit.

II

1

Sing it, Sir. Would you ever ask of a song – is it romantic or realistic? You sing it!

That's the only relation you have to poetry. There is no other relations. All the rest are crutches. Have nothing to do with the truth.

But instead of saying that you eat meat, you say you take vitamins, so you can never taste the good meat. The same thing. You and you believe it, too, that there are so many calories. I assure you, if you eat caviar, you eat caviar. If you eat lobster, you eat lobster. It does you a lot of good, because lobster and caviar are real things. But vitamins and calories are absolutely nonsense. They're good for doctors, and for nurses, but not for a healthy man who wants to eat something good which God has created.

Vitamins! And you are allowed to eat venison.

And the same with this poetry. "Keep this forever." You say, "Is this realism, or is this romanticism?"

2

I shall never teach again American students, I can assure you. This is my last term in my life.

I'm very glad I won't repeat it. This is only damaging. Any illiterate American is better off than you poor students, who are filled with this chaff. This nation is absolutely destroyed - - whether it's psychology or English literature -- by all this nonsense.

You can no longer read poetry, and that's a very serious situation.

3

Now do you read this once more?

*"I keep forever, like the sea-lion's tusk
The broken sailor brings away to land,
But when he touches it, he smells the musk,
And the whole sea lies hollow in his hand.*

*So from a hundred visions, I make one,
And out of darkness build my mocking sun."*

Ja. Because now comes this attempt. It's a sea, and this is the sun. That is, we are outside the traditional sights of the land, of these borders of firmness. And we are really out in universe. "I build my mocking sun," "hundred visions" and he has the sea and the sun. Ja.

And now comes his apology.

*"And should that task seem fruitless in the eyes
Of those a different magic sets apart
To see through the ice-crystal of the wise
No nation but that nation that is Art,*

Their words are just." ...

4

Now let's analyze this. We point here. What does he say with these four lines?

It's very difficult to understand. To whom does he speak? Or of whom?

He says very clearly that he doesn't address these people, but he says, "Their words are just." So he is in this French prison cell of the American mind, where it all comes from, these borrowed heads, these borrowed reasons, where you say "romantic," and "realistic," and all these schools of poetry.

And here, he says, "Well, they say nation -- art for art's sake." Then you can classify. And he says, "They are, just" -- "I do not want to refute them. Only art in general. And therefore my task seems fruitless in the eyes of those a different magic sets apart."

Now will you explain to me whether these lines mean them or means him.

(I assume it would mean them, not him.)

Ja, this is very doubtful English, isn't it? "Those a different magic sets apart/To see." And obviously the "to see" then means they are set apart, so that they see --?

(Well, my interpretation of this quatrain here is: he is doing something more humanistic; whereas these other individuals of whom he is speaking -- who look --.)

Now just construe first the third line. Who is he ---?

(Well, it's definitely not him.)

Who is ruling the sea? It is very difficult really to interpret it.

("Those a different magic sets apart.")

(But it's --.)

Those. Those see -- would you say? That's my interpretation, too.

*"And should that task seem fruitless in the eyes/
Of those which" -- and for "whom a different magic sets apart/
So that those" -- or "they" -- I'm only transcribing it.*

(I agree.)

III

1

No. Why don't you see it? It's better we take the trouble just to understand each other. This is all I want, to force everybody to follow our interpretation.

So that they who are set apart by a different magic, "through the ice-crystal of the wise/No nation but the nation that is Art." That is, who can be kept loose from their national ties, and therefore see in their vision nothing but this airy art. Then I say you're right. "But --."

*"But when the birchbark-call
Is shaken with the sound that hunters make
The moose comes plunging through the forest-wall
Although the rifle waits beside the lake."*

2

Now, please. This is all very difficult. You know what he says of himself in this line?

(Of himself?)

Ja. "Their words are just." But now he says that he's plunging through the forest-wall, although the rifle waits beside the lake. That is, what's going to happen to Mr. Vincent Stephen Benét?

He'll be shot dead. "I'll be killed," he says. "Never mind. I'll be the victim of my enterprise. I am going on a dangerous path not only, but on a path that will kill me in the eyes of those".

And this is very intricate.

3

"Art has no nations," he says. He bows to the hunter who is going to rifle him down. That is, the professor of romantics and realism, and who says, "This is an impossible undertaking," and "You can't do this, because you are still connected with your nation. "I am a nationalist," he says. That's what he says. "I'm still rooted, and I'm not an artist to be classified with romantic and realistic art, because I'm just an American who has to sing the story of his nation."

4

That's why it is so dangerous if you try to classify him, because he says, "I'm breaking away from these classifications". Art would have your classification. But this is not art. Art has no nations. But the mortal -- and this means the boy who is to be shot dead; "mortal" here meaning, "I'm a very limited man". He's still a human -- a normal, living being. He's not an artist. He "lingers like gold in immortality."

"This flesh," and there he's in mortality.

If the people in the Civil War were shot dead, well, you art critics shoot me, too. I'm very ready for the kill. The rifle is already awaiting me. I accept your verdict, that I'm not a poet. In your sense, I'm not. Fortunately he is a real

IV

1

And so this whole century of art for art, and your whole century of thinking is over. The poet is the voice of his nation, and he's not there for literary courses, to be dealt with, with Cs and Bs.

If you don't need Vincent Stephen Benét outside your English courses, he has never existed for you. If you don't sing him to your children, and if you don't give him to your bride, but if you think that you take a course in it and then get an equivalent of a C-point or an E, you don't understand where literature is in the life of a nation.

2

This is the necessary event in the history of America.

And it is quite unnecessary that any professor of English would take notice of him. But it is very important that the man at the filling station should quote it. That's the use of poetry. And that's what he says.

And he says it in such a sophisticated, difficult manner that it is very hard to get, because he is speaking to people who have given up -- like most students at this university -- the idea that literature is for anybody else but the professors and their students. Because in this country, it's a barbaric country.

The people who don't go to college don't read literature. It's quite true. There are no bookstores. There is no poetry read.

3

THE STORY OF STEPHEN SPENCER

So I have heard Stephen Spencer come to our college and say, "It is in America, the critic of literature ranks higher than the poet."

And that's the end of the world. The poet is only there to feed these courses on literature so that the professor has something to tell to the students. And he says, that's hell. Everything stands on its head.

This man is more important than all the courses in literature chained together, because he is an event in American history. And I have tried to show you that the historian, the genuine historian -- like this poet -- has an immediate position in the life of a nation, and is not a scientist.

4

Worked in vain. You cannot understand him. Here you have speech. And you have a speech department. It would be better to center the whole university, or the whole social sciences and humanities, around the speech department. You could do a very good job.

Then you would see,

that the historian has the problem of narration to solve, to keep the past alive, as an influence as today.

*And that the prophets have to promise the future,
and that the politicians have to fight for the present.*

CHAPTER FOUR: KNOWING POETRY

I

1

And these are the three languages -- *the rhetorics, narration, and prophecy* -- that are the original languages of the human race.

And all three are dying out in this country. Perhaps this is still in existence. This is dying out, and this is dying out. Because you have replaced it with the language for dead things, which you call "science."

2

And science says, "2 and 2 is 4." And that's about the dead. And these three languages are about the living. The living that have not died yet, although physically they are absent, have to be told.

That's what Vincent Stephen Benét says. He keeps them alive. And so he apologizes. "This is my mortality," he says. And the prophet pulls the future into our lives, so that we are not bereaved of direction and future.

As the politician fights for the present.

3

There are then four laws of speech.

History sings, and that's why this is the more normal form of an historic book, and Homer is -- than the prose. History sings into our memory that only apparently on the surface of things have died.

Prophecy promises, and makes us yearn for better things, stretch out into the future. "The promise of America," therefore is necessary for making meaningful the life of this generation. If you have no promises, as the country at this moment has, it has lost its faith in the future. And that's why at this moment, it is flat. It has no direction. It's floundering.

And it has also no past for this reason. Everything is just the car. And in the middle, there is fight.

4

So will you take down these three rules?

*The past is sung;
the future is prophesied;
the present is fought for.*

II

1

The present is a conflict. You cannot establish any present without parties. Without saying one "yes," and one "no." Because that's a duel, that's competition. It's like husband and wife, both going to their utmost to emphasize their opposite view of reality. And that's the reality of the present.

The past is sung, because the fight is over. But the meaning of the fight has to be sung into our memories. Like the Fourth of July celebration or the Gettysburg Address; that's song, because you better memorize it.

And prophecy is prayer. You can also put here "prayer," anything that you can expect from the future. Supplication. Praise.

2

And then there is a fourth language, of knowledge. Knowledge is about dead things. We are allowed to know dead things so that at the given moment, you can use these dead things and bring them back into the crux of life.

You study geology after a hundred years; we drill oil wells. And the geologists for a while seem to deal only with dead things, useless things; and then finally we discover how we can lead the oil back into the mainstream of life, our own life. And all science prepares dead things for re-entering the stream of life again.

3

Once you see the position of science, you see its full meaning, and yet its very great limitations. Science is going out into the dead universe, preparing dead things to be resurrected, to join you and me.

We eat now on a deeper level -- topsoil was the first nourishing of man. And now we go down six thousand feet and get the oil. Which only means that we have enlarged the reservoir of dead matter which serves us and which joins the life-stream of humanity.

4

So what must happen if notions like realism and romanticism that are good for dead notions of classifications of dead books, if this enters your bloodstream and poisons your relation to song, and to prophecy, and to politics, you can never apply these notions to your relation to a real poem. Because this poem has an immediate effect on you. It's part of you.

You only live by knowing poetry.

III

1

A child that hasn't been sung to, is a barbarian not only, but it's a heartless juvenile delinquent. And why do we have juvenile delinquency?

Because these children are confined to doggerels instead of to the Psalms. They have never been allowed to sing themselves into life during the first fifteen years of their existence. They are not allowed to -- hits is the only thing that hits them. Slogans are the only things that they hear. Nothing is sacred.

How could they reverberate the word of God? The life of the race? The memories of mankind?

2

You don't sing them into them. You deprive them.

Our children are starved for the spiritual love, because is love is song; and song is love. You cannot love without song. In a brothel, you don't sing. Or except a juke box makes a loud noise to make sure that these harlots and these people who go there have some semblance of music, and song. But it's an artificial song.

The nightclub music is deviltry, diabolical. It has to be music, because one cannot make love without song. But it's second-rate music. It's artificial. It's the same like lipstick, instead of your natural color.

3

And in this country, the harlot rules. Hollywood rules. And you think that lipstick is normal, and the normal colors are abnormal. So you say that the hit is the normal food of a child, and the puns, and the quiz, and the doggerels, instead of the highest songs of the human race. And so they don't learn to sing the Psalms, and they don't learn to sing hymns. But they do sing all this poisonous gas.

And so it is with everything.

4

And so you think that a narrative, the short story that is read by recipe, in a writer's school, fulfills all the requirement of real poetry and real art, which is an existential undertaking, where a man has to spend his whole life before he dares to say something.

IV

1

THE STORY OF THE WRITER

He is not here today, but I have a young friend who wants to become a writer. I can only hope that he will not follow this dream at the age of nineteen, because you cannot become a writer. It's a curse to be a writer. It's an obligation, perhaps, a compulsion. But it is not agreeable to be a real writer, because you have to become the mouthpiece of a nation. And you have to prostrate yourself, like the angels fall before the face of God, it's a blessing and a curse to have to write, my dear children.

I know what I'm talking about.

2

And anybody in this country who says, "I'm going to be a writer," has no idea what he's saying. He thinks that he can learn how to write short stories and make money. He may, but this has nothing to do with literature, or poetry, or service to the nation, or to the peoples of this earth. That's making money out of their skin.

There is no profession of writers. Cannot be. Either people are -- like musicians, they are born. But you cannot say, "I want to be a writer."

3

Every day this is in jeopardy.

THE STORY OF ROSSINI

Rossini stopped composing operas -- he certainly was a genius -- at the age of 48, and said, "this is over now." He became a cook.

That's the normal relation to your own genius. You never know how long it lasts. And why shouldn't a man stop writing after he has written this? He died, feeling that this was the end.

4

A real poet, or a real singer is the singer of one song. Like Julia Ward Howe. When she had written the "*Battle Hymn of the Republic*," that was it.

SECOND PART: SAVE OUR SOULS

CHAPTER ONE: WHY WE SPEAK

I

1

Now, this has been the aim of my whole seminar, and I'm quite serious now.

To tell a story is usually the imperfect of grammar. That is, simply building on this one form, we all can say, "I did love," "I went." This is a miracle that our language tries to embrace the past.

And then we can say, "This shall be." And that's all prophetic, and all promising language, or programmatic language, and all prayer.

And I also can say, "2 and 2 = 4." There is not a verb in it. Science is verb-less language; it's an attempt to eliminate time. And dead things have no time element. The stone is supposedly there the same way, when I come back tomorrow. And so you can say,

All scientific language eliminates the process and thinks that it can deal with matter, or atoms and electrons forever.

It neglects the time element.

2

Scientific language neglects the time element.

Epic language stresses that it has gone before us.

Prophetic language stresses that it must come to us.

And political language stresses that it is in conflict, that it is in jeopardy, that it is in danger, that it is not yet decided which way the cat will jump -- that is, conflicting language.

3

Now our grammar was formed out of the material of verbs. That we can say "I go," "I went," "I shall come" to you is no miracle.

And you think, if you analyze language as these positive semanticists do, these scoundrels, they say, "The sky is blue," and then they analyze such a sentence. That's not a

sentence of original language: "The sky is blue". The original outcry of the creator of language, of the poet, is: "As blue as the sky, this battle day was," or "The future is going to be" or "You, my sweetheart, look."

That is, the "is" is not a normal statement of language. It always means that when you say something is, that you step outside the living process of time, and try to put it into a museum. Where anybody says, "This is," is already a Greek mind who has catalogued away life.

4

Why do we speak, gentlemen? It's very important -- pardon me for bothering you with this. But I have to save my soul. Otherwise I would fail you.

*To speak means to be able to testify and verify an event
before it has happened,
while it is happening,
and after it has happened.*

All language is built on a grammar -- all articulate language which enables us to call the same event as it looks before, while it's happening, and after. That is, the original language is not the language that you can say, "The sky is blue." But people speak so that they be able to say "was," "is," "shall be." All the three forms are like a fork, like a trident.

*We speak in order to march through time, so that this point here can be looked upon
before it has happened, and after it has happened, and while it is happening.*

This is the history of the speech department. This is speech.

II

1

So all your analysis, all these logical semanticists -- Mr. Wittgenstein and Mr. Reichenbach -- and I don't know -- what is dominating here, this school of philosophy -- it's just so absolutely silly, because they take any one sentence and try to analyze. But to speak means to be so much alive that you know that you will survive -- you pass through the horizon of the event. The event is prophesied. It happens. You look back on it.

And therefore all our linguistic mysteries in any language consists of this power to say, "I loved," "I shall love," or "Love," as command. God says, "Love the Lord," as you say. You try to love, and you get very bleeding fists and lips in the process, and then you look back and said, "I have loved." Or "I have not loved," "I have not been loved," which is more important to most people.

2

And this is life. This is history. This is experience. And this is why we speak.

We do not speak to make single statements. For this, we wouldn't need speech. Sign language would be enough. For the sign on the road, for all these technicalities, between mother and child, for example, which is sucking her breast, no language is necessary. Mother and child would never have invented language.

Language is necessary because man dies. And man is not yet born. And we are temporary beings. So you and I, in order to conjure up the times before and after us, were gifted with language.

And that's why we are not beasts.

3

The animal is confined to its own day and place. And you and I are constantly immersed into the tension from the end of time, and the beginning of time. And that's why we speak -- so that we can get orientation, what has gone on before, and what's going to come.

This is to speak. That's why I said, to teach means to groom successors, Sir. Because to speak in such a language which will still be translatable into words a hundred years from now. "Successors" means, "I'm no longer there."

4

When I teach you here, I identify myself with you. And I hope a hundred years from now, somebody will say these things to somebody. And that's why teaching is one form of eloquence, because it means that I take you into my confidence, and I unbosom myself, and I say what I think, so that you may later inherit this, and be able to tell your grandchildren.

So I'm teaching you for the sake of the year 2000. And on the other hand, gentlemen, you listen to me for the sake of the year 900 or 1100, because you hope through me to get in touch with this past, as far as it is still living. What I'm telling you is St. Augustine and the New Testament. They said this. And I am trying to tell you this, so that you may see that it is still true.

III

1

All teaching is a model case of all these three styles of speech, in a teacher and in a student. There is, after all, alive in you some expectation that at some time what I say will be of

some use to you. So the future is present in this room. And on the other hand, what I mention is not of my invention. It has come to me from thousands of years back. And in this very moment then, narrative and conflict, your resistance and my eagerness, for example -- or your eagerness and my resistance; it works both ways -- are in conflict.

That's the present. Any hour where there are two minds clashing, two times are clashing. But on the other hand, if I do not select that of the past which has a future, which promises you a better life, you will not listen to me.

2

Therefore, that is the claim of every good classroom meeting, that the original situation of speech is present, that I'm invoking -- now I come to my point today -- invoking a spirit that will triumph over the past, over the present, and over the future. "Invocation" means this.

And that's the meaning of Vincent Stephen Benét's *Invocation*. To invoke means to believe in the three times in one. You cannot only invoke a god, because he survives death, and he is not split in past, present, and future.

3

If you invoke the *Fifth Amendment*, what do you do? Would you kindly explain to me: what do you do when you invoke the Fifth Amendment? What does it say, the Fifth Amendment?

(Don't have to answer ... incriminate yourself.)

Ja, now please, now analyze this. This is a very strange invocation. It's an invocation, but what does it invoke? Have you ever thought that "invocation" and "invoke" is the same word? So the Muse and the *Fifth Amendment* must have something to do with each other, which is very strange to you.

What do we mean by invoking the Fifth Amendment? What shall it do at this moment? If you think in terms of time, if you would only give up your damned logic, by which you think that speech has to do with dead things.

What is a man is allowed to hope for, when he invokes the *Fifth Amendment*?

(Protection.)

Ja, but don't use this ... -- of course, true protection. To get by. He's allowed to hope that he can get through this dangerous moment unscathed. That is, he can live it down. He can still be the same man tomorrow because he has invoked the Fifth Amendment, there is - as you say, protection -- an umbrella over his head for the rainy day. This is the rainy day, his

day in court; the court cannot do anything, and he is tomorrow the same he was yesterday.

4

That's invocation: to make all times one. Or more than one time, one. And the invocation means that there is molded a pathway from yesterday into tomorrow, and today he cannot get stuck; he cannot be shot dead; he cannot be killed in this. It's an arcade of time that any invocation molds.

(If that's all it meant, then they would change it and throw it out. But if it meant only something that you could use for the very moment --.)

But you can use it at any moment.

(Yes. But I say, if that's all it meant....)

I haven't said that it was all it meant. But that's the one thing you never think of. So that's why I had to stress this first.

IV

1

(It's what everyone thinks of whenever they invoke it. That it will take them over that moment of danger. I would --.)

What's your objection?

(I would suggest that more fundamental than this, it invokes your immediate protection, but that it draws on the mistakes of the past that required that the Fifth Amendment be written into the Constitution for the protection of future rights. So that when you invoke the Fifth Amendment, there is --.)

Oh, but I'm perfectly willing. Why is there any conflict in my statement and yours? You say, "Here is a man's life. Here comes the Fifth Amendment and he walks under this protection into this future."

You say yourself "future rights," my dear man. You have the time element in your thinking. You all think in terms of things. Every American thinks in terms of space. You do not even feel that "future rights" means exactly what I have tried to tell you. That tomorrow you are still in the possession of the same rights as you were yesterday. That's what I say.

(That's what I say.)

But you resent that I said it.

2

This is not one day, this is your lifetime. You are protected by this Fifth Amendment, to lead your life, under its protection, because you cannot be nailed down for something in the past. You are not your own accuser.

Aren't we identical twins?

(Yes.)

3

So invocation, which is not seen by you -- and that's why I had to say it -- puts a higher authority above the conflicting parties of the Senate Committee on Un-American Activities and you. And there is suddenly a sky -- what the Bible calls the "heaven," the heavenly higher powers than the living.

Wherever you have the power to build an archway through past, present, and future, this in all nations and all peoples has been called "divine." You don't have to call it one god, but it has divinity. It is one god. God is the power to unite the times. Or who denies it -- divides it.

4

And we only can unite the times in the name of God.

Nobody can speak if he does not believe that what he says today could be understood yesterday, and can be understood tomorrow, despite the fact that you are dead.

CHAPTER TWO: WE ARE PERFECTLY USELESS

I

1

...it's a restoration of art to the life of the community, around which this invocation is written. That's why it is a serious invocation.

2

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S PAPER AS A BOY

I have, as a boy, as a student of your age, I have written a paper on the invocation in classical literature, Homer and Virgil. And this was my thesis for being allowed to enter the seminar there, in the classics in Berlin University.

And so I know a little bit of invocation in antiquity. And today, I mean on the surface of things, you think it's indulgent, you think invocation is a luxury; it's just a fashion-- or not even -- it has gone out of fashion.

Certainly you think it is old-fashioned.

Now therefore I think it is terribly important that I think you should invoke the Fifth Amendment, and know that invocation is the way of gaining a public. God is the power that makes you speak. You cannot speak and think that there is truth in what you say, if you don't believe in God.

3

THE STORY OF ATHEISM

There are no atheists. The atheist says, "Believe me that there is no God." And in this, he invokes your and my belief in the power to speak the truth. And therefore, atheism is self-contradictory, because to speak means to believe in God, to say something that has validity before and after my physical existence.

Formerly this was called "the Holy Spirit." Everybody who speaks makes this claim. You couldn't pass an examination if you didn't believe in God. It has nothing to do with your going to church. To speak means to believe. That is, to have the power to take part in a process that has gone on before your birth and will go on after your death.

That's called "the belief in God."

4

A perfectly godless person is he who takes everything down into his grave, who says, "Really, after me, the --" who abuses every law, every truth, by the big lie, because he says, "I don't care what goes after me." There are very few such people. They are the really godless people, but they usually go to church, and pay the tithe. Because they want to play safe.

But the so-called atheists are always the religious people of their time, who find fault with the expression of the time, and want to say it a little better.

II

1

To speak means to believe. This you must understand, because to speak means to unfold into these three times.

And while I'm saying this, I cannot give up this hope, that you will leave this seminar with the understanding that history is not a part of science, but is as original as any scientific statement.

2

But if I say, "I was once young," I say something as independent from science, as obviously science is independent from history when it says that the water is H₂O. These are two sentences that are completely heading in different directions of reality, that water and H₂O makes water at this moment not a vital and living force, but a dead thing, which I can use and store away.

THE STORY OF H₂O

But the Colorado River is already more alive than just the H₂O; and the Grand Canyon is, and the lake is; and the ocean is. So that the deadest form is to say that H₂O. And that's science. The scientific style.

3

And that's when you say the poem is realistic, or it's romantic. Then you are trying to make this poem a part of the library of dead things. But if you say, "I sang this morning" from enthusiasm about the good morning, you have evoked. That's how we proceed. And here in the middle is our vocation.

4

All this is lost on you. I know you hate even to be pinned down to words.

But I cannot help to tell you that these words have a very honorable family. Your vocation is what you have to fight for in your whole life. And the spirits of the past have to be evoked, and the future has to be provoked, and the powers that regulate this process have to be invoked.

And many things. And the people whom need for your help -- there is the convocation, which means "to convene," originally. But *convocation* - that are the people who will listen to the same invocation. The convocation, the public is convened by this invocation.

III

1

Vincent Benét tries to find his true public among the Americans themselves, instead of the professors of American literature, by his Invocation. You can put it down as a rule:

where you invoke, you also convene, you also convoke.

Because those same people who believe in the same gods as you, will congregate under this invocation. To invoke means to draw into the people, to throw that net, which will catch the fish. Because who feels the same invocation, will come.

2

(*Going the same way, would you say that the language of science "unvokes," or makes speechless?*)

Ja. It speaks of things. It doesn't invoke anybody. It speaks of, and about. It says there is a dead world, which should not be conjured up, but should be toned down.

That's why every scientific language says, "This is the style of science." "This is nothing but." And all other three - the character of the historian, and of the priest and of the prophet and of the politician says, "Imagine! This is really water! This is really a man! This is really a child!" That is, this is all talked down, and this is all talked up.

And the word "vox," voice, is always intonation. And all science whispers. That is why all science ends in mathematics, because the figure, the number, is speechless. If you express yourself in numbers, you have lost your speech. To tone down is the essence of science, and to tone up, to tune in -- as you say these days -- to intone-- you can also call this "intonation."

And science, as you see now from the atom bomb, is a detonation.

That's a good joke. But it means in every sense "de-tone," to tone down.

3

Anything that can be spoken of as a formula -- like the logical positivists think everything is dead. It's dismissed into the realm of the dead. It is not important for history; it is not important for the future; and it is not important for making love or hate at this moment. It is useful, or useless.

That is, it comes under the category of use or non-use.

Now you and me, we are perfectly useless and we are not useful. We are outside the realm of use -- we are the ends.

4

I just read a novel -- who gave it to me? You did a wonderful thing. The man of the foundation says, "We are abundant in means, but absolutely no ends." Absolutely no ends. We have eight thousand foundations in which every administrator gets three times as much as any of the men they try to help. And that's the meaning of these foundations. Because the means are abundant, but they don't know for what purpose.

But man is his own purpose. What's the use of a newborn child? None whatsoever. Don't try to define man in any terms of use.

IV

1

THE STORY OF WHO IS A CITIZEN

Well, I have told you my story of the education officers of the CCC. That they defined a citizen as a man who's profitably employed. And I got up -- and we had a violent argument. That's twenty years ago. And they said, "Well then, how do you define a citizen?"

And I said, "Well, that's very simple. A citizen is a man who, when the city is destroyed, can refound it". But has a higher power of not just being individual, but who carries in his loins the community. It can create it out of his loins again, a founding father. That's a citizen.

2

And these are the two worlds in which you live. And every day I see American, good boys and girls sink into this morass of being told that they have to be profitably employed, that they have to be useful, and that they have to be instrumental -- and all such nonsense!

You cannot be instrumental. You cannot be useful. You cannot be profitable.

Nothing. We are perfectly useless. As useless as God Himself and His angels. God is useless. And He is not profitably employed.

This is only for dead things.

All this employment business treats a man as in the service of somebody else. He signs away his living time. Mr. Riesman calls it, "He's alien-directed," or "outside-directed."

("Other-directed.")

Oh, "other-directed," yes. It just means that it is nothing in his life. It means nothing in his life, and it is a dead power in his life. He cannot invoke any spirit -- any divine in these eight hours in the factory. It's somebody else's life, which he is leading. And you are all acquiescing in this.

3

Now I tell you, every one of us is an earthen worm, and as far as our mortality is concerned, certainly we have to strip down, and serve. That's the meaning of "service," that we do give part of our existence, and lower ourselves to becoming means to other men's ends.

But that's not me. That's a voluntary humiliation. That's humility. The ordinary level of man is that he can be loved, and can be desired, and can be yearned for, and can be expected. And the highest degree of man is that he can found communities for other people. A family, and a city, and a country, and a university, and in this he even shoots higher than just being his own life, because he finds forms in which people are hanging together.

4

So this is not only a figure of speech, my *Cross of Reality*, but there are these three levels, for things, for men, and for gods.

And Mr. Stephen Vincent Benét is not simply writing an ancient invocation in imitation of some classical doctrine, but he's restoring the arts to their divinity, by making himself serviceable to his brother-man instead of writing to literary critics; because he invokes, the god of America, as against the Muse of art.

(This term, the "ice-crystal" --.)

CHAPTER THREE: INTERLACING OF SOULS

I

1

Will you kindly keep in mind these three levels -- every sentence, has three levels.

*The things of which you speak,
the person to whom you speak,
and the power in whose name you do speak.*

As a chemist-professor, you stand in your chair. And you say to the class, "Water is H₂O," you invoke the god of science, truth. And you invoke him so that the children may believe you. So above your head, here is the god of science.

Then you speak to your students, so that they may know this, as your successors.

That's teaching, so that you may create this avenue of time in which somebody will know after you have been dead.

2

That's why I'm talking to you at this moment.

3

And then there is a third level in which "of water" it is said that there is H₂O. So this one-and-the-same sentence contains three levels of language.

And as long as people do not see this, they do not know what they do when they are speaking.

4

And at this moment, I think most people do have no idea that they always invoke when they say the simplest truth. Because the say, "Believe me that I do not lie." That's prayer. That's a supplication.

All language is prayer. All language is *address, introduction, embrace, declaration of love or war*. We speak to each other. And then we speak of something. And the something of which we speak doesn't listen in. It doesn't have to understand.

And you only see today in your analysis of language always this fact that you speak of. And you have to admit that you also have to speak to, and that the other person only listens to you, because he expects you to be obliged to speak the truth, to be compelled to say what he otherwise would have to say, that you speak as much for him as you speak for you.

II

1

THE STORY OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS' DIALOGUE

I have read a very great story of a dialogue.

And you know the Platonic dialogues are bandied around as the normal dialogues in this country. Of course, they are highly stilted and artificial, and I think, excepting two or three dialogues as the *Symposium*, there are no dialogues at all. The poor interlocutor is just always to be made to say "yes," and "no".

But there is an American dialogue which is written under compulsion, and is not a leisurely talk of two gentlemen having nothing better to do. It's the dialogue published in a 50-cents booklet, "*The Columbian Orator*," in 1837. And you would think that this can be much less important than the Platonic dialogue. But I just sent it to a man who's writing a book on dialogue -- Harold Stahmer -- and telling him that this was a much more beautiful dialogue than any Platonic dialogue on which he is writing his dissertation.

2

Why? Very simple. You can then study this story of the power of speech. It's a dialogue between a slave and his master, in the days of the beginning of Abolition. And it is handed over to us by the greatest American Negro, Frederick Douglass. I don't know if you have heard of him. Frederick Douglass. I recommend his autobiography very much.

And he reports that he was quite overcome when he read this "*Columbian Orator*" dialogue. And why is it so great? When they begin, the slave is made to say, "I submit to my fate." That is, they are in agreement at the beginning of the dialogue. "I submit to my fate." Incredible word, too, I mean.

Then the master is so touched by the harmony, or the submissiveness of the slave that he says, "So, make your point." And then only, after they have, first found their unity, they find their dissent, and finally the dialogue ends very beautifully that the master emancipates the slave.

3

Now the greatness of the dialogue is, I feel, in this simple fact that we cannot speak to each other before we have not found our common god. You have to invoke one spirit before you can even begin to speak.

And that's completely lacking in the Platonic dialogue. There are two individuals. And that's why I do not think they are real dialogue.

But this is an incredible story.

THE STORY OF HUSBAND AND WIFE

It's like a husband and wife, talking in the night, over their sorrow, where also the wife will say, "Well, if you want me to do it, I will do it, and invite this beast. But I won't invite her if I can have my way." And then she'll begin talking. But since the husband has first been told that she is willing to invite him, if he insists, she can cure him from this insistence, by giving her reasons later.

And that's what any good woman will do. She will not say first, "I'll never do that." But she will say, "I'll do it, but let me tell you". That's human speech, because it means that without having first having been in agreement, there can be no agreement in the end.

4

And people think they can talk themselves into agreement. That's impossible. You have already to prefer the peace between you and the other man first. Then you can go to all the arrays of your ammunition and your guns in the process. And then the other can surrender and come around to your point of view.

III

1

But all logic in this country is taught in this idiotic way, as though reason was vested in you and in me.

To speak means to be of one spirit. You couldn't listen to me here if you hadn't the good faith that it was worthwhile to take this seminar. That's the first degree. And therefore, we always have already invoked a higher spirit when we enter a room and sit down to talk to each other.

2

That's called "peace," and that's called "understanding," and that's called "good will," and that's called "joy."

All the nine gifts of the Holy Spirit are involved in this.

You couldn't come here, and bear with all our disagreements, if there hasn't first already been the invocation of a command, "Listen," "Wait," "See". It may in the end turn out to have been worthwhile.

3

So all speech is a movement inside one spirit. And all speech is a movement in constellating -- as in the square dance, the partners constantly taking turns.

The real talk is not argument. The real speech is between two friends, or between a teacher and a student, that one comes to the viewpoint of the other, and the other comes to the viewpoint of the one. They change their roles.

It is never that you convince the other person. But if there is any real speech, at the end, both see each other and this very often -- so that then the wife begins to defend her husband's position, and the husband begins to defend his wife's position. You will find this very often in your married life. That at the end, it's just in reverse, because both love each other, are in one spirit, and suddenly see that the other has an important point to make, and to defend. And since they both see this, at the end, it is very strange; there are still two points of view, but now they are represented by the opposite number.

And don't be ashamed of this. This is how it is.

4

Of course, this happens in politics all the time.

THE STORY OF DISRAELI AND GLADSTONE

You remember Disraeli putting the bigger franchise in than Gladstone in 1867. Have you heard of this in English history? So there was Gladstone asked for an enlargement of the franchise.

And there are such things in American history by the way, too. At this moment, the Republicans are doing more for the farmers and burning more crops than twenty years ago, the New Deal ever did. They have seen the light, and now they have seen a tremendous light.

IV

1

This changing of the roles is the true essence of speech. That's why there's drama. That's why it's worthwhile to play on the stage something in which people change their places, at the end.

All your logic however, is based on the old Greek, pagan idea that man is impenetrable: that one man is here, and the other is there, and now they club each other down with argument. Gentlemen, that isn't worth mentioning. That's in court, still, a remnant of paganism. And even there, it is quite nonsense.

The famous Darrow in the Loeb case, he never did this. Said the man is guilty. Of course, he's guilty. But what do we do with such a man? That's a Christian defense.

2

Because speech means interlacing of souls. It means opening up. And that's why all speech is disarmament. That's why *Moral Re-Armament* is such silly heresy today in the world of religion. Have heard of *Moral Re-Armament* movement, because all real life is the disarmament of the spirit, and not the armament.

If we must disarm to understand each other. It's a condition of understanding each other. You can only understand each other - and if you are not on speaking terms, you have to fight.

To speak means to disarm. And we disarm in the name of the truth, or in the name of charity, or in the name of the future, or the name of our children.

When *Romeo and Juliet's* parents get reconciled, they invoke the spirit of their children.

3

If you only could see "disarmament" as the essence of speech, it would help you greatly. And you would also see how little peace there is in this world of ours, in so-called "peacetime," because every shyster -- and every merchant there tries to arm. "Advertising" means to arm, not to disarm. And so you wouldn't become pacifists. You would see that war is going on all over the place.

Peace is where we disarm. And you disarm when you speak. And when you shout and have neon lights, you lie. All the streets in Los Angeles to me are all harlots, because they have all makeup. It seems that not one of these stores ever tells the truth. It's all exaggerated.

4

Can you understand why I get excited over this? This would be my minimum I always feel the world goes to pieces, because nobody wants to know that history is a way of keeping the dead alive. It's evocation.

CHAPTER FOUR: HEALING THE WOUNDS OF THE PAST

I

1

(... remarked on this sentence that he follows through a little bit later. Isn't he trying to call us back again to the past, that the Civil War -- so that we can recognize our debt, so to speak, over a half-forgotten)

Sure, sure. Well, you can even say that he has exactly the same picture as I had with *Invocation*. He says, "Let's build a roof over this Civil War."

And I think this means that it will not be bracketed, and omitted from our memory but we can march through these blood-stained battlefields, South and North, an invocation of the Muse. That's his poem.

He says exactly what I have tried to say: like invoking the *Fifth Amendment*, a poet invokes this amendment of his history. So that the ghosts of the past can march through this, as in *Macbeth* without hurting you. You have the power now to accept them and look at the last page of the poem. What is the last verse?

"Say neither, in their way, 'It is a deadly magic and accursed,'
Nor 'It is blest,' but only 'It is here.'"

2

By which he has said, that he has evoked the past; no it's here, present. And you live with this, under the protection of this poem, without being shot at, without being wounded, without feeling that you are hurt. It is this -- if the past doesn't hurt, then the power of the poet has succeeded.

3

So I insist that the word "invocation" has to be taken very seriously by you.

At this moment, if you read a history of literature, Sir, you will find that invocations are brushed aside as an old-fashioned cobweb; just a habit, or a routine, and cannot be taken seriously. Mr. Pope or Mr. Dryden uses these artifices, invocation.

And so we don't believe in Muses, and therefore, it should be dropped.

4

Now I do. I'm so enthusiastic about Benét because he has rediscovered the original power of the invocation. And he says, "Without this invocation, you readers of mine will think that I am a partisan, that you have to --." And so he says, "It is just here. You have walked with me under this invocation of the Muse, unscathed, unharmed, unwounded. Nobody has to feel that his heart is pierced, and that he is attacked. The past is reconciled."

II

1

And all speech is when it belongs to the past, healing the wounds of the past. We said this about Thucydides. It's always the same story.

This problem of the history is to make both parties read one and the same story. Then it is over. Then it can be made a part of our memory. Before, the memory, as you know all from psychology, has traumas.

2

We don't wish to remember certain humiliations, certain acts of shame, certain acts of impossible behavior of our own, usually. And so we repress half of the past. Our memory is always incomplete. The poet makes it complete, and therefore allows it to be part of reality, the frontier between past and present is broken through. And the present -- that is still conflict -- gets tremendous resources, because here is a unified past, which has not this conflict.

And you can see that even Republicans and Democrats belong to the same nation.

3

THE STORY OF ROOSEVELT

I once had a dinner at the Somerset Club in Boston. That's the snootiest club they have. And I was only a very modest guest. But there were high judges, and it was in the days of the New Deal, in 1935 it must have been, or '36. And I have never heard human beings speak of the president -- the head of their country - in such disrespectful terms. "Him, Roosevelt was only a paralytic". Imagine, a man with the polio.

He was a paralytic who had syphilis.

And since he had syphilis, he was out of his mind.

And since he was out of his mind, he was ruining the country.

And that a syphilitic should run the United States that was just too bad.

And every bite of the venison we were eating, and of the good food was spiced with such and other poetical excursions.

And then I finally said to them, "Now, gentlemen, I understand that the president went to Harvard, like you." And I taught at Harvard. And they were furious. Absolutely furious. That set them flat; had nothing to say anymore. Because they had, as alumni of Harvard, to admit that it did something to you. "Once a Harvard man, always a Harvard man."

Which means, that the past does reconcile. Well, gentlemen, very soon they went on: "Traitor to his class," and so on.

4

THE STORY OF STEPHEN VINCENT BENÉT'S DISCOVERY

But perhaps you understand why I'm in love with Vincent Stephen Benét, because he, at the growing point of the word, of the living speech, has discovered that beyond art for art, there is still a future for poetry again. And because he has shared the superstition of the 19th century, he was tempted to think that art was something quite by itself, and had not this normal relation between humanity of either past, or future, or present, or this decision. And he is a convert.

And he is not treated as this, in this country. The people haven't even noticed that there is this distinction between the poet who is really against the serving his nation and the people of this earth, and the poet who writes for his own satisfaction, or from getting a reputation of being called "a poet."

III

1

Any man who performs a service in his community must perform it even at the risk that he is denied the title. That is, you have to risk your label as a poet in order to write the good poem.

And you have to risk your label as a scientist in order to be the poet.

2

THE STORY OF MR. PLANCK

When Mr. Planck said that there was quanta theory -- that there was not gradation, or gradation in nature, that nature did make jumps -- he risked all his reputation. They might have called him a phantasm, a fantastic quack.

This you have to do with any new creation. When you want to renew the function of any important branch of the human spirit, you have to be willing to be denied the title which was given today for this performance under other conditions. That's the danger spot. That's real greatness. When you perform the act, although the people say, that you aren't doing it, because they are accustomed to have done in routine ways that in your mind are now poisonous at this moment, and dangerous.

3

And I think therefore the modern artist is in exactly this way. The painter is. The musician is. You see it from the crisis of the arts, that any real person has at one moment in his life the risk to be called "a quack" or "a fool," not because this is one thing you can fall down and just be a quack and a fool. But I assure you,

there comes in every function of life the moment where the doing the thing itself is more important than being called it, honorably.

4

THE STORY OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS

I always tell the story of John Quincy Adams, who had been president of the United States of America, and then stepped down and became a simple member of Congress. And from 1831 to 1848, he was in the Congress. I think it was in 1839, the House was in such a partisan mood that they couldn't elect the speaker. And the clerk who was instructed by one party, by the Democrats as against the Whigs, declined to call the members from New Jersey. Their election was contested. And the partisans were so evenly matched that if he had seated them, by simply calling the roll, they would have elected a different speaker. And that was a partisan issue.

And so the clerk for three days always read the roll. When he came to New Jersey, one party shouted it down, and said, "Call the name," and he declined; and on it went again. And the whole House was in an uproar, and being the sovereign power of the United States, it seemed that the United States had no government. And after three days, they had exhausted their ammunition. And John Quincy Adams, you must know, was hated by the whole South, as the Abolition man, and as a man who already presented the petitions from the North against slavery, and had been already threatened with being unseated, and being excluded from the House, so he was far from popular. And just the same, when storm raged for three days, people grew tired. And everyone turned to John Quincy Adams and acknowledged that he was the only authority who could replace this corrupted clerk and bring the House to order.

And so they turned to him -- and the Democrats from South Carolina, marched up to him, and seated him in the speaker's chair-- provisionally-- and he called the House to order and ruled it with an iron hand for 24 hours, until the speaker was elected. And everybody

agreed, this was the highest moment of his life, in which he was the acknowledged leader of his country, without having the name of it.

That is, he performed this one act by which the House could organize itself, and for which there was no provision in any order, law, prescription.

IV

1

And if you have such a man, a country can be saved, because he does the act without the title. Doing is more than being called with a name. And the greatness of John Quincy Adams' life to me is expressed that you have to live a very good life indeed, in order to rise to this height, to do justice.

2

THE STORY OF MYRON C. TAYLOR

And the same, I told you, about Myron C. Taylor, who just died, that he had once performed a function for which was there no name in this country. And thereby, he is the great pacifier of American industry. And when he died, the people don't even know it.

You remember?

3

And so this is greatness, to evoke, to invoke the spirit of peace, when you only can do it without the title, because the title has been abused by people who have fallen down on the job. Here, as in this case, the clerk. And in the Myron Taylor's case, the president of the United States even had to prevail, and the industry. You had to do it just on your own tour of good will.

This is the greatest thing in life.

4

And this I feel Benét is doing. He says, "I'm risking my reputation." And therefore he turns away the wrath of the critics by saying -- how does he say it? It's a very beautiful -- "Their words are just". So he steps outside this whole magic circle of literature, and this is what he really says. "Their words are just. But when they -- killed. But I have to say it."

And his tone -- he's deprecating his impotency, that's his modesty. "But," he says -- now it's a very beautiful -- the other side of speech. The invocation, and the evocation of the

poet or the historian: to what should they be? How does he get his certainty that it doesn't depend on him alone? If you read these last verses. He says who heals this incongruity?

*"My maimed presumption, my unskillful skill
My patchwork colors, fading from the first,
And all my fire that fretted at the will
With such a barren ecstasy of thirst,
Receive them all,"*

and now -- who is invoked now? Who is provoked? In whom does he put his hope?

(The reader.)

Yes, in the reader.

THIRD PART: STEPHEN VINCENT BENÉT'S OFFICE

CHAPTER ONE: PRAYER

I

1

And there you have real dialogue. The reader has to complete the task. "You and me," the poet says, "together can only form the success of this. I cannot write, if you do not respond."

And so the response of the reader is not just reading, as in art for art's sake, where you have contemplation, and lookers-on, but you have, "Should you choose to touch them," "With one slant ray of..."

So the light comes from the reader. This is what he says.

2

And then the last line is: *perhaps another giant must come after me*. This is what it means, the last two lines: if I find no readers –

*"the dry bones littered by the way/
May still point giants toward their golden prey."*

It's still the greatest theme of history, he says. But it's hard. It's all very concealed. Very tactful. And so in this life -- let's now read the end.

3

Let's go, here. Three hundred thirty-three in most editions. *John Brown's Body*. We have to read this more or less -- could even begin before, because all this is already epilogue. John Brown's Body. You have it? Ja.

Would you read this?

*(I guess it's page 333 on most of them.)
(Yes, 333.)*

*"John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the grave.
Spread over it the bloodstained flag of his song,
For the sun to bleach, the winds and the birds to tear,
The snow to cover over with a pure fleece
And the New England cloud to work upon*

With grey absolution of its of its slow, most lilac- smelling rain,

*Until there is nothing there
That ever knew a master or a slave
Or, brooding on the symbol of a wrong,
They threw down the irons in a field of peace.
John Brown is dead, he will not come again,
A stray ghost-walker with a ghostly gun.*

*Let the strong metal rust
In the enclosing dust
And the consuming coal
That is the furious soul
And still like iron groans,
Anointed with the earth,
Grow grow colder than the stones
While the white roots of grass and little weeds
Suck the last hollow wildfire from the singing bones.*

*Bury the South together with this man,
Bury the bygone South.
Bury the minstrel with the honey-mouth,
Bury the broadsword virtues of the clan,
Bury the unmechanical, the planters' pride,
The courtesy and the bitter arrogance,
The pistol-hearted horsemen who could ride
Like jolly centaurs under the hot stars.
Bury the whip, bury the branding-bars,
Bury the unjust thing
That some tamed into mercy, being wise,
But could not starve the tiger from its eyes
Or make it feed the beasts of mercy feed.
Bury the fiddle-music and the dance,
The sick magnolias of the false romance
And all the chivalry that went to seed
Before its ripening.*

*And with these things, bury the purple dream
Of the America we have not been,
The tropic empire, seeking the warm sea,
The last foray of aristocracy
Based not on dollars or initiative
Or any blood for what that blood was worth
But on a certain code, a manner of birth,
A certain manner of knowing how to live,
The pastoral rebellion of the earth
Against machines, against the Age of Steam,
The Hamiltonian extremes against the Franklin mean,
The genius of the land*

*Against the metal hand,
 The great, slave-driven bark,
 Full-oared upon the dark,
 With gilded figurehead,
 With fetters for the crew
 And spices for the few,
 The passion that is dead,
 The pomp we never knew,
 Bury this, too.*

*Bury this destiny unmanifest,
 This system broken underneath the test,
 Beside John Brown and though he knows his enemy is there
 He is too full of sleep at last to care.*

*He was a stone, this man who lies so still,
 A stone flung from a sling against a wall,
 A sacrificial instrument of kill,
 A cold prayer hardened to a musket-ball:
 And yet, he knew the uses of a hill,
 And he must have his justice, after all."*

Would you go on?

*"He was a lover of certain pastoral things,
 He had the shepherd's gift.
 When he walked at peace, when he drank from the watersprings,
 His eyes would lift*

*To see God, robed in a glory, but sometimes, too,
 Merely the sky,
 Untroubled by wrath or angels, vacant and blue,
 Vacant and high.*

*He knew not only doom but the shape of the land,
 Reaping and sowing.
 He could take a lump of any earth in his hand
 And feel the growing.*

*He was a farmer, he didn't think much of towns,
 The wheels, the vastness.
 He liked the wild fields, the yellows, the lonely browns,
 The black ewe's fastness.*

Out of his body..."

4

You may stop one moment.

As you know, the old distinction between the Christian era and all other civilizations has always been the idea of incarnation. That is, what the future has been, the future then comes true and takes shape.

II

1

It's all lost -- the word has no meaning for you, and you don't think that the spirit gains body, and the whole process of creation is that the word comes first, "Let there be light, and then there is light."

2

Here is prayer, and then it hardens to a musket-ball.

It is the shortest formula I've ever heard for incarnation.

Here, I put you, prayer, or the future; and the musket-ball is of the conflicting moment. And he is now John Brown, he is now looking back, and the epic, because that's what an epic is, history.

"*A cold prayer hardened to a musket-ball.*" I thought this was exceedingly beautiful, and exceedingly precise. And you can't find it in any other poetry, this recognition of our orthodoxy.

3

And I still think that you will discover, if you just base yourself on this, that the tradition of the Christian era, that we are there to incarnate, is the only way of coming to agreement with our fellow man.

With all problems of education. Our poor educational misery comes from this very fact that your educators do not know what "incarnation" means. They don't know what it is. They have no idea that this exists. And here it's very simply said as -"the fate of America, here is this --.

4

I just read Victor Hugo's intervention with Virginia, not to execute John Brown. And the spirit is extra-space. It's super-mundane. The word flies. It has no natural frontiers. And therefore, incarnation always resets the boundaries of the world.

That's why you are frightened now by the Russian Revolution. How could it? There are no Communists in this country.

III

1

But the word knows no frontiers. Whether you have a Communist enlisted in a party or not, the words called "Communism," or "industrial sharing," or whatever you call it, they are over our heads. And they press. And people in their nationalism today think that frontiers are real.

2

For the process of incarnation is always that a cold prayer is a universal. There enters with any word that provokes the future, there enters something that defies all walls of houses, all private-property fences – anything that is earth-made -- prayer is always in Heaven.

Then it comes to earth in a conflict.

That's what he means by the musket-ball. And now Benét leaves it to us, as a procession forever, as Thucydides said, the process is then at an end, when you can see what it did.

3

And so "*A cold prayer hardened to a musket-ball*" is great Christian theology.

And I feel that this is the way today theology alone can be probably taught effectively. Not in theological terms, but it's exactly the story. And it is always simply -- and that's why we all have to be -- pardon me for saying this to you, who don't believe it -- of one faith in the next fifty years.

The process of incarnation is the only process by which people can understand how we have to live. Whether in education or politics.

4

And if then the prayer will always -- if it is resistant -- turn into a musket-ball, there will always be terrible wounds and terrible war. And the poet will always have to come and try to make peace in the end.

This is our eternal destiny. There is no getting out of this. Either the prayer is understood and shared, or it will lead to this. Or it isn't prayer.

When man is serious, his spirit always will beget conflict.

IV

1

And since you are all evading this, and want security, gentlemen, I have to tell you that you want to stop the process of creation. And you will not be able to.

Any country that cries for security will perish.

You will just all perish. You will be counted out of history. You are just like weeds. We root ourselves not on this earth by building houses, or digging down, but by taking upon ourselves this process of *future, present, past*.

Promise and prayer; conflict and song. You have to try to become a song in the mouth of the people whom you have loved, who have loved you, but you cannot begin this way.

2

Today everybody wants to be liked. That's not a way of entering life. This is not the way. You can only invoke the gods and ask what your vocation is. A song you become after you have struggled, and after you have been hated. And since people do not take it upon himself to be hated, they cannot be loved. They can only be liked. And that's not important.

3

So, pardon me for dwelling on this. Perhaps you understand why I think that this is a very great event in America. That here the right faith has been restored. If you take it seriously.

*"A cold prayer hardened to a musket-ball:
And yet he knew the uses" –*

we go on, please?

"Out of his body grows revolving steel,
 Out of his body grows the spinning wheel
 Made up of wheels, the new, mechanic birth,
 No longer bound by toil
 To the unsparing soil
 Or the old furrow-line,
 The great, metallic beast
 Expanding West and East,
 His heart a spinning coil,
 His juices burning oil,
 His body serpentine.
 Out of John Brown's strong sinews the tall skyscrapers grow,
 Out of his heart the chanting buildings rise,
 Rivet and girder, motor and dynamo,
 Pillar of smoke by day and fire by night,
 The steel..."

4

Now what is this quotation? "*Pillar of smoke by day and fire by night*"?

(... going in the wilderness.)

Well, it's a quotation.

(From the Bible.)

Yes, quite. I only wanted to find out if somebody still knows.

CHAPTER TWO: POET AND SCIENTIST

I

1

*"The steel-faced cities reaching at the skies,
 The whole enormous and rotating cage
 Hung with hard jewels of electric light,
 Smoky with sorrow, black with splendor, dyed
 Whiter than damask for a crystal bride
 With metal suns, the engine-handed Age,
 The genie we have raised to rule the earth,
 Obsequious to our will
 But servant-master still,
 The tireless serf already half a god--..."*

One moment, one moment. You know what this is? And it is very biblical. You know what from the "steel-faced cities" to the "half a god," what this really tries to remind us of? Where is the final, electric, and crystal and jewel city described?

Well, it's the golden Jerusalem of the Revelation, in the last two chapters on Revelation. "And I saw the city of Jerusalem". And it's all building, jewelry, and very similar.

2

I only want to tell you that this is the kind of vision, which as much as this is from the Old Testament, "Pillar of smoke by day, and fire by night," so this -- from now the "steel-faced cities reaching at the sky," this whole -- this is "hung with hard jewels of electric lights," that is the attempt to replace the vision of Revelation by the vision of our perfect cities.

3

*"Touch the familiar sod
 Once, then gaze at the air
 And see the portent there,
 With eyes for once washed clear
 Of worship and of fear:..."*

Ja, here you have: worship, the future; fear, the present conflict; and "I have made you march through this with wise -- I have washed your eyes clear". That's what he really said, the poet.

4

*"There is its hunger, there is its living thirst,
There is the beating of the tremendous heart
You cannot read for omens.*

Stand apart..."

What does this mean? I cannot quite follow.

*"There is the beating of the tremendous heart
You cannot read for omens."*

What does this thing? Does it mean "for omens" because there are so many omens? Or you cannot read it and ask it to give you omen? I mean, the f-o-r, the "for" --.

(I think he says, "No omens.")

They must not try to read an omen. Is that no knowledge of the future ... That's what it means.

II

1

"Stand apart

*From the loud crowd and look upon the flame
Alone and steadfast, without praise or blame.
This is the monster and the sleeping queen
And both have roots struck deep in your own mind.
This is reality that you have seen,
This is reality that made you blind.*

*So, when the crowd gives tongue
And prophets, old or young,
Bawl out their strange despair
Or fall in worship there,
Let them applaud the image or condemn
But keep your distance and your soul from them.
And, if the heart within your breast must burst
Like a cracked crucible and pour its steel
White-hot before the white heat of the wheel,
Strive to recast once more
That attar of the ore..."*

What's attar?

(The pure pure part of the ore.)

Ja. You mustn't read anything you don't understand.

*"In the strong mold of pain
Till it is whole again,
And while the prophets shudder or adore
Before the flame, hoping it will give ear,
If you at last must have a word to say,
Say neither, in their way,
'It is a deadly magic and accursed,'
Nor 'It is blest,' but only 'It is here.'"*

2

So, if you want --.

This is a real philosophy of history. That's what historians do. That's what he has done.

And he's aware of it, that he makes -- what we call the past, is beyond conflict; it has been healed. That's what he tries to say. As long as this war is still making parties, it has not been lived down. And history means this power to make us keep the event, but no longer engaging us in fighting the Civil War.

3

And he has laid down in a extremely decisive way the conditions. He has said to the South: "Slavery is over." And he says then -- and that is the great mastery:

*"Obsequious to our will
But servant-master still,
The tireless serf already half a god."*

That is, the slave whom you despise is also half of God.

If you read this very carefully, you understand that he cures the South from from its arrogance by saying, "These people whom you treat as slaves are in fact half gods, because even your machine is more dominating you than you dominate it."

It's a very subtle way of deciding the issue between slavery and South. Not saying, "Emancipation; free him, the slave," but seeing that all serfdom is divine. And that if you could have seen in the slave the divinity that you really make yourself after all dependent on his faithfulness.

4

It's a very complicated religion here. He declines to take sides simply, between the working man and the aristocrat. But he says,

*"The genie we have raised to rule the earth,
Obsequious to our will
But servant-master still."*

Don't be betrayed. The servant will always master the master.

"The tireless serf already half a god."

So this comes full cycle. The slave of the South is now replaced with the great monster of the machine. But don't think, he says, that you are now therefore able to forget his service, or to walk on his services. You are dependent on them in the sense that you must associate, and -- how would you say? -- democracize them.

III

1

Has anybody any idea if this book is read in the South?

*(I was just thinking that.)
(It's not read in the North.)*

Well, can you say that? I think it is suffering simply from the anemia of reading today. This can only work by being learned by heart. And all poetry must be learned by heart.

THE STORY OF CAMP WILLIAM JAMES AND THE BALLAD OF THE WHITE HORSE

And I once established a Camp William James for leadership training for CCC. Did I tell you my story?

(Yes.)

Of the "*Ballad of the White Horse*"? And the people did learn it by heart, and they still recognize each other by quoting this line. And there is no other way as a test of poetry than it be learned, that people know that it has to reverberate in their own self.

2

So what can you do in a world in which nobody learns anything by heart?

(The brother of Benjamin Spock, the author of this book on baby care, is a teacher, was a former colleague of mine, and teaches American history. And he uses this book as the center of his course. And it's always the high point. I don't think he requires that it be memorized, but they spend a great deal of time on it.)

Well, I only can say that anybody who would take it upon himself to memorize the *Invocation*, will have a panacea of all the heresies of our day, because he will get into his system all the eloquence of a real, living soul, as against all your temptations of looking down on reality by your little brain and staying outside of it.

3

I assure you, any good historian has ever tried to do this. I think it is nothing, but today

there is one thing that today the arts and the sciences have grown so apart, that the reconciliation or the renewal will only come when the scientist becomes poetical, and the poet becomes scientific.

That is, he admits real historical source research. This is solid work which he has done. And you demand this today.

Take the historical novel, where you also prefer a novel that is really saturated with good historical knowledge, to a poor novel.

And why is this so? Because we have so specialized art and science to such an extent, they have gone to such extremes -- that I think today the reconciliation is that this man is an historian and he calls himself a poet. But in his lines, he has made this transition, that -- by saying, that-- how did he? -- with the nations --.

4

"I'm going to be a historian." He cannot say it, because the secret of a new deed that's done for the first time is always --

THE STORY OF THE SON OF MAN

Jesus said, "I'm the son of man," and only when He went to the Cross did He allow to Pontius Pilate to say, "You are the son of God". He was not allowed to say it during His own lifetime.

IV

1

Now you may know something of Mr. Kierkegaard, of the incognito that is required from any man who The best, you must not blackguard yourself. Who you are, the others must find out. And anybody who has a vocation in life, is not allowed to label himself. Only the quack does this. And you can distinguish the quack who claims that he is somebody extraordinary -- that's never true.

To be extraordinary, part of it is that you do not claim to be extraordinary.

And that's a contradiction in terms. Very difficult. But he does it.

2

And I therefore feel that poor Vincent Stephen Benét will only come into his own if the historians of today do repentance and say, "We are not scientists, but are very glad to walk in the footsteps of this man," who has set an example of true history writing.

And this is a hard lesson for you.

But this is what we are living in, that all the functions, so-called, are no longer to be found under their labels. You buy a book, and you think you get what it is called. But all these things have today been ruined, overdone. And all free, creative life is today *incognito*, and must even prefer a different title, in order to allow the public to find out what it really is.

3

Because that's part of the reader. That's part of the reader's contribution: that he must wake up to the greatness of the thing, and by his own. He cannot be told by the publisher that this is the greatest book of all times. And he won't believe it, anyway.

Because the advertising has reached now such proportions that Dante is always not Dante, because he wrote *The Divine Comedy*, but because he comes out with Scribner's. The publisher takes it upon himself to distribute the crowns and garlands of life, not one word of truth in this. And since we have this system of self-blackguardizing, and the situation is such that you must learn to discern the spirits.

4

This is the latest issue I want to talk about perhaps next time. I think it's enough for today.

But I do feel that history today is not simply what is labeled in a catalog of the college, "History." Poetry is not what is labeled "Poetry" in the catalog of the bookseller. If you do

not know this, you will not find out the genuine fruits today that are produced, the green flowers -- the green grass, and the real flowers, the real fruits of life.

CHAPTER THREE: RENEWING AN OFFICE

I

1

The genuine today has to hide, because as soon as it calls itself with one of these names, it's commercialized, it's cursed. Prophets cannot call themselves prophets. If they call themselves prophets, they come out as Bill Graham. Twenty-four hours' prophets.

That's not prophecy. Prophecy means to direct this nation back into the path of mankind for the next thousand years.

It doesn't mean to cure pickpockets, and such things. It's a complete misnomer. This has nothing to do with religion, what this man Bill Graham does. Religion is not a private affair. It's the tie-up of man with his destiny from being created to reaching his destiny in five thousand years' march.

2

So the prophet today must not call himself a prophet.

The historian must not call himself a historian.

And the poet must not call himself the poet.

And on it goes.

And you are in a terrible confusion for this reason that you think you go and buy this label.

THE STORY OF THE SUBSTITUTES

But go buy bread, and you get bread. You get some substitute for bread. It's nothing of bread in the bread. And with all the vegetables, and with all the things you buy. You nowhere get the real thing today. Is this in food, in mental things, and you are so accustomed to take these pseudo-things for the real thing that you live in a second-hand world.

So first of all, sing. And write your own songs; that's the very least. It is worth it.

3

So, will somebody take it upon himself? Would you do me the favor and bring Joel Barlow's poems or works. He has written other poems, too. And I think, to show you the distance America has traveled -- it's interesting just to look into it.

You bring it here. You have it? Joel Barlow.

And if there are several copies -- take one -- perhaps you go with him, and there may be several editions. There is one Collected Works, and then there is probably an edition just of the poem, "*The Vision of Columbus*," and then there is his later rewording of it, *The Columbiad*. And then he has *The King's Man*, and then he has the famous poem, *Hasty Puddings*.

And would you prepare something, you two together, about the life of Vincent Stephen Benét, and what else he has written? And perhaps you can get his books to us, please.

4

And our topic then is the function of the poet, next time. Or the function of the word, I mean, or function of ... it's just in between. The Benét today I think is ruined by being treated as a poet. And that's why he can be forgotten. There's still danger; you have to do something about it.

II

1

You say your friend has taken it upon himself to save him in American history. Is it the brother --?

(No, it's American history. I don't know how widespread this is.)

No, but I mean, there we just do the same thing, he and I, trying to put him in his real place. But I -- Ja?

(I was going to say, the treatment is such, they spend enough time on the book so that these boys never forget it. They're quite taken up by the spirit of the book.)

2

The exciting question is: anybody who does renew such a path of mankind, like narrating the past and evoking it, renews the office, the function of the historian.

Benét is not simply an historian in the eyes of the American Historical Association. But at the same time, he's more of an historian. He covers a wider ground. He plays on deeper chords of the human soul, and much more comprehensive. In this sense, then, the office of the historian is renewed. It isn't the same office after Benét has sung his song.

3

So that in every moment - take a surgeon and take any doctor. Any great surgeon renews his function. Since we operate now heart and brain, surgeon is not surgeon. Formerly it was a barber, who would only cure limbs, arms and legs. Today they go into the thorax, and they go into the skull. This man is not the same. The office of the surgeon simply doesn't mean any longer what it meant a hundred years ago.

You must not forget this. It's simply a quite different capacity and faculty today, because you have just to have a quite a different imagination. You are not dealing with the same part of the human body.

4

So any greatness stakes out a new claim, and revamps the relations of the various fields of human endeavor.

III

1

You are in this great danger to have this fixation to believe, for example, that this division: social sciences, humanities, and science is based on any real separation. Whereas every creative effort - like psychoanalysis, for example -- moves these spheres into new order. Is it scientific? Is it humanity? Is it social?

That's open to doubt. And this is, I think, the great merit of any great feat of human expression, that it forces us to admit that these boundary stones and these fenceposts between the departments are all preliminary, that any creative action laughs at them, ridicules them, overthrows them. They are only for children.

And today, the grownups believe in them. That's so terrible.

2

What? Anything?

We have only one more meeting, I'm sorry to say. You will, of course, rejoice.

3

And now do I get my papers? Will you kindly furnish them tomorrow, into Miss Braun's sanctuary? Or they are already here? Who has theirs to give me?

Well. Will you kindly put them -- I have there a box in the history department.

THIRTEENTH LECTURE: THE GREATER LOVE

FIRST PART: WHAT PREDESTINATION MEANS

CHAPTER ONE: NOT TOILET-BROKEN

I

1

...not one of you has read over his manuscript, his typewritten manuscript and corrected the misprints.

I've never seen such a treatment. A pig wouldn't be treated this way. And I can prove it, because not one has any emendation on his typewritten errors. There is never a pencil or even a bit of ink on any one of your papers, where you have been good enough to correct your own nonsense.

Why should I read such stuff? I was very reluctant not to throw these papers into your faces. I'm not your wet-nurse. And you have never grown up beyond the age of two, are not toilet-broken. That's how I call this. This is what you are.

I really had to use very much restraint to read these papers.

2

And the second thing: do you think I'm so stupid that I do not see that you copy *literatim* from another text? I've even mentioned it. It's despicable. You just have copied pages and pages from printed books. Do you think I'm such an idiot?

That's Number two. What shall I do with you?

I don't care. I'm an old man, and I thought it was a privilege for you, that you could hear these things. You haven't treated me this way. You have made me understand that I'm just a fool.

3

These two external things are just incredible. I haven't even noted down when I knew that you were just copying pages from printed books. It's so stupid, quite out of place. Here, there *Scriptores Rerum Historia Augusta*, you come with Herodotus, and Thucydides, as though that had anything to do with it, because the introduction to this -- in Loeb, probably - contains such a retrospect of rhetorics and what-not. Nothing to the point.

There are some decent papers. You know your own exceptions quite well. And I'm quite satisfied. But most of you could do much better work than you condescended to do.

4

But these two points, gentlemen, that even the best of you do not read over their paper. You know very well that you make slips. This is very strange. All of you have to learn to be clerks and secretaries for rest of your life, so teachers will all have to make reports, that it is obvious that you will never allow yourself to hand this into a principal without having read it over.

But why not to me?

And some of these misprints are just indescribable.

II

1

Now we come to the content.

And there of course it's very hard to find any standard of behavior. One of you performs a remarkable feat: he derives the Jews from Cain. Obviously not knowing who Cain was, and said that the story of the Jews was short, because it began with Cain. Now Cain is the son of Adam, so it's quite a long story. And I thought that even you would know that the story of the Jews begins with Abraham.

And that's pretty late in the game.

How anybody can offer me a paper with such a sentence. This is not even in grammar school, because they wouldn't mention something they wouldn't understand. Can somebody explain to me how a man can begin the history of the Jews with Cain? He must be a dyed-in-the-wool anti-Semite, because Cain is the first murderer.

2

Who has written this? Confess. It's on the front page of of my criticism. Here it must be. What's the use of teaching anything if this can happen?

Mr. ... is not here. Wise. Kranz? Here. It's really in print here. "The Jews don't claim eternity, but begin their history with Cain." Quite some achievement. Where is this man? Has he ever appeared here?

(Yes. He's here most every time.)

(Who?)

Norman Kranz.

(He's Jewish, also.)

(I was going to say, he probably's Jewish.)

(He is Jewish.)

He is Jewish? Well, that's a specialist. Well, he says it himself, so it must be true. You know him?

(I know him.)

3

Will you tell him? We accuse him of anti-Semitism. He's ruinous. This record in Cain?

(It's obvious he hasn't read *Out of Revolution*.)

4

Well, he hasn't to read *Out of Revolution* -- just to go to the encyclopedia, or something of this kind.

III

1

So I wanted to read Barlow today, just to show you the transformation of an imitation of European models into a genuine American creation, as in Benét. This step is very great from Barlow's "*Columbus*" -- which is still a vision from Europe of America -- and this first poem, which takes explicitly its stand in the Rockies, and does not start from the Eastern seaboard.

But we don't have a copy on the shelves, strangely enough. It's either/or ... the one copy that isn't there. So this library is a very shoddy one. And if you can do anything to spread the word that this library has to get a shot in the arm. Some million dollars have to be put into this library to make it into something, not just current expenses. It hasn't been done. And the staff is always defeated. Whenever there were two million dollars, set aside for filling the gaps. And I'm told that one million dollars immediately went into buildings, as they always do.

2

This country is intoxicated with brick. And everything is overbuilt, externally, and nothing is there to run the show, to put something inside. This really -- all over the country. Every donor gives ten million dollars, and nine million dollars have to be put into the building. Then there's too little left to fill it with anything that's going on inside, because it has to be showy.

Well, I haven't to tell you here this. Everywhere it's overbuilding.

You can run a good university without buildings. But they think you can only have a greater university through buildings.

This isn't true.

3

And the first thing, here, this library is not comparable even to Berkeley, which isn't such an extraordinary library, either. And you can't get anything.

(Well, the downtown library is a pretty good supplementary institution. It has practically any book that I've ever tried to find. But even to get the books in our library at UCLA, you have to go through hell and high water. It's just discouraging.)

This cannot be helped. But there are just incredible gaps. And why didn't you go to the downtown library?

(Well, I have listened to the "Hasty Pudding" poem.)

It doesn't have it. But you could have gotten a copy of Mr. Barlow, I'm quite sure.

(At the downtown library.)

4

Well, this is our last meeting, so let's forget about all this.

IV

1

I would like to ask you -- do you feel capable now -- and that should be one of the fruits, after all, of our gatherings -- to define the difference of historical time and scientific time -- physical time? This at least would be some achievement or some understanding which should stay with you, among other things. That's the main problem. Do you understand

why historical time and physical time are not the same? Does anybody care to try to express this?

We have talked about this time and again, last time again. But I would like you to be able to articulate this yourself. Does anybody feel up to this? Wouldn't you try?

(Me? I could try.)

You can go to the blackboard if you want to. It may help.

(I'm going to sound like a machine, because I feel so hesitant to try to --.)

Oh, Sir. Well then, never mind. Nobody will poke fun at you.

2

(First of all, the time of science examines things as in one area of time, they examine them in the present. Science examines things and objects, and doesn't --.)

Well now you can even say it neglects time. I would even go so far. You say "present," but it isn't a true present, because it says, "This thing is. The expression for all science is "is". And here is your mind, and here are -- as you rightly say -- the objects. "This is": that's after all the formula of science.

(Whereas...)

In history, we don't speak this way.

(The language of an historian must look at the three elements of time.)

Good. Now you come nearer to the truth.

3

You can put these in opposition on the other side. No, put the future first, because the two --. Past and future he has on top, and underneath, as a result, the present. That's the story of the historian.

In other words, the historian, here stands between his mind and things. That's what you always think you do, what you call "objective". And then you have only as opposite "subjective."

And I have tried to tell you that the historian has neither to do with the mind's subjectivity, nor with the thing's objectivity. We don't know anything, except that at this moment, I'm talking to you. And yesterday I was not talking to you. Today I'm talking. Tomorrow I have talked.

4

And this is history, that we can say of an event, "I shall be talking," "I am talking," "I have been talking." That is, that we have landmarks to say whether we live before an event, in the event, or after an event. That's all what history is, but it's magnificent.

And you want to magnify it into something quite different. The great thing of history is that we can *announce, prophesy, suffer, undergo, submit, and report, and praise, and remember*. This is our movement through time. And by this, anything that has happened stays with us.

CHAPTER TWO: DESTINY AND SPACE

I

1

Take the story of the Jews, then you cannot begin with Cain -- no, no, you stay.

(You told me to sit down.)

I yield to the gentleman, yes, Arizona. Come on.

(Because when I realize how hard it is to explain these things when we just start with ourselves up here, all alone without any notes, because as we're reading our notes and seeing all the things that you said, and it seems like we understand it, until when I meet someone who doesn't even know you, and I want to say that I met an instructor that I think has made some difference in my life, and he asks the question, "Why?" and I try to explain --.)

Kill him.

(I just say, "You have to meet him.")

Well, that's very good of you.

2

But here, let's state what we have. I do feel that it is possible to formulate this in such a way that even the cynic is put in his place. And I want you to get that far today.

So let's work on this. Don't give up.

Once you break the spell of these people's naïve faith, the past is what they have, what they own that causes then the present, and then the past and present together, cause the future. That's all their superstition they have that the past is theirs, because they have totally forgotten that it isn't theirs.

It's just down in oblivion, it's in the abyss -- really analyze what these people call the past, they think it's there, that nothing can happen to the past. It is imperishable.

Now in -- history, that isn't true.

(I think that 1984 by Orwell does a very fine job of alerting us to this problem and possible defeat of all our past by showing that we can lose ourselves.)

It has helped some people when they think of themselves as sitting on a raft on a river, and this raft is longer than they themselves, that it expands backward up the river and down the river to a certain extent.

3

This raft is our memory and is our historical sense. And we move on this raft backward and forward with a certain liberty. We can go up and down.

THE STORY OF THE TRIBAL ORGANIZATION

Any tribal organization, any family organization through the grandfather and the grandchild has a raft that goes through five generations. The whole river of time is inaccessible to us. But the whole experience of backward and forward is already on this raft. You go back to the Heck and you go forward-- how do you call the forward end of a boat?

(Bow.)

A bow. And although you are very definitely aware that this is very limited, it gives you still a feeling of expanse.

4

Now what all human beings since they buried their ancestors, have tried to do -- to expand the time after their death and before their birth. And the analysts have also made us aware of this simple drive today that anyone of us wants to penetrate beyond his own lifetime in both directions; and want to place this, his own lifetime, so they hang it up in this, between past and future, to make it meaningful.

II

1

That's called "education," Sir. The lifting up from the flat level on the ground where you lie dead with your own seventy years of life to lift it up in such a way that the past and future can stream through it, so that you become a part of this process of time which has existed when your parents married without your knowing it, and which will exist when your children marry. And therefore man is lifted up higher and higher in the stream of time.

If you only cover the time from your parents to your children, this is a smaller education, than the education to the highest, of the divine time of the whole creative process, when God said it was light, and to the Last Judgment Day, when He said "It's over." If people

want to behave right in this fuller time, our education will obviously have to dispense with all purely temporary goals and aims of ours.

2

THE STORY OF A PSALM

And just yesterday, one of my colleagues here said very nicely -- the meaning of my life must be to praise the Lord. So whatever I do, I must try to make it a Psalm. Here, my life must be a song of praise of my creator.

This is a very wonderful way of expressing the eternal relation of any one life to the whole process of creation. How do you praise your creator? That's a different question. But he has felt he should lift himself out of the boots -- out of the goals of his private life. And it's quite remarkable that a man at this university could formulate it this way.

3

And if you look at education as a constant attempt to reach this historical level in which all the influences of the creative acts of the past are allowed, are fostered by us, are promoted by us -- so that we do not block them, do not obstruct them -- you see that time has started. And we are purely accidental inside of this time.

And I always mention this fact: you are obliged to teach your children the English language. And if you don't, you abdicate your parents' rights. And now the schools are already taking over, and now they say the parents cannot teach. In this moment, there are no parents.

Then there is no reason why they shouldn't be gotten in ovens, the babies. And artificial semination is a complete consequence of this abdication of parents, giving over to the schools the right to teach children English. Because to teach language is the acknowledgment of history.

4

The English language didn't exist at one time. It probably will not exist all the time.

III

1

If you enter history, you feel that at this moment, the English language is something still to be held onto. We do not say that it will be forever. We do not say that it has existed forever. But while it is here, you and I have to speak English, Sir. You must understand

that this is an imperative. This is an order given. This is a command: "There shall be English."

Now all history therefore cannot be understood without the future. Because you must know, when you take up the study of English in the English department, whether you mean still to say, "No English any longer, Esperanto," or whether you want to say, "Let's cultivate English." Therefore the future has a decisive voice in your study of English.

2

Because if you want to prove that it can go, that you no longer have to know English, that the universal language, artificially seminanted, can replace it -- like Volapük, or Esperanto, or how all these artificial languages now are called -- you will treat English as a superfluity. And therefore the history of English will seem to you a fluke that has passed like a dream in the night, as the Bible says of such things.

But if you say that English is so marvelous, and so rich, and so expressive of the history of the human soul, that it must not be abandoned, there are 40,000 words -- they cannot die, because they are all verses of the spirit, that you will defend it, and you will be down on the artificial language, or you will put the artificial languages in their place, and say, "That's good for commerce. But that's not good for the deepest imaginations of the human spirit."

And so you see that first you know already whether you want to expand English or limit it. And from this on, you will study. And you will give hours of study and place to English, accordingly.

3

I only want to prove to you that even in the simplest way of using language, and teaching your daughter to speak, we are not only turning to the past, in the English as it is written. We have decided that it is worthwhile to keep English alive.

Now that's a decision over the future.

The same is true about political science. If you want to talk about democracy and its development, you already have decided whether you want to abolish it, or you want to cultivate it.

4

This only to bring out that there is no such situation in which the pressure is not on from both sides. This is why this figure is perhaps quite useful.

IV

1

Now history is an attempt to unfold, backward and forward, and your freedom from these cynics is that you say that you do not live in past and future. That's part of the We look backward, and we look forward, and the future looks on us, and the past looks towards us. The past expects us to be saved fro destruction.

2

On you this English language depends, Sir.

On you the *Declaration of Independence* depends. If you throw it into oblivion, you destroy it.

That's an active act. Oblivion is destruction. You give it over to oblivion.

So the past knocks at the door and says, "Please, don't forget." The past is not there, but it's a ghost that wants to drink your blood again. And the future is impinging on you, saying, "What do you think your future of the destiny of the human race is to be?"

3

In this country, you are so hard-put, all of you, because *Manifest Destiny* has meant a space development. To go West, that was Manifest Destiny. But please recover this wonderful word, "destiny." It's a notion in time. Your destiny is not geography, but is history. Obviously "destiny" means the end of time.

And this is one of the reasons why Americans destroy history, why you are slayers of history. You slay history, every day, every one. Every American is a destroyer of history, because you have transposed the term "destiny" into space.

That's the fate of America, that an historical venture -- to discover the West, was allowed to absorb the whole term, "destiny," obviously that's a passing phase that you went West.

4

Here, you are in California. This cannot be now further destiny. Therefore, it is very difficult for you to recover a sense of sanity with regard to history, because it has all been dismissed into space. Destiny seemed a walk over into the Rocky Mountains. But is this your destiny, Sir? Your destiny is whether you have twelve children or not, because that's in time, purely in time. I don't know if the word "destiny" can be saved in this country. Would you say it can?

(I think so.)

CHAPTER THREE: PREDESTINATION

I

1

That's why you do not understand predestination.

It's one of the wisest insights of the Christianity. You always say, "That's Calvinism, predestination." Don't believe it for a minute. It's in the Letter to the Romans by the Apostle Paul. And it's the central word of Christianity, that man is free if he changes his future. That is, if he hears the voice of the future, a new voice from the future, then he is *praedestinatus* -- then his destiny is able to change his background.

2

Obviously, you just take any conversion of Paul, himself, as a "*homo praedestinatus*" as a predestined being, he can read that certain things of the past have to be changed. He hasn't to adhere to them. That's destiny. In the light of destiny, all my past becomes movable, mobile, changeable. I take it, yes, and I say, "Yes, but I have to do something with it. It cannot go on like that, because my destiny is predestined."

So we go before this past into our origin, into our father's hands and man is then God's thought. And even your mother and your father are already disguises of your full destiny. They can be, because they have a limited environment. And they are just your step-parents. Because God wanted you as a creature as it has never existed before.

3

And so that's the story of the Holy Ghost, that conceived by the Virgin. All these superstitions are not there. It's an attempt to express that Christ was a thought of his Father in Heaven before He was the carnal son of Joseph and Mary.

And that's true of all of us. You cannot live, if you do not believe that everybody rebels against his parents, now, because we are all just shot through with Christianity, and everybody believes that there is a destiny which he has to rediscover, which makes him predestined. That is, before he is determined by conditions -- that's the difference between determination and destination.

My destiny is recognized destiny. And determination is outside of me, hangs over me as a cloud, and as a compulsion.

4

And so the history is the only means for us to get outside our environment.

(I'm a little unclear about the difference between predestination and determination. It seems to me that I got one glimmer there that maybe predestination is something from the inside, whereas determination is from the outside. But I'm not clear.)

Yes. Come nearer to the sense of history, now. It is necessary when you make this distinction.

II

1

Now the whole difference --

nobody brought a Bible. Anybody has a New Testament here? That's all obsolete now.

Well, if you read the letter of James in the Bible, there it's made very clear that he lived by the law of liberty. That is, whereas all things in nature live by the necessity of the law -- by natural law, James tries to express it in this stupendous way that he says, "We are children of the law of liberty."

2

Now what's the law of liberty? It's a contradiction in terms. Where there is law, there seems to be no liberty.

THE STORY OF THE LAW OF LIBERTY

If you take American teamwork, and improvising camps, settlements, Gold Rush, and Klondike, that's meant by the law of liberty, that in the process of being free, we discover the law of the action which this action needs from us to be fulfilled.

What we call "teamwork" is such a law of liberty, that is, volunteers get together and people of good will discover the law that this one action makes necessary: the division of labor, building a bridge, fighting a forest fire. These would all be laws of liberty because the first instinct is "I wish to help." And if I wish to help, in order to implement this, there is obviously a lawful proceeding, necessary. One has to be first, one has to be last, and so on, and so forth.

3

The law of liberty is a law that comes about by the power of our speaking to each other, our inviting, our obeying, by commanding. The word is the whole difference between a mute nature and humanity. You are called into life and your parents admit, by giving you a name, that you are bigger than just their dependents. They cannot kill you. They have to teach you language, they have to make you a citizen of the kingdom of Heaven.

Simply by teaching you English.

4

You must not overlook that the fact that you learn to speak emancipates you from your parents. If you wouldn't speak, if you would be an animal, with our constitution, we would be under the yoke of servitude, all our life. Because never would we be able to get outside our environment, and to replace it, to change it.

To speak means to be no longer under the servitude of the accident of our own time and space.

To speak means already to meet our ancestors before our birth, and to meet our children after our death.

This is the secret -- that's why the Gospel of St. John says, "*In the beginning was the Word*" for man.

We are only people because we speak and can therefore can speak us outside any casual form of existence, any passing chapter of our life. The word saves our identity -- you are still Mr. Erskine after this class. You are not the prisoner of any one state of affairs.

III

1

THE STORY OF PREDESTINATION

Now this is then the whole difference, gentlemen. Predestination means that you can, by the names from the future and from the past, by sacred names from the past and by sacred names becking you from the future, as in Israel the Messiah, the expectation of the Messiah beckoning from the future, and the creation of the whole earth by our Lord, makes you and me absolutely sovereign, compared to any one phase of history to which we are born.

What does it mean, 1959? I am of a much longer ancestry. And the casual laws of this moment cannot bind me.

2

THE STORY OF GREGOR VII

When the pope revolutionized the Church, Gregory VII in the 11th century, the imperialists, the people who were adherents of the old state of affairs said, "But four hundred years, the Church has lived by the rules of Constantine, or even five or six hundred. How can you revolutionize the Church?"

And he said, "What? Our Lord has allowed the devil to govern the world five thousand years before Christ came. And then He came. And so five thousand years makes no difference. There is no prescription. There is no statute of limitations for human abuses. If something has gone on for five thousand years, that's no reason why it must go on any longer."

3

Now this is all human. And I think any American feels an echo of this in his person. The statute of limitations doesn't run.

But how do you? How can you claim this? You can only claim it if the claim made on you is from time immemorial; that is, before you have been bewitched *en masse* into the temporary form of your existence. Otherwise there isn't. You have otherwise no claim.

4

Now all this then is put on us by being spoken into life. The language is very wise -- please take this down.

Predestination presupposes that we are called into life. That is, that we hear a voice that commands us to go beyond the present moment.

This is very wise in the language, to call into life. That's why man has a calling, and why he has a vocation, which is just the same word like "calling".

And why it has to be expressed in this way? Because when you wake up, here as students in this university, you have been talked into existence and called into existence for twenty years, and you must not overlook this fact that people already have constantly pressed home on you the fact that you are allowed to speak back.

It is the gift of the community to you that you are allowed to speak, and that we expect you to speak.

IV

1

You always begin with your own contradiction and say, "I." This is not the first sentence of the living word. The first word that is spoken to you is "you." Man wakes up as somebody else's you.

Perhaps you take this down.

You wake up as somebody else's thee.

2

Because your parents say "thee" to you in the name of humanity, you are entering history, because you are called into this stream by being addressed. Not as an animal that wants to eat and to drink, but to shit -- but as a being that has to participate in the creative process of history. So you begin as a "you."

And in this moment, you are made into a citizen of destiny. You take part in the direction of the march of events. Through being called by an older group of people, strangely enough, the avenue into the future is open.

This is this dualism of life, that because they hope and look into you, their expectation that you will continue, you are suddenly thrown into the forefront of the future. But it is their throwing you, that's the problem of your education, that the educated person cannot be self-reliant. He must know that he has been thrown.

3

That's why I have called these two stages in man is a traject from the past. And he is prejected into the future. And in history, object and subject do not exist.

But at this moment, gentlemen and ladies, here we are: trajects from history, and prejected into the future. And this whole division, of object-subject, doesn't exist for the historian.

If I tell you about the *Declaration of Independence*, we recognize that somebody has thrown us here, that we have been trajected over an abyss of time from before our birth, into this moment. And we know that we are prejected into the future, and have to reach by hook and crook through our great-grandchildren some future destiny of the human race.

4

If you would see this, you would understand why the center of my thinking has been crucial. You and I are not, as you think -- we are here sitting on our fannies or standing in

space. This is, of course, the aspect of the schoolroom. That's why this whole idealistic philosophy was possible.

Plato and his students, you and me, we sit here on our fannies. We don't move. We sit in front of a table. So it's very easy to say, "Here is your mind, your wonderful mind, the minds of men, and they are all abstracted into one mastermind" -- whatever that may be; I've never seen one, in fact they are only 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 people at this moment, 12 minds, forgetting their physical external, and using their brain.

That is, the mind is the abstraction where I neglect the other limbs of my body for a moment, and think on what can we agree.

The mind is the instrument of agreement between people.

By neglect of time, and we sit here, and we stare then at history; and this has become our object.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE AGONY

I

1

Now gentlemen, this is an abstraction. That's a cross-section of your and my life.

In fact, you are a *steaming, breathing, loving, hating, aspiring* being. And for a time you are just in the refrigerator of suspended animation. You are kind enough to be patient for an hour, and that's a stopping place, a railroad station.

That's not the railroad of your life.

2

Here we sit back, and meditate for a moment. In this moment, the world appears split in space in this manner. But if you kindly look at yourself, when you get up and leave this building, and run elsewhere, and have an appointment with your sweetheart, and are very anxious not to miss it, and are looking forward to the next appointment when you have to leave her –

because it is terrible to leave somebody we love –

then you know that man is in agony -- "agon" meaning a race.

Agonistics, as you know, *Samson Agonistes*, what does it mean? You know *Samson Agonistes*? By whom is *Samson Agonistes*? Never heard of it? By Milton?

Well, there is a book by Unamuno, *The Agony of Christianity*, the great Spanish writer. And it means the fight in the arena of Christianity. "Agon" is the fight in the arena -- how do you call it? -- a match. That's the agon.

And so we are in agony, constantly. It's a good word. Take it up. We are not just in agony when we are sick.

All life is agony, because all the time we are in danger of losing our breath.

3

And once you see men, panting -- that's why the Psalm says, "the human heart is" -- what does it say? -- "like a heart panting --

(As the water.)

Yes. Well, that's simply true. That's not poetical. That's a much better description of mankind, than to call him a rational animal. We are panting, poor breath, because we are in such a hurry, and have so many duties to fulfill, and so many desires to complete and to respond.

THE STORY OF THESE HUMAN ANCESTORS

And this race run, and then I think I am right to say that in looking backward, I recognize that I have been trajected from the cave man, through many dark ages, and here I am in the light of the present day, as a traject, over many abysses, through a mysterious bridge of human history. These human ancestors are the bridge-builders who have carried me along so that I am not sunk.

And that's why I mean -- I'm already on a certain level of behavior. You take it for granted. Again, the word "educated" means "lifted up and inducted into this tension between the past and the future."

4

And if you look at the human situation, here you stand, or here you sit, or here you run. And at any one moment, you can allow yourself *to sit back in space, and to take stock, and to measure, and count, and to stand still*. And in this moment, you become the subject of an objective world. And you follow out your objectives, and so on.

But that's always in space.

But when you treat creation as your brothers and sisters, like your sweetheart, you forget all about the space -- your girl is not your object. And you -- Sir, I hope you will not think that love is something subjective. It is a preject of the future. You assume that this is your destiny. And you are one, and not two.

And as soon as a man or a woman dares to try a person of the other sex as their object, they become prostitutes, and they become murderers. And they become perverts.

SECOND PART: GOD'S FREEDOM

CHAPTER ONE: SUBJECT AND AGENT

I

1

The English, and the whole Cartesian era, has masochism and what's the opposite?

(Sadism.)

Sadism for this reason. It's a temptation of treating the person with whom we embark on a common life as an object.

2

Cruelty is always the result.

It's a very simple thing that in a Cartesian age, you must get masochism and sadism. They are simply the fact that the man has become so helpless that he thinks everybody, even the person he wants to melt in with as one body, is an object of his lust. Then it makes no difference, if you want to have objects around you, the best thing is to explode them.

The atomic bomb is the best expression of a Cartesian age of space domination.

Because the whole world is becoming an object to which I prove to myself, to my great satisfaction that I can do as I please.

3

So wherever there is love, the life looks like this. Here is my mind, it is true. And here is some outside person. But I want to make this girl from an object of my admiration and from my good looks into somebody who shares with me, as we say, partner. At this very moment, she has ceased to be my object, and I have to cease to be her subject. We must be pre-projected into a common future.

And people who have a common future strive for a common history. And when people have no common future, gentlemen, they are outside history.

And Americans have no future at this moment. That's why they have no relation to history. That's corresponding.

4

This may solve your problem: mind and body -- because, instead of "objects," you can also say "body," mind and object are only split as long as this somebody who is against you in the outside world, in front of you, whom you see, whom you like to know -- ceases to be an object, and becomes a partner. And as the more you forget your own mentality in the process, the more your mind and her body become one, or vice versa.

II

1

The whole illness of schizophrenia is that most people cannot do this. So they remain split in mind and body themselves. It is really very simple.

This I call *the Cross of Reality*, and because man is in a crucial position, your liberty is at every one moment to plunge into the stream of life, or to retire from it. In retiring, you objectify. In entering it, you take the plunge, and forget that there is this division between objects and subjects.

2

If you become President Eisenhower, you are simply George Washington. You can't help it. You are projected into this situation, whether you like it or not.

And even a small man, like Mr. Truman, suddenly is president of the United States. And he had this feeling, that he was prejected, and had been trajected through a series of grandiose magistrates, into his own responsibility. And where there was no mind and no body, he simply was acting out the voices of the past, trajecting them into the future.

3

And it's the greatest story I feel in American history, that Mr. Truman was able to fire MacArthur, because he had read the story of Lincoln and McClellan. That's encouraging. That's history. That's the sense of history. He had learned that in a democracy the civilian authority has to remain on top of the generals.

And that's the great danger of any republic: it perishes as soon as this is lost sight of. It perishes. Whether you take General Boulanger in France, or whether you take Napoleon, or whether you take MacMahon -- the whole French story is -- take Napoleon-- strewn with these corpses of civilian authority. And McClellan ran for president, and thought that he had it in his bag, and very tempting: the successful general, because he invented a good pack saddle. He wasn't a successful general, but he thought so.

4

THE STORY OF CLEMENCEAU AND PETAIN

Now Clemenceau said the same: the war is too serious a business to leave it to the generals. And he deposed Monsieur Foch, and made Petain, really, the supreme commander. Very strange story because he disliked Petain. But he said, "The man has faith, the man has the sense of the future survival of France, and Foch hasn't".

Or Joffre -- no it was Foch.

And so --

III

1

(I don't know if this is -- I think this might be of the point. But the word "subjective" has always bothered me for what might be even a naïve reason, because I don't really understand what you mean when you say "subjective." I know that we're subjective in the sense of our feelings to love someone on the basis of our own purposes, and we sort of throw a block off --.)

Good question. Put your mind at rest. You are absolutely entitled to your feeling absolutely confused.

The word "subject" has changed its meaning two hundred years ago with its opposite. And literature is strewn with the corpses of the two usages. So you are quite right to say, "I don't understand it."

(It seems that --.)

It's just poison.

(It seems that what you have to appeal to, when you say you're being subjective, you appeal to some objective reason anyway, you appeal to the fact that I want to do this, because I want to satisfy myself. This is)

2

May I explain to you what it meant for the ancients, for the Greeks, and the Romans?

THE STORY OF THE SUBJECT

"Subject" is the translation of "*hypokeimenon*," that is, the underlying in the Greek language. You don't have ... in the Greek, but I want to explain to you that the grammarians -- it's

not a philosophical term originally, but a term of grammar -- said there is a verb. Most verbs have somebody who does the act. "The king reigns." So the king, when I say this, submits to the action as passing through him. And he becomes the vehicle, the instrument of this act, in order that there is reign: "I need a man who does the reigning." This is the idea of the subject, that he is subjected to the act which passes through him, and thereby becomes invested in him.

3

And now you see the word "agent" is a very good case in point. By acting, you become the agent. If you take upon yourself to perform a certain act time and again, you first are the agent in real estate, the agent -- finally you become the actor, as of the stage. Because 2,500 times, you will enact *Tobacco Road*.

A decent person doesn't do this, just actors. That's why in the ancient world, actors were despised, as Plutarch says. You remember -- we read the story in Plutarch. Don't you remember the chapter when he said, "A decent man isn't an actor"?

You must understand that this is very deep-seated. An actor who does arbitrarily subject himself to acts that are not necessary in his own life.

4

I still have a suspicion against actors. And I think it's an indictment of American society that the movie stars are the one thing that is the shingle of this country, gentlemen. That's impossible. Actors are subnormal people, because they submit voluntarily to repetitive actions.

He is the greatest man on earth who does everything once, when it is needed.

That's the story of Jesus, why He didn't write any books, had no bestseller, because He would have had then to revise the second edition. There are no second editions of any saying of Christ, in the Bible. It's all original, and all once, because what He wanted to preach was that every moment was absolute -- fulfillment and prophecy -- all related to the beginning of time, and the end of time.

Every minute being a diamond on this necklace of time.

IV

1

And I mean it. A society that is for mass production must worship an actor who plays the same role 2,500 times, as they did in *Tobacco Road*. I despise these people. And I think it's

right that they are overpaid, because they abdicate their soul. And the devil -- if you sell your soul to the devil, you must get some reward.

2

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY GIVING A LECTURE

I have never, to this day, ever repeated a lecture twice. I have never given a lecture twice.

THE STORY OF A GERMAN PROFESSOR

But I have a colleague, when he came to America, as a young man, as a student, he told me the story himself. He is a German professor. He said he gave the same lecture two hundred times at two hundred colleges, and thereby financed his travel to the United States. I looked at him in dismay, because I certainly couldn't have financed my journey that way, because I cannot give the same lecture two hundred times.

3

And this is why you have such a hard time today to understand history, because to you, doing the same thing every day is more obvious, than doing something different every day. The routines of life, the schedule has completely disjuncted if you think it is normal to go three times a week to a lecture.

It isn't, Sir. Quite abnormal.

The great events are the great events, because they cannot be repeated. You can't miss them, because once you haven't been there, it's too late.

(I was just thinking. Wouldn't you say this is the reason that the diaries have gone out of vogue for quite a while, whereas in past times, people always felt)

Yes, always felt that days were different. Quite, quite, exactly.

And you feel now it's the same thing every day. Breakfast food, et cetera.

4

So.

The historical time will be sharp, now when you still agree that every day differs.

As soon as you begin to think that the days are repetitive, just the same day all over again, you have ceased to live in the sense of destiny, because destiny is the creation of all time to its appointed end, of which you are a modest, humble servant, or partner, or sharecropper.

CHAPTER TWO: TO EXCUSE

I

1

And so the uniqueness of time can only be reached by degrees.

There are routines, they are less vital in our life. But every man says during the day one sentence which he hasn't said yesterday. And he will not say again tomorrow. You have an accident on the road, and there are certain outbursts of your feeling and of your response. And they'll stamp the day. And everything that is more unique is more historical.

The more unique an event, the more it belongs to history; and the less, the more it belongs to nature.

Anything that is -- like the sun rises, and goes -- that belongs to astronomy. Already an eclipse and an earthquake belong to history.

2

Even they not quite, because an earthquake - no, we cannot yet prefigure, we are unable to do so.

THE STORY OF THE EARTHQUAKE OF LISBON

The earthquake of Lisbon is an event of human history, because in 1775 the big city of Lisbon in Portugal was destroyed, and people in Europe and America too woke up to the fact that God was not a benefactor. Because there were thousands and thousands of people destroyed. And the deep pessimism of Volney's on the ruin -- *Sur les Ruines de l'Histoire*, appeared in 1772, I think it was, and for the first time the Enlightenment was balanced, and checked by an inkling that we did not live in a good nature, that nature was not good, that it wasn't so simple as that. The optimism of the age, preparing the French Revolution, the American independence was crushed in the earthquake of Lisbon.

3

Only to show you that there can be events in nature, which, because they are so unique, enter history. I think an historian of the 18th century must mention the earthquake of Lisbon. He doesn't have to mention that it rained in spring.

Except in Los Angeles. Because that's repetitive.

But the earthquake of Lisbon has woke people up to a different sense of their existence.

4

This is just an example. You have a yardstick, all this is dynamic, all this -- as you call it -- goes in degrees. There is more history and more nature, less history and less nature in any event. The most unique event is the original sentence spoken in a certain moment as in response to a certain need, because the word is the freest; it is the most changeable; it is the most original. It is least hampered by space, and environment, and conditions.

The Gettysburg Address is immortal. And that's very strange for you, but the originality goes in this way: *spirit, passions, reason, rhythm*. We say something has "neither rhyme nor reason," then it is quite dead.

II

1

Rhythm is when you are asleep.

Reason you use when you are awake.

Passions you use when you are hot, on fire.

And spirit you must use when you stand, when you are created, and when you have to act in the night of despair, in the place of God Himself, and if you have to say, "My God, my God: why hast thou forsaken me?"

Because the son shall be equal to the father - you all, gentlemen, have in one moment in your life to take it upon yourself to say the word, to stand up and be counted. And if everybody says, "Yes," you have to stand up and say "No." And that's the moment, of your -- you don't do this impassionately, because you are in love with the girl, but simply because truth must not go out from this earth -- this a big lie, a lynching, everybody wants to lynch, you cannot go with it. Although you don't do it passionately, you do it for the sake of the truth.

2

And this is down there, there is just gravity.

Now you can imagine what happens to a universe which is explained by gravity. This is Number 5; this is Number 4; this is Number 3; this is Number 2; and this is Number 1.

Lynching, murder must be abolished. Human society cannot be based on murder. You will admit this? Therefore the spirit rules, because this has to be upheld whether I like it or not.

All spiritual demands are demands against my self-interest. I'm not asked whether it's interesting. There is no humanity left,

speech is destroyed, if I can murder the man to whom I have spoken and who has spoken to me.

3

Therefore, everything is here on the creative side. It lays down the order of our existence on this world. The spirit pronounces judgment, how you and me -- with regard to the dead and the living -- shall behave.

For example, can you kill a ninety-year-old man, just because he's too old for you, because you want to inherit him? He's no good for anything, but you cannot. He is your predecessor. You have to wait till he dies.

THE STORY OF OLD AGE

That's a very important rule, today, where people already begin to kill these people by retiring them at 65, and putting them into an old-age homes. That's a way of killing people.

Don't be betrayed. That's a way of killing them, because what they need is the spirit. And you deprive them of any participation in the life of the community. And they do die. And they become of course terrible people, full of vengeance, and full of boredom, and they are like a blight on our society. Because you have murdered them.

4

You can murder people through twenty years. Don't be betrayed. Murder is not just shooting a man.

III

1

So if you take these things: there are bodies that are ruled by gravity. And I meet you in the road and am polite, and I have only treated you as a body. Obviously then we apologize.

What does it mean to excuse, gentlemen? To say "excuse me"? It's a very wonderful word. It means in the realm of causes and effects, we treat each other as dead bodies. "To excuse" means to eliminate a cause. It means to say this cause shall not produce the effect that you slap me in the face.

History begins where causes are eliminated, and are not allowed to take effect.

That's history. History is the abolition of natural causes.

2

Now, for example, gentlemen.

The first act in history is the funeral. The original idea of the process of death is that any animal leaves the herd when it feels it must die and it goes into a corner and dies. The Africans -- Negroes -- some still do this. That is, any horse in a herd, or any cow that feels her hour has come, runs away from the group. This is isolation.

Funeral is the abolition of the isolation. It's the abolition of this cause of the breakdown of continuity in history.

Where you do not bury the dead, gentlemen, you are outside of history.

3

That's why it seems so important -- when one of the Filipinos dies, the whole family, the whole clan crowds into the sick room in the hospitals -- eighteen people, 25 people, because everyone has to receive the breath of the dying man.

You know, that takes some reluctance to overcome. You cannot do this. You cannot be in a dead room without feeling chilled. You run away. The natural man in us wants to have nothing to do with death.

I assure you, that our tribesmen here, the Indians, are only men because they attend funerals. This is the first victory over a cause. It's an excuse. That is, an excuse means, you see, to eliminate the cause.

4

The word is very simple, but nobody pays any attention to it. When you say, "Excuse me," you want to abolish the effect of a cause.

And you shouldn't slight this word. You should say, "Excuse me," and you should not say "Hello," as the people here say. It's a great word, because it's the first word of history that we excuse. That man is able to abolish causes. That's his predestiny, as with your parents. You are predestined to excuse yourself from being just these parents' son. You have also a destiny. You have a higher office. If they want you to be a farmer, or a banker, or a teacher, you can say, "No. My destiny; excuse me." Because by all causes, you would be the heir to their fortune. But you can excuse yourself.

You all admit this, but you never give it a thought that this "excuse" is an historical feat which doesn't exist in nature. In nature, every cause has its effect.

But we can revamp the past by saying so, Sir. The word "excuse me," has this creative power backward, that you and I can agree, and be treated as though it hasn't happened.

IV

1

Now you begin perhaps to see that the past is what we look into. Here, looking backward, I say of certain events, "They shall have no result." Cain murdered Abel. But that doesn't mean that everybody has to murder his brother. So we abolish the precedent by saying, "No" to it. We negate it.

Part of being in history means that we eliminate certain causes, that would otherwise lead to constant bloodshed, disaster. The same with war. We conclude peace, and say, "This war must not go on. It must not happen again." And if we abolish the causes of this war, then it doesn't happen again.

2

So all history is an act of freedom, of rewriting the past. This is the secret. That's why it has to be rewritten in every generation.

There's plenty to do for an historian, in every generation.

Every past has to be rewritten in the light of the present.

By the way, this is also done. Every generation of historians discovers a new slant and do this. Only they say, "That's scientific progress." It isn't. It's just their responsibility to the future which forces them to eliminate certain causes from the past that are still overhanging us.

Mr. Beard tried to have a new economic order of the United States in the future, so he wanted to eliminate the worship of the rich in this country. So he wrote his economic history of the United States.

(I understand what you're saying. I haven't read Charles Beard.)

Oh, you haven't. Ah, it's very interesting. A very conscientious book, by the way. He is not a cheap man. He acted in good faith.

3

So if you kindly would adopt this freedom, that neither objects nor subjects are the heroes of history. They are always heirs and ancestors, founders and successors.

These are all quite good words.

We succeed into successions for example, *of speech, of writing, of law*; and we found. And nobody escapes this.

If you pass a law in the legislature, never think that the law is for yourself. The law is for -- you have suffered. You wake up to the necessity of a new law. To you, the law comes too late. You can put this down as a rule:

all legislation comes too late to those who wake up to the necessity of a legislation.

And even if it happens to you a second time, the reason why you pass a law is that you care for somebody else who might be hit by this. And it is this which makes legislation possible. The people who have suffered from an injustice do not enjoy the result of the readjustment. Because in their life, years have been spent on this fight in the legislature, so their life has been licked. It has been used up.

4

(Lincoln's Gettysburg Address again, how he keeps on emphasizing the fact that those who have died are not going to be able to enjoy the fruits of their victory, but we are ...)

Ja, exactly. Once you see this, all your political, democratic ideas will be sobered by historical insight that it isn't for our enjoyment, or delight, or pleasure that we pass laws, that we are already there, enacting a process that reaches far beyond my generation and my own time.

Even if I should live ninety years, I will not be in this position which has sharpened my eyes that I have not suddenly known this was unjust.

CHAPTER THREE: THE SPIRIT HAS BOTH SEXES

I

1

I always appeal, when I have to speak to capitalists, to their identity with their daughters. I say, "Nobody can protect his own daughter against becoming a secretary." Therefore, the richest man in this country still has a solidarity with the working man because his own daughter in due time may find herself in a dependent position.

And today you should not appeal to the identity of mother and son, which is a prehistorical situation, but the situation of father and daughter, by which an employer, for example, and a boss must identify himself with somebody in the next generation, for whom he cannot possibly make real rules, except by law. Except that he creates a society in which young women are not abused, and not tortured.

2

I feel that in his symbol of father and daughter, you can melt the heart of the most hard-boiled industrialist. That's the only point where he is weak, and you can show him that his own daughter is the victim of the society which he runs. Because it is very simple, that in history, the father identifies himself not with the son -- who is a rebel, anyway, a no-good, an anxiety -- and never does what he is expected to do - but the daughter is. There is the complete, simple identity. And through this, fathers are living already in the future.

3

By the way, that's an interesting historical sidelight. The real inheritance of the spirit, gentlemen, goes always through the maternal grandfather: *grandfather, mother, son*. That's the true story.

If you look into family relations, never look up the paternal grandfather, because that's just a misleading thing by name. Because the name is the same: Smith, Smith, Smith. But the spirit is usually transmitted from the grandfather via the mother to the son. That's the true story. Because the mother is identified with her father, and in turn is identified with her son. And the father is not identified with his son, but he's identified with his daughter.

To anybody who has to write a biography, I recommend highly this investigation, that's a true spiritual pedigree. The physical pedigree, and the name-giving is from father to son, to grandson; they call themselves "Seniors" and "Juniors". But the originality of every one generation depends on this strange transformation, because that's another rule:

only that is important, gentlemen, which can be expressed in both sexes.

A truth that is just carried from man to man is little, programmed. Free masonry - such things can be transmitted from male to male. But the true spirit can only be transmitted if it can be expressed in feminine terms, and in male terms. The spirit has both sexes. The mind hasn't.

4

Well, pardon me for waxing so eloquent again. But I want you only to see that in history, we unfold; and in science, we shut up. In science, we say, "This is nothing but." And in history, you must always say, "But imagine!"

That is, history makes us always bigger. And nature makes us always smaller than we feel at this moment. There are two tendencies towards growth and diminution. Science catalogues you and says, "Well, don't get excited. You don't have to care. We know all about it."

I had a colleague -- I told you this, perhaps already -- who used to say, "I can tell you all about Goethe in ten minutes." Did I tell you this? You see. Never forget this. He tried to treat a wonder of human history as a "nothing but."

And so you must tell your cynics, that history and nature are two methods of dealing with reality. You can have a history of nature, which begins with the creation of light, and says, "*Let there be light, and there was light.*" And then you build it up into something big.

And you can tone it down scientifically, and say this is nothing but a source that developed, and began to circle, and expanded, and so on, and we get the solar system.

II

1

Every human being can treat a thing as doomed to die, and as predestined to live.

I have a very much shorter life expectation than you have, and you say therefore, "This man is already done in. He's nothing but a senile old quack." Or you can say the opposite, you can admit that you learn something from me. In this very moment, I become very important, because I become the head of a school.

2

So will you kindly take this away? I think this is the very best I can offer you that history and science are two methods which cannot be confused.

History is trying to educate you, and nature is a training ground to make you into an animal that jumps as it is expected to jump.

3

Perhaps you now understand that there is really a difference between determinism and predestination. Predestination depends on your cooperation, on your explicit participation. And determinism describes your actions, regardless of what you think about them. And would you now understand this?

This is really something. Determinism comes from the outside, upon you; and predestination waits till you have heard, and have responded. Predestination is able to base the decisive act into your own free will. Because hearing can be resisted, and it can be obeyed. And there it runs freely.

(I always get the feeling from Mr. Calvin, that there's something of this determination from the outside entering into his idea.)

4

Well, if anybody's interested, I will illuminate this.

I have a very fruitful argument on this for the last three years with a professor who translates Calvin at this moment into a new English version. They commissioned, and he's the editor of the Calvin, so I'm at the center of the controversy. And it has something to do with our story.

THE STORY OF LUTHER AND CALVIN

Luther is so natural in history that all Germans are by nature historically-minded. Sense of history is a German sense. And I just received a review that I was a German of the Germans, because of this historical sense. And I have inherited that.

But Calvin isn't. And therefore we have to study this. It's quite good. If you have the level of determinism, you have also predeterminism. You are predetermined by your hormones, and your genes, and your sex, and your environment, and so. And here we have predestination, and predestination can only be...

III

1

... and I, for fifty years, I assure you, never used the term "free will," because I said it had been over-talked, and there are certain problems which one cannot deal with usefully, because they have just been have bandied around too much. Perhaps the time has come where we can fruitfully cope with it. Where does free will go?

If you have a natural universe, ruled by natural law, free will is just like a cork on top of it. As many people, the agnostic liberal will say: "Everything is determined by nature, or by chance, or by fate, or by accident, or natural law. But man seems to have some leeway."

And this is the argument of the natural man, of the humanist. "Free will is an exception from the rule; we don't know quite how."

But you find many humanists who do not see the contradiction that there should free will in this one animal, and the rest of the world is under iron law.

2

Now this then is the picture. Christ is predestined. Everybody has a feeling -- and I think even the worst nihilist will admit that Christ gives you the feeling of freedom, that He was free. In every minute of His life, as Galsworthy has expressed it, "He is incalculable. Christ is incalculable." That's freedom. You cannot predict Him. He's unpredictable. And to be unpredictable means to be free, and to be free means to be unpredictable. That's the same thing.

And I think you should learn this, because today that's all confused. People do no longer know what freedom is. It's not anarchy, but it's only that nobody can, from any law, derive what he's going to do next. That's freedom.

3

And that's why there are so very few people in this country who are free. They pretend that they are free, but they aren't, because they never do anything unpredictable.

(Everyone that I meet -- well, I think all around us in this country, they want to be free. They want to be free to such a degree that they don't want to have any costs. And this is what these in 180 the other day when these fellows were asking the question. This is the thing: they can't think of being free, and yet still have anything that's determining you in the sense of any destiny.)

Destiny; well, I know that.

(To be free means you can also be free in something that's making a demand on you, too at this point. I think you're freer in a sense when you love somebody.)

Ja. Exactly. True. You're quite right.

(You're a lot more neurotic and determined in the sense when you don't love anybody.)

4

Ja. Love makes you free, because it gives you the power to sacrifice. Where there is sacrifice, there is freedom, because it is unpredictable.

You can never rely on a man's sacrifice. It still is a miracle our existence that man can make sacrifices from love. The laws of a state cannot ask sacrifices. They can ask duties, and service, and obligation. But a sacrifice is something beyond the call of duty. And anything beyond the call of duty cannot be predicted. You cannot predict that a man will do something extraordinary. Or a mother will save her life, as this young woman who -- you read in the paper perhaps, extraordinary story.

THE STORY OF THE CHILD BITTEN BY A RATTLESNAKE

A little child was bitten by a rattlesnake, and the mother had the double presence of mind to -- but she had learned it in first aid, I suppose -- to first to -- how do you call it?

(Tourniquet.)

Tourniquet, turn on the tourniquet, and then suck it out herself, for herself which is quite dangerous. Sucked the whole poison out, and the child was saved. That's beyond the call of duty.

IV

1

(I wanted to ask, are there in any sense of the use of free will, you submit yourself, or enslave yourself, or become bound to something --.)

Well, now allow me to go on from here. Because you are quite right.

The question is: where is this free will really rooted? But let me finish this. Because you will see that this humanist position: here are these strange two billion human beings who allegedly have a little bit of free will, and here are the laws of nature. So then every man is a miraculous something, without direction, because he's just free to do something.

But you don't know what. Is he going to restore the Stone Age? He's free to do that.

So life has no direction if everybody has his own free will, private. Therefore, with free will, we come to anarchy. With free will history has no sense, no meaning. Two billion people just milling around, and doing arbitrarily -- then this free will becomes arbitrary.

2

Now in this life on our earth, if you look up from below, you see here the earth, iron-clad, and here are the stars -- also iron-clad -- on top of us. And in the middle, man is dancing a dance of free will.

Isn't this ridiculous? And it is not free will at all, but it is two billion free wills, will of the wisps. That's really the picture of humanism. And it is unsatisfactory.

Then I will always surrender to economic materialism, and I say, "Marx is right." Because that's the more reasonable solution, that we are the products of our environment, I can understand. But I cannot understand why, in the midst of earthquakes, and geology, and mountains, and rivers, I suddenly shall here be free, when all the animals, we say, are subordinated to laws. I am under law, too.

3

No, allow me to show you that it really is quite complicated.

With Calvin, it was this way.

THE STORY OF CALVIN

Here are stars -- I think "stars" and "earth" is better than to say "nature." It's much clearer. The sky and the earth teach us laws. There are seasons, there are sunsets, there are sunrises, and please be concrete. It's the sun and the moon that make us feel that there is a lawful order that's repetitive, that we cannot change by our will. And without this majesty of the natural laws, the whole problem of free will wouldn't be so shaky, because if the world was anarchical, and wouldn't move in certain avenues --

as the old people, they had their freedom of the will, because they saw the lion, and the tiger, and the wild animals. And they seemed to follow no law, and so man was quite lusty about it. They had no astronomy. And the oldest, the Indians, and so, they based their faith in freedom, because they compare themselves to the royalty of the lion and the cruelty of the tiger. And they feel, "Well, we jump as they do." But stars and earth are simply adamant.

4

So here is law. Then you get this strange sphere of free will. And now enters the scene the majesty of the creator of all this, the problem of the deity.

Now the unfortunate fact is that for historical reasons, because of the struggle for sovereignty in France, and in the Netherlands, and in all the secular states, the word for the majesty of the image of God on earth was "sovereignty." The high magistrates, the

princes were not called "free to act," but they were called "sovereign." The word "sovereign" in the sixteenth century had a tremendous theology, just like "economic materialism" or "revolution" today. And a man was a sovereign, because it had entitled him to revolutionize the government.

And so God's sovereignty was abrogated. And it was said that the community down on earth took part in the sovereignty.

So Calvin would say that his church in Geneva was as sovereign as the papacy, in order to express his equality with the papacy. He wouldn't speak of his own free will, but you would speak of the sovereignty of the church of Geneva -- the church of God was as sovereign as God is Himself.

CHAPTER FOUR: THESE FORTY DAYS OF TEMPTATION

I

1

So you get a breach in the vocabulary. Here is God and His church, which are sovereign. And here is free will for man -- as an individual, everybody -- and here is a law of nature. And these three orders are so confusing --

*God is sovereign,
man has free will,
the earth is under law --*

that Calvinism can be accused of having made things un-understandable.

And now I'll tell you the simple reason -- that has been my argument with my Calvinistic professor in Hartford -- that I said, the whole thing there could have been avoided, if Mr. Calvin hadn't always spoken of the sovereignty of God, or of the majesty, as he also does -- but of His freedom.

2

I have written a book -- some of you may have heard of you -- *The Christian Future*, in which I end on the note that God is free to re-create the world in the light of the mischief His children make. That is, He always opens new avenues when we have reached an impasse. And the divinity of an inspiration is always when people find a way out -- after they have made a terrific mess of things.

When we say, "Excuse me," that's exactly what we try to do, to re-arrange the world, regardless of something that has happened. That is, we abolish a certain consequence.

3

Now what Calvin tried to say, and what Jonathan Edwards tried to say in his famous book on the freedom of the will, was: that men were ambivalent. That is, they could throw themselves under the creative act of freedom by sacrifice and love, or they could follow the inclination, the first urge, the stimuli from their being involved in the process of nature.

That is, man -- as separate from history, is unfree, as a part of nature. And as entering that which has to be done tomorrow in order to recuperate the past, and to say, "Excuse me," makes him a partner in the creation of the world by God, through all time. Because he can only reach this state of freedom if he does something that is meaningful in the continuity of the race.

If he decides murder had to be punished, obviously he makes a law for the future, and he abolishes another law of anarchy or cruelty. Therefore, Calvin -- and all theologians say that we are at every moment tempted to throw ourselves upon the creative freedom of God, and be partner of His freedom, or sink down into the magma of natural law. And it's either way.

And you know it that it is this way.

4

Now, mercifully, however, the saints, the creators of new ways of life create institutions between God and the individual man -- like Church, and state, and universities, and arts, and families. And so, even though you and I are not at every moment up to par, and we cannot always be creative -- that's nonsense; you are creative one minute a day. But we can participate in all the sacrifices made by our forerunners and predecessors. And we can marry, and undergo the ceremonies, and the law of marriage, we participate in the acts of freedom which these monogamists created when they cured the Don Juans from their running after every shirt. And so on it goes.

II

1

Church, state, universities, families -- whatever you take -- the sports, the health, medicine, they are witnesses of God's freedom in former times, and man's participation in His creation before.

Therefore history looks up to the founders of these social orders.

And there comes the law of the historian, gentlemen:

the historian looks up to the people of whom he speaks, and the naturalist looks down on the things about which he talks.

And if you do not look up to the history, don't say that you are an historian.

2

Plutarch is humble before Pericles. And that's why he's allowed to write about him.

And if you are not humble, you are not an historian, because you as an historian are less important than the event which you try to report. This is a condition of history, that there is a rank, and order, because we report the acts of freedom.

But in the reporting, we may be appointed to do it. But that's not bad. We participate -- we have the great honor of commemorating this event. But we can only commemorate it if we put him up and us down.

And since this is never understood, we today have historians who act like physicists. This is nonsense.

The physicist hasn't to respect electrons. But I have to respect George Washington.

3

Now -- so the whole problem today -- and I think we enter a new era of theology, religion, in every field, because everything circles today around the question: is God fate, or is He free? That you call Him "creator," you call Him "redeemer," you call Him "revealer" -- doesn't mean anything if He isn't free.

If everything is already known to Mr. Tillich, then God isn't free.

And you read these theologians, and they know God by heart, and they can never be surprised.

4

So the theology today has talked so much about God -- who God is, as though they knew Him. And therefore, God's freedom today is not understood. If God isn't free, all the talk of human freedom is impossible, because you can only act meritoriously as a free animal, if you participate in something that lasts beyond your life.

That's why I told you, legislation is meant for the next generation. Therefore, you would never be allowed to pass a law, because it comes too late for yourself, and it must be valid for the future. Now if it is valid for the future, you take upon yourself to direct the stream of time. This you can only do if you know where you're coming from and where you're going to.

III

1

(Would you say then that predestination is not something that is pre-ordained for all men, but something which man can choose to enter into?)

That's why - of course, you discover it! "Pre-ordained" would still be God's plan forever. But "predestiny" means that before I go on from "pre" to "destiny," there is a hiatus in which the whole of creation holds its breath: will this man be tempted by the devil, or will he survive?

2

That's why the story of Jesus begins with the temptation in the desert. If He hadn't, in this hiatus of forty days listened and weighed the other paths, down to gravity, to earth, He would just be an angel, but not a human being.

We all are ambivalent, and perhaps the greatest piece of evidence in the New Testament is that this story is reported.

THE STORY OF CHRIST'S TEMPTATION

And at the beginning of His messianism is reported, because that's unique. And it is unrepeatable. Here, He must have told Peter and John the story, that His whole messianic office begins with His looking down on the temptations of the natural man in Himself, feeling them very strongly and said, "I can become an emperor," "I can become an economist," a big feeder, and "I can"--what's the third?--"become a genius." "I could jump down". These three temptations -

*the pharaoh is the feeder,
the chieftain is the tribal hero,
and the genius is the Greek temptation.*

And these three He had to forgo.

3

And all antiquity gave itself rendezvous in His soul. Because these were the three routine ways of life:

*you could become a priest of Egypt, a sorcerer;
or you could become a chieftain giving laws;
or you could become a genius, like Archimedes or Plato.
And this was not His business.*

(Then is this why Calvinism emphasizes the fact that man is responsible to God for his acts, even though God predestines you because there is this hiatus in between where you can choose to accept God, anticipate Him, or fall from His grace?)

This hiatus -- these forty days in the desert every one of you -- women and men -- have to undergo.

*You can sell yourself short in marriage,
or you can wait for the right husband.*

It's the same thing. Every woman knows very much about predestination. This is determined whom you marry. But it is predestined. You can discover, but it is your word that makes the say-so stick.

4

No, I think perhaps the whole word "predestination," is doomed. I don't care to recover it. What I mean to say is one simple thing, gentlemen:

that man as an individual is unfree; and man, as participating in history, is free.

And therefore, I would propose that it is wiser to speak of God's freedom in which we participate by throwing us upon the not-yet-existing part of creation, by doing something unheard-of, and participating in acts which good free souls have done before us.

IV

1

If parents today send their children to school, they are acting already under the Christian inspiration that the children must be emancipated, that the children have a soul of themselves. This is all in Christian tradition, that they can discover their own destination.

THE STORY OF THE PARENTS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

So the nineteenth century demanded from the parents the incredible sacrifice of their egotism, to such an extent that we now recoil and said, "It goes too far." The parents haven't allowed the children to have their own religion, to have their own politics, or their own convictions. And there is absolutely nothing that makes a parent into parents anymore.

So we have gone too far in this respect. But you could write the history of the nineteenth century as the constant sacrifice of parents, giving up their authority, and then asking the children, "Discover the truth yourself." People in this country always speak of rebel thought. I think Americans are very soft, and just no rebels. But parents have forced their children to rebel, all through the nineteenth century. They have inculcated into them these powers to go on their own -- to go it themselves.

2

And the greatest part of American life in the nineteenth century -- I have seen it -- you must have seen it in many families -- has been the willingness of the parents not to make any demands of their children to an excess which I think is exaggerated. It has gone too far. If you raise families, you will not be able to do the same. Your children will demand

from you authority, and leadership, and values. I'm quite sure -- they must. And you have to give it. And I think the situation is totally changed today.

(I still get the feeling though, that with Calvin -- that the road -- whichever road the man takes is not of his own choosing.)

No -- well. Let me complete this argument.

3

THE STORY OF THE ARMINIANS

Jonathan Edward -- there was a revolt in 1616, at the center of Dordrecht in Holland, the Arminians were condemned. And there came this break, which goes through all Puritan tradition in this country, between Arminians, and Calvinists. And the Arminians said, "Man is half-free and half-bound". And the other said, "He has no free will."

Now I'm siding with the austere ones, with the Calvinists. I think it is absolutely illogical to say that I and you are free, without a magnet which allows me to enter a flood of light, and freedom, and creativity. If I cannot participate in the history that has given me free choices already; if I am not, as an historical being recognized as made a partner by the lure of the saints, of the heroes, by the choice of my hero on whom I look as my predecessor, by the founding fathers, and their voices, then I have no freedom.

All by himself, a man without speech has no freedom. To speak means to be able to listen to what people have said to me -- and have asked you to perform, and have challenged me with -- and to speak myself into the future.

4

So since I believe the Holy Spirit is the more important aspect of the deity than anything else -- if you and I today want to understand what is meant by God, you cannot be interested in the god of nature, and you cannot be very much interested in merely individualism, but in the Holy Spirit that makes it possible that men, and women, and children, and old men speak the same language. Although they have different interests, they have a different outlook on life, yet we can speak to each other.

THIRD PART:

CHAPTER ONE: QUITE CONCRETE, QUITE SPECIFIC

I

1

The miracle that is not the human mind, but the human spirit.

You can take this down, too:

"spirit" means that people of different interests speak the same language, of different insight, of different perspective.

And "mind" means that people say the same thing about something. "Mind" is always identifying. In mind, you neglect sex, you neglect age, you neglect parties, you neglect religion, "regardless of color, sex, and -- " et cetera.

But "spirit" means that a Jew and a Catholic sit down together and have peace, despite the fact that they are Jew and Catholic. That's the miracle of the spirit. Or that a child and a grandfather can act together, although the child has to have legends and fairy tales; and the grandfather, is enlightened, and has nothing of the kind.

This is the miracle of life.

2

Children must read fairy tales. Don't make them into the Cartesians. But the greatness is that although they read fairy tales, and you read scientific facts, you live together.

That's the spirit. And that's not the mind.

3

Now it's so hard to talk to you, because you never heard of the spirit anyway. You don't know what the spirit does. That it allows you to be in harmony with people who say different things, and have different opinions.

You think that the mind is the ideal, when everybody thinks the same. This is not an ideal at all. That's on a very low grade. We must agree on things. That's science. That's the mind.

But you must never agree on anything important.

Because the world exists only of mankind because a mother is interested in something different from the daughter.

Heavens! What would happen in a family where *mother, daughter, father, son* would all have the same ideal? You would die from boredom. You wouldn't marry anybody. You would be impotent. Because you only marry somebody who says something opposite to you.

That's so interesting.

4

That's the spirit.

I do think therefore that the Arminians wanted to have it both ways. They said, "Man is half-free and half-bound." That's Arminianism.

And that's usual American heresy. You all believe this for daily life. Most people act as though it couldn't be quite decided. Half -- so the psychologist -- treats you as not free, he knows all your reactions in advance, and so on. And you go to him. And after all, by the free choice of this psychiatrist, because you think he's a good man. And so you get into this trap, that he treats you -- once you are in his room -- as a mouse. But you go there by attraction, that is, by a free choice of the allegedly better man.

Well, this is still the humanist attitude.

II

1

Now I feel this is only what I come to believe. It is much more simple to say that man is not free. Man is under necessity.

I must breathe, for example. It's obvious that I choke, if I do not breathe. It is necessity. So why quibble? I am under necessity.

But when I throw myself on the mercy of God, I am allowed to forget myself.

All love forgets its own interest. All passion does. Even hatred does. Hatred is self-destructive.

So there are innumerable actions in our life. Even just rhythm, just marching in tune with the music where we forget ourselves, and where this self-interest simply is not prevalent.

2

By the way, how do you spell "prevalent"?

(P-r-e.)

Every one in this room seems to ignore the laws of spelling. "Prevalent" is spelled p-r-e-v-a-l-e-n-t. And not as you have spelled it. Everyone here spells it pre-vel-ent. v-e-l. Just shocking.

That's special, isn't it?

3

Now if you decide that man is unfree, then the divine is a voice inside himself. He is attracted by the creation that has already gone on before.

There has been a Constantine. There has been Caesar. There has been Pericles and his funeral oration. We are all magnetized by the greatness of these men who overcame their natural fears and anxieties and spoke up. And therefore, we can throw and join ourselves on the mercy of God as I said.

Or you can say: join the battalion of freedom fighters. You can join the Lincoln Brigade of life, of history. And in this moment where you forget yourself, you are inspired.

And since the word "God" today is so shame-faced, and should not be used in vain, anyway, forget about the sovereignty of God, call it "the freedom of the spirit" that it listeth where it blows -- or blows where it listeth. I never make out.

(Bloweth where it listeth.)

4

That's a very important saying, that at every moment, the spirit seems to make the rounds and look for somebody who will act as its transmitter -- as His transmitter.

III

1

So if we become trajects of the spirit, we enter the not-yet-finished process of creation, because we excuse a part of the universe. What is meant by freedom is not to be subject to cause and effect. Not to be under necessity.

You have two husbands. One is very rich, the other has a promising future. The wise woman will choose the man who has thirty years to go before you know who he is, and will not marry the palace in Beverly Hills. But why?

The wider response, the more remote and the more invisible, is the more delicate response of the deeper understanding of the layers of creation, because God moves more in centuries and generations than He moves as of the moment. Everything just of the moment is the devil.

THE STORY OF THE DEVIL

The devil always sells you short. The devil doesn't do anything wrong, except that he says you can have it immediately.

2

Now the woman who marries the man who will be rich in thirty years listens more to the divine processes of creation than the person who wants to have it right now, without marrying of either husband or wife, just by inheritance, because that's the devil.

3

THE STORY OF HITLER

The devil told Hitler that he could have an empire for a thousand years to come, in twelve years. And after twelve years, it was all over.

And that's a typical deviltry story.

And I think it was enacted for your benefit, gentlemen, because you grew up in a world which doesn't believe in the devil. The devil is any moment the temptation to do something in a shortcut. *To get something for nothing* -- is the American description of the devil. And like the installment plan, culcating your freedom by simply prepossessing your whole future.

And the devil governs in this country for this reason at this moment, because everybody wants to have things faster than he shall have them.

4

Wherever a man tries to get something faster or cheaper, he's selling out. So that the creation is then destroyed and replaced by some substitute.

IV

1

That's why I think the problem of God's freedom is not abortive, or by the freedom of the spirit. It is a practical question today.

If you want to be understood in education or in law - take juvenile delinquency. Freedom of the person -- if you want to make him a child of God -- allow him to be inspired, you will treat a delinquent of fifteen quite differently than when you think he has to be immediately reformed. The problem: how much time do we have? - is the assertion: how much faith do we have?

Faith is the belief that there is time.

War is always the expression that there is no time, and it's always an act of disbelief.

The South in 1860 is a typical case of disbelief, not even waiting for Lincoln, they said, you see, "We have to act immediately." It's a very good case of having no time.

2

(Well, the devil must really be in me, because I'm very --.)

I'm sure it is!

(...because I'm really in agony about this -- seems to me, I don't understand, and I'm very anxious to find out what seems to me you've been using the term "freedom," to mean that there is a choice - well, and it seems to me now you're saying that there isn't, that man is not free.)

Well, Sir, are you free to breathe? Or not to breathe?

(No, I'm not.)

Therefore, be careful. Are you free to live forever, physically?

(No, I'm not.)

You are not. I mean, so let's not betray ourselves. Obviously the word "freedom" is not something in the abstract, in the air, free. It is under the limitations of our earthly existence.

(There are limitations to freedom, but you're not --.)

No, the meaning -- not even limitations. But I wouldn't call it "limitations," because if you do not first submit your earthboundness and your mortality, Sir, you cannot place that which is free in us in the perspective. The spirit is free; and the body is not.

You want to place freedom where it doesn't exist.

(No, no. I don't want to do that. But I'm just trying to understand what you mean when you say that it's a heresy to say that man is partly free and partly unfree. But it seems to me, you just said this, that there is the spirit --.)

... it's the complicatedness that arises from this.

(But I'm just trying to understand to reconcile what seems to me to be two conflicting statements, here.)

3

Well, "man" in the singular, this man -- but be quite concrete, quite specific -- this one man is not at the same time half-free and half-unfree, because if he forgets himself, that he's just this man, and becomes an instrument, he can become an instrument of the devil or God, that's true -- he joins in a partnership, the society of souls, of all souls, who take part in the creation. They become from creatures: creators.

And in this partnership, the creation of the world, his self disappears. He has an office. And therefore, I would not call this man then in this this-ness, in this concreteness, "free"; but only in his holding office in the economy of salvation.

That's a different thing. This man changes his character.

Anybody who forgets himself in saving your child, this child's mother, and the good angel of the child -- whatever you call it. It is therefore that here falls upon us this mantle of history, of which I have tried to speak. We are lifted up and hold office, again. And we are not our naked individual, but we are clothed in authority.

(Well, this is what I'm always felt -- or thought of as being a slave of the truth. I mean, if you do follow your belief, then you no longer are free, once you --.)

4

Well, look, because I think we both share agreement. You have here an order which has completely disappeared from human thinking, what the Bible calls "dominions and principalities," and "powers." And "angels and archangels," and "cherubim and seraphim."

Now take the nation. America is an in-between -- God and you, because you feel it is enough to be Americans. But America is bigger than individual man, and has a kind of spirit, of independence, and *Manifest Destiny*, and democracy, and many, many qualifications, which say "this is" -- you say, "that's know-how, and that's America."

CHAPTER TWO: GREATER LOVE

I

1

Now this I would call in the Biblical sense, "principality," or "power," or "dominion." It holds dominion over every person who is born here.

We just can't escape it. It holds us in its sway. But it is not earth, because it is historically created.

At one time America didn't exist, and it was created by the word. It was created by the *Declaration of Independence*, by the Covenant of the Mayflower -- by the word. These words may be transient, but they have created free men, participants in the process of creation. Wherever you participate in being an American, you are not simply an environmentalist, the product of your environment, but you are invited to share in the creation of the world.

2

Therefore, above men are these offices. Degrees of office.

I would say the simplest degrees of office, the simplest office is to be an American here in this country. Then you are an American missionary. That's already a very complicated office, if you go to Samoa. Then you are perhaps a senator. That's the devil. And then you become president. That's the archangel Michael. And this is a country under God.

3

Now any American has these temptations. Now to be just an American, and to be an ambassador of good will, as you call these children we have to send out to foreign countries, in exchange; it's all the missionary idea. And here you have politicians. You are in politics, as in a good democracy.

And I would say, for example, the college professors have no American office. If you are here a professor at the university, this is just a German or an English office that has been imported to this country. It's not a very American office. It hasn't been created in America. It has been imported to this country.

But I would say that missionary-- and just being American, or pioneer -- is something only American. You have neither pioneers nor missionaries in the same, naïve sense as they are here, where everybody tries to pioneer some time in his life, or to camp, at least, and where everybody is also a bearer of good will. And I have been sending now a sixteen-year-old girl from our village to Greece, as an ambassador of good will. That's a

typical American idea which we are now spreading over the rest of the world with great success.

4

So there are American offices into which every man is born. But obviously there is a moment where this same man has to ask God for a new commission, which will not be simply missionary, or pioneer; there may be something new. Perhaps there even has to be teaching now invented in America -- as a specific American office. Because it has never been one here, yet. It's all imported.

II

1

And so I would say, whenever such a man is hit by a ray of inspiration, or a ray of service, he ceases to be this man, what Whittier calls, "*The prayer has clothed me in my righteous mind*". A very beautiful idea, too. You know the hymn? No? By Whittier?

The prayer, in this hymn. Asking of God to clothe us in our righteous mind, which means participating in His free act of creation. And therefore the word "m-a-n" then disappears.

It is no use to imply that the naked man of flesh, the carnal being has freedom. So only if he gives himself up, does he become free. But then he receives an office.

(But it's the giving up which constitutes the freedom, doesn't it?)

All right. The negation of my own will, "*Thy will be done,*" and not "my will": this is the act by which man recognizes his predestination.

2

(May I only ask one further question?)

So it's a "no" to oneself. That's why I shouldn't say "forget oneself," but I say, "negate oneself."

(But can you only then tell me, who is it that gives up?)

The listener.

(The listener. All right. I have my answer.)

3

This is the quality which doesn't exist in nature that we can listen to voices from the past and the future.

No animal can. An animal has only this present moment. But you can listen to voices that are not represented in the flesh. You can read the Bible, as Augustine did, and just be struck by something that was written four hundred years ago.

(And this would be the first act of freedom, the act of listening. But then there could be --)

That's why the First Commandment begins, "Hearken Israel." Without hearkening, no Ten Commandments.

(But then whether one actually heeds is also an act of freedom? Or a negation of freedom, you might say; if one does not heed, it's a negation of freedom.)

Ja, but that's the power to love. I think you're quite right in asking this question. But that's not an intellectual question. It's a question of affection. Can you be affected by the word in such a way that all your passions are overcome by this greater love?

(This is outside of us.)

And that's not truth, but love.

(This is outside a person. Whether he has the power to love is not something of his own will.)

4

No, no, no. There come these Augustinian mysteries where you --

THE STORY OF THE EMPEROR OF AUSTRIA

I'll tell you a joke. The father confessor of the emperor of Austria in 1908 wrote a book on the fate of sinners after death, whether they all had to be in hell forever, or whether in good universalist faith, everybody went to heaven finally. And at that time, there was already the softening of the brain, and universalism even invaded the Roman Catholic Church. It seemed to be such a hard doctrine, that sinners were eternally damned.

So Mr. Joseph Mechner, father confessor of the emperor, Francis Joseph of Austria, wrote this book on *Das Fortleben der Sünder nach dem Tode* -- how you call it? The After-life of Sinners after Death. And I bought the book. And I am very proud that I own such a wonderful book. Because it says, "After all," at the end, after much discussion, "After all, we cannot be surprised that we do not know much about the after-life, because hell is so very dark."

III

1

And so I would say to you, this is very dark. If you want to quibble about the equipment of a person to love, I think that's like a vicious circle, because the love is imparted to us. If a child is loved, it becomes not only lovable, but it becomes capable of love. And people who are not given love, cannot hand it over.

So that's what's meant by original sin. The depth of our fall is in this, that the sins of the parents are visited on their children. If a child cannot love, and therefore cannot act in freedom, really, because it cannot throw itself beyond -- love means to forget oneself. That's potency. And if a child hasn't been hurt --

we talked about this professor in Harvard and his wife, who brought up their child psychologically, because they were anthropologists, and so he went to a jail, because he was incapable of loving.

2

And so there is the tragedy of man. We are so much under law, that my not loving is the consequence of your not having loved me. And therefore, there is a concatenation, there is a solidarity in guilt of the human race.

And this is the deepest secret: that we are so much under the law, that you can never attribute to this man his failure to love alone. We all have borne our share in not loving, so that he cannot love. And therefore the nature in this sense exists. The moaning and groaning creature.

3

And therefore it makes no sense to speak of me in the singular, as "this man." Because I share this guilt of not enough love with, or I'm immersed into this guilt. I wouldn't say "share," but I'm a product there really of not enough love in the world.

(Well, on this point, Calvin is compatible. I see no conflict.)

Quite.

(But now -- then the other day, you made the statement in class --.)

4

Well, you understand now. The two logics are possible. Either I am immersed in this lovelessness of a society, and therefore simply an atom in this social pressure group, and I

haven't received enough electricity so I can't hand it on. Then I'm not counted as a person. I'm not the person. But I'm just a particle of a mass.

And on top, if I throw myself upon God's mercy, and ask for His commission, I join the company of saints, or of the fellow travelers.

IV

1

In between, there is my power to negate myself. This is the act by which I escape from hell and brimstone of the mass of perdition, and so it is very true that this hyphen between "pre" and "destination" is the moment in which I become a person.

And therefore it is not use to argue the man -- before he has become a person, as though he had qualities, before I have heard my own command, my own words addressed to me, alone among all millions of men, I am not a man and a person. That's the mistake of the individualist, who want to argue the case as though here is a man in the abstract, and having to decide -- here was this free will, and here was his necessity.

This is not true. It's a process. You wake up one day, and are put up.

2

You see, there's a scene in Carlyle -- I wish you would read this -- on his experience of freedom and the devil.

THE STORY OF CARLYLE

He goes in Paris to the Rue de St. Thomas de l'Enfer. Now that has a symbolic value: Thomas de l'Enfer, Thomas of hell. That's one special saint -- the *rue* -- the street still exists. I've been through it. I think it's the most eloquent page in Thomas Carlyle.

There he describes himself, his discovery of being a person. And he has to make a decision, all himself. Before, he played. Playboys are not persons. If everything can be taken back, you are not yet a man, and you are part of pathology. There's one point where one made a decision, when he should have spoken, and doesn't go to the mat, or where he does speak and becomes a man.

3

And so, the argument runs this way: to speak of this man is in impermissible anticipation. What we really meet in the world are products of environment, to whom something is imparted. But there is this power to listen to the deeper voices, who come to you on a

wider wavelength. And in this moment, you can be redeemed from the fetters of this immediate -- and the more past a man acquires, the more future he acquires.

To be back to Adam means to be completely free as in the moment when God created man first.

4

The funny thing about history is this: you have exactly as much past as you have future; and you have exactly as much future as you have past. Nobody can have future without past; and nobody can have past without future.

That's all unscientific. But it's true of a physicist.

THE STORY OF MR. EINSTEIN

If Mr. Einstein understands Newton right, and then he can go forward and continue physics. But he has to dig up the first crevices of this science, in the dark past of Archimedes, in order to renew it. And that's what his principle of relativity, after all did: to go back to the premises of Greek thinking, that time could be neglected, and said, "No, it cannot be."

CHAPTER THREE: THE GRACE OF GOD IN HISTORICAL FORMS

I

1

(Well, now we spoke the other day about such physicists as Mr. Einstein who now maintain that with regard to law, it is not something inherent in nature which the mind discovers, but rather a kind of a supposition -- let us imagine that this law -- and let us see whether this might be a way of explaining nature. And from this, taking of law within society out, and seeing whether it applies, as against the opposite of seeing the iron-clad laws impinging on society, and governing us, there's a similar conflict of freedom and --.)

That's why the Bible begins, it says -- "God created heaven and earth." So the laws of Heaven and earth are abolishable. That's the meaning.

2

I'll give you a very simple illustration -- can you still bear with me?

THE STORY OF THE EGYPTIANS DISCOVERING ASTRONOMY

The Egyptians discovered the astronomy. They discovered the constellations. They discovered the movement of the stars. They figured the calendar. And they said, "Everything has to be kept moving." So the poor pharaoh had to move like a star, every day he had to rise exactly with sunrise, and everybody had to behave astrologically. That's what you still get from the horoscope.

THE STORY OF THE SABBATH

The simple experience of the Bible -- I think we talked about this before -- well, it is so important -- is to say, "We have the Sabbath" - that is, we are not astronomical. We are not always on the move. For a moment, like our creator, who created the stars, we set time aside, and we don't do anything. And this freed man suddenly from the completely apoplectic devotion to astrology, that there was one day in every week in which the Jews laughed at astrology, and said, "The sun may have to rise, we don't." And the sun boils, in Egypt. It does. And we don't bake bread. No fire in the oven.

3

This negation is an act of freedom of the Jews. And bears out my insistence that it is this hiatus of the "no," which creates freedom. As to the existing order, you have to say at one time, "no."

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY'S ESCAPE

I can only tell you, when I escaped from the academic clannishness, it happened exactly this way, that when at the end of World War I, I was asked to go back to the university, become a full professor, et cetera, et cetera. And I knew this -- had other offers, and I said to myself, "Well, I do not know what I'm going to do. I have to wait. I haven't got my commission." I felt that since July '18, that something completely different would have to occur.

But I did go back in January '19, when the troops returned home, and gave a lecture at six weeks, always with the deep feeling, "God, what shall I do? This is all over." But I only know that it is "no." I haven't found my "yes". And the "yes" came then only four months later. So after all, a full year -- no, ten months later, after I knew already that I was through with what I had been doing.

4

So I do think that an inspirational freedom, an act where you do not act for your own aggrandizement or for self-expression, but because something has to be done or the world goes to pieces, where you have to obey the highest orders of your commander-in- chief, the "no" precedes the "yes." And that's meant with the forty days in the wilderness, I'm sure.

And it's meant by the forty years in the wilderness of the Jews. That the "no" to Egypt had to precede the "yes" to the promised land.

II

1

Now that's all against modern psychology. People think this is impossible. And on a lower level, you can only help a person usually to cross a stream when you have jumped across it, and pull him after you.

And that's what love does, so that you see already where you're going.

2

On the highest level of human behavior, where you have a complete change of life, the "no" precedes the "yes." Because the "yes" is not yet created, it is an absolutely new thing you have to invent.

I had invented a new career for me, that didn't exist. I had to persuade -- very strange story -- I had to persuade a man that he needed it. Man like me, he didn't believe it at all, but finally he hired me, to his own surprise. And an act of real creation, gentlemen--

would you consider this for a moment? -- new creation can only happen when the thing is unforeseen, untold, unpredictable, never has been mentioned before, an act nobody thought of before.

Like the rainbow in the sky. That's why the Americans worship the rainbow. It's unpredictable. There it is. But a minute before, you didn't know that it would come.

3

Now in order to make room for this rainbow of a new creation, you have first to feel that something old is dead. So this is already over. But a wise person will then --.

Take a daughter; she knows already she has to leave her parents' home. But the right man hasn't turned up. She will go on, and -- at least she did in the old days. She doesn't have to go to college under all conditions. She can stay home, but she's through with it. But she serves it out, the full term.

As Jacob did by the way, with Laban.

And I warn you: God is very original. Where God speaks, where the spirit speaks, the "no" is patient.

And you know already that something is over and dead, but you wait before you know what positive steps you may need. You can only even probably receive the message of the positive, because you have inside yourself tugged yourself from the allegiance to the old gods.

4

Can you understand this, that the "no" is necessary to wipe the clean slate, so that this new sound, this new command can reverberate in you? You can be engraved on this waxen plate, which we are.

(This is why Augustine says that the only way he can explain God is by what He isn't, and not by what He is.)

Exactly. He is nothing preconceived.

III

1

(There seems to be some confusion in my mind, arising out of this definition of man's freedom. You said that when he leaves his individual "this man" idea, and he enters his office, sacrificing, that this is when he attains his real freedom.)

Well, in degrees.

There are these nine degrees of the hierarchy of the angels. And it is not a bad idea, what the medieval people said.

2

Look, you are an American. You are a pioneer. That is, you risk your life against grizzly bears. Then you are a patriot. You go into the army. And you can be shot dead, even by a stupid sergeant on the training field. And so everywhere you take upon yourself, meritoriously, sacrifices of self, in degrees. It isn't quite personal, yet. But it is already lifting you above the pigsty.

And since you are not limited to the functions of your stomach, and your genitals, and your bowels movement, when a soldier has already a uniform. But that's not the highest degree of personality. If you would think in terms of personality degrees, really of the American discussions on character, personality, and so would vanish.

3

This boy in class -- who attends this class?

(I am.)

(I am.)

Well, you know this, who -- what's his name?

(His first name is Bill. I don't know his last name.)

Ja, well, he's a typical example of this unfortunate character who can only think in these abstract absolutes. He never sees himself in these many colors which he wears, in degrees.

We are already held by the grace of God in historical forms. And he wants to have it in the absolute, his mind. But I nowhere find people who have his mind. I, if anybody, have my mind, have I not? I have a good mind. But I cannot exaggerate its importance. I have so many ranks and orders surrounding me that this little bit of a mind at times is an excrescence. That's not me.

So what was your question?

4

(So -- assuming these various degrees, can we say that there is one, definite, highest degree of man's personal freedom, or can't we make this --?)

Ja, ja. I would say. The going to the Cross.

If you take this case of Bill Mitchell, for example, to heart. Here he is participating in the freedom of a naval officer of the United States. That's all right something -- that's already responsibility. And he is already beyond self-interest. Any naval officer could say, "Well, I'm just a good patriot as you are."

But there's an unpreconceived office which he takes upon himself. An office of contradicting the existing order. And that goes beyond the call of duty. And that's a higher freedom.

But the so-called brass has its freedom, too, because these people are fearless. They'll go to their death, these same captains who obstruct Bill Mitchell. In their own right, they are marvelous people, perhaps, because they will take any risk, and any chances in this jurisdiction of already known and conceived duty.

IV

1

It is always the non-preconceived that has a higher rank.

And this is why, today, where the people poke fun at martyrs and saints, we are in a very bad way. If a woman, historian, can write a book, The -- what was it?

(The "martyr complex.")

Ja, the "martyr complex." We are in a bad way, because the historian then is allowed to look down on the leading creators of our lives. We have nothing else but these saints and created martyrs, and revolutionaries, and heroes. They are -- that's me. We have nothing else.

Don't look beyond. Through them, the divinity has entered humanity.

2

We know nothing more, but there have been good people who went before us. And as soon as we turn the wheel, and look down on them, we are absolutely in the fog. We are just nowhere.

And when women can do this, I think the country goes to ruin. Such a person has the obligation to make clear where she stands. There can be martyr complex, perhaps. But nowhere -- I have read this book. Have you read it? Who has read the book, by the way?

I think it's the great scandal of our time.

(You say there can be such a one? Did you say --?)

Well, you can be a sick person who simply wants to be a martyr, at all costs. I will not deny that there are fanatics. But this is quite a different story. She simply -- this woman has no discrimination. Every martyr to her is just a fool, just stupid.

3

(Well, we don't even use the word "martyr complex," though. Even for these people -- Freud has already called it "thanatos" or some such term.)

You have to discern the spirits. Anywhere where people want to go behind the created persons of humanity in history to their own values, there's the devil. We have nothing else but the real sequence of the generations. And you have to choose your heroes to whom you look up.

4

As soon as you give this up, gentlemen and ladies, you are absolutely lost. The idea that by righteousness, virtue -- all these abstractions which everybody can explain as he pleases, after all, you can get rid of the example of Heracles, or Christ, or Moses, you are completely mistaken.

There is nothing to go behind these real creatures of God.

CHAPTER FOUR: YOU WILL NEVER HEAR THESE THINGS AGAIN

I

1

Isn't any one of these people ten times more real than these abstractions of virtue, and faith, and justice? These are just words. And you can put into these words all the explanations you want.

But you cannot deny that Moses forwent, for the sake of your and mine, the satisfaction of being a conqueror of a land. And he said he -- "I have to wash myself clean by forty years of negation from these idols of Egypt." And what it means to believe in a non-preconceived god, we only owe to him. There's nobody else who has taught us this, that God is incalculable, that God is not in any form of worship that can be predestined. The voice of the prophet must come tomorrow.

2

By the way, gentlemen, one of you had the effrontery to write that *Ichabod* was the son of Eli. Now we read this chapter together, that the glory has departed from Israel, and it said that the daughter-in-law of Eli begets this son, Ichabod.

3

So pardon me, I have to end on this creaky note. Why do you do such a terrible thing and not even quote the Bible correctly?

Cain is the founder of Israel, and Ichabod is the son of Eli! When the whole shame comes about, the sons of Eli are no good, and Samuel has to be brought in as the real spiritual successor, as a prophet of God's mercy, of God's grace, and Ichabod is the grandson of Eli. Who wrote this? Admit it. Who has said that Ichabod is the --?

(I was confused on the genealogy. I --.)

What? Well?

(I hope not. I said I was confused on the genealogy. I might have put that in by ignorance.)

But how can you? The whole story makes no sense. If Eli had said, "The glory has departed Israel," he wouldn't have lost his sons. Now, so --.

(Anyway, that's what I wanted to say about the scientific time That's what I wanted to say about)

4

Forgive me for I have talked too much here.

But please allow me to explain this to me. I have had to make a choice. If you have this opportunity -- and I said to myself, you will never hear these things again. And they aren't said in this country. And I felt it was more important that you heard them than that you would get a fine training in stupidity.

So thank you very much.

CONTENTS

FIRST LECTURE: THREEFOLD INTRODUCTION

First part: What history is to you

Chapter one: The record of a death

Chapter two: The four events that make history

Chapter three: How to be born

Chapter four: To be shot into history

Second part: Conditions for the historical personality

Chapter one: Playboy and man – woman and laughing girl

Chapter two: The overflow of free American agents

Chapter three: Statistically unimportant

Chapter four: Two mutually exclusive concepts

Third part: The chronology of the bible

Chapter one: Thousands of years?

Chapter two: The Bible is written against myth

Chapter three: The greatness of the Jewish story

SECOND LECTURE: WHERE WE ARE MEANT

First part: The Bible founds History

Chapter one: Why? – How? – Who?

Chapter two: The Bible comes in the middle of global confusion

Chapter three: The fall of man

Chapter four: The transformation of speech

Second part: The Magnificat

Chapter one: Promise and fulfillment

Chapter two: Case and future

Chapter three: Perseverance

Chapter four: Simony

Third part: Corruption

Chapter one: Mental slavery

Chapter two: Ruere in servitium

THIRD LECTURE: JAWEH

First part: Repetitive purpose and unique history

Chapter one: Werthers Leiden

Chapter two: Suicide

Chapter three: The concentration camps

Chapter four: Uniqueness

Second part: Promise, prophecy, future

Chapter one: Prophet and king

Chapter two: Geography

Chapter three: Reading

Chapter four: Recognition

FOURTH LECTURE: THE FOUR OFFICES

First part: The phylogenetic history of man

Chapter one: Collect, synthesize, create

Chapter two: Arabia

Chapter three: Ichabod – the glory of the coming Lord

Chapter four: To bury the sons of Eli

Second part: The four offices of the bible

Chapter one: The philosophy of the ashcan

Chapter two: Life not yet articulate

Chapter three: Testimony

Chapter four: The offices

FIFTH LECTURE: THE BIBLE AND THUCYDIDES ARE ANTI-MYTHICAL BOOKS

First Part: Ichabod and the Battle hymn of the republic

Chapter one: Daniel Webster and "Ichabod"

Chapter two: The continuity of history

Chapter three: The Old and the New Testament

Chapter four: Your own time

Second part: A completely new task

Chapter one: The innocence of happening

Chapter two: Myth

Chapter three: Organized association

Chapter four: Thucydides

Third part: Tribes - valleys - Greeks - Jews

Chapter one: The Greeks

Chapter two: Greeks and Jews

SIXTH LECTURE: THUCYDIDES AND THE WORLD WAR

First part: What it is to look at the times

Chapter one: The third century after Christ

Chapter two: Time and space

Chapter three: Speech and reality

Chapter four: Thucydides and his stroke of genius

Second part: The historian creates past and future

Chapter one: Thucydides and the World War I and II

Chapter two: The rediscovery of World War I

Chapter three: The miracle of the present

SEVENTH LECTURE: MAN AND WHEN

First part: When - is the question

Chapter one: The flair of the unique

Chapter two: Interpenetrating bodies

Chapter three: Given time

Chapter four: Marx and Jefferson

Second part: Naturalistic and historical time

Chapter one: More than one calendar

Chapter two: Enlightenment

Chapter three: Children a pre-historical

Chapter four: Peace has to be concluded

Third part: The history of our century?

Chapter one: Clouds of unconcluded peace

Chapter two: The song of the World Wars

EIGHTH LECTURE: THE LAUGHTER OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE 1945

First part: Critical reading

Chapter one: The responsibility of teaching

Chapter two: The doctors of human memory

Chapter three: Knowledge and engagement

Chapter four: Witness, chronicler, historian

Second part: Historian and philosopher

Chapter one: The baby

Chapter two: Phylogenetic wars

Chapter three: Creation is not a generalization

Chapter four: Warning against arbitrary fanaticism

Third part: Polybius

Chapter one: Scipio

Chapter two: What to read next?

Chapter three: You cannot be a Greek

NINTH LECTURE: WHAT IT MEANS TO SPEAK

First part: To find the right time for speech

Chapter one: 1850

Chapter two: The old textbooks

Chapter three: Literary forms change

Chapter four: Thucydides and Plutarch on Pericles

Second part: What language does

Chapter one: Constancy and change

Chapter two: Warning against classification

Chapter three: The whole language

Chapter four: Gods, men, world

Third part: We learn to speak today

Chapter one: Courage

Chapter two: Face-to-face with the mighty of today

TENTH LECTURE: THE CRISIS OF AMERICAN FUTURE

First part: There are no synonyms

Chapter one: Education by fear?

Chapter two: Careers of changing

Chapter three: Dresses and dishwashing

Chapter four: One thing begets the other

Second part: To risk one's life

Chapter one: Movie star and madonna

Chapter two: Ethics and virtue

Chapter three: Seviceable?

Chapter four: Poet and historian

Third part: The next step

Chapter one: Remember

Chapter two: Boredom and cruelty

Chapter three: *Novus ordo seclorum*

Chapter four: The American experiment

ELEVENTH LECTURE: THREE AND FOUR AGAINST THE GREEK MIND

First part: The Greek achievement

Chapter one: Shame

Chapter two: Wonder and astonishment

Chapter three: Our individual pre-history

Chapter four: The Greek mind

Second part: Our triune existence

Chapter one: Representation

Chapter two: Heir, man, founder

Chapter three: Triune

Chapter four: Religion

Third part: Touching the Cross of Reality

Chapter one: Thank you, yes, no and please

Chapter two: Respect for poetry

TWELFTH LECTURE: THE FEAT OF BENÉT'S JOHN BROWN'S BODY

First part: The Invocation of John Brown's Body by Stephen Vincent Benét

Chapter one: Invocation

Chapter two: The America of Stephen Vincent Benét

Chapter three: An event in American history

Chapter four: Knowing poetry

Second part: Save our souls

Chapter one: Why we speak

Chapter two: We are perfectly useless

Chapter three: Interlacing of souls

Chapter four: Healing the wounds of the past

Third part: Stephen Vincent Benét's office

Chapter one: Prayer

Chapter two: Poet and scientist

Chapter three: Renewing an office

THIRTEENTH LECTURE: THE GREATER LOVE

First part: What predestination means

Chapter one: Not toilet-broken

Chapter two: Destiny and space

Chapter three: Predestination

Chapter four: The agony

Second part: God's freedom

Chapter one: Subject and agent

Chapter two: To excuse

Chapter three: The spirit has both sexes

Chapter four: These forty days of temptation

Third part:

Chapter one: Quite concrete, quite specific

Chapter two: Greater love

Chapter three: The grace of God in historical forms

Chapter four: You will never hear these things again

NAMES

Abaelard V,II,4, IX,I,2
 Abel XIII,II,2
Abraham II,II,1, V,II,4, X,III,2, XIII,I,1
 Achilles V,III,1, XI,I,3,4
 Adam and Eve XI,II,3
Adam II,I,3, II,II,1, III,II,4, V,I,3, XIII,I,1
 Adams, Brooks IX,I,1
 Adams, Henry IX,I,1, IX,II,1
 Adams, John Quincy III,I,4, XII,II,4
 Adams, Sherwood I,II,1
 Aeschylus VI,I,4
 Agamemnon IX,II,1
 Albright I,III,1
 Alcibiades IX,III,2, X,I,2
Alexander the Great V,II,1, VIII,III,2, IX,III,1, XI,I,4
 Anderson, Mr. IV,II,3
 Annuncio, Gabriel d' X,II,4
 Antoninus Pius IX,I,1
 Archimedes XIII,II,4, XIII,III,2
Aristotle VI,I,2, IX,I,2, IX,III,2, X,I,2,4
 Arnold, Benedict IX,III,2, X,I,2
 Artedimus VI,I,4
 Athene X,II,2
Augustine V,II,1, V,III,1, XII,II,1, XIII,III,2

 Bancroft III,I,4, VIII,III,2, 1, IX,III,2
 Bankhead, Tallulah X,II,1
 Barlow, Joel XII,I,2, XII,III,3, XIII,I,1
 Barnu & Bailey X,II,2
 Bathsheba III,II,1
Beard, Charles I,II,3, IV,II,1, V,II,1, VII,I,1, X,II,4, XIII,II,2
 Belial II,II,4
 Belisar III,I,3
 Benda, Jules II,III,1
 Benét XIII,I,1
Benét, Stephen Vincent IV,I,2, VII,II,4, VII,III,1, X,III,2, XI,I,2, XII,I,1,2,3,4, XII,II,1,2,4,
 XII,III,1,2,3
 Bismarck XI,I,4
 Blücher VIII,I,4
 Boleyn, Anne II,I,4
 Bonaventura V,II,4
 Borah, Mr. Louis VIII,II,2
 Boulanger, General XIII,II,1
 Bradford, John II,I,4, II,II,3
 Brandström, Elsa XI,I,2
 Brasidas VI,I,4

Braun, Eva III,I,2
 Braun, Miss XII,III,3
 Braun, Mr. von VI,II,2
 Brinton, Crane IX,III,2
 Brown VIII,III,2
 Brown, John III,I,2
 Brown, Mr. IV,I,4
 Brutus XI,I,3
 Buber, Martin XI,I,1,3
 Burnet, bishop IX,I,2
 Byron II,I,2

Caesar III,I,3, V,II,3,4, V,III,1, VIII,III,2,3, IX,III,1,2, X,I,2, XI,I,3,4, XIII,III,1

Cain II,I,3, III,II,4, XIII,I,1,2, XIII,II,2, XIII,III,4

Calvin XIII,II,3,4

Camillus XI,I,4

Carlyle XIII,III,2

Cartesius X,II,4

Castro, Fidel VII,II,4

Chamberlain, Mr. IV,II,2, X,I,1

Chamisso II,I,2

Channing, Ellery VIII,III,2

Charlemagne VII,I,1

Charles I VI,I,1

Chopin VII,I,3

Christ III,1,3, IV,I,2, IX,II,1, XIII,III,3

Christina of Sweden I,I,3

Churchill, Randolph and Jerome VII,III,2

Churchill, Winston VII,III,2, XI,I,3

Cinna VIII,III,2

Clemenceau XIII,II,1

Collingwood, Mr. VIII,I,1,2,3,4, VIII,II,1,2

Columbus, Christoph X,III,4

Commodus IV,II,4

Constantine VI,I,1,2, IX,I,1, XIII,III,1

Coolidge, Calvin V,I,2

Cooper, Fenimore X,I,1

Copernicus I,III,1

Cousin, Victor II,III,1

Crane, Ichabod IV,I,2

Cromwell V,I,1

Daniel V,I,1

Dante XII,III,2

Darrow XII,II,3

Darwin

Darwin, Charles I,I,4, II,I,2, IX,II,1, X,I,2

David I,III,3, II,II,2, III,II,1,2,3, V,I,3, XI,II,1

Davis, Jefferson VIII,III,2
 De Gaulle III,II,4
 Delilah VI,I,2
 Demosthenes VI,I,4
 Descartes VIII,I,2
 Deucalion V,II,4
 Dewey, John XI,I,3
 Dickinson, Emily XI,I,3
 Diocletian VI,I,1,2
 Dionysus X,III,1
 Disraeli XII,II,3
 Domitian IX,III,1,2
 Donne, John V,I,3
 Dostoevsky IX,I,3
 Douglas VII,I,2
 Douglass, Frederick XII,II,3
 Douris IX,I,4
 Dryden, Mr. IX,I,4, XII,II,4
 Dulles, Mr. I,I,1, VII,I,1, XI,I,1
 Duncan, Mrs. II,II,1, V,I,1, 2
 Durants X,I,2

 Earl, Gary I,II,1
 Eber III,II,4
 Edison, Thomas Alva II,I,1
 Edwards, Jonathan XIII,II,4
 Ehrenberg, Hans V,II,2
Einstein, Mr. II, I,1, VI,I,2, VI,II,3, IX,II,1, X,II,4, XIII,III,2
Eisenhower I,II,2, III,II,1,4, IV,II,2, VII,I,1,2, VII,III,2, IX,II,2, Mr. X,I,3, XI,I,3, XIII,II,1
Eli II,II,4, III,I,4, III,II,1,4, IV,I,2,3,4, IV,II,4, XI,II,1, XIII,III,4
 Eli's wife IV,II,1
 Eliot, Mr. VIII,III,1
 Elkanah II,II,4
 Ellsworth, Mr. III,II,3
 Elpinike IX,I,4
 Emerson X,I,1
 Engel, Mr. IV,I,4
 Ephorus IX,I,4
 Epstein, Mr. III,I,3
 Erasmus IV,II,2
 Erik of Sweden X,III,2
 Erskine, Mr. XIII,I,3
 Euclid VII,I,2
 Euler VI,II,3
 Eve II,I,3, II,II,1, III,II,4
 Eyring, Professor IX,I,2
Fabius Cunctator IX,I,3, IX,III,1,2, X,I,2, X,II,1, XI,I,4
 Faulkner IX,I,3

Feringer, Mr. IV,I,1
 Fermi, Enrico VI,II,2
 Ferrari, Giuseppe II,III,1, VII,I,4
 Fidel Castro IX,III,2
 Fisher, Dorothy Canfield II,1,3
 Fitch, Clyde V,II,1
 Fitzhugh, Mr. IX,I,1, X,II,3
 Foch, Mr. XIII,II,1
 Ford
Ford, Henry I,II,3, II,II,4, IV,I,2,3, VI,II,1
 Förster, Mr. VI,II,1
 Francis Joseph of Austria XIII,III,2
 Francis, Saint VIII,II,3
 Franklin, Benjamin V,II,3, X,II,4
 Fraser X,III,1
 Freud, Mr. VII,II,2, IX,I,1

Galilei I,III,1
 Galileo IX,III,2
 Galsworthy XIII,II,3
 Gandhi V,III,1
 Garbo, Greta I,I,3
 Garrison VII,I,2
 Gaulle, de VII,III,2
 George III VI,I,1, IX,III,1
 Gibbon IX,I,3
 Gladkov X,I,4
 Gladstone XII,II,3
 Gobineau, Count de IX,I,1
 Goethe III,I,1, V,I, XI,II,3
 Goldfein, Mr. I,II,1
 Goodspeed X,II,3
 Görgely VII,I,3
 Gough, Dr. VII,I,2
 Graham, Bill XII,III,3
 Grant, Mr. VI,I,1, VI,II,1
 Grassman, Mr. VI,II,2
 Gregor VII. I,III,2, II,II,4, XIII,I,3
 Grimm X,II,4

Hacker VII,I,1
 Hahn, Otto VI,II,2
 Hamlet II,II,3
 Hannah II,II,2, 3, V,II,1
 Harding, Mr. VI,I,1
 Hawthorne IX,I,3, IX,III,1
 Hayne, Mr. IX,I,1
 Hearst, Mr. III,I,3

Hector XI,I,4
 Hegel VIII,I,1, X,III,2,3
 Helmolt, Hans VI,I,2
 Heloise IX,I,2
 Hemingway IX,I,3, XI,III,1
 Henry VIII II,I,4, II,III,2, III,II,1
 Heracles XIII,III,3
 Heraclitus IX,II,2, X,III,3
 Herod IX,II,1
Herodotus I,III,3, III,I,4, VI,I,3, VIII,I,1,3, XIII,I,1
 Herter, Mr. XII,I,2
 Hindenburg XI,I,4
 Hinton, Bill I,II,2
 Hintz, Mr. IX,II,2
 Hippocrates V,II,3
Hitler III,I,2, VI,I,1, VI,II,1, VIII,II,1,2, XI,I,2,3,4, XI,III,1, XIII,III,1
 Hölderlin III,I,2
 Holmes, Justice VII,I,3
Homer II,II,3, V,II,4, V,III,1, VI,II,2, VII,II,4, VIII,I,3, IX,III,2, X,III,1, XI,I,3,4 XI,III,1,
 XII,I,3,4, XII,II,1,
 Hoover, Mr. III,I,2
 Hope, Bob V,II,3
 Horus XI,II,3
 Howe, Julia Ward IV,I,3, XII,I,4
 Huch, Ricarda IV,II,4
 Hugo, Victor XII,III,1
 Humphrey, Mr. I,I,4
 Hutton, Barbara V,I,2

 Ichabod V,I,1, XIII,III,4
 Iphigenia IX,II,1
 Irving, Washington V,II,2
 Isaiah IV,II,4
 Isis and Osiris V,III,1

 Jackson, Stonewall IV,I,3
 Jacob XIII,III,3
 Jacobs, Miss XI,III,1
 Jaeger, Werner IX,II,1
 Jahweh III,II,4
 James Henry Sr. I,I,1
 James I V,I,3, VI,I,1
 James XIII,I,3
James, Henry I,I,1, VIII,III,2, XI,I,3, XII,I,1
James, William I,I,1, IV,II,3, VI,I,3, VIII,III,2, XI,I,3, XII,I,1
 Jefferson IX,III,1
 Jefferson VII,I,4, VII,II,1,4
 Jeremiah IV,II,4, V,II,1

Jesus II,II,3, III,I,2,3, V,I,2, V,I,3,4, VIII,I,3, IX,I,1,IX,II,1, XI,II,2,3, XII,III,2
 Joffre XIII,II,1
 John IX,II,1, XIII,I,3
 Johnson, Samuel X,I,2
 Johnston, Eric VIII,II,2
 Jonathan III,II,1
 Joneses, the III,I,4, III,II,1
 Jonson, Ben V,II,1, X,II,3
 Joseph X,I,3
 Jowett V,II,4, VI,I,4
 Judas Iscariot III,I,3, X,I,2
Jupiter Capitolinus VI,I,2
 Justinian III,I,3

 Keats VII,I,3, XI,III,2
 Keller, Helen IV,I,3
 Kemal Attaturk V,II,4
 Kennedy, Mr. X,II,1
 Kettering I,I,1
 Khrushchev VII,I,2,4
Kierkegaard IV,I,2, V,I,2, VII,I,4, XII,III,2
 Kipling, Rudyard VII,III,1, VIII,II,2
 Kleist III,I,1, 2
 Knowland, Mr. XI,II,1
 Kranz, Norman XIII,I,1
 Kruif, Mr. de II,I,1
 Krushchew, Mr. I,I,4, IV,I,4

 Laban XIII,III,3
 Labery, Emmett VII,I,3
 Lambeth, Professor II,II,3
 Laplace VI,II,3
 Lawrence, D.H. X,III,1,2
 Lee, Robert VIII,I,4
 Lenin VI,II,1
 Leo, Friedrich IX,II,1, XI,II,3
 Lewis, Sinclair II,I,, IV,II,2
Lincoln I,I,1, II,I,4, II,II,3, IV,I,3, IV,II,1, V,I,3, V,II,1, VI,I,2, VI,II,1,2, VII,I,2,4;VII,II,3,
 VIII,II,3, VIII,III,2, IX,I,4, X,I,2, X,II,4, X,III,4, XI,I,2, XI,II,1,4, XIII,II,1, XIII,III,1,
 Lind, Jenny X,II,2
 Lindbergh V,II,1
 Lodge, Cabot IX,III,2
 Loeb brothers X,III,1
 Loeb IX,III,1, XIII,I,1
 Louis XIV IX,III,1
 Louis XV VI,I,1
 Louis XVI VI,I,1
 Lovejoy VII,I,2

Ludwig, Emil XI,I,4
Luther Martin I,I,3, II,II,4, V,II,4, VIII,I,1, XIII,II,3

 MacArthur III,II,1, XIII,II,1
 Macaulay VII,III,2
Macbeth XII,II,4
 MacDonald X,II,4
 MacMahon XIII,II,1
 Malinovski X,III,1
 Manning, Cardinal IV,II,4
 Marc Aurelius IV,II,4, IX,I,1
 Mark II,II,3
 Marlborough VII,III,2
 Marlowe V,I,3, X,II,3
 Marx Brothers V,II,3
Marx V,I,1, VII,I,1,2,4,VII,II,4, X,III,2,3, XIII,II,3
Masters, Lee V,I,3, V,II,1, 2, VII,I,2,4
 Matthew II,II,3
 Matthiessen, Mr. XI,I,3
 May, Mr. Rollo III,I,4, IV,I,2
 McCarthy X,I,4
 McClellan XIII,II,1
 Mead, Margaret X,I,2, X,III,1
 Mechner, Joseph XIII,III,2
 Melanchthon V,II,4
Melville IV,I,2, IV,II,2, V,II,2,3, VI,I,4, VII,I,4, IX,I,1,3, X,II,2, XI,II,1
 Mendeleev XI,I,1
 Methuselah VIII,III,2
 Meyer, Donald I,I,2
 Michelangelo IV,I,1
 Miller, Perry V,II,2
 Milton XIII,I,4
 Mitchel, Bill VIII,II,2, X,II,3, XIII,III,3
 Moltke, Helmuth James X,I,2
 Momigliano VI,I,1, IX,I,1,2
 Montezuma VI,I,1
 Moody, William Vaughan V,II,1
 Morgan, Pierpont V,II,1
 Morison, Eliot VIII,II,4
 Morrow Lindbergh V,II,1
Moses I,III,2, III,II,1,2,4, IV,I,1, IV,II,4, V,I,1,4, VI,I,1, IX,I,1, XIII,III,3,4
 Muir, Mr. V,I,3
 Musselman, Mr. VI,I,2
 Mussolini VI,I,1

 Nabokov, Mr. IX,I,3, X,III,1
 Napoleon III II,III,1
 Napoleon III,I,1, VIII,I,4, XIII,II,1

Nathan III,II,1, XI,II,1
 Nehru V,I,1, V,III,1, VII,II,4
 Nero IX,III,1,2
 Newman, Cardinal IV,II,4, VII,I,3
 Newton XIII,III,2
 Nietzsche III,I,2, VI,II,1, VII,I,4
 Noah V,III,1
 Norris, Mr. I,III,2
 North, Thomas IX,I,4
 Northcliff, Lord I,II,3

Oedipus XI,I,3
 Oppenheim, Robert . I,II,3, II,I,1, IX,III,2

Paine, Thomas IV,II,1, VII,II,2
 Parkman VII,II,4
 Parkman VIII,I,3
 Pasternak II,III,1, IX,III,1
 Pasteur, Mr. V,II,3
 Patton XI,I,3
Paul V,I,2, V,III,1,2, VII,I,3, X,I,3, XIII,I,3
 Pavlov, Mr. IX,III,1
Pericles VII,II,4, VIII,III,2,3, IX,I,3,4, IX,III,1,2, X,I,2,3, X,II,1,2,3, X,III,1, XI,I,3,4,
 XIII,II,4, XIII,III,1,
 Petain XIII,II,1
 Peter, St. II,II,3, IX,II,1
Philemon and Baukis V,II,1
 Pindar XI,I,1
 Planck VI,II,3, XII,II,4
Plato V,III,2, VI,I,2,4, VII,II,1, IX,I,2, IX,II,2, X,I,2,4, X,II,2, X,III,1, XIII,I,3, XIII,II,4
Plutarch VIII,III,2,3, IX,I,3, IX,III,1,2 X,I,1,3,4, X,II,1,2,3,4 X,III,1, XI,I,3,4, XI,II,2,3,
 XI,III,1, XIII,II,1,4
 Poe, Edgar Allan VI,I,4
 Polybius VII,I,1, VII,III,2, VIII,III,1
 Polycrates of Samos VIII,I,1
 Pontius Pilate VI,I,2, IX,II,1
 Pope, Mr. XII,II,4
 Priam VIII,III,1
Prometheus VI,I,4, X,II,1
 Proper, Jacob III,II,3
Prospero XI,I,2
 Proust IX,I,3
 Putnam, Mr. IX,II,1

Racine VIII,I,1
 Ramses I,III,3
 Rath, Herr von VIII,I,1
 Reichenbach, Mr. XII,II,1

Reuther, Mr. V,I,2
 Rickert VII,I,1
 Riel, Jürgen de IX,II,2
 Riemann VII,I,2
 Riesman, Mr. XII,II,2
 Robertson, Frederick V,I,1
 Rockefeller II,II,4, V,II,1
 Rodgers, Will V,II,3
Romulus VI,I,2
Roosevelt I,II,1, VIII,II,1, VIII,III,2, XI,I,3, XII,II,4,
 Roosevelt, Franklin D. IV,I,3
 Roosevelt, Theodore VI,I,3, IX,II,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy, Margrit X,I,4
 Rossini XII,I,4
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques X,I,3
 Ruskin, Charles XI,II,3
 Ruth V,II,1

 Sachs, Dr. XI,II,2,3
 Samson VI,I,2
 Samsone, Mr. VIII,II,4
Samuel I,III,2, 3, II,I,3, III,I,4, III,II,1,4, IV,I,2, IV,II,4, V,II,1, 3,4, VIII,III,3, XI,II,1,
 XIII,III,4
 Sandburg, Carl VIII,III,2, X,II,4, X,III,4
 Santayana X,II,3
 Sartre XI,II,3
 Saul III,I,4, XI,II,1
 Schopenhauer, Arthur IV,I,1
 Schubert VII,I,3, X,II,2
 Schweighäuser, Mr. VIII,I,4
 Scipio VIII,III,1
 Scribner's XII,III,2
Shakespeare II,II,3, V,I,3, V,II,1,4, VII,II,4, IX,I,3,4, X,II,3, XI,II,2, XI,III,1,2,
 Shaw, Bernard I,I,1, II,II,1
Shem I,III,3, III,II,4
Shotwell, Mr. I,III,1, 2, II,I,1, III,I,4, IV,I,1
 Smith, Joseph IX,I,2
 Smith, Page VII,III,2
 Socrates X,II,2
 Solomon I,III,3, III,II,2
 Solon IX,III,1,2, X,I,2,3, X,III,2
 Spencer, Stephen XII,I,3
 Spengler IV,I,4, VIII,I,1, VIII,II,4
 Stahmer, Harold XII,II,2
 Stalin, Mr. III,II,1, VII,I,4
 Stanton, Edward I,I,1, V,I,3
 Stein, Edith III,I,3
 Stendhal, Henry Beyle VIII,I,4

Stephen, St. VIII,I,1, 2,3
 Stephenson, Mr. VII,I,1
 Stevenson, Adlai V,I,2
 Stier, Douglas I,II,2
 Stimson I,II,1
 Stokovski X,II,2
 Strong, Georg Templeton X,I,1
 Swinburne V,II,4

Tacitus II,III,1
 Tarkington, Booth V,II,1
 Tarquinius X,III,3
 Taylor, Elizabeth X,II,1
 Taylor, Myron C. XII,II,4
 Teller, Mr. I,II,3, II,I,1
 Themistocles IX,II,1, X,I,2

Theotis IV,II,4

Thomas a Kempis X,II,3
 Thomas Aquinas V,II,4, IX,I,2
 Thompson, Dorothy VIII,III,1

Thucydides I,III,2, 3, III,I,4, V,II,1, 3,4, VI,I,1,3, VI,II,1,2, VII,I,1, VII,II,3,4,
 VII,II,3VII,III,1,2, VIII,I,3, VIII,II,1,2, VIII,II,3,VIII,III,1,2, IX,I,4, X,II,4, XI,III,1,
 XII,II,4, XII,III,1, XIII,I,1

Tillich XI,II,2, XIII,II,4

Titus III,I,3

Tolstoi IX,I,3

Toynbee IV,I,4, VIII,II,4, XI,II,3

Treitschke, Mr. von IX,I,4, X,I,2

Truman XI,III,1, XIII,II,1

Turner XII,I,2

Unamuno XIII,I,4

Uno III,II,3

Vandenberg XI,I,3

Vanderbilt, Gloria V,I,2, XI,I,3

Virgil XII,II,1

Volney XIII,II,2

Washington, George VIII,II,1,3, IX,III,2, X,I,2, X,II,3, XI,II,2, XIII,II,1,4

Webster IX,I,1, XI,II,2

Webster, Daniel IV,I,2, IV,II,1, V,I,1,2

Wellington VIII,I,4

Wenthausen III,I,4

White, Dr. IX,II,2

Whitehead, Mr. XI,I,1

Whitman, Walt VIII,II,3

Whittier, John Greenleaf IV,I,3, V,I,2, XIII,III,2

Wiener, Norbert III,I,1
Wilberforce, Mr. I,III,2
Wilson VIII,II,1
Windelband VII,I,1
Wittgenstein, Mr. XII,II,1
Wright, Orvill III,II,4
Wright, Professor IV,I,1

THE STORY OF ...

1945 VIII,III,1

a boy who is distracted X,I,1
 a Chicago tycoon III,I,1
 a colleague II,II,3
 a description of the Civil War VII,I,1
 a doctor IV,I,3
 a friend forty years older VII,I,3
 a friend in Harvard II,II,4
 a friend of Hanover, New Hampshire II,II,1
 a friend too old for being chloroformed IX,II,3
 a friend who composed a world history VI,I,2
 a friend who volunteered as a private 1941 IV,II,10
 a funeral VII,II,1
 a gardener V,II,3
 a geneticist XI,I,2
 a German professor XIII,II,1
 a great Italian composer IX,I,3
 a homosexual V,I,1
 a Jewish friend IV,I,4
 a lady II,I,1
 a pawn VII,II,3
 a professor at Dartmouth III,I,2
 a psalm XIII,I,2
 a psychiatrist in Hollywood X,II,1
 a socialistic enterprise VIII,II,4
 a student in Charleston VII,III,1
 a symposium in London VI,I,1
 a teacher IV,I,3
 a very serious psychoanalyst IX,I,1
 a woman of 76 III,I,1

Abraham Lincoln quoting the bible XI,II,3
 America as a second thought of our creator XII,I,2
 America's only religion IX,II,1

an American student coming to Heidelberg XI,I,1
 an inscription in Cochem VIII,I,1
 an inscription in Rosenstock-Huessy's school VIII,I,4
 an old Austrian professor from Prague II,III,1
 an old Italian art historian X,I,4
 an old lady in Frankfurt X,II,2
 anatomy IX,I,2

any primitive people VIII,I,2

Aristotle in the university of Paris IX,I,2
 Arthur Schopenhauer IV,I,1

barbarism X,I,1
 Bill Mitchell X,II,3
 biographies of Christ, of Jesus IX,II,1
 Bulgarians and Serbs VIII,I,3

Cabbage and asparagus VIII,I,1
 Calvin Coolidge V,I,2
 Calvin XIII,II,3
 Camp William James and the Ballad of the White Horse XII,III,2
 cancer IX,I,2
 Carlyle XIII,III,2
 Cartesius VIII,I,3
 Chamisso's poem II,I,2
 chapter and verse in the bible XII,I,1
 Charles Darwin and the bible X,I,2
 children absolutely corrupted X,I,3
 children's questions XI,I,3
 Christ VIII,III,2
 Christ's temptation XIII,II,4
 church as a social agency IX,I,2
 Clemenceau and Petain XIII,II,1
 common traditions V,III,1
 Count Moltke X,I,2

De Gaulle III,II,4
 Deucalion V,II,4
 Diocletian's garden VI,I,2
 Disraeli and Gladstone XII,II,3
 Dorothy Canfield Fisher II,I,3

Edith Stein III,I,3
 educational camps X,I,4
 Elsa Brandström XI,I,2
 England and America 1939 VIII,II,2
 ethics X,II,2
 evolution (Edgar Dacqué) IV,II,3

family Eyring IX,I,2
 forbidding to say "thank you" XI,III,1
 Frederick Douglass' dialogue XII,II,3
 Frederick Robertson V,I,1

Gabriele d'Annuncio X,II,4
 George Templeton Strong X,I,1
 George Washington an American VIII,II,1

George Washington X,I,2
 Germany the very dead county at this moment XI,I,4
 going to the hospital V,II,3
 Goodspeed X,II,3
 great poetry X,II,1
 Gregor VII XIII,I,3
 Guiseppe Ferrari II,III,1

H₂O XII,II,2
 Hamlet III,I,2
 Heinrich von Kleist III,I,2
 Heinrich von Treitschke X,I,2
 Helen Keller IV,I,3
 Henry VIII II,III,2, III,II,1
 Heraclitus IX,II,2
 Herman Melville's tragedy IV,II,2
 Hitler and Eva Braun III,I,2
 Hitler being a Czech by birth VIII,II,2
 Hitler XIII,III,1
 how the Russians were treated X,III,3
 husband and wife XII,II,3

installment plans IV,II,3
 interpunctuation XII,I,1
 introducing prayer X,I,4

Japan VI,I,3
 Jefferson VII,I,4
 Jesus ceasing to be a Jew XI,II,3
 Jesus X,II,3
 Joel Barlow XII,I,1
 John Bradford II,I,4
 John Quincy Adams XII,II,4
 John X,II,3
 Judas Iscariot III,I,3

Ketterings diploma I,I,1
 Kleist III,I,1
 Kraft processed cheese X,III,2

Labor Day VI,II,1
 Lawyers, ministers, doctors in America X,I,2
 Lee, Robert X,I,2
 Lincoln defeating secession X,III,4
 Lincoln's assassination VII,I,49
 Lincoln's burden VII,I,4
 Lincoln's celebrations I,I,1
 Lincoln's marching into Richmond VII,I,4

Luke X,II,3
 Luther and Calvin XIII,II,3
 lying X,II,2

Mann and Wann VII,II,1
 many a boy I,II,1
 Marc Aurelius IV,II,4
 Marx VII,I,4
 Masters against Lincoln VII,I,2
 mathematicians II,I,1
 McCarthy I,II,1
 Miss Jacobs XI,III,1

Mr. Anderson IV,II,3
 Mr. Chamberlain IV,II,2
 Mr. Dulles I,I,1
 Mr. Einstein XIII,III,2
 Mr. Eisenhower I,II,2
 Mr. Eisenhower III,II,1
 Mr. Eisenhower visiting Mr. Dulles VII,I,1
 Mr. Eliot at ninety VIII,III,1
 Mr. Eliot Morison VIII,II,4
 Mr. Förster VI,II,1
 Mr. Grassman VI,II,2
 Mr. Hearst III,I,3
 Mr. Henry Ford IV,I,3
 Mr. Hintz IX,II,2
 Mr. Lindbergh's baby kidnapped V,II,1
 Mr. Musselman VI,I,2
 Mr. Oppenheimer I,II,3
 Mr. Otto Hahn VI,II,2
 Mr. Planck XII,II,4
 Mr. Wilberforce I,III,2

mutation XI,I,2
 Myron C. Taylor XII,II,4

Norbert Wiener III,I,1

obedience X,I,4
 one of your best friends IX,II,1
 one year spent abroad X,I,3
 our western movies VI,II,2

passports I,II,2
 Pasternak II,III,1
 Pearl Harbor in class VI,II,2
 Perry Miller's book on Melville V,II,2

Plutarch VIII,III,2
 Polycrates VIII,I,1
 pronouncing Greek words V,II,4
 propaganda I,II,3

Quakers and Baptists I,I,3

Ricarda Huch IV,II,4
 Roosevelt XII,II,4

Rosenstock-Huessy's library II,II,4
 Rosenstock-Huessy a naturalized citizen I,II,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy and the corruption of our schools IX,II,4
 Rosenstock-Huessy being a lawyer II,II,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy being a native of Berlin III,II,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy being an intellectual VIII,I,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy being recognized VIII,III,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy being so unusual IX,II,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy called Plato VII,II,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy climbing Phthiotis V,III,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy coming to this country I,I,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy giving a lecture XIII,II,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy going to Yugoslavia I,II,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy having been able to prophesy IV,II,3
 Rosenstock-Huessy in Dubrovnik II,III,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy in his own town VIII,I,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy in the McCarthy purge I,II,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy in the Paulskirche VIII,II,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy living in Vermont IV,I,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy losing a case IV,I,3
 Rosenstock-Huessy never being the same with these people VIII,III,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy writing biographies X,III,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy's address in Germany VI,II,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy's alter ego Georg Müller X,II,4
 Rosenstock-Huessy's being likable II,I,4
 Rosenstock-Huessy's bitter experience V,II,4
 Rosenstock-Huessy's book binder X,III,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy's book Die Vollzahl der Zeiten I,III,3
 Rosenstock-Huessy's escape XIII,III,3
 Rosenstock-Huessy's index to Mr. von Treitschke IX,I,4
 Rosenstock-Huessy's letters censored I,II,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy's life full of miracles XI,II,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy's mountain climb in British Columbia XII,I,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy's own class III,I,1
 Rosenstock-Huessy's paper as a boy XII,II,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy's parts VII,I,4
 Rosenstock-Huessy's record IV,I,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy's sisters IX,II,3

Rosenstock-Huessy's son XI,II,2
 Rosenstock-Huessy's Soziologie VII,II,3
 Rosenstock-Huessy's Soziologie XI,I,4
 Rosenstock-Huessy's teaching II,II,4

Rossini XII,I,4
 Russia and America 1914 VI,II,1

San Pedro II,I,2
 scholasticism in Europe V,II,4
 schools of foresters VIII,I,4
 secretaries of labor unions I,II,1
 Shakespeare III,I,2
 Shakespeare the poet X,II,3
 simony and the reformation II,II,4
 slavery in the South IX,I,1
 smiling IV,I,3
 Stephen Spencer XII,I,3
 Stephen Vincent Benét's discovery XII,II,4
 suicide in the concentration camps III,I,3

Tallulah Bankhead X,II,1
 thank you, yes, no and please XI,III,1

the "Battle Hymn" IV,I,3
 the Arminians XIII,II,4
 the arts X,II,1
 the Ballad of the White Horse XI,III,2
 the battle of Waterloo VIII,I,4
 the Beethoven movie scriptwriter X,II,3
 the Bible IV,I,1
 the Book of Mormons IX,I,2
 the bored person X,III,2
 the boy saying Jesus committed suicide III,I,2
 the bull-fight in Spain V,III,1
 the catastrophe of pragmatism XI,I,3
 the cause of revolution VI,I,1
 the cemetery Forest Lawn III,I,2
 the chemical elements XI,I,1
 the child bitten by a rattlesnake XIII,II,3
 the Christian monks IV,I,2
 the Christmas cards II,I,2
 the Dead Sea Scrolls IX,I,1
 the devil XIII,III,1
 the Dictatus Papae I,III,2
 the doctor in England XI,II,2
 the doctor in the hospital I,I,2
 the dollar bill X,III,3

the drunkard's wife II,II,2
 the earth rotating around the sun VI,I,1
 the earthquake in Lisbon XIII,II,2
 the educational process in the United States X,I,1
 the Egyptians discovering astronomy XIII,III,3
 the Egyptians V,III,2
 the emperor of Austria XIII,III,2
 the Etruscan saecula X,III,3
 the existentialists XI,II,3
 the fall of Adam and Eve II,I,3
 the fall of man I,III,2
 the father of William and Henry James I,I,1
 the founder of the department of biography IX,II,1
 the Germans in Poland I,II,1
 the Gothic New Testament X,I,4
 the Goths III,I,3
 the governor of Virginia VII,III,1
 the greatest act of faith of Jesus X,II,3
 the Greek map V,III,1
 the Greeks and Anglo-Saxons in Britain V,III,1
 the half-column XI,I,2
 the historical event of a birth I,I,2
 the human ancestors XIII,I,4
 the imitation of Christ X,II,3
 the Indo-Europeans V,III,1
 the inserted comma X,II,1
 the installment-plan III,I,2
 the Italian encyclopedia III,I,4
 the Japanese prince VII,III,1
 the Jewish prophets I,III,2
 the judge in New York City I,I,1
The King Must Die X,III,1
 the law of liberty XIII,I,3
 the leading Russian Bolshevik in Europe VI,II,1
 the League of Nations X,II,2
 the lesson understood by the English VIII,I,2
 the lords paying a man in Oxford II,II,4
 the made child XI,I,1
 the medieval churches V,I,1
 the mink coat I,II,4
 the mirror I,III,1
 the Navajo Indians X,III,1
 the Negro question in the south VI,I,2
 the nicest women in the community III,I,2
 the novel "Concrete" X,I,4
 The Oxford Dictionary X,II,4
 the parents in the nineteenth century XIII,II,4
 the Phaecians V,III,1

the poem "Ichabod" IV,I,3
 the president's speech IV,I,4
 the professor IX,I,2
 the respect for poetry XI,III,2
 the rich people I,I,2
 the Roman nobility III,I,3
 the Sabbath XIII,III,3
 the Scriptorius Rerum Augusti IX,I,1
 the son of man XII,III,2
 the speculum IX,I,2
 the state of Israel V,III,2
 the student who came to Professor Lambeth II,II,3
 the subject XIII,II,1
 the substitutes XII,III,3
 the Swedish nation turning christian X,III,2
 the third century VI,I,1
 the tribal organization XIII,I,2
 the use of a newborn child VIII,II,1
 the white elephant VI,I,2
 the widow I,I,1
 the word "Pelasgian" V,III,1
 the word "thing" X,I,4
 the writer XII,I,4

Thucydides' banishment VIII,I,3
 Toynbee, Mr. X,I,2
 travelers of good will I,II,2
 Tucker fellowship at Dartmouth II,III,2

understanding the meaning of Mass X,I,3
 us nobodies I,III,1

vacations I,I,2
 very proud, very arrogant X,III,3
 Veteran's Day VIII,II,3
 von Görgely VII,I,3

Wernher von Braun VI,II,2
 Whittier on his death-bed V,I,2
 who is a citizen XII,II,2
 Winston Churchill VII,III,2

SENTENCES

All attempts to make the hero the hero of his youth are ridiculous.

All legislation comes too late to those who wake up to the necessity of a legislation.

All life is agony, because all the time we are in danger of losing our breath.

All my books are not in this library.

All paleontology is simply the story of the Bible, played backward.

All scientific language eliminates the process and thinks that it can deal with matter, or atoms and electrons forever.

All the acts we have to remember are those acts where a man forgot himself.

And all our self-realization, all our incarnation in this world depends on this fact that there are no synonyms.

And evolution is a strictly Christian idea.

And formerly you had the smallpox, and now you get the passport pox.

And I assure you, Sir, there will not be peace on this globe unless somebody can write the history of these two world wars in such a way that the Russian, and the British, and the German, and the American will say, "That's it."

And I warn you: God is very original. Where God speaks, where the spirit speaks, the "no" is patient.

And in authority, recognition and representation are unified.

And science, as you see now from the atom bomb, is a detonation.

And so man is unrevealed to himself.

And so the true title of God, "He who shall be who he shall be," that's the name Jahweh.

And that's man's humanity that you can see what you say. And you can hear what you say.

And that's the essence of mourning, gentlemen, that you feel that it's our own fate that's happened.

And the Bible says, "By every sentence that we speak, we are transformed into the man who has said this."

And the constancy is the problem of ancient biography, and for us the change.

And the fiction story of this country is that everybody can do everything for the first time.

And the phylogenetic history of man is not in zoology; but the history of man is this constantly being called back from our specializations into the mainstream of life.

And the true man determines the present from the future, and not the future from the present.

And where you have God, you have the limitation of our insight.

And your own task in life is to keep the solidarity with the human race, yes; but in it, become a species.

Any country that cries for security will perish.

Any man who experiences life, Sir, cannot experiment.

Anybody who goes home after an eight-hour day, and says he has done his duty is second-rate.

Anybody who knows something becomes responsible.

Articulation is our way of dealing with the future.

At the end, we know the results, and we are apt to know everything in reverse order.
At the very moment somebody tells you, you have no special questions any further to ask.

Because a book, if it is a book, has to be read whole.

Because it is terrible to leave somebody we love.

Because the criterion of a book is: is it one sentence?

Because to play Hamlet is less virtuous than to act Hamlet out in life.

Biography is separating the individual actors of the drama, of history.

Birth means the entrance of a child into a preparatory stage, and I call this intentionally to shake you into consciousness -- you are prehistoric.

Boredom is always introducing the vices of the past.

But God is a direction, the direction into you.

But history is not there to deliver facts, but to make you chain the facts into fiats.

But hospitality means to make room for somebody other than yourself in your heart.

But the true biography is that you make the man himself correspond and talk with his friends and enemies who make him.

But when I throw myself on the mercy of God, I am allowed to forget myself.

But whenever you classify, you are Greek; and whenever you name, you are Jewish or Christian.

But you must never agree on anything important.

Children are prehistorical. They are not in history. They are down below. They are on a level of playing with the past.

Christianity abolishes human sacrifice. Christ is the last human victim.

Christianity came into the world to show that life had to be fruitful, and not ethical.

Christianity says all political organizations are temporary, are second-rate.

Concrete times are plural. We live in more than one order of time.

Conflicts of memory -- as we know now from psychology only too well -- constitute a trauma. Therefore humanity needs an office for procuring the traumas of conflicting memories.

Dead things are those who have no time within themselves.

Every minute being a diamond on this necklace of time.

Every past has to be rewritten in the light of the present.

Faith is the belief that there is time. War is always the expression that there is no time, and it's always an act of disbelief.

Father, Son and Holy Spirit -- that's the daily experience of every human being, because every moment you either recognize, or you decide, or you sow. Or are sown.

Fruitfulness is destroyed by consciousness. And gratitude is destroyed by consciousness.

Gentlemen, if life is an experiment, you are outside of it.

God is nothing to be joked about or be left out.

He is the greatest man on earth who does everything once, when it is needed.

Historians attach us to life. And philosophers detach us from life.

History begins where causes are eliminated, and are not allowed to take effect.

History is made when an automatic trend suddenly is interrupted by a personal act for which this man takes the responsibility and allows himself to be quoted.

History is the past seen in the light of the future: that's the biblical story.

History is the step out of nature by which an individual centers not on the shape with which it enters the world, but the shapelessness, so that it can obey orders as of today.

History is the story of the events which at one time did not form a part of nature, but entered the process of existence.

Humanism is the power to take two people outside their environment and to compare them as to their third qualities, regardless of their historical context.

I don't say a "free" country, but the condition of freedom is openness.

I shall never teach again American students, I can assure you. This is my last term in my life.

If a child can understand the engagement period of his parents, he is an historian.

If you analyze all the words which we use in chemistry, they all come from human experience, from "fury," and so on. "It boils furiously".

If you have to read the comics, then read them. But then don't read anything else.

If you want to understand the thing, cling to this expression: Children are liturgical.

In paganism, space comes before time; and in Christianity, time comes before space.

In play-acting is no virtue. There may be knowledge, there may be skill, there may be in this perfection of the artisan, of the craftsman in a stage play, but it's not virtue.

In the poet, the words work; in the historian the events work.

It is always the non-preconceived that has a higher rank.

Juvenile delinquency is the necessary result of our society, because children are allowed or asked to live from day to day.

Man has exactly as much past as he has future, and he has exactly as much future as he has past.

Man is a reflection of the divine countenance.

Marriage is the forming of one cell out of two bodies. And the word "house" or "home" is the expression for this direction inward.

Mathematical thinking is always cross-sectional, geometrical thinking. And historical thinking is always transverse thinking. And that's why they can't understand each other.

Money has no philosophy.

My destiny is recognized destiny. And determination is outside of me, hangs over me as a cloud, and as a compulsion.

Mythical means longer.

Nations are ways of bewitching men into a shell of accident.

Never is a bad ruler the cause for a great revolution.

Never is the present in existence except on faith.

Nobody can be educated within the circle of one language.

Nobody can speak if he does not believe that what he says today could be understood yesterday, and can be understood tomorrow, despite the fact that you are dead.

Nobody holds office, nobody can be employed, except as a representative of an order in which society cooperates.

Now any real achievement is something that hasn't been done, yet.

Now living means to leave something behind in time, and to go forward, to decide what is dead and what is living.

Now that makes the real man, who allows himself only to be the man of the hour.

Obviously, we have to live everywhere.

Only one process, that God is unique, and man is unique in as far as he believes in God.

Only that is important, gentlemen, which can be expressed in both sexes.

Our problem is that God has given us as creatures a limited time, and that our will and our insight has to try to keep inside this allotted time.

Poetry is not really read; it has to be learned by heart, and spoken.

Predestination presupposes that we are called into life. That is, that we hear a voice that commands us to go beyond the present moment.

Revolutions have nothing to do with individual wickedness, because people will always forbear an individual's wickedness, hoping that the next will prove better.

Rhythm is when you are asleep. Reason you use when you are awake. Passions you use when you are hot, on fire. And spirit you must use when you stand, when you are created, and when you have to act in the night of despair, in the place of God Himself, and if you have to say, "My God, my God: why hast thou forsaken me?"

Scientific language neglects the time element. Epic language stresses that it has gone before us. Prophetic language stresses that it must come to us. And political language stresses that it is in conflict, that it is in jeopardy, that it is in danger, that it is not yet decided which way the cat will jump -- that is, conflicting language.

Self-consciousness makes impotent.

Since the Russian Revolution, literature no longer has the same role of taking you into the future.

So a philosopher is like the stag who tries to have the whole world as his antlers.

So historians are doctors of human memory. They are the physicians who try to cure contradictory memories.

So history has to do with the newness of unwhole events.

So the question of the Bible is always empirical.

So, better to say to nobody about a third person something unless you have the moral courage also to tell the person to her face.

Speech is destroyed, if I can murder the man to whom I have spoken and who has spoken to me.

Speeding up is the problem of natural science, and slowing down is the problem of history.

"Spirit" means that people of different interests speak the same language, of different insight, of different perspective.

Textbooks are one thing. And original history is something else.

That man as an individual is unfree; and man, as participating in history, is free.

That the historian has the problem of narration to solve, to keep the past alive, as an influence as today. And that the prophets have to promise the future, and that the politicians have to fight for the present.

That things, before they can get better, must get worse.

That's a full expression: postmaster of the past, for an historian.

That's the only hope we have, that all propaganda will be counteracted by counter-propaganda.

The miracle that is not the human mind, but the human spirit.

The atomic bomb is the best expression of a Cartesian age of space domination.

The attitude toward the past is recognition.

The Bible is to be read in responsories, because any man who says something hasn't said it unless he allows it to come back upon him, and he accepts it as being said truly. The Bible is written around the simple fact that man experiences himself as divinely complete.

The Book of Samuel. First real historical book of the world's whole literature.

The brain is our roots, not our crown.

The destiny of men, gentlemen, is never explained by comparison.

The devil always sells short.

The devil says you can have this pleasure now, where you can only have it after you have served well.

The English language didn't exist at one time. It probably will not exist all the time.

The essence of the invention of the history of the Bible is the power to speak of man not as a hero of the story.

The event is unique because it has an irreplaceable date. It is only the unity of the history through all times that gives to this hour, to this moment in which we mention an historical event, the quality of belonging to this event.

The fall of man is the falling-out of the relation of past and future.

The great events are the great events, because they cannot be repeated. You can't miss them, because once you haven't been there, it's too late.

The greatest favor you do a human being is to forget who he is and to take him up on what he says.

The greatness of the Jewish story is that it begins with Cain; and all other nations, except the Jews, have insisted that their own story begins the story of mankind.

The historian looks up to the people of whom he speaks, and the naturalist looks down on the things about which he talks.

The historian should not pass any judgments on dead people, on past events, unless he has learned how to make those judgments on living events.

The historical is always this one step where a man decides to be representative, or to be germinative.

The historical time will be sharp, now when you still agree that every day differs.

The history of man is very short. It consists of perhaps fifty generations.

The Israelites have to do with the epochs of the world, with the eons of eons, with the ages of ages. The Greeks have to do with the fate and destiny of cities, of the individual entity, of the body politic and its history.

The Jews are the enemies of myth.

The less conflict, the less you need the specific role of the historian.

The mind is the instrument of agreement between people.

The more popular a name, the less you can change it.

The more unique an event, the more it belongs to history; and the less, the more it belongs to nature.

The oldest plays of the children are also the oldest institutions of mankind.

The only way in which you grow is through shame.

The past is that which makes demands on you not to obstruct its growth into the future.

The power to say to yourself, "I am detestable," is awakening to the true history.

The primary function of memory is to remember.

The problem of history is that somebody dies, and yet something survives.

The process of incarnation is the only process by which people can understand how we have to live. Whether in education or politics.

The real relation is by learning by heart, the songs of the past, for example.

The religion of the scientist is to be liked by your colleagues, and to be taken up on your word, and to be believed as a reliable scientist.

The secret of a person in history is that he is just as much at peace with the world when he sleeps as when he is awake.

The sense of wonder is the growing point of the human soul.

The Southern Californians have to keep identity with the Russians, or we have a Third World War.

The whole Bible is written around this fact that we cannot commit suicide.

The whole of Christianity is the sense of what is dead and what's alive, the sense of life, and the sense for the dead.

There comes in every function of life the moment where the doing the thing itself is more important than being called it, honorably.

There is no love without the balance between lust and sacrifice.

There is one thing that today the arts and the sciences have grown so apart, that the reconciliation or the renewal will only come when the scientist becomes poetical, and the poet becomes scientific.

There is only history in the Christian era, in the full sense of the word.

There would be no history if people wouldn't die; there would no history if people would not be born; there would be no history if people didn't have to marry; and there would be no history if they didn't have to have an office.

This is the quality which doesn't exist in nature that we can listen to voices from the past and the future.

Those sayings that are worthwhile are only by a hair's breadth away from hell.

To be back to Adam means to be completely free as in the moment when God created man first.

To be born means that somebody else is still responsible for you.

To be extraordinary, part of it is that you do not claim to be extraordinary.

To be in politics means never to say anything too early, and never say anything too late.

To speak means to be able to testify and verify an event before it has happened, while it is happening, and after it has happened.

To speak means to decide over life and death.

To speak means to disarm. And we disarm in the name of the truth, or in the name of charity, or in the name of the future, or the name of our children.

To speak means to divide the reality into gods, men, and world.

To tell a tale is something quite different from being a witness in court.

Today this is so difficult, because you have to move out of America as a mere nation, or as a mere self-contained isolated continent into its becoming a part of the universe.

Under what conditions do the members of any body politic retain the plasticity of representing the whole human race.

Vital is something that entails death, gentlemen.

We are all self-appointed when we listen to the cry of an emergency, to an SOS and go there.

We are in every moment in the danger that somebody has to find a scapegoat.

We only know, because we are provoked to know.

We owe to the historian the recognition of epochs.

We speak in order to march through time, so that this point here can be looked upon before it has happened, and after it has happened, and while it is happening.

We would have had peace long ago if there was still this overflow of free American agents.

Well, we have only one priesthood in America, medicine.

What is realism? The invention of some professor for an examination!

When man is serious, his spirit always will beget conflict.

When we face each other, we beget each other.

Whenever you hear a noun used instead of a verb, you are going pagan.

Where you do not bury the dead, gentlemen, you are outside of history.

Where you have God, you have unfinished business.

Where you invoke, you also convene, you also convoke.

Wherever, the thing I say makes me, because I'm quoted on this, and people say, "That's the man who said this," I'm in history. Before, I'm not.

Why do we dress, gentlemen? So that we may gain time.

With the past we are connected by obedience, and with the future we are connected by smell, by scent, by flair.

You are an end in yourself, and you are not a means. The mankind is God's playmate, but God doesn't use us.

You are in history only if you can form a generation consciously between the laws of the past and the promises, or programs, or prophecies of the future.

You can be sure that in an historical issue, all parties are right. The question is always in history "when," and never "what."

You can never fulfill your own purpose without becoming the most dissatisfied and hungry beast in the desert.

You can only win not by fear, but by going ahead, always beyond that which is today.

You can only write the complete story from the end backward.

You cannot explain the death of any person unless you relate it to what happens after his death.

You cannot organize creative effort. You can only organize derivative effort.

You can't eliminate the waves that an event, the stone that falls into the water mobilizes in a pond.

You must never think that you can pay me for what I'm telling you here.

You only live by knowing poetry.

You only must think that hell is a state not somewhere else outside this world, but in this community.

You wake up as somebody else's thee.

You will all discover how difficult it is to know, when to stop.

You will always find that when there is no way out, man does his best.

Your generation has to re-conquer the unity of the horoscope and the constellation of the time when you are born, and your respect for it.

Your whole problem is to live through a number of generations, and to do your part to reconnect all generations in your own life, and in the life of the country, and in the life of the human race.

NOTE OF THE EDITOR

In the year 1959 Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy gave 13 lectures in Los Angeles: Historiography. They are minutely transcribed by Frances Huessy.

I

Here I offer an edited sample. I did the following operations.

A

FINDING THE TEXT WHICH IS FINALLY MEANT FOR THE LISTENER TO BE KEPT IN MIND

- 1) Elimination of oral empty phrases as: you see, obviously, so to speak, of course.
- 2) Elimination of false beginnings of sentences which are corrected by the speaker.
- 3) Elimination of words, that come first in German, then in English.

B

DIVIDING THE TEXT

- 4) forming paragraphs: after a slight change within the field in which speaker and listener go together,
- 5) forming subdivisions: after a mental change of aspect of the cross of reality: from 1 forward, 2 inward, 3 backward to 4 outward,
- 6) forming higher divisions in the same manner: I forward, II inward, III backward, IV outward,
- 7) forming chapters, after four times four aspects within a chapter are paced off, one lecture usually containing three parts, the first and second complete (four chapters), the third one shorter or missing. So you have about forty times change of aspect.

The reader may keep in mind:

I and 1 = appeal to the listener as a person thrown in to a new future

II and 2 = appeal to the listener as a feeling and participating person

III and 3 = appeal to the listener to hear something about the history of which he is invited to be a part

IV and 4 = appeal to the listener to sum up a theme and take home a message.

So the edited text tries to give you a help to change the aspects in time (not to be taken by surprise too much which tends to make you desperate) as one of the students said:

Because when I realize how hard it is to explain these things when we just start with ourselves up here, all alone without any notes, because as we're reading our notes and seeing all the things that you said, and it seems like we understand it, until when I meet someone who doesn't even know you, and I want to say that I met an instructor that I think has made some difference in my life, and he asks the question, "Why?" and I try to explain -

Kill him.

I just say, "You have to meet him."

Well, that's very good of you.

C

HEADINGS

8) to chapters taken from the text - this is of course arbitrary, result of selecting what is important considering the whole lecture,

9) to the parts taken from the text, directing your attention what will come out as the main point.

10) to the lectures taken from the text, giving the outline of the whole process,

D

INDICES

11) *Contents* - this makes it possible to have an overview of the whole series, with the headings for lectures, parts and chapters,

12) *Names* (the Roman ciphers indicating the lectures, then parts, then chapter). Many names of course, several should be more precisely given - the ease in their appearing during the lectures is astonishing, no pressure, apt to flow into the speech as Americans, I surmise, expect.

13) *Put it down* - is often the imperative, or: take it down. Here are the sentences which Rosenstock-Huessy himself (or me!) wants to be kept in memory. It is quite a collection of aphorisms, emphatic enough.

14) *The story of...* - I have listed in alphabetical order the beginning of short and long stories showing how great the part of oral history here is. Especially interesting of course all the stories beginning with "I" (listed as: The story of Rosenstock-Huessy ...). There are

personal experiences and historical details which appeal to the listener as traject – to pass them on.

II

The whole series reveals tragically how speech is constituted out of misunderstanding – creating the future. And it is really a pity that Rosenstock-Huessy couldn't follow his first vision of continuing with his new findings about reading the bible: he had to change to Thucydides, Plutarch, Polybius – and even there he met the shortag of learning and education in his listeners. And notwithstanding: he continued to call to listening and courage to enter history, in his sense: to accept the unique moments of unique life.

III

The shaking, shocking decision: this is my last full lecture to American students:

I shall never teach again American students, I can assure you. This is my last term in my life.

after one of the students rejected listening to John Brown's Body as imperative to his own heart and asked:

(Is this his realism, or naturalism, or --.)

Oh be ashamed, in this context to ask for stupidities.

(Or is that romanticism ...?)

I could shoot you! Breaking up our understanding at this moment with these abstractions.

came true – almost: you find in the chronological bibliography after 1959

Liberal Arts College 1960 (26 pp.)

What Future for the Professions? 1960 (93 pp.)

Grammatical Method 1962 (51 pp.)

In Defence of the Grammatical Method 1962 (87 pp.)

The Bionomics of Language 1962 (149 pp.)

The Cross of Reality 1965 (10 pp.)

Economy of Times 1965 (79 pp.)

Talk with Franciscans 1965 (36 pp.)

Lingo of Linguistics 1966 (63 pp.)

Cruciform Character of History 1967 (65 pp.)

Universal History 1967 (396 pp.)

Fashions of Atheism 1968 (20 pp.)

The University 1968 (8 pp.)

that is – the twenty lectures Universal History of 1967 made good what he had promised eight years earlier.

IV

It is really astonishing that Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy didn't squint at the listeners and readers through tape recording: he spoke really to the present persons.

And this is why these lectures speak again as if we were these persons.

Cologne, August 8, 2017

Eckart Wilkens