

PRIVILEGE AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Six lectures on, and three from within the future university.

Lecture 1. The German University.

Parents, scholars, students, administrators. The human side of thought. "Mr. Dick" and the end of the German University.

Lecture 2. The American University.

Woodrow Wilson's legacy to American universities, Princeton, Chicago, Dartmouth. The modern confusion between ideas, sciences, education, and knowledge, exemplified by A. E. Housman's "Introductory Lecture!" The proper relations between the birth, growth, spread, and death of thought. Economy of the mind.

Lectures 3--6 apply the principles of the first two lectures to parents and ideas, scholars and sciences, students and education, administrators and knowledge.

Lecture 3. Ideas.

The opportunities of parents. The ten commandments of education: Listen, read, think, play, doubt, protest, suffer; return, teach, designate. The institutional representation of these commandments in society.

Lecture 4. Facts.

The opportunities of scholars: the question of their trustworthiness. How ideas are changed into sciences. The transition from faith to science through work, which must be

- (1) of universal significance,
- (2) detached from the environment,
- (3) vouched for by concrete persons,
- (4) exposed to constant criticism.

The forgotten principle of the occidental universities: Paris, Sologna, Salerno, and their secret.

Lecture 5. Men.

The fellowship of students.

Lucius Ampelius and the introductory course in antiquity. Elementary knowledge and elementary education are identified today. They should be treated as opposites. When they are mistaken for each other, rampant fascism ensues. Why the classical, the parochial and the universal elements of education are mixed up today. Consequences for the teacher. The contradiction between a teacher as a hired man and teaching as a public trust. Why an educator cannot be an educator only.

Lecture 6. Administrative Measures.

The proper place for quantity. The cynicism of the young. The cheapening of knowledge and the devaluation of values necessitate the search for a new sort of teacher. The convergence-principle as a way out. Our next practical step.

Lectures 7 -- 8 take up what
must be studied by the new staff.

Lecture 7. The Luther of physics; and the re-embedding of the natural sciences. The situation of theology in 1500 similar to the situation of physics today. The important scientific parties of today.

Lecture 8. Scepticism and Mystification.

The modern Sophists and the university machinery and monopolies. The three scientific processes; defining, enumerating, articulating. The growth of logic and mathematics. The lack of a science of articulation. Popular substitutes. The disease of self-expression. Proper remedies.

Lecture 9. The new frontier: the timeliness of thought.

The mutual conquest of West and East. Abraham, Jesus, Buddha, Laotse.

THESES, October 28, 1938

Thesis One.

History, education, and politics today are full of good ideas; they are not sciences.

Thesis Two.

Today we shall build up a scientific terminology. We shall try to come to grips with operations instead of having to look up to ideals. This can be done.

Thesis Three.

The ten commandments are addressed to three generations: the child, the adult, the elder. They deal with man as a natural recurrence, as a social fighter, and as a lasting value. On all three levels--childhood, adult, elder--the human being passes through four essential stages.

Thesis Four.

These stages take the individual (childhood), the person (adult), the personality (elder) through the four forms of grammar: You, Ego, We, It.

Thesis Five.

Our institutions stop at the sixth commandment. The latter part of life means: how to become a parent, and it appears in the problem how to train teachers, since teachers act in parents' stead.

THESES, October 28, 1938

Thesis One.

History, education, and politics today are full of good ideas; they are not sciences.

Thesis Two.

Today we shall build up a scientific terminology. We shall try to come to grips with operations instead of having to look up to ideals. This can be done.

Thesis Three.

The ten commandments are addressed to three generations: the child, the adult, the elder. They deal with man as a natural recurrence, as a social fighter, and as a lasting value. On all three levels--childhood, adult, elder--the human being passes through four essential stages.

Thesis Four.

These stages take the individual (childhood), the person (adult), the personality (elder) through the four forms of grammar: You, Ego, We, ~~It~~ They.

Thesis Five.

Our institutions stop at the sixth commandment. The latter part of life means: how to become a parent, and it appears in the problem how to train teachers, since teachers act in parents' stead.

PRIVILEGE AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITY OF THE UNIVERSITY

LECTURE 1. The German University.

October 7, 1938.

Parents, scholars, students, administrators. The human side of thought. "Mr. Dick" and the end of the German University.

When I arrived here today I saw the invitation sent out by Dr. Cabot, and I said to myself, "The inside story of these lectures is a little bit different." It began with a defeat. When I was in Dark Harbor in August Mr. Glenn started a discussion on universities and we went on with that for some time. I had in my baggage a paper which had been on my mind for five years, and I am going to tell you why. But before giving the story of this paper and its rather erratic adventures and the funny way it never came to be published, I must mention that Dr. Cabot did not like the paper. I read it to him and he said, "I am Irish and I must have a jolt, and you begin ^{with} a chapter on universities called 'The boredom of education,' and that is nothing to me." So I sat down and wrote it for the tenth time, and now I begin with an over-energetic warning against parents. I said they are absolutely unaware what they do when they send a boy to school; that they pay tuition with their sons; that money is an insignificant affair; the real sacrifice is throwing children to this Moloch of a university which can always turn into an idol to which we sacrifice. The unawareness of parents of this fact makes it difficult to make any connection between the parents and the modern university.

Parents are beginning to see that the ^{present work} ~~place~~ of the university leads rightly to great misgivings. It has got out of hand. ~~It is not the field of one or the other side, but the relation which needs to be restated.~~

When I came to this country I came as a lonely man apparently, but really I came to represent the fact that the German university was gone.

In 1933 this was beyond the understanding of ^{this} / country, full of youth and health. Such people think a country cannot be destroyed altogether, and that there is no such thing as permanent destruction. Today I think most people are aware that while ^{before 1930} there had not been ^{any extensive} / migration of scholars from Germany, there had been ^{in Germany} something which had been copied and imitated in England, in France and in America, which with its inner springs of movement had originated in Germany and had only work^{ed} / there with any speed and thoroughness. So that even the educational best conditions in another country could not make up completely for the loss of ^{these} one institution in which Germany had ^{been in} ~~taken~~ the lead.

I tried to express this in my article ^{University and Germany in 1933}. I was full of this problem or perhaps I should not have come to this country. It was a question, How can ~~somebody~~ ^{the world} be tempted to let in this xx dangerous fellow called a university, when it is much easier to be self-satisfied like the old Oxford and Cambridge, which had the name of universities but were in fact colleges.

The great scientists in England up to the end of the last century have not necessarily been university professors at all. You went to Oxford to be there four years and to have tea—and why not? It was probably perfectly sufficient to have one country, ^{, Germany,} which offered itself, its sons and children, to be sacrificed to the kingdom of science.

* * * * *

Theology does not exist in this country as an organized group of scientists, at least down to 1920, because ^{we have and have not} Harnack was enough for every student who ^{wanted} to go to Germany. ^{Anyway} Even today theology as a scholars' affair is I think flourishing only in Switzerland, ^{in the Netherlands, Sweden} and ~~xxxx~~ other dependencies of the German center. How then can any group of normal people in a national community ^{that} understand that there must be something, / there is something which goes beyond the limits of its own country, and for what purposes? You can deteriorate any university to a fascistic affair, but it ceases then to be a university. The German university was always bigger than the nation.

groups
I have found here four/—students, parents, scholars, and administrators— contributing to the university, and though I found that the parents were paying with their offspring, I found that students were not getting ideas ^{not} but were being formed into an image, into the ruts of thought, ^{but were getting information on legs. Now, information is not formation.}
Even ~~it~~ seems to have got into certain ruts of thought. It ~~is~~ the fact of being stamped which ^{was} is so amazing. In German universities, I have seen it done within two years. By the second or third year, while ^{was} he was taking his doctor's degree at twenty-two, the student ^{was made} ~~was made~~ what he was going to be for the rest of his life; *he acquired, for good or evil, a mental character.*

The colleges of Germany, for example those of theology, really ^{was} ~~was~~ produced a ^{one} ~~one~~ divisions among people. So for a student it ~~was~~ not the occasion to get something as much as the fact that he ^{himself} ~~was~~ undergoing a process of change. ^{It was} It ~~was~~ very risky. He ^{might} ~~might~~ be transformed into something as useless as an economist!

The third thing I would say is that the teacher in a university—the scholar—is not at all a man who knows ^{something} ~~one~~ but who has to represent a ^{part of reality} ~~part~~ in an ignorant society, and has to fight for ^{it} ~~its~~ representation tooth and nail. In any given moment a part of the Word may be forgotten. The scholar is a custodian. He is fighting for something, perfectly useless as you know, for something for which nobody else cares. Primarily he is an ambassador of ^{the truth} ~~the truth~~ to an ignorant and unwilling world. Again and again this is his special contribution, that he identifies himself with parts of the Word which the average society has no time for or does not wish to be reminded of. So to be an ambassador or representative of something ^{about} ~~about~~ and something rather abstruse is again something very different from what you understand through the Carnegie Foundation to be the scholar's job; because you think it is something that everybody ^{wishes} ~~expects~~ him to do, which it is natural to do. ^{It is unnatural.} ~~A~~ and certainly the real scholar

★ can land as a pedant, as a crank. Scholarship is not easy but it is a duty.

For the administrator we have ^{one clear} ~~this~~ function, in that he must ^{try} ~~not~~ be too

obvious ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~is inside~~, should aim to become superfluous. People grow up and lead on and change without too much administration. I know of one ^{American} university which has a Department of Efficient Administration; when you want some ^{stationary} ~~paper~~ ^{your application} you ~~send~~ to the Department of Efficient Administration--and you never get your ^{material} ~~material~~. That is the wrong way. The right kind of administrator is less visible than any other part. He is the hub of the wheel, and that is a very difficult task. It is a permanent effort to efface yourself. You don't represent something visible but you keep the other parts of the wheel from falling down.

Most educational discussions start the other way round and ask: What can we do for you?; my whole answer is that this is not the idea of a university at all. Nobody does anything for / ^{the teacher} but he is doing something for the growth of the spirit, for the growth of the world, and nobody can tell what will happen ^{to you}. You may lose your children as parents, ^{scholars} ~~you~~ may turn out as skeletons at the end. ~~your children may fall victims~~ ^{indispensable}

Why then is the university in any way ^{interesting}? Why does the world at large need this growth? Won't all these things take care of themselves?

I must express my feeling that when 33 millions of children go to school in the United States, it seems perfectly futile for an individual to say ^{that} when this educational temple ^{The true University} is destroyed we must be able to rebuild it in three days. Any social group on a desert island would have to refound the ^{me} ~~university~~ ^{which has disappeared} ~~university~~ ^{today. Please} ~~take~~ into consideration that that group would not have to get something but to give something. One group would have to give faith; the children would have to give themselves; the teachers would have to give up themselves in order to represent those parts of the university which on this desert island were not there; and the administrators would be these wise men whom you never see. Well, my only excuse for this whole enterprise ^{which is opposition} ~~against~~ the odds of this incredibly huge machinery of education ^{now} running smoothly and with

great profit for many everywhere in the world, is that I cannot help it.

To ~~the~~ German professor Whirlwind... *(G.K. Chesterton's Handbook says:)* begins in this way, "Stick to one excuse." He thought the German scholars always had so many reasons that none of them was in any way important. *(Well, I shall stick to one.)* My only excuse is that I cannot help it. You know the story of "Mr. Dick" in Dickens' David Copperfield, whose real name nobody knew. I suppose he was named Richard. But "Mr. Dick" had this unfortunate habit of always mixing into everything he did the fate of Charles the First of England. I have the unfortunate habit of mixing the fate of the university in ^{to} everything that I say or think. Mr. Dick was a little mentally unbalanced. As Betsy Trotwood said.....

After all, Mr. Dick had one quality which made up for this fact of his always writing memorials about Charles the First. When she asked him what she should do with David Copperfield he suggested the thing which she really did. He said, "I think I should wash him." All I have to say, or I may perhaps at the end of these lectures be able to say, I should wash *The universities and colleges, as they are now, they are unclean.*

That is, to say what I think is the next step that we could or should take in this country, to testify to the fact that the German university is destroyed, and that there is no hope to draw on the resources of the other side of the ocean for the rebirth of this spirit which goes beyond the life of ^{one} the continent in every age and prepares the road for something essentially different, for a new form and existence of life in society. You will not mind, since I have frankly stated that I do not know whether this is illness or agitation, you will not mind, I hope, when I say that really, from my first memories I have been puzzled by this question. When I was 14 or 15 I founded, of course, *as a* *old German*, an Academy of Sciences, in which there were three members and we thought that was enough. After this experiment I devoted some years to the *(study of the)* scholastic method of medieval universities and the process of the doctorate; and after coming back from the war I threw up my university teaching in a pamphlet in which

as the War
I said that after such a thing, the fate of the university had to be re-deter-
mined, and since nobody was going to take any such steps ^{from within} I could not go on
teaching; we should have to find new people who would devote themselves to
the study ^{new way of life}. So I went out and founded three ^{academies,} / with more or less success,
~~*****~~ I started an academy of labor which lasted ten years. Then I
started an academy for adult education, trying to get rid of the rather childish
way of teaching the social sciences, ^{to adults, where we} treating adults like children who know
nothing about society. Again it was a problem of organizing a real division of
faculties of grown up people, responsible not only for themselves but for the
larger world. Finally I got my own college together within the university
called ^{universitas & training} and again I had the satisfaction of making this inter-
departmental machine ^{of 25 full professors out of all departments} work smoothly for a number of years.

I have started my career as a scholar three times in my life, and this leads to
something essential: I have been a privat docent three times, at 24, 34, 45.
privat docent?

What is this? It is a man who undertakes at his own risk, without salary,
to challenge the scholastic community and the public to give him a hearing. The
only thing granted him by the university is his chance to teach: he is not an
instructor, not an assistant professor, he is nothing whatever except what he is.
Here we come to one of those mainsprings of acceleration of teaching in the
German universities. I do not wish to idealize this. I think the times for this
institution are gone. But one of the things unknown in England or here is that
this thing was one of the main causes of success in Germany, and when one has
to face the fact that it is gone, one has to know the causes of its success be-
fore one ^{may have to} plan to put something in its place.

After I had thrown up the university, work + started once more, after the
war at 35, ^{at an Institute of Technology, as a Privatdozent} ~~started~~ with a lecture on the Four Faculties, because this was
so much on my mind. I may mention too that again my luck or my misfortune led
me to teach in seven different departments in Harvard because it was impossible
to find my ^{a special place} way in the university; and at the Tercentenary of Harvard I was in-

vited by the one department in which I had not taught! So the defeat of the German university has harassed me all these years. I had no illusion after 1918 but that the ~~thing~~ ^{the German university} was dead, but to ~~try~~ ^{I wanted} to tell everyone so that when everyone faces this fact something can be done about it. ~~But it has not helped me to know this fact.~~ Today it is not necessary to say much about the destruction which has been brought about. What I have to say in the second part of the lecture is ~~that has died.~~ ^{is a description of the process)} What were the secret springs of the privat docent beyond which allowed the Germans to represent something / national boundaries? A chapter on this from my book will be mailed to you. I assume that we may go forward on two roads, - some material which will be sent to you I take for granted that you will scan over.

Without going into detail the thing which should be mentioned I think in this connection is that the German university allowed the Germans to defeat the Roman Church, ~~and to get rid of the encroachment of the Italian Papacy on German affairs.~~ The German princes were willing to let in another witness of the faith, - the German universities, preaching freely in a Christian world, treating Christians in this so-called Christian world as if they were pagans and had to be reformed. This was done from the chairs of the universities, and this power of St. Paul allowed him to rob Peter. It was therefore a struggle of life and death which encouraged the Germans to let in the university ~~in~~ ^{its} sovereign character. The university ^{was} not asked for immediate practical results, nor promising ^{in return} for tuition any direct reward to the parents, ^{It was} shaping people to a shape which ^{has the manifest destiny of the spirit} they could not escape, and allowing an amount of freedom and self-government which today has vanished from the European soil.

In this fight for life and death, the chairs, first of theology, later of the other sciences, played the rôle of reform. ^{The} Reformation was not something done on one day as in England; it was something going on day after day in every

The German Reformation

German university. That is the thing we should know: that ~~it~~ was the emanicipation of the spirit of St. Paul from being swallowed up by the spirit of Peter. At every moment Christianity can be pagan--clergy and people--and there must be someone to tell them so. That is why the German universities were state universities, because they stood for the whole nation against a relapse into paganism. It may seem to you a subtle point that I make, this connection with St. Paul. Luther, ^{however,} ~~thought~~ he was St. Paul Redivivus. It is something very simple. There is at every moment, once emotion has done its work, a great tendency to complacency. The moment ^{that} the university ^{loses} ~~lost~~ the power of reform and St. Paul ^{it} is not there, no other power can do; St. John cannot do it; the Good Samaritan and the Levite and the Priest must all be ^{is he wowed} ~~there~~. The German universities played the part of the Levite and interpreted the new spirit, and of course neglected Nabob; but scholars are poor people. I am today defending the Levite against the Good Samaritan. You cannot build society on the Good Samaritan, and in order to teach people to be Good Samaritans, there must be someone to teach. The university tried to reform ^{the nation, through a new learning, a con-} ~~this and to look through, at least, and~~ ^{stantly fresh rediscovery of the old texts, teaching that any student must} not to be blinded by any visible thing. Working in the invisible you are not at all impressed by any big buildings, by any endowments, by any great numbers. The 33 millions of children vanish, and ^{one case teaches the whole lesson.} ~~somebody sees what is wanted~~ In this sense the German university ^{was} ~~was once more~~ interpreting the scriptures in the light of today, ^{year after year, going beyond local or tribal or national existence.} And this university covered greater territory than any political unit. For 350 years in Germany the acts and documents of any case in court in any German principality...because the courts, or justice had to turn to the law faculties to get, not a judgement on the facts but an opinion on the merits of the case. So in this sense the law faculties in Germany became the sovereign courts of justice, dealing with the evidence/ establishing and reforming justice. In the same way the faculties of theology were approached by the

*High
and Herpistrates*

princes and asked how they should reform their churches, and it is the princes who brought about in Germany all the changes in religious instruction or criticism during the last 400 years.

When these two faculties had exhausted their energies, the faculties of philosophy and of the social sciences took over, and what you know of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, can only be understood through Melancthon, *Luther, Pufendorf, who precede them.* Once more they translated the voice of reform in their lectures and from their chairs.

Again the universities represented the truth systematically, with the idea that certain abuses can be by systematic and free interpretation attacked and outruled. All of German liberty *and eloquence* has gone into the liberty of the academic world. The liberty of the university was that liberty which distinguished the Germans from a nation tyrannized over. These liberties were developed within the university only. You may say a pretty poor substitute for national liberty, but there it was, and it had made on these universities an indelible impression. It made them into something much bigger than any local or princely or patriotic institution. You could buy this reformed truth and establish *London University in 1825* ~~an English college~~ just because the German university had found the way and started the historical science which we have developed. It came in the wake of Schelling, of Fichte, and of Hegel.

The last faculty established was that of the Social Sciences, about 1870, which brought about sickness insurance, old age insurance, etc., and was based rather exclusively on the work of the *Katheder =* Socialists who had chairs in German universities. The social policy of Germany is the last contribution of the German universities to reform in Germany. It was completely successful, and with this all four faculties had done their part and there came exhaustion.

But it is significant that the last great group got the nickname Kathedersozialisten from their

University chairs.

Already in 1900 you could feel that the influence of the German universities on the nation was vanishing. But I wish to stress that ~~therefore~~ reforming truth was proclaimed first in the university, actually achieved later in practice. This had been the secret for 400 years in Germany; the promise, the forecasting of the things imagined happens when the student walks into the university. For example, something very special, like *natural law* in the 17. century, was first taught in *the universities*, and twenty years later it was law. This does not happen here where you have the Supreme Court; but in Germany there was first teaching and doctrine and then reception by the court. The German official would carry out as official what he had been taught in his younger days, and you can find *in social policy.* that when the first *German* officials had reached the stage when they could be influential, in 1881, they made the first shift from Manchesterism and laissez-faire to the *first step* *cher?* social policy. It is this relation of the teaching to the effects in the outside world which I wish to stress, because here comes the significance of these universities to the community. The

usual idea is of course, that the thing should be ^{taught} ~~taught~~ to the boys which to their parents and elders seemed to be the right thing, and we are apt to consider the thing to be right which we think to be right. The policy of the German universities was, ^{that students should be taught} ~~that students should be taught~~ something which the parents did not think to be right, and so persecution of the professor was always going on. This is nothing to boast about; you could always go to another place. There was one safety valve, - the free competition among many states. There was one language for all the Central European region, German; but there was ^{no} one sovereign state, and thus you could go, when you fell into disgrace, from Berlin to Vienna or to *Saxony* or to Switzerland. and they did it; and you have the examples of *Schlegel* going to *Vienna*, *Hegel* going to *Berlin* etc.

This is the real story: that everybody could evade the immediate pressure of his environment and establish himself only on the basis of his own capacities in a new environment with a new state allegiance. He acquired the citizenship of this other state by being appointed to the university. This was his privilege, that the university in this sense made him a new man. We had no self-made men in Germany; ^{but there was a thought-made group of men.} In the proper sense their citizenship was not based on their birth-right but on belonging to a university. It was quite amazing to find ~~that~~ 80 per cent. of them have not taught in the state in which they were born or went to school. In *1871*, with the unification of the smaller German States. this broke down, ~~and~~ There was a crisis in university affairs and this was felt by The spirit of free wandering, of free migration, had gone, and Mr. Ulich can testify to the kind of pulling which went on. In 1932 it had reached such a stage that practically there was already complete cartel between the chief administrators, in which they promised not to buy off the fellow from the other country, This unity deprived the professor of his full freedom of going where he liked. This had been in the making since 1870. Only Switzerland and Austria were completely free and they more and more ~~separated~~ and lost contact with us. There was one great moment when Jacob Burchardt, ^{of} *Basel*, got a letter inviting him to *Berlin*, at the behest of the

Franco-Prussian War. Burckhardt wrote the *Culture of the Renaissance*. He also ~~the man who~~ wrote the deeply pessimistic book on Constantine the Great, that and told megalomaniac of an emperor, how nobody could keep his head as Emperor of Europe; this book he anticipated all the mass movements. He declined to go to Berlin. There was one moment of enlightenment. The faculty offered him after the victory the chair of ~~World History~~ ^{in the Berlin of Bismarck}. They were willing to allow a Swiss to teach the history of the world. ~~The Nation still was greater than the State~~ But he had already gone neurasthenic and ~~provincial~~; he preferred to live with his neighbors in Basle, and in his stead you may guess who came-- Treitschke. So between these two the history of the German universities was in the balance for ^{one} moment, and with the refusal of the Swiss ~~to accept~~ ^{rate} free exchange of all German-speaking privat docents through many states was ~~beginning to decline~~.

I mention this as a rather dramatic moment ~~because~~ The man who came, Treitschke, has done more than anybody else to undermine the international idea of the German university because he was only teaching about German interests and was not responsible in any larger sense for the truth to the world at large.

German professors were perfectly able to shed tears, to get excited in the chair. It was the only popular eloquence we had in Germany. The German is a very poor speaker; ^{one cause of} the victory of the Nazis is that for the first time they have broken through the tradition of ~~very bad~~ ^{being} speaking. ^{in public} ~~Because~~ All the eloquence of the German nation was concentrated in the German teachers. There were many very bad teachers, but at least they got excited. ^{and some spoke excellent} ~~badly well~~.

Now may I come to two more points: I want to give two more secrets of the trade of the German university, and again explain why this could not last and is over now.

One was the German tradition of craftsmanship and guilds. German carpenters and cabinetmakers and craftsmen doing all kinds of jobs are quite well known here too. The professors were craftsmen too. They were united in a guild, but that did not mean they were hired men but that they were privileged

men, perhaps too highly privileged. All guilds are privileged. There was competition in the group but not competition with outsiders. There has been very little free-lancing ^{of the thought in Germany.} Lessing was one of the few, and Schopenhauer at least tried to go through a university and failed. He never got over it. If you list the German contribution to thought you find 80 per cent. of ^{the} ~~people~~ ^{here} connected with the university. And ^{even} Schiller ended as a university professor. I once ran into a document of the Metternich era about a young man who had been suspected by the police; the ^{Russian} ~~ministry~~ thought of him as a rebel ^{but as talented} and as a way out they made him a privat docent. There he ~~could~~ say what he liked. That ~~was~~ the proper place to have new ideas. There are countries where you must not have ideas when you are ^{a university teacher.} ~~In Germany, your promotion was based on your ideas.~~ The secret was ~~the~~ free enterprise. You could earn your living as a professor on the basis of your own success. If you were ^{a public} ~~teaching~~ down to 1918, you could earn a princely income if you had ^{many} ~~100~~ students, because they had to pay half the fee to you. This shows you that the professor was not a hired man but an entrepreneur. To a large extent he ran his own house, depending on his merits. To be sure sometimes he used disgusting means of self-advertising, but that does not matter at all. The principle is at stake. The state allowed you ^{to put out your sign} ~~let you paint a sign~~ as a painter would. The German professor did not sell books but he sold his lectures to the public, and it had an immediate influence on his salary. He was out of competition with the general, secondary or primary schoolteacher, because he could make his income far bigger than any official salary in Washington. My colleagues would earn 60,000 marks in the Law Faculty, which amounts to \$20,000 a year ^{this} here, and in Germany ^{made} them of equal rank with the ^{est} ~~great~~ manufacturers in the town.

And there was one other result. Not only that they were able to build up a fortune, but also to build up a library. The idea of the scholar in Germany is very much connected with the ideal that every scholar owns a library. There is not much hospitality in the German ^{public} ~~libraries~~; the Berlin Library is

But

still hell for anybody who has to work there. /the faculty did not care because they had their libraries at home. This of course is very largely responsible for the capacity of the professors to shift the field of/on their own account. They had not to deal with anybody else when they suddenly/build up a new field. Most of them did so. The shift from philosophy to the natural sciences at the beginning of the ~~nineteenth~~ century, - this shift from philosophy to mineralogy or physiology, was done by all these people who had, f.i., studied with Schelling, on their own account. And they had not to wait for gifts or endowments because their own salary enabled them to do something about it. ~~In this sense I think it is quite important that they went with the most prominent class of liberals in the university.~~ *One quarter of his income, a full professor could spend on his own apparatus and books.* A large part of their research is due to the fact that they ran their own workshops; because as soon as you get regimentation everything is fixed. The new professor in Germany, when he got his chair, could do something different from his predecessor, because there was nobody to whom he was accountable. *all this was expected from a full professor. He would change to new problems, develop new sciences.* ~~size for it, but as you know, two righteous men are enough to save the city.~~ Lastly, the privat docent: this funny creature was admitted to teaching without any responsibility to the faculty for what he taught. He was not integrated to the faculty. At 23 I was in the Faculty of Law at *Leipzig*. Nobody cared what I announced. I proposed a system of my own. When I was 23 I had one student—no, more than one, but this one whom I had in mind was a privat docent in 1920. I began in 1912. He had in seven years run the course and already wrote against me. He wrote on the same subject, the problem of penalty by confining in prison in the Italian States of the *Quattrocento*, the questions whether prisons at that time meant what we call reformatories today. The important fact remains that a man born in 1892 was able to go against the doctrines of a man who had not been a man when he taught them but was only four years his elder when he taught them. Now I already ~~taught~~ *contradicted* people 20 years

older than I was and corrected their research work, took a different slant, had quite a different basis of approach. And ^{so} the shift in emphasis which makes progress in science was accelerated beyond ^{it's natural} descending ~~and~~ from father to son or grandson. ^{the result was} It implies that through this institution there ^{and often stifled} was an acceleration of thought instead of waiting for the natural growth of ideas through the family. There ^{was} ^{special} an invitation to the individual to make a career by taking the next step in a way that ^{was} understood by the craft and that ^{was} new ^{too}. (You must proclaim your new theory in a way which after some time still is recognized as sound scholarship; yet you are stimulated to say something that is different, and to speak of different steps because both things are important, - what can be forgotten ^{as of old} and what should be emphasized ^{newly}). There are too few things today which are forgotten. ^{It is a misstatement, all is left to nature which equals inertia.} ^{existing} as the

I think there is no other ^{as of old} (institution as good / privat docent for this ^{newly} ~~the~~ process of acceleration. We have to find something, and Mr. Dick's problem has been to find something which would represent something similar to acceleration of the process of inviting the teacher to shift emphasis and not only to go in for the things which his ^{own teachers} ~~pupil~~ will appreciate. And he could do this, this privat docent, because he was invited to teach without being paid. When ^{after 1940} economic conditions forced the government to subsidize the privat docent the thing was doomed; because once you made him a paid agent he lost a little of his spirit and felt himself to be a part of the organization and then his ^{helpless} groaning and ^{is secrecy} ~~moaning~~ ^{which is so scandalous in college life} against the upper crust began. The funny thing was ~~that he~~ was a monk, had vows of poverty and could only marry the daughter of his professor; but was invited to sing a new song. And in this figure of the privat docent, comic as it was, you had embodied the courage of the free ^{and convincing} scholar. ^{that is} It is perfectly possible that a truth has to be represented ^{official} against our regular ^{official} privat docent lectures. The ^{was} ^{set} ~~was~~ against all the courses. Sometimes it would happen that this man had no students. But the fact that he ^{could} ~~had to~~ build up his lectures ^{hardly}

that he ^{as a heretic by establishment)} meant / had to think in a ~~very~~ different way. You cannot get this by a doctor's thesis or a monograph even when you can weigh them by the pound. The monograph is nearly always the result / of an ^{of your teacher)} established ~~opinion~~ ^{opinion}. (But a lecture may imply more originality because it is your vision of the university, of the whole faculty, of the whole field, ~~which is both more responsible and more comprehensive~~ ^{a lecture is both more responsible and more comprehensive} I think that is more important, perhaps, than too many learned studies by which you get the applause of people who had no time to ^{write} ~~read~~ the footnotes of their books and ask their students to do it for them. The German Privatdozent ~~has~~ ^{has} come to an end for state reasons, for political reasons. There is no free ranging of the German-speaking populace. The university has been walled up by the State. Germany does not represent to the outside world any influence in the way of a university. ^{any longer} And one is not at all surprised that the Nazis had to execute its death warrant. They had to knock down the walls, the energies inside had been exhausted many years before. But they had worked ^{successfully} for some centuries, which is not so bad.

The German University had been in the lead of the German nation for exactly five hundred years. Every new idea, reform, law, change had been heralded and advocated from the chair before it was incarnated in any legal or institutional rules and forms. The eloquence, the courage, the energy of Germany was concentrated here. And this mental life had a clear direction towards reform, towards humanity, towards a truth for all men.

DISCUSSION

DR. CABOT: What all of us are most interested in in this particular lecture is how much of what you describe as a historical fact ought to go on. For instance, competition: you may not think it was altogether a good form of competition, but should competition something like as intense as you have described go on?

R-H: I think ~~largely~~^{all} that we ~~were~~ not at all free to choose our means. It is no good to be in favor of it, but can we establish it? I am very doubtful about it. Somewhere in the process we must have competition, but we may be obliged to have group competition. The machinery has grown so large that I am not going to tackle it. The abstract competition of the university I am keeping in mind. When as individuals we have given it up in schools for many reasons. In my day we were scaled...

RCC: I was talking of competition between professors.

R-H: I think the situation is that the schools have taken the first steps and the universities are behind, and nothing can work on the first and second floors which you have not thought through. We must think of the scholars in the universities.first.

MISS TAYLOR: I think there is inevitable competition, simply because one person observes another person; but in our school there is no instigated, individual competition.

R-H: Exactly--no organized competition.

? Yet my 8-year-old daughter had her seat shifted every week, only two years ago. There was great tribulation over it, but it still goes on.

R-H: But competition as it has existed can last in certain places at least a long time, but the problem of which we think, official competition, is not the organizing spirit.

? Children biologically and naturally provide a good deal of it.

R-H: Yes, but in Germany it was more than natural. Don't you think we should be satisfied when it works out naturally?

RCC: I don't think it is nearly so much different here as you suggest among professors. I have seen it in medicine, ~~Many~~ professors such as you spoke of, who were earning their fees their students more than from the university.

? I think it is unfortunately directed rather towards promotion than towards achievement.

RCC: What I want to know is if you think it is desirable. Recently it is not particularly encouraged, but it might be if it is desirable.

R-H: You must not mistake competition for ambition. Genuine competition means that you have the means in your power to make a success. Now two men depending on promotion are not in the same sense competing as lecturers being able to direct students. I think it is sounder to let them work out their own system. But ~~since~~ economically speaking there is no expectation that any university administrator would ever allow any professor to earn any fee...

RCC: I remember one summer teaching in medicine when I earned \$5,000. for my fees and \$500. for my salary.

R-H: Once I earned with one lecture 3000 marks, which was quite incredible for me.

? Would you consider it competition where the students rate the professors, as they do in some of the colleges, Antioch for instances?

R-H: I think anybody who does not know the good nature of the college student is horrified by the idea, but it does not matter because they over-rate all the professors. In all this business of conscious expression of appreciation I have never seen anybody rate the man who has influenced him most in the corresponding terms. When you ask a man how he rates a professor-- it is quite ~~different~~ different--whether he is willing to go and sit and study

with this man, that is important. He may not like him, but he will think he has to go there. I think a student is unable to rate a professor, and a professor is unable to rate a student. I can educate a student, but the marking system I feel perfectly incapable of. The conscious expression of your real reaction is something quite different from your real reaction. I can vouch for a student and still be very doubtful whether he is B+ or B- . That is one of the problems of the academic community. Where is the more integrated part of the relation? Isn't it only in the fact that he takes a course, ⁷ and ⁹ is not all the babbling of both sides about their criticism of each other neutralized ⁴ by the fact that they are thrown together in the classroom?

In Germany University
 ? But I understood that you thought ~~this process~~ had broken down *by 1900* and all the Nazis did was to bury the corpse.

R-H: I should say so. In Germany the State university was the jewel of the country because it brought one principality in contact with the whole nation. The moment you have one state covering the whole nation, the thing which was a blessing becomes a curse. ~~There was~~ ^{by} before, there was no social class or section of the country—every poor and rich boy entered the state university. That was a great blessing because it was one public school. Now it is a prison, because you can enter but you cannot get out. There is no other place to turn. I have just had a tragic letter from a friend, a professor of history in Goettingen. He wrote, "I am here at the conference of the historians in Zurich. It is my first visit abroad since 1933. I have saved up the expectation of writing you this one letter—that you were right. I have fought tooth and nail your teaching and doctrines, which I have now to accept as true, and I am not able yet to build up a new life. On the surface I am leading the life of a professor. I cannot move. I am living like a mask and my wife is the same. We are a distinguished professor's house in Goettingen, but we know that it is all bunk."

He is the son of one of the leading theologians of the 19th century. Having missed the hour of jumping off the band-wagon he feels that he leads only a fictitious existence.

MRS. MORGAN: What would have been the next reform that the universities would have taken the first step in, if there had not been a breakdown?

R-H: What we tried to do, the social sciences and the economic relations. We have done something to bring the students face to face with real experience and with every class of the people. Individually there have been many, but I think already centralization had gone so far that the thing could not do. The next step was the social field, but the only success has been the economic one, which in a way has anticipated the solution which you are carrying out now.

Pres. Cynant Going back to competition again, would it be at all correct to say that you could at least trace it back to the competition between the princes themselves? The fashion was set among those who were running the universities. There it really goes back to the question of competition among those who were controlling the universities. Therefore you would hardly expect that in a democratically controlled university the same thing would appear.

R-H: I think so. If you can see an achievement and not try to imitate.

Pres. Conant Isn't there a possibility of the same fruitful competition springing from the fact that our institutions are providing *different sorts of education?* The very fact that German centralization destroyed the German university could not apply here because ours are private institutions.

R-H: Yes, and probably it is true to say that all the energy that existed in this field springs from this fact. But when a man emigrated from one principality he had to begin a new life in a new country. Here the environment is not different enough; there is no complete break when you go from one university to another. The man had to leave when his slant did not go with the place. Now wherever you find such an instance here—and there are such—you

immediately get a more integrated life. But I think it is here more incidental and casual, because the environment all over the world is ^{now} so incredibly universal.

MR. CONANT: It probably means that in no other conditions you ever had anything like it. The medieval was different again, and there has been no counterpart of the German spirit. How about the Dutch universities?

R-H: Their greatest success was theology, and they managed in that little country to keep up the fire between the denominations to such an extent that they got *warmth* from it.

MR. CONANT: Perhaps the fact that they failed to keep up with the universities of the 19th century was due to the They were very powerful in the theological sense in the 17th century, perhaps for the reason that they were not separated by these different principalities. At least it could be argued.

R-H: There was a large influx from Holland. The scholars went to those places and enhanced this deficiency. The Dutch university was a refuge.

Prof. Conant You said a university had to act as guardian or custodian of certain truths in spite of opposition, and yet you said that the success of the privat docent is the willingness of the student to come and study with him. Is there really no inconsistency there?

R-H: As you know, younger people move quicker than older people. You can have the applause of students and not of the faculty. The authorities would not influence the students. The free movement of the student was from one university to another. He would have three universities, not one, and he would follow the name of a teacher very often. As so many Americans went to Germany to take one year with someone. They had this influx of people who did not belong to the community, as you would think. ^{*The professors*} ~~They~~ Had nothing to fear or to lose whether they pleased the authorities in conducting this course or not. There

is not an integrated student body which depends on the university. Every student was actually free to take courses or to leave them. I do not wish to idealize the thing at all. Wherever you get the student as the bread-and-butter student they react the same way.

PSC: Would you say that the same thing holds for the Scotch universities?

R-H: I always thought the Scotch had real universities and the English not.

? There must be at least one English university at the present time, because -- -- and ----- are teaching at ----- and if you attend the course of one you must ^{not} attend the tea that is given by the other, and vice versa.

[Dr. Salvemini?] ? In a university like that of Berlin when ----- was full professor, was it possible for the privat docent to teach his students that the whole ----- was wrong?

R-H: Of course. It was done in the next room. I certainly have done so with great pleasure. You know the story, when there were three professors of law who hated each other: one man came into the room with a book and threw it against the wall, and said, 'Gentlemen, you of course think it is the book of my colleague Smith; you are mistaken; the book was written by my colleague Brown.'

? Perhaps there might have been some fundamental thoughts on which discussion was not allowed? For instance, ^{Could} a man who was publicly acknowledged as a Socialist ~~might~~ have become a professor of modern history?..

R-H: This is the story. I think the full professor ^{was} ~~has~~ not been touched. If he permitted himself to differ with a political ^{party} before he was established he got into trouble. But I think the group which enjoys ^{ed} more liberty than this in Germany ^{was} ~~has been~~ the privat docent. I do not say there has not been administrative interference. Still ^{was given} ~~the~~ famous course in 1931 ^{by} a physicist who, ~~because~~ was an inscribed member of an outlawed party... But it had nothing to do with teaching, and I think that is the great point. There have been a great many persons in German universities teaching radical doctrines.

? Was it not argued in that case that if he had been a lawyer and not a physicist then he ~~would have~~ been out of bounds? But of course if he had been teaching in the legal faculty there would have been no case for him at all.

R-H: It seems to me that the radical ideas in the law have been introduced in the law faculties. But they should put their radical ideas into their books and their teaching. ~~and~~ if they were seen in any public movements ^{there might be trouble}.

? I understood they could not become a professor if they were not conformist, and if they were established they could not be removed.

R-H: My colleagues were men of 28 to 30. How can you know a man of 30? He can go on to anything. There was a way out for them. They got a chance again of public teaching, so that they could do what they had done before.

? There is a way out here too. They go into advertising.

R-H: Now as to our plan: If you look at this outline--I am trying to deal with ^{the} American university so far as I have been able to see something of it. ^{I shall send you} Woodrow Wilson's message: I really think that perhaps ^{he} ~~it~~ would have ^{done} ~~been~~ better to remain President of Princeton, because he had something of spiritual intention and drive. There was a very strange paper written before he left Princeton, one page long. He first said it in Pittsburgh. You feel that this man is on the way of being defeated in his university and therefore becomes governor and president.

I have found that the most important things have been started just before the Great War; between 1905 and 1913 or 1917 there have been already the beginning of things which have been completely forgotten. We are going to send you a paper ^{Woodrow Wilson's} which I think is the most beautiful and universal which I have seen. I wish only to explain that I know enough about the American scene. In the problems of Woodrow Wilson and the pre-war problems to which most of us have been exposed, we find exactly the problems of today--problems of organization--and the things appear in their true quality and not just as problems of quantity. Today every-

thing is difficult because of quantity. On the other hand Woodrow Wilson was up against the great heresy of the century, the decline of the sciences; and I think before we can come to any common resolution we should try to make the difference which I propose to make in the second lecture.

I insist that parents and scientists are more important than students and administrators, and we cannot serve the students rightly if we have not made sure that the teacher can live and can find his satisfaction. The idea of always dealing with the student leads nowhere because What do they most want for the student? Why they must sacrifice him to the learning community? And what the teacher can give? Between these the student has to go back and forth.

I will end with something which I meant to say before. We ~~have~~ ^{to become} our own parents when we expose ourselves to foreign ideals. We have done in the last forty years something tremendous, that a father sends his daughter to be under the influence of professors--which is much harder than to send his son. But to sacrifice your relation with your daughter, to allow her to be influenced by the teachings of other men about life, is tremendous. That is real emancipation, and everyone of us now acts as his own father. Parents are out. The child is no longer the father of the man. But I had to withdraw from teaching three times in order to restore my human existence, to find myself in the same situation as when a parent sends out one olive branch into the scholastic world. ~~Therefore~~ ^{found in all of us:} these four people are ~~united in each:~~ students, parents, administrators, and professors. And we have to act against our own scholarship in the manner that we must take ourselves back, ^{from being scientific merely. Let us} become shaped and educated, and become a father, a child, a scholar, an administrator all in one. This would be the real edu. I have not carried this far. I think it will come out later.

Today the whole discussion about education is terrible because you take for granted one is either an educator or a person to be educated. But we

are all at every moment exposed ourselves to this terrible business, and
sometimes we have to throw up the whole business and go out and hunt the ele-
phant again to restore the normal ^{man} which later decides to go back into study.

PRIVILEGE AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Lecture II -- Summary

Referring once more to the German universities, Professor Rosenstock-Huessy said that the Privatdocent was a means to combat the laziness and conservatism inherent in universities where money was invested in professors' salaries or in researches which tend to continue the ideas of the older men without making any fresh starts from new points of view and in response to the needs of the time.

I.

Woodrow Wilson saw this need, tried to meet it in Princeton, failed, and then forsook college life for politics, hoping to kindle there what he could not set going in the college. After his departure Princeton has tried through the Institute of Higher Learning to meet the needs of the moment through pure physical science. It is a wholly international and perhaps belated attempt to save the world by a movement of the human spirit which is valuable but not the food which the universities need most at present.

St. John's College is trying to reform university education on the Summa of St. Thomas Aquinas. But to rely on such a textbook is to give up the hope of a university which is a movement to fit the needs of each generation as it appears.

At Dartmouth President Tucker focussed energy on the third of the great problems of the human spirit--society. God and nature are the other two. Social responsibility and co-operation is Dartmouth's contribution, and it is in line with the needs of the present and the future.

God, nature, and society are the three great human problems. The middle ages and St. Thomas dealt with God; and the 19th century dealt with nature. The present day university must deal with man and his sufferings. Not the glory of God nor the light of reason on nature, but the cries of men are the basis of the future college.

II.

There are four stages in the life of truth: (1) Idea. (2) Science. (3) Education. (4) Knowledge. Knowledge is not the business of the university. Knowledge is not life-giving. It is a residuum, a sediment which is left after one has dealt vigorously with experience. It is the privilege of the old, not the aspiration of the youth. We are most alive when we are between ignorance and knowledge, when wisdom is underway and we have to act in spite of ignorance.

Mere instruction, mere knowledge, can be given as facts and used at once. We learn to read, write and cipher. In the natural sciences we have reached beyond instruction to education. The laboratory enters the school and pupils are stimulated by the touch of experience. In the social sciences we cannot give an education. We have no truth, only a great

idea, a vision, and a stimulating fear that saving knowledge of human nature may come too late to meet the crisis of our time.

Natural science at its best attains the power to predict the future because it will repeat the well known past, as all nature does. Man has the power to change his life, to create something new and to reform the chaos in which we live. Such a hope is an idea, which is a driving power greater than we, a creative energy. Such an idea is our present belief in popular education, the aspiration to scientific Enlightenment of the 18th century, the scholastic ideal of systematic theology in the 13th. A science makes it possible for men to work together all over the world on a single problem. That is the function of a working hypothesis. It unites workers. But an idea is a guiding star, a fertile hope. It is something you cannot master. In the university the main goal is ideas, not mental discipline or instruction. Science is co-operative and productive, as Henry Ford produces cars. Ideas are creative.

Education comes in between science and knowledge. The child watches and imitates what his teacher does before him. What the teacher has done the child sees that he too can do. But he does nothing new, though we often imagine so.

Idea, science, education, knowledge. The idea is a lion. Science is the lion hunt. Education is cooking and dividing the lion. Knowledge is eating him.

In answer to the question, "Is not man included within the realm of nature?" the lecturer emphasized men's freedom to doubt, to change himself and to reform his world. Man is like the rest of the world in much of his structure and habits. But he is unlike it because he can create, invent, discover and so perhaps progress. In the non-human world science finds cyclical laws at work. If it tells men that they are machines, and a part of this changeless cosmos, they rebel and destroy themselves in fascism or communism. Education is a great word today because we hope to change man as the non-human world cannot be changed. We hope for civilization. Nature is not open to civilization.

I. Address at the inauguration of E. F. Nichols as President
of Dartmouth College, October 14, 1909.

(Not in his Public Papers; published by
E. M. Hopkins, Hanover, 1909.)

.... I have been thinking, as I sat here tonight, how little, except in coloring and superficial lines, a body of men like this differs from a body of undergraduates. You have only to look at a body of men like this long enough to see the mask of years fall off and the spirit of the younger days show forth, and the spirit which lies behind the mask is not an intellectual spirit: it is an emotional spirit.

It seems to me that the great power of the world - namely, its emotional power - is better expressed in a college gathering than in any other gathering. We speak of this as an age in which mind is monarch, but I take it for granted that, if that is true, mind is one of those modern monarchs who reign but do not govern. As a matter of fact, the world is governed in every generation by a great House of Commons made up of the passions; and we can only be careful to see to it that the handsome passions are in the majority.

A college body represents a passion, a very handsome passion, to which we should seek to give greater and greater force as the generations go by - a passion not so much individual as social, a passion for the things which live, for the things which enlighten, for the things which bind men together in selfish companies. The love of men for their college is a very ennobling love, because it is a love which expresses itself in so organic a way and which delights to give as a token of its affection for its alma mater some one of those eternal, intangible gifts which are expressed only in the spirits of men.

It has been said that the college is "under fire." I prefer, inasmuch as most of the so-called criticism has come from the college men themselves, to say that the college is on fire; that it has ceased to be satisfied with itself, that its slumbering fires have sprung into play, and that it is now trying to see by the light of that flame what its real path is. For we criticise the college for the best of all reasons, - because we love it and are not indifferent to its fortunes. We criticise it as those who would make it as nearly what we conceive it ought to be as is possible in the circumstances.

The criticism which has been leveled at our colleges by college men, by men from the inside, does not mean that the college of the present is inferior to the college of the past. No observant man can fail to see that college life is more wholesome in almost every respect in our day than it was in the days gone by. The lives of the undergraduates are cleaner, they are fuller of innocent interests, they are more shot through with the real permanent impulses of life than they once were. We are not saying that the college has degenerated in respect of its character.

What we mean I can illustrate in this way. It seems to me that we have been very much mistaken in thinking that the thing upon which our criticism should centre is the athletic enthusiasm of our college undergraduates, and of our graduates, as they come back to the college contests. It is a very interesting fact to me that the game of football, for example, has ceased to be a pleasure to those who play it. Almost any frank member of a college football team will tell you that in one sense it

and one of the things that constitutes the best evidence of what we could make of the college is the spirit in which men go into the football game, because their comrades expect them to go in and because they must advance the banner of their college at the cost of infinite sacrifice. Why does the average man play football? Because he is big, strong and active, and his comrades expect it of him. They expect him to make that use of his physical powers; they expect him to represent them in an arena of considerable dignity and of very great strategic significance.

But when we turn to the field of scholarship, all that we say to the man is, "Make the most of yourself," and the contrast makes scholarship mean as compared with football. The football is for the sake of the college and the scholarship is for the sake of the individual. When shall we get the conception that a college is a brotherhood in which every man is expected to do for the sake of the college the thing which alone can make the college a distinguished and abiding force in the history of men? When shall we bring it about that men shall be ashamed to look their fellows in the face if it is known that they have great faculties and do not use them for the glory of their alma mater, when it is known that they avoid those nights of self denial which are necessary for intellectual mastery, deny themselves pleasures, deny themselves leisure, deny themselves every natural indulgence in order that in future years it may be said that that place served the country by increasing its power and enlightenment?

But at present what do we do to accomplish that? We very complacently separate the men who have that passion from the men who have it not, - I don't mean in the class room, but I mean in the life of the college itself.

I was confessing to President Schurman tonight that, as I looked back to my experience in the class rooms of many eminent masters I remembered very little that I had brought away from them. The contacts of knowledge are not vital; the contacts of information are barren. If I tell you too many things that you don't know, I merely make myself hateful to you. If I am constantly in the attitude towards you of instructing you, you may regard me as a very well informed and superior person, but you have no affection for me whatever; whereas if I have the privilege of coming into your life, if I live with you and can touch you with something of the scorn that I feel for a man who does not use his faculties at their best, and can be touched by you with some keen, inspiring touch of the energy that lies in you and that I have not learned to imitate, then fire calls to fire and real life begins, the life that generates, the life that generates power, the life that generates those lasting fires of friendship which in too many college connections are lost altogether, for many college comradeships are based upon taste and not upon community of intellectual interests.

The only lasting stuff for friendship is community of conviction; the only lasting basis is that moral basis to which President Lowell has referred, in which all true intellectual has its rootage and sustenance, and those are the rootages of character, not the rootages of knowledge. Knowledge is merely, in its uses, the evidence of character, it does not produce character. Some of the most learned of men have been among the meanest of men, and some of the noblest of men have been illiterate, but have nevertheless shown their nobility by using such powers as they had for high purposes.

We never shall succeed in creating this organic passion, this great use of the mind, which is fundamental, until we have made real communities of our colleges and have utterly destroyed the practice of a merely formal contact, however intimate, between the teacher and the pupil. Until we live together in a common community and expose each other to the

yet themselves; but you can create the direction of learning by associating undergraduates with men who are learned.

How much do you know of the character of the average college professor whom you have heard lecture? Of some professors, if you had known more you would have believed more of what they said. One of the driest lecturers on American history I ever heard in my life was also a man more learned than any other man I ever knew in American history, and out of the class room, in conversation, one of the juiciest, most delightful, most informing, most stimulating men I ever had the pleasure of associating with. The man in the class room was useless, out of the class room he fertilized every mind that he touched. And most of us are really found out in the informal contacts of life. If you want to know what I know about a subject, don't set me up to make a speech about it, because I have the floor and you cannot interrupt me, and I can leave out the things I want to leave out and bring in the things I want to bring in. If you really want to know what I know, sit down and ask me questions, interrupt me, contradict me, and see how I hold my ground. Probably on some subjects you will not do it; but if you want to find me out, that is the only way. If that method were followed, the undergraduate might make many a consoling discovery of how ignorant his professor was, as well as many a stimulating discovery of how well informed he was.

The thing that it seems to me absolutely necessary we should address ourselves to now is this -- forget absolutely all our troubles about what we ought to teach and ask ourselves how we ought to live in college communities, in order that the fire and infection may spread; for the only conducting media of life are the social media, and if you want to make a conducting medium you have got to compound your elements in the college, - not only ally them, not put them in mere diplomatic relations with each other, not have a formal visiting system among them, but unite them, merge them. The teacher must live with the pupil and the pupil with the teacher, and then there will begin to be a renaissance, a new American college, and not until then. You may have the most eminent teachers and may have the best pedagogical methods, and find that, after all, your methods have been barren and your teachings futile, unless these unions of life have been accomplished.

I think that one of the saddest things that has ever happened to us is that we have studied pedagogical methods. It is as if we had deliberately gone about to make ourselves pedants. There is something offensive in the word "pedagogy." A certain distaste has always gone along with the word "pedagogue." A man who is an eminent teacher feels insulted if he is called a pedagogue; and yet we make a science of being a pedagogue, and in proportion as we make it a science we separate ourselves from the vital processes of life.

I suppose a great many dull men must try to teach, and if dull men have to teach, they have to teach by method that dull men can follow. But they never teach anybody anything. It is merely that the university, in order to have a large corps, must go through the motions; but the real vital processes are in spots, in such circumstances, and only in spots, and you must hope that the spots will spread. You must hope that there will enter in or go out from these little nuclei the real juices of life.

What we mean, then, by criticising the American college is not to discredit what we are doing or have done, but to cry ourselves awake with regard to the proper processes.

II.

ADDRESS TO PITTSBURGH ALUMNI

Public Papers, vol. II, 202 f.

How does the nation judge Princeton? The institution is intended for the service of the country, and it is by the requirements of the country that it will be measured. I trust I may be thought among the last to blame the churches, yet I feel it my duty to say that they -- at least the Protestant churches -- are serving the classes and not the masses of the people. They have more regard for the pew rents than for men's souls. They are depressing the level of Christian endeavor.

It is the same with the universities. We look for the support of the wealthy and neglect our opportunities to serve the people. It is for this reason the State University is held in popular approval while the privately supported institution to which we belong is coming to suffer a corresponding loss of esteem.

While attending a recent Lincoln celebration I asked myself if Lincoln would have been as serviceable to the people of this country had he been a college man, and I was obliged to say to myself that he would not. The process to which the college man is subjected does not render him serviceable to the country as a whole. It is for this reason that I have dedicated every power in me to a democratic regeneration.

The American college must become saturated in the same sympathies as the common people. The colleges of this country must be reconstructed from the top to the bottom. The American people will tolerate nothing that savours of exclusiveness. Their political parties are going to pieces. They are busy with their moral regeneration and they want leaders who can help them accomplish it. Only those leaders who seem able to promise something of a moral advance are able to secure a following. The people are tired of pretense, and I ask you, as Princeton men, to heed what is going on.

* * * * *

If she loses her self-possession, America will stagger like France through fields of blood before she again finds peace and prosperity under the leadership of men who know her needs.

PRIVILEGE AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Lecture 2. The American University.

October 14, 1938.

Woodrow Wilson's legacy to American universities, Princeton, Chicago, Dartmouth. The modern confusion between ideas, sciences, education, and knowledge, exemplified by A. E. Housman's "Introductory Lecture." The proper relations between the birth, growth, spread, and death of thought. Economy of the mind.

I should like to see the statistics drawn up of the number of American scholars who have gone to Europe to study and come under the spell of the German university during the last century. I think it is quite amazing to find how many have taken the subject matter of their lifetime interest from this. You remember that Professor ^(Bress) Perry ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~his~~ ^{his} ~~Tale~~. It is quite amazing to study the ^{American} ~~mutual~~ dependency. There was this vast apparatus producing that funny creature the German professor, and the spark of human interest carried from Leipzig or Goettingen to this country. ~~for all~~

May I draw attention to another thing, - the general inertia of people all over the country. They always try to praise the past. You have to make a special effort to have a university accelerate, not because acceleration is in itself so much, but to make up for the deficiency of human laziness. The ~~revolution~~ ^{revolution} of the privatdozent comes up in the effort to find out how we can find something to accelerate the process. With an instructor coming under the spell of his freshman course here, being assigned to certain things, this instructor will not have any impetus to make a start with new things; he will carry on. In physics today, with this big machine which we are trying to build to shoot the atoms, the great worry of one of the men who is doing this work is that he will run the risk of killing the imagination of all the staff for years to come, because the work must be done in shifts and they will be so close to the machine that there will not be time to work independently at all. It is the same in the great medical machines. You may have admirable results in carrying

on certain designs for thirty, forty, fifty years; but when a man chooses his staff he chooses men for their ability to co-operate with his plan; and the associate professor again chooses an assistant for his special field.

So you have a thinning out, and in the third generation you get a man who is narrowed down to a footnote. ^{he is an assistant's assistant, in mental character.} This is inevitable as soon as you invest money ^{in institutions instead of paying the man} and power. Invested capital always means conservatism. The English before the war were conservative because they had invested, ~~invested~~ for thirty years in steam, and so when ^{electricity came} the war broke ~~out~~ they were behind; ~~was behind now,~~ after the war, they have the most modern equipment.

What I want to say is that a privatdozent is a very inexpensive form of accelerating the process, because he was put in a stormy sea all by himself. There was no invested capital except his own career, which was serious, because he could sink and often did sink. But today most people think we are living in the best of worlds when we have a tremendous amount of capital invested in research. We do not think about the change in ideas which asks for a new group of people starting again, as poor and simple as the poor generation who got the endowments and who of course made their reputations without the endowments, and that was the reason why they got them. Heinrich Hertz made his invention ^{of the Radio waves in} a little shed, and when he was offered a great gift he said, "You fools, I am a dead volcano now; I have done my work without your gift."

So I will leave the German university now forever. The future before us, if there is a future, is in America. I think I have to draw attention to two remarks of the last evening. One was Professor Salvemini's question about politics and the university, and his idea that only a conformist would get a chair in a university. I had to answer that that was not true, but I have to say one thing more. The public life of Europe ~~ran~~ through the different schools of thought in the university; we have ^d Cartesians, Paracelsians and the Hegelians. They were real parties as had been Catholics and Protestants.

political
When the new parties crept into Germany, where they never really were at home, then of course the old system ceased to function. Here in America the thing

is just the opposite, and here I come to my friend Woodrow Wilson. The movement and excitement of the colleges / the stagnation in public life. *Germany's*

life - philosophy seemed to dwell in the colleges. *Germany* *in America, colleges* They were behind the scenes,

where the backwater *what?* bearing on public life. *Once* for a moment the academic people

in my part of the country tried to establish a state of New Connecticut, and for ten years they called--I don't know for what reason--they called Hanover

Dresden. This state of New Connecticut contained part of New Hampshire and Vermont. Then Ethan Allen for instance in Vermont scolded them *colleges people* for daring to

interfere in politics and set his foot down; and I think that has been the

How inverse ratio compared with Germany. story for the 19th century. Now the one college president who became Presi-

dent of the United States felt very deeply about this. His papers seem to

me to bear out the idea that he tried to change the relations between the

excitement outside in the world of the common man and the quiet calm, the

ivory tower and harking back of the colleges. It was this feeling which

drove him out of Princeton, where he could not start the crusade of the

spirit which he had within him, and he tried to mobilize these energies

at a time in politics within the educational system of America, when everybody said the party system

was on the decline. So he tried to catch it and lead it over into the edu-

cational system and into scholarship. Then he failed. Things were not right

for him. The colleges did not answer to his challenge, and he then said,

sent you: *se int you:* says in these ~~same~~ addresses, "Since the colleges have not worked I am going

out into the world, ~~so to speak~~. So like a real knight he took up arms,

which were not perhaps the most familiar arms to him, and began the process

outside the colleges. With the breakdown of *Wilson's political* his idea that he could save the

world and make it safe for his ideas, the whole thing comes back to us.

Can a college today be a great haven for the nation? Can a universal

spirit, can a crusading spirit get a foothold at least in the mental, the educational, the scholastic life of this new world? Woodrow Wilson's life-history then contained a foreboding of the problem.

Princeton has ^{tried to} ~~solved~~ the problem ^{put squarely by Wilson} by adding to its college the Institute of Higher Learning, which practically is something like the Faculty of Natural Sciences in Goettingen; ^{it} ~~which~~ ^{of} ~~invited~~ scholars from the natural sciences. You have in Princeton a line/least resistance, ^{of the spirit of natural science} a spirit which has carried the world forward, ^{Princeton has not} ~~has discovered that~~ the light of nature is ~~put~~ in the candlestick, in the hope that the great experts teaching there will be able to carry this on. I think it had to be done. I think it is a very natural growth. It relies on achievements which have been produced by this strange constellation in Europe, and ^{it is adequate to themselves} ~~they are equal~~. ^{They come in the spirit at Princeton} They come in the spirit of natural scientific research. The question is not asked ^{whether the uni-} ~~whether the uni-~~versity, the college, the nation, can live on this food, because it ^{is} ~~is~~ something already very specialized, this Institute of Higher Learning. It has no relation to Princeton; it could be anywhere; it was transplanted here because nowhere else at this moment could these people find shelter. It is really, then an international institution, but its international basis comes at a time and a period in which we can no longer be sure that it will respond to the need of this moment. The scientists are already in an apologetic mood; they protest that they did not invent poison gas. ^{Princeton is like Tuscany. It plays great music; but the music was composed some time ago.} ~~College,~~ President Hutchins/ Chicago and St. John's and some surrounding and depending institutions are rallying under the war-cry of a new scholasticism. They tried to replace a meaningless ~~and~~, too noisy and too disintegrating system by the sounder system of Thomas Aquinas. We have seen ten years ago the revival of Thomism. It has been coming very slowly for the last thirty to forty years. It is now the vogue. And I think we should be grateful, at a moment when the domination of the natural sciences cannot be received without

misgivings, that a responsible administration strives to collect some remains of the past. May I say a little about Chicago and this scholastic experiment? I wish to show you first my respect for this very sincere beginning on the part of Mortimer Adler in the real emergency in which men like President Hutchins find themselves. But on the other side, why I cannot acknowledge their attempt to be sound. He thinks about his college, and he asks himself, Are these four years wasted? Should they be given up? Should two years be given to professional studies and two be added to the high school? All this is not the development of ^{absolute} truth or the growth of the spirit. ^{from mankind?} This is concerned with practical questions. The students are the aim of his practical considerations; and so he looks for a textbook. He does not look at the parents and he does not look at the scientists. You know last time we said that parents and scientists should be our first patients, and that students and administrators would have to accept what would develop if we could get clear what a scientist ^{discovered} ~~stood for~~ and what the parents believed.

Mr. Hutchins had to make a short cut. He could not expect that any of the professors already appointed would read Thomas Aquinas, so he omits the group who carry on the research work and tries to give something to the students which is not cynical, which is positive. So he has a textbook; but by drawing on an old text he has given up the very idea of a university, which is movement. For example, this text is concerned with God, one of the greatest questions of human history. ^{But did} ~~Why should~~ it take 500 years to have a revival of Thomas Aquinas? That is a question of which theology cannot know anything. It is not a theological

question but a human question, to know when is the time to do something in life.

^{A new science of Renaissances must be a jumping into Scho-}
About Dartmouth I wish to say a word because I think it might interest

you. We had a splendid President, President Tucker, who at the bicentennial of John Wesley College in Middletown, Connecticut, made a rather startling speech. He said, teachers have one occupation: they have to

criticism. Or it
is merely a
fad.

"vivify the commonplace. When you look deeply into the matter this really contains the wisdom of the ages, because each age has to look at the truth-- at all truth--as if truth had never been known before. This same man in his wonderful simplicity looked round and said, here is Princeton which has developed this trend to the natural sciences; he looked at Harvard and said, here we have scholarship and investigation; and here is Dartmouth within the Big Four. What can we do? We cannot hope in our remote corner to develop *great* scholarship in the *accepted* ~~old~~ sense; we cannot have the equipment for the natural sciences; nor, having been run on non-denominational lines, can we take *to a dogma*,

to Thomas Aquinas. But we have the tradition of doing something for the Indians, we have the Christianizing spirit, we have the memory of Daniel Webster. We must keep these social traditions, this social inheritance. We must try to make everybody in Dartmouth realize that he is not studying for his own sake, that he is studying as a member of the community, that he is one of 29 or 30 introduced into something which they have in common.

I spoke with a Harvard student last evening. He told me that Dartmouth men were all one brand, much more ^{so} than Harvard men; and that is true. Dartmouth has developed a kind of college stamp and character, for better or worse. It has made something of its peculiar situation.

We then get a theological textbook in Chicago; we get the natural sciences in Princeton, and in a very modest but distinct way interest in social behavior and cooperation in Dartmouth. We have here the three great topics of the human mind: God, nature, and society. *They* ^{are} the three great ~~things~~ ^{x, y, z} on which universities have based their existence, the three darknesses to be revealed, the three problems to be discussed, the three ideas to be transferred into scientific treatment. *let a man become hungry for x or y or z, and he is a student of our university.*

As you see in the Chicago solution, they took up ^a ~~some~~ classic because they knew it was not the time today to write a new Summa. Nobody would accept

it. There is no authority to make a new book on theology as important as this old text of Thomas Aquinas. Princeton has the very cream of the physicists and mathematicians, and here they have an educational tradition some centuries old. Dartmouth is unscientific. They have no *social authority*. Marx or Pareto could not do it, Adam Smith could not. There is a community without much science but with a distinct endeavor to be neither scientific nor scholastic and still have the right to be called, to be in some way or other, academic. This gives a hint to our situation today; the attempt to get ~~out of~~ *away from* over-specialization and departmentalization which has come about during the past few years and split the university into *pleasant humanistic* on one side, and graduate schools, ^{and on the other} teaching how to preach and how to cure disease ~~on the other~~; that is to say, specialization on one side and very general topics on the other without much connection between the two. The man who feels it and suffers from it, ^{Hutchins does} as in Chicago, who had to do something to keep his college together at all and let it stand up against all the studies of the graduate school—this man must go back to have something immediate, something which has reached the stage of application. But a man like Tucker, who knew that the time for religious education was passing and who loved his boys too much to give them over to the laboratory, took ~~up~~ social responsibility *upon himself*.

I venture tonight the suggestion that in these three topics, divinity, nature, and society, we have in short the three great topics which have made possible the medieval, the modern, and the future universities. We are on the borderline between the modern and the future. That is to say, the natural sciences have done all they could do to create a new university during the last century. They are frustrated today. They are producing *and multiplicity* multitude ^{we} but not integration. Wherever today ^{we} find something new it is not simplifying, it is adding to the knowledge of our time. If you wish that I should specify or bring together these three aspects of investigation, it is to say that the

great achievement of the Middle Ages has been to cover all the projections and qualities of the Creator. The Middle Ages deal with the Creator, the natural sciences with the Creation, and we are dealing with the process of creating, the problem of society. How can the man in society go on creating in a machine age, how can he be creative? How can society itself keep up the spirit of creation? So, ^{the personal God} Creator, creature or the creation of things, nature, *qual'ies*, and creating as a process, are the three simple topics. Now, when I made up my mind to say that tonight, I read Chesterton's St. Thomas.

Thomas. He said, "These people in the Middle Ages had wonderful names; they would call themselves John of the Cross... If I could give a name to my beloved hero St. Thomas I would call him St. Thomas of the Creator." So I have good authority on my side when I make the distinction that whenever we turn to the problem of the Creator we can draw with great profit on the scholastic writers. They really knew when they were talking of the way God reveals Himself to the universe. ~~He~~ ^{There} is not a God whom you cannot discover but one who ~~has~~ and is disclosing His depths, not a letter x but a God who entitles man to establish science and knowledge and education around His majesty.

But when you wish to know Nature you will not go to any of the scholastic writers. You cannot read St. Thomas on Succubus ^{and Incubus} without being seriously disgusted. On any matter of nature you have to turn to people like Audubon, The Birds of North America, for example. Hence the second phase of the university was dealing with creatures, not with the Creator. But isn't it funny that when you treat man ^{i.e. yourself} as a created thing, as an automat/whom you can treat as raw material, something very terrible happens. He suddenly becomes excluded from heaven. There is one simple statement which we can make about the method which divides the natural sciences and each discovery of the creative ^{catalogues} spirit of man: ^{It is explosive.} we speak of "the word of God" in theology, and wherever we speak of the Divinity we have to base it on words: scriptures, prophets, songs,

prayers,-- they are words. Now when we treat of creatures we have something, not the word, but the light of reason. That is something about which the creatures have no say. We look on them in the light of our reason--or, the famous word in the 16th century was ^{"the"} "the light of nature."

But when we deal with man, or when we think now of establishing the university on a modern basis which will carry into the future, which will draw interest, which will pour out new fecund ideas, we must be rather radical and turn to the simple utterances by which man makes himself felt; and that is by man's cries. These are not like the word of God; they are disagreeable; they are not harmonious; they are not beautiful; and mostly they are not wise. But no psychologist, no preacher, can do well today if he does not know the struggles and cries of human nature, the perfectly hopeless utterances. Why do we speak of self-expression? Because the sighing and moaning of the creature makes itself felt. Not the perfect and wise, not the outer ~~extension~~ ^{extension} and features of things, but the cries and moanings and sighs of human beings are, I believe, the first basis of our studies of the future.

I have thrown out this suggestion to make clear why Chicago cannot be the solution. In this very genuine endeavor to save the best tradition of the middle ages, ^{to save} in this moment, at least, some of the wisdom of the past, we might go too far. We might presume that the Summa, written in the ^{13th century} can solve the problems of ~~tomorrow~~. It cannot. St. Thomas was the Thomas of the Creator; he was not Thomas of the creativity of man. And we must not try to impose on the new generations something which was not meant to serve their need. Because it is not the glory of the Creator but the ^{of man} unglory, the ignominy ^{of} the birth throes ^{becoming} of ~~being~~ which we have to solve; ^{prophandise} ~~because these~~ ^{now will} people begin to devour each other. It is hard to be fair to science and ^{theology} I have tried to revivify the commonplace of what they taught. There is enormous wisdom within the ^{if fabric} fabric. But just because I love them I know that I cannot base a textbook study today

on these old writers. Perhaps in the society of the future they may become familiar ~~but~~ as persons,— not for their doctrines but as saints, as important men in the history of their race. But this would mean that I hear also their behind their perfect facade. I see what they were driven off. cries, I do not care for the book but I care for the man. Because our whole problem today is man, man, man, ~~once~~ and again—not nature and not God.

In my little syllabus I have tried to prepare or to explain the situation by mentioning that we are laboring today under a terrible confusion. So long as we think of universities as a place for knowledge, what I say is nonsense. Because ~~men have thought~~ about nature and God simultaneously, and I ~~am trying to say that looked~~ at by and large / St. Thomas was occupied only with God, whereas science was left to the alchemist, the astrologer, the molners, etc., who knew the midwives, etc. very much about medicine but were left to themselves. Then I want to say that natural sciences became legitimate sciences only after 1500, and today we are struggling to replace the wisdom of ^{educating} parents, ^{mature making} aunts and grandmothers, by the wisdom of colleges about people. about Society. story telling

Now let me take up my remark of last time about daughters going to universities. Dr. Cabot told me that when I said this it ~~that~~ was a moment in which everybody was opposing me, and nobody thought I was very serious in thinking that to send a daughter to a university is more dangerous than to send a boy. I think that this changing point, this turn from nature to humanity, from things to men, from investigations by microscope and stethoscope, to listening to the cries of our environment in a new manner, for instance by psychoanalysis,— is a serious ^{epoch} time, — to listen to what goes on inside a man. However this may be, formerly in the medical university the main thing is that ~~the~~ the student who went to the university sacrificed his future completely. He was a monk; he would have no children and he was left to his ambitions to become pope or cardinal. Or ~~the~~ ^{the student became} later, the lawyer who was taught to stand up against his feudal lord because of his studies, and to know what it was all about and not follow every whim of the mighty. Then he became ~~have~~ the doctor, who was getting rid of the traditions of the kitchen and the

barn, and trying to establish universal values in a superstitious environment. Again, only very slowly ^{was reached in academic studies} you reach the average man, the man who did the usual thing. Finally, ^{however} ~~the~~ got business schools, cooking academies, and I don't know what is not taught today in an academic way. Now when you reach into the family and snatch the last human being and put her into a university, it is obvious that all human beings are now sitting in the colleges all together; then it becomes the familiar situation which you have. The whole nation certainly is receiving its inspiration in the public schools. But when suddenly the daughter of the house ^{is} ^{from} snatched from her parents and ^{unheard-off} religious, moral and social authority, and thrown on the mercy of her professors, something has to happen. Social science is a new principle of listening to the human problem. You see it everywhere happen. This whole incubus is due to the fact that for the first time the whole population is brought into the institution. Because the self-abdication of parents has gone so far that they really think these daughters can get more for their future in college than at home.

I got a very nice story from a lady, who said, "All the subtleties are gone out of life." She said she had been driving with her ^{pretty} mother and her very pretty sister and a cop stopped them for some traffic reason. The ^{mother} put her hand on the arm of the man who opened the door, and this flattery of putting her ^{pretty} hand on the man ^{seductively but flattered} appeased him completely and he said, "Go on!" And the mother ^{experience} turned round and said to her daughters, "Now you put this into your pocket."

~~Now~~ ⁴ It seems that the subtleties of life no longer pass from the mothers into the pockets of their daughters. That is why in colleges and universities we

have to take this to heart, - the subtleties of human society. - all the things that once ^{common}

everybody knew because there was knowledge but no science, no research, no investigation about them. ^{Science always comes in then common sense}

^{no longer can be relied upon.} I hope now that I have answered your objections of last time, that after all daughters are not a greater risk. In this country they do not seem

to be. But in fact they are the last group who have entered the scene of college teaching, and that makes them tremendously important. Also it makes a difference whether a daughter has an illegitimate child, as she probably should have, in the sense that she should know what life is, what passion is, and that petting is wrong. The whole situation today in which the economy of the emotions is made the solution of all social problems, is certainly most dangerous for women, more so than for men, who have always been more experimental in their lives, who seem to be ^{the} sailor type who go through experiences and seem not to be ruined. ² ["] ~~If~~ ^{if} a daughter can, should, must experiment - that is a new social problem of the first order.

Now comes my greatest protest tonight. All this will not convince you if you do not see that divinity and natural science today have reached the degrading stage of mere knowledge; and as soon as any great problem is treated as though it was just facts, it loses its spur on the community; it does not lead them ^{any longer} into common work. Knowledge is individualization, is dividing people, not uniting them. I see in the ^{Boston Street pretty} ~~fars~~ signs asking "Do you know?" and I learn that New York was once the capital of the United States. Very well. I know it. I shall go in all the buses in Boston and learn what they say.

This is knowledge. This is the stage of bread and butter. This is consumption ^{consumer,} ~~by the~~ Also it is to be stowed away and nobody can steal it from me. I am the last / ^{my food,} and I have / and it is private property now. I can take an examination, I can become postmaster. All right. It serves my interest. ^{But} / it is all within me. That is why this knowledge has no uniting quality and has what I call "consumptional quality." There is nothing to be said against it. Everything must reach this stage. But when you think of humanity as being ever able to live on knowledge you mistake the whole process of ^{life. thought as a living power.} ~~life.~~ ^{to science,}

Knowledge is the last stage through which the spirit passes. From idea ^{to} to education to knowledge it goes. When people think that knowledge is the aim ^{of} our mental life they seem like the Christians who overrate the importance of life's

the last hour. You know these Christians, who think the last gasp is the only important one. Like Philip of Spain who said to his father, Confessor as he died: 'I have done everything; now you alone are responsible for my entering heaven.'

It is a famous study of Spanish thought, which has always roused the ~~people~~ ^{people} of ~~good~~ ^{these} Catholics. ^{As a secular parallel today, we are asked to pile up knowledge.} We have reached a stage today where people will tell you that in your old age ^{in your deathbed,} you cannot enjoy the other pleasures of life, but the mind ^{still}

will be working; or, you have given up the pleasures of the body but the pleasures of the mind are still there. Now I deny that you can tempt a boy by telling him that at sixty or seventy he will like to know. This concentration on one, ^{and}

^{especially the last} moment of life seems to me horrible. Every moment has a right to be lived whole and properly, and not only the last hour. I know so many people who have lost their souls in middle life. What the ^{wrong} Christians have done with death we have done by concentrating on knowledge, because knowledge is in this sense not life-giving, because it has thrown out the idea of ~~process~~ ^{process}. Man is only alive when he is between ignorance and knowledge. These are the stages which keep us alive. A scientist is not a man who knows. By definition he is a man who knows that he does not know, a man who knows that he cannot cure cancer, a body of lawyers who know that they cannot really solve the relations of labor and capital. They are between ignorance and knowledge; their wisdom is under way. They are developing something, and they have to act in one moment. The group of physicians who know that they do not know, still have to do something. It is not enough to throw up their hands and say 'We are ignorant.' But they have at the same time to do ^{though} all that the code of their profession asks them to do, ^{and} it may be all wrong. ^{TP} This is certainly true in educational method. A scientifically trained man is a man who does something on his own responsibility today, without ^{the fact} ignoring that he is ignorant. The ^{fruitful} drive to get knowledge is that you ^{have} become aware of your superstitions. The ^{not} important man in society is ^{the} the man who knows all the data in the Encyclopaedia

Britannica. The important man is the man who writes the articles in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, knowing how little he knows. The writer of the articles I prefer to the reader. Why? Because he is a real human being. He is thinking. He is going on, and by being aware of his ignorance he is going on in a more important way. Because every day this man who writes on the Renaissance, for example, is ready to discard his knowledge. His knowledge is growing like a tree ^{planted on the banks of the river}. But the man who thinks he knows because he has read the Encyclopaedia Britannica is not interested, because he thinks he knows forever. It is the same as the incomplete enjoyment of the audience at a concert, merely as compared with of the man who hears music / the man who plays the music.

If we look at divinity, at natural science, and at social sciences, we ^(give the disfigure) ~~can find~~ ^{each of them is} are at the stage of knowledge. They think they know everything; there is a Summa; you cannot go beyond that. ~~That is why~~ ^{Further more} Every boy is given religious instruction, because instruction can be given on facts. They ^{churches} expose everybody to the reading of books. There is this free liberty about it because it has, ^{Every individual is encouraged to have his full play} to a great extent, run its course. In the natural sciences we have reached the stage of education. The laboratory enters the schools. We try to give everybody a share by educating him. When you have ^{brought the} entered sciences within the school it only means that ^{pupils} they get in touch with it and are exposed to the formative principles, - Ideas, science, education, and knowledge. Theology seems to be so complete that you can give a boy a history of it. In science you can give a boy an education. In the social sciences it is obvious that we have nothing of the kind. We have no truth, but we have, ^{perhaps} a great idea, a vision. We have fear, which is very useful. We are afraid that we may not ^{society} come to know human / It is this fear which works up our hopes into this ^{of fear} ~~possibility~~ ^{dans idea} that there might be a universal knowledge about humanity. You remember the sundial with the inscription, "It is later than you think." I have the feeling about humanity today that it is later than you think. That is a

life-giving idea and may start us on a track into something which may claim to be a science. So long as you speak of "the social sciences" you may be sure it is not a science. Where you have a plural you have no science. Plurals, repetition, cyclical things all belong to nature. Anybody who believes in them is dealing with natural science. He ^{still} treats man as a natural being. Great curves and repetitive things are always stated when we apply to man the method of nature. You must not be disturbed that theories about cycles etc. always come into our ken when we give up humanity ^{, ambiguity} and place humanity with the natural order. Rotation, cycles, mean that we are treating man as just a part of blind nature. The life-giving idea of a new groundwork for centuries to come persists in spite of scientific prediction of inevitable results. Again, this ^{new idea behind the special work} is overlooked today as much as we over-emphasize the side of knowledge ^{is science}, not seeing that as soon as a thing can be printed as a "Do you know?" it becomes utterly unimportant as an educational proposition. Science ^{educational knowledge} and ideas ^{they are fine phases of thought} are utterly different. An idea is superior to us. It is dominating us either by fear or love. An idea is a driving force which is overpowering us. When parents send their children to college they are overpowered by the idea of education. The idea must be a guiding star, much bigger than anything you can do about it ^{yourself}. The idea creates a new life, and so we should add to the word idea always the word creative. It is a gift to humanity when a man has a new idea which he creates out of nothing, out of darkness, out of night; out of a nightmare you can start an idea.

The confusion in the ^{dark} ages had reached its peak when each school taught something different about theology. In Paris they had the bright idea of thrashing it out and attaining an integrated knowledge. The idea of a systematic theology was something perfectly new in the middle ages. The old Christians had declined ^{The word and principle of 'theology'} it as something forbidden. St. Paul could never have called himself a theologian. ^{In 1100, it saved Aristotelianism from disintegration.} Again with the light of nature, a guiding idea ^{and astronomy} was established, starting with anatomy, leading from the anatomy of the body to the anatomy of melancholy,

also leading from the telescope for he slides to the microscope for the cells.

and finally to the anatomy of Revolution; ✓ The idea that you could reach nature by dissection. by going down to the smallest unit, impressed itself on the mind of people long before it had any results. For a long time an idea overpowers you and you go as in a maze and it is not true that you can put it in a scientific way. The sciences come when you can work with an idea. When people set out to work in co-operation, when a man in South Africa, a man in California, and a man in Scandinavia begin to work for the same goal, you have a science, you have a working hypothesis. Out of this idea the rays have reached many men and ^{they} have begun to work on a common adventure. This is today overlooked. People think ^{that} working hypotheses are things by which problems are worked out. The ~~real~~ ^{about a working hypothesis} thing is that you begin to work in a certain spirit, and everybody begins to work in a certain spirit. Science is something which can ~~put~~ ^{to} people work. It is a ~~process~~ ^{co} of operation. Whereas an idea is under the open sky, a star leading you on to endow a university, to build a laboratory, long before anybody works there. An idea is something you cannot master. A science is something where people can be guided to co-operate. That is why sciences are educational, - because they are the greatest lessons of co-operation we have. Every co-operation starts in the brain and only later comes into other organs of the human body or the human society. And the union round an idea brings to pass this phenomenon, that fifty men begin to correspond and to be interested in the same problem. And all the problems are absurd, ^{at first} (The problems of the 12th and 16th century are absurd today and probably ours will seem so centuries from now. Because we ask the most direct questions and later, perhaps, learn that we have to make many detours.

Allow me to make a distinction which has been lost in the industrial age; this is the difference between creation and production. Henry Ford is a producer of cars, but he did not invent the engine. He went into

mass production. He did not invent the machine which he is producing. Most machines today, for practical use, are not distinguished in their inventive from their productive stage. It is a long way from creation to production. The production of science is when people begin to work and accelerate the process, to operate with it, handle things with it. *The creative process precedes Science.*

~~Of course~~ The middle stage of education is to be discriminated from knowledge and from science on either side. Education is something quite different from knowledge, because it makes an ignorant person see how another person comes to know something. A child, a student, ^{by himself} is unable to see how another man thinks, a man who is on his way to get results. In every good school there is a mind in operation who knows how to go on from ignorance to knowledge; ~~and~~ he introduces this process in the presence of his students and they get the idea and attack the subject under his guidance. It is exactly like mountain climbing, where the guide goes first with his rope and pulls the others up. And because he has done it before, they can do it. I do not think that any child does anything else but follow what the teacher does himself.

We have reached the ~~material~~ stage in which we think that the teacher makes the pupil do something which he does not do, ^{himself} but it is not true. The word education means drawing somebody after you, starting somebody in your image.

And that is why there is this deep abyss between education and knowledge.

Knowledge ^{communicates} ~~has reached~~ the stage where "two and two make four" is acceptable to everybody, - "Mathematics for the million." " ^{it is information} This is knowledge, Education

is much more modest. It consists of the simple fact that a man can tell his experience to someone else. For education, when it reaches out to bring science into the ken of the student, is started by one ~~educated~~ ^{educated} person who ~~gets~~ ^{simply} in touch with the sciences by the one princess to whom ^{Descartes}

wrote his letter, by the one Heloise to whom Abelard wrote. Every ~~education~~ ^{education} is an apostolic succession. There must be one person who is taught, ~~and then~~ ^{what} you do yourself. And because you and your pupil are me, because you must communicate to him what

you are doing because what you are doing is important and must not die with your own death, you try to explain and you can explain. The classroom is a necessary evil, but we must not forget

person. that a teacher is already a teacher when he is able to teach one. If he is

not able to teach one he is not a teacher, although he may be a head waiter

in a restaurant giving ^{me of information} soup to everyone. Knowledge is not education; it is

what you may call instruction. Because the ^{sequence of knowledge} ~~man~~ is not interested in raising

^{to} in his pupils the situation of a living person, making ~~them~~ participate in his own

work in human society. ~~The educator communicates, he popularizes, he sells.~~

In a lion-hunt you have to science and finally to ideas

You may compare the whole story from knowledge to education: The idea

is a lion; the science is a lion-hunt, which happens only long after he has

^{seen} been at large; cooking the lion and dividing him is education, and eating

the dead lion is knowledge. It is impossible to eat the same lion always, but

that is what people think today. They really believe that you can have an

education in which every generation gets the same old knowledge. But we are in

a much more complex and richer and more impressive process; we have these

three great subjects. God, the world and man--Creator, creation, and our

own creativity, that is ^{our being} ~~human beings~~. We have the Word, we have the light, and ^{kindly}

we have this moaning and sighing of ^{us as creative} ~~creatures~~. We have the amazing faculty

of analysis, and we have this healing capacity of developing sighs and moan-

ing into articulate expression which I would call the ^{synthesis} ~~synthesis~~ of man. These

three things are round us all the time, and it is clear that the West has gone

through the three phases ^{in part} and cannot jump out of this ^{course of events} ~~condition~~ except by

going barbaric. This you can do at any time but costs a high price. ^{It is desertion.}

^{This Judas Iscariot who always waits lies in wait.} If we wish to start with a new chapter in the life of the university

we cannot do it by carrying over certain finished items out of the middle

ages ^{or} out of modern times. ^{life giving idea of a university, after the} ~~This idea that they should be placed~~

^{destruction of the German} will never come true, while we console ourselves that it is enough to have

one certain basis ⁱⁿ ~~of~~ scholasticism and one certain basis in nature sciences,

and even less ^{now we think we can have it} ~~on the sciences only~~. If you get through this natural process

The light of a new discovery must shine before us, must

give us direction. Or, we shall cease to undergo the life-giving process from idea to science to education to knowledge.
~~in which we are one that won't rub off that shall be made the~~

basis of investigation. The tension between ignorance and knowledge is the

thing which we think valuable, which makes us alive, which integrates us.

If life ends with natural science, we shall have dictatorship here, too.
 People who only know are the communists and fascists. In Moscow they know

everything. I heard a story of a young man who spoke to a communist of
 in Russia,

German descent who lived / and said, "What a tragedy! Three children

were killed in that *street-car* (accident)" and the communist turned and said, "Never mind.

In the perfect Communist society that would not happen." That is to say, *The Communist*
to be shaken

knew he was no longer able to experience, (to love. Knowledge has a disheart-

ening and a hardening effect on the human soul. You cease to be afraid, you

cease to be willing to co-operate and to be in the fear of the Lord, to be

overpowered by a thing bigger than you; you become asocial. Then you omit

the driving push of all humanity into a new science of man *under an inspiring idea*
 you give up the

hope of any social co-operation, of any business, of any future. In this

sense I wanted to say that Woodrow Wilson's crusade and the university are

intimately linked with the idea; Can we have an *new* idea and an education center-
 ing about man?

DISCUSSION

RCC: We want to know more what you mean by "moaning and crying."

R-H: That there is something very valuable that is the beginning of wisdom, /the simple fact of disharmony in all human voices, in a free-for-all fight. This idea of the free-for-all fight ^{of perpetual confusion} ~~which~~ ^{ruined} makes all the words meaningless: you hear so many voices and so many sounds you get tired, and so what / hear is sound, but the meaning of these words is nothing important; only the push ^{and sigh} ~~which is expressed in~~ ^{behind} these words seems to be important. When you see the workers and employers mobilized today you feel that it is a question of vigor much more than of meaning. Still I think that to a certain extent you would admit that any group which does shout forth its own suffering is driven to this by suffering. It is the expression of something real, and you can only meet a person when he is willing to confess ^{This suffering} / You can only meet a man on the basis of what he has not, because there he is willing to change. That is why the rich man cannot enter the kingdom of heaven, because there is no opening where he can be won over. Look at Ulysses by Joyce. It is a very important book because he crushes language, smashes it to pieces, takes a word of St. Thomas or a hymn or a poem, takes them apart, shows that they are just sound, memory, fragments. People have attacked him for it, but I think he has shown ^{man} ~~himself~~ ^{crushed} under the burden of this petrifying wisdom of the ages, so that he is / ^{now only} a bundle of nerves repeating these things to make himself important or because he has to pass an examination, or for something utterly away from the capacity of expressing his own meaning by it. His ^{Niagara of} words only means that he is nervous, unhappy, running amok. By so doing he destroys civilization because he is not simply shouting but he abuses the most sacred traditions. You get the stage of the cynic, who knows everything and writes "1066 and All That." That is the stage before ^{Joyce} In Joyce ^{himself}, you get the man who breaks down because of his inability to say anything of his own coloring, a man breaking down under the burden of an education he

could not digest. You could have called this book a waste-basket.

? Or a basket of rubbish.

R-H: Whatever you may say against it, it is symptomatic of our time, the inability of the common men today to stand up and express what he really means, under the guidance of so many contradictory teachings. I think this is the cause of Joyce's linguistic difficulties. You may dislike the book but the man whom he describes I know exists. You find him in every physician's waiting-room; you may be shocked by it; *reality is shocking.*

? I should like to ask, apropos of your remarks on the civic and political influence for so long of the German universities and the absence of it here, it seems to me there is some significance in the "brain trust" men and in the using them as government has afterwards.

R-H: I don't think it is a solution. *The brain-trust* ~~it is~~ a short cut in an emergency which I admit may easily be valuable. It is not a solution because of this *time-* difference between idea, science, education, and knowledge. *The brain trust does not* full faith in the mental process. *It is not everybody* ~~The mental process is not diffused.~~ *enough* *which is required* The President gets hold of his Brain Trust but with the exclusion of the rest of the nation who have no time to participate. That is all right in an emergency but does not do what the German university tried to do, - that is to live by *its teaching* faith along, not to know when the hour would come but to expose the country to ideas with the implication that when the time came to do something they would.

? Is it something like calling in a surgeon to do something, rather than having a healthy body to begin with? On the other hand, it is an attempt to bridge the gap between the ivory tower and the world of need.

R-H: The gap is not so great when you look around and see the state universities. You will find that they have done a wonderful job at Madison, Wisconsin, but not enough to establish a living ~~community~~ *community* forever. What I have tried to say is that there must be something bigger than any special *local* community as a driving *spiritual* force in order to get what

we should call a university. I think it is admirable what has been done there, but I am told it has run its course. You know the difficulties at Madison, that they are all feeling at this moment. They have done what they could to teach the ~~farm~~^{city}, and they have come to this same crisis that Harvard and the others have. You see the indignation of the common man against the Brain Trust. Roosevelt would never have been called a dictator without it. A king is just a king; that is not so bad; but a president who surrounds himself with all the brains of the country—where is the rest?

DR. RULON: How is it that you say that we should keep human beings out of the realm of nature? Why aren't we included, so that the study of nature includes these human cries?

R-H: The scholastics thought they could not do anything better for man's nature than to treat him as a child of God. The 15th century previous to Luther was filled with attempts to analyze theological knowledge; only it did not work because some of the practical worries of these people had nothing to do with their souls. Now the same is true of nature and man. It is very nice to give everybody a bathtub and make everybody aware of his body. Only the real problem is that the man doesn't know just how much to spend on his bathtub; and you get a moral problem—how much must you keep up with the Joneses? by sociologists
My students are told that marriage should always be entered into by similar results.
people, because otherwise it makes non-eugenic / You may imagine that I am horrified. It is simply that (You must marry your sister or your first cousin, which has been, of course, done in other civilizations for the simple question of keeping the peace at all costs. It is applying the principle of least resistance, which is a principle of nature. The simple truth about any human individual is that you get nothing done when you do not tell the person that ^{his task} / is the most difficult thing in the world. If you tell him it is easy he won't do it at all. When you treat a man like a natural being you will be let down by

him. When you appeal to him to overcome obstacles he will overcome them. Any human being is caught by the idea that he must tackle the most difficult thing, and ⁱⁿ any scientific proposition ~~proposition~~ what is interesting is not the thing you can do but the thing you can't do.

DR. RULON: I understood that you were making this distinction, that humanity should not be placed with the beasts. That was your statement rather than a statement of policy in handling human beings. I was wondering how we can be sure that there is a fundamental distinction between human beings and the other beasts.

R-H: The only proof is the possibility of the human being to be in suspense between ignorance and knowledge. Man can live through a period of doubt, through a period of freedom in which he has a choice. He can admit that he doesn't know. When you attend these lectures you are not acting like a beast.

DR. RULON: I have seen a collection of dogs and I would hesitate to say that they were not doing much the same thing. How do I know that any collection of dogs is not doing the same thing?

R-H: It is the risk of exposing you to a new idea which distinguishes the animal called man. On this exposure to the danger of being challenged on some habits a man can follow a new scent. An animal always follows an old scent. It has a flair for it, a better flair than man, but a man can ~~beat~~ a new track.

DR. RULON: So far as our imagination goes he can perhaps.

R-H: May I ask what your interest in this question is, because in practice...

DR. RULON: Of course I know the difference in structure; but it disturbs me to have this creation and creativity set off from nature. Isn't the human being a part of nature?

R-H: Of course we are, very much a piece of nature and creatures. What I meant was this evident capacity of the human being to be created and to create. By being created we share fifty percent with the animals. Creativity does not decide how far we are being made and how far we are making. It is this situation of assistance, the fact that there can be any talk about our being in the know, being on the side of the process of creation, anticipating it, helping it on, which makes man standing between the two opposites, between the way of being made and of making. I admit that many people never reach the stage of mental health in which they expose themselves to the voluntary use of ideas. In this sense you are quite right when you state that we have learned that men can live 100 percent as beasts. But this is not satisfactory, because the natural science which has discovered this law has done something which no beast can do. I have to admit that the scientist himself was the man who explained this beast to the world. So he was on the side of God.

DR. RULON: The thing I had in mind was that this natural scientist would probably have to continue to listen to the cries and systematize the data.

R-H: Do you know what the ~~Medievalists~~ ^{crushed} did when they did not want to be ^{something worse} collapsed by the scientists? They burned the witches. And ~~that is what we~~ ^{begin to} are going to do when you go on with your natural sciences: You torture the ^{Mojoists, the women, the prophets, the wise...} children, ^{It is carrying them away to a field where they should never set} ~~It is carrying them away to a field where they should never set~~ foot. ^{scientists} ~~Alfred Cane~~ a great author and Nobel prize winner is at this moment trying to study telepathy in a laboratory. ^{This is insanity to study creative processes in a laboratory made for mechanic processes}

DR. RULON: It disturbs me, this distinction between science and these observations in the home. Isn't it simply that the scientist has got burned ~~by going~~ by these homely observations and taken the safer course?

R-H: I am very glad that we have reached this stage of real fight

between our views. By adding to the achievements of natural science we can do very much good. There is no reason why this should stop, only I fear the encroachment of science on the fields which are essentially human, where there should be social wisdom. We must put up some safeguards now. Because every natural science reduces what we see with our senses to some lawful process. You see the sun turning round the earth, and you say, that is all wrong. You reduce it to the simple fact that the earth is turning round the sun. You have reduced the truth to reality. You have only omitted one fact, - the fact of illusion. And since scientists are doing this all the time, the myth-makers go, and man cannot live on this regimen of fact, man must have feelings. If for ten years a child has considered a man an ogre some harm will be done. You know Mr. Murdstone in Dickens. The fact that he appeared as a tormentor is not explained away by the fact that any psychologist can explain Mr. Murdstone, that he was not so bad, that he merely had a one-sided point of view. He remains Mr. Murdstone. Why do the Germans *surrender to myth?* They have ^{had} too much science and so they break out into this realm of myth-making. They have made a real cut between scientific fact and myth. The man, the human being, says, I cannot live on sawdust. I am not interested in the fact that the earth is turning round the sun but I, as a living being, am impressed by the sunset. You add up all sunsets and you get your myth. They only have forgotten that these instinctive impressions, these illusions, can be purified into poetry, can be articulated. They are perfectly satisfied with shouting. But you must not be astonished with the response of the mass to the gospel of the natural sciences. To stress the fact that they are things and to explain them by curves and statistics is not interesting to them. As soon as they have been told by the scientists that they should consider themselves as part of nature they react. They save themselves on this raft which nobody can take from them, their right to yell. That is the one thing which we must face; it is a real fact before

us today. They do it when you try to base a university on the one-sided wing of the nature sciences. Abolishing chapel and not going on into a new realm of creativeness you get fascism and communism. When man is treated as a machine and is taught all the time that he is a part of nature, nature can be managed, you can make slaves out of it. / Why should you not do it with man?

Fascist political machinery is an imitation of the technical machinery of the era. Children are taught to consider themselves as part of nature, and they are not seeing that everybody treats them as ^{not}ent from it. / It is a perfectly natural thing.

PROF. SALVEMINI: Perhaps you might put it in somewhat different terms. The I do not know that I am in full agreement with you, but I think I am. / human mind always works in the same way, ~~either~~ in the field of nature or in the field of human relations. Of course mind is one, and the method of research must be the same in any field. Only while the natural scientist deals with physical phenomena, the man who deals with human behavior deals with human phenomena. Human phenomena are quite different from physical phenomena. They escape scientific treatment. First of all, they are more complicated. When in the field of natural phenomena they become more complicated they are more difficult to handle. Human phenomena cannot be measured, while physical phenomena can be measured. But I don't believe in statistics. Let us take the book of Sorokin. In that there are given marks to different revolutions.... Well it is childish. You cannot give 23-1/2 to the revolution of '88. So human phenomena are more complicated. Then they do not recur. And if they do not recur you cannot compare one with the other and you cannot experiment. What you do with physical facts you cannot do with human phenomena. I do not know whether a supergenius ever will arise who will be able to measure and experiment on them, but at the present state of our knowledge, though our minds must work always in the same way, because

logic is one, the material of human relations escapes. If you by the method of scientific science think you can give terms to human relations, you are mistaken. We are still at the stage of alchemy ^{about human beings.} / Therefore the physical scientist who brings into human affairs his dogmatic attitude, which is quite natural and legitimate in physical phenomena--though even there a certain amount of prudence would be advisable--but when they pass into the human world and say two and two are four; no, two and two are five, or three. So then comes in what you called ~~the~~ wisdom, not ~~the~~ knowledge. I do not know whether I am in agreement with you?

R-H: At this moment I think we are in perfect agreement. Only I in-scientists vited ~~you~~ to take a broader outlook, to start something which will have a wider range for centuries to come. If you do not encourage in the American people such a hope ^{If} you will drive them crazy. / in all these people you cannot raise a hope to establish a society of men, you will not carry the day against the forces which ^{now} try to establish themselves by means of technical domination. It is a very practical question. If we cannot get up the star which unites people in a common endeavor in the field of spiritual ~~endeavor~~ ^{peace} they will come to the short cut of the alchemist. I am convinced that it can be done, that this wisdom can do something with ^a ~~the~~ new method, applying the same logic to the real phenomena of human nature. It will be logical enough; it may be scientific enough too. But try to see clearly what the starting-point is. The starting-point, when you have a student before you, is that you try to help his ignorance. A teacher is a physician, and in his action he does something which goes far beyond a statement of the law. This individual you have never met before. He has the right of being an original being. You give yourself to him to educate him. The teacher is the one element which the scientist cannot explain. Why must the pupil ^{in one way} ~~be~~ treated as the object of our knowledge? Why must you let him in? Why must you treat him as much as a

subject as you are treating him as ^{an} object? It is again this ambiguous situation of any man who cries aloud. You know he is a Negro, you know he is twenty years old, and on the other hand, you talk to him as if you expected him to share what is inside you. The scientist can never explain what teaching is. And those are the problems of the future. That is why education is the magic word today. Every move in the class room is going beyond the fact that the student is a body, matter.

? When you carry out this idea in terms of policy and the setting up of policy and fields of knowledge, etc., you must draw this frontier. This is not an abstract question. There comes the place where you must say, you must draw the line. But where are we to draw it? Are we to stay in that alchemist period, in that state of the human mind and the nervous system that baffle us? It becomes a practical question in three dimensions.

R-H: Any man in society is a teacher of laws when he draws a line and says, these things are true. In the same moment he takes the full risk of being misunderstood. He shows himself in the process of trying to say something and being entirely misinterpreted. Any teacher has this dualistic position of being a teacher of the law and an erring soul. You must get the living person into the dogmatic process, who in his own person shows the struggle. There is no class-room situation in which you have not in every moment the two things, - what the man says, and that he says/ ^{it.} In standing up and risking his soul and his reputation he does something to the student. He inspires him, encourages him to become something like the teacher. This is overlooked today. ^{Teachers} / try to be skeptical. They try to teach the student what they know. But there is always ^{made on students a} double impression ~~by~~ the man and ~~by~~ his subject-matter, ^{besides} That is the salvation of the human race. Parents teach something to the child, and ~~on~~ ^{besides} the side of ~~that~~ they are something. ~~In this paper it comes three times.~~ Your problem of drawing the line

between nature and creativity

is exactly what is the real problem today. But the ^{present} confusion about knowledge has eliminated the dualism. We don't draw any line. We try to make the people think that everything is ~~on~~ this side of the line. That is not a drawing of the line. Yes, we do it in every moment, and ^{stand} on the other side suggesting that there is something bigger than what I can see, that you and I by having talked together will have discovered tomorrow something in common which will be bigger than anything I have said today.

PROF. SALVEMINI: Perhaps I might add that if we were not still in a world of alchemy but ^{wholly} in a world of chemistry we could ^{not} discuss what today we are/ discussing. There is only one single solution to even a problem of chemistry, so there would be no line to be drawn. It would be drawn naturally from the fact that the problem is solved. But since we are confronted with doubtful issues, because natural sciences do not work in problems of human behavior, how is the line to be drawn? It is a practical problem, but what do we mean when we say it is a practical problem? We take our attitude according to our moral individuality. Before we know which is the solution we say we have to do so- and-so; another takes another attitude, how to get votes, how to make money. These are the practical solutions according to our moral instruction. In this world of alchemy we take our attitude and the dividing line is drawn by our moral outlook. And that is why the crisis today arises, because we have no longer any common ^{moral} outlook. In the middle ages they had a common moral outlook.

R-H: Let me stop on a more encouraging note. They had a common outlook, but they had not a common world. So I am not so hopeless as you all seem to be. ~~We have a common world. Now, let us discover a common society.~~ Mr. Flexner made a speech two days ago about science and civilization. He says: science is good, science is wonderful, and ^(was there) ~~we are here~~ for science. Of course the use to be made of science will be the problem of civilization. The scientists do not belong to civilization. They are just scientists.

* *This* is nihilism. It is the common effect of American education.

PRIVILEGE AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Lecture III -- Summary

The Three Scientific Eras

A. Eternity. Limiting concept: mortification.

Phases of this science:

1. Soliloquy. Cur Deus homo? (Anselm)
2. Summa. (Aquinas)
3. Imitatio Christi.
4. My Religion. (Tolstoi)

B. Space. Limiting concept: vivisection.

1. Monograph.
2. Academic communication.
3. Popularization (H.G.Wells)
4. Encyclopaedia.

C. Time. Limiting concept: vivification.

*Madness Monomania.
group*

The sciences of society, the greatest need of our time, will rest on the nature of time, rather than on the properties of space. In the social sciences (such as history and education) man is under tension between loyalty to the past and the pull of the future. The parent as he decides to send his child to school or let him grow up without schooling decides between the wisdom of anticipation and planning on the basis of past experience (which says send him to school and hope for good) or let him alone and have faith that he will find what he needs.

Hope is based on the past. Faith trusts the child's future knowing that we do very little about it.

The Ten Commandments of Education (as emended since the lecture)

1. Harken (Listen)
2. Seek (Read)
3. Learn (Think)
4. Forget (Play)
5. Try (Doubt)
-
6. Choose (Protest)
7. Bear (Suffer)
8. Accept (Return)
9. Teach
10. Designate

The parents hear these commandments and should apply them to their children by establishing institutions (not only schools as we now have them) to carry the commandments out.

(1) Listen (or harken) and (2) read (or seek) are opposites. The second sets the child free to find his way or miss it.

Lecture III - Summary - Page 2

(3) Learn means memorize and also answer.

(4) Forget (play) means vacations and travel.

(5) Try (doubt) means splitting oneself into a questioner and an answerer, the dialogue of thought.

In the last five commands we are thinking of the grown man.

(6) Choose (Protest) means rebel, go your own way, be self-reliant.

(7) Bear (suffer) the reproach of contemporaries and the folly of the ignorant. It is a middle mood, between activity and passivity.

(8) Accept (return). Take your place when the time comes and people know what you can do.

(9) Teach. All parents must teach, adding their own experience to what they have learned from others.

(10) Designate. Choose your successor, one who is not your disciple or your imitator but can go beyond you.

* * * * *

Listening is done in the family, seeking in the schools and in the movies, memorizing has gone out of business though it still has value. The last five commandments have no institution to apply them.

PRIVILEGE AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Lecture 3. Ideas.

October 21, 1938.

The opportunities of parents. The ten commandments of education: Listen, read, think, play; doubt, protest, suffer; return, teach, designate. The institutional representation of these commandments in society.

1. I am very grateful for certain letters which some of you were good enough to send. They encourage me to go on. I must tell you frankly that after the last lecture I said, "It is too difficult," because talking to adults has this one special quality, that everyone who does something ~~himself~~ ^{at chance}, ^{3, 4, 5} We are afraid to change anything in our own realms when anybody talks about new things. For every man thinks it is insulting that anyone should tell him what involves change in his capacity or field, or he finds fault with something which could deliver him from the evil. Before we reach the level where we can co-operate it is painful. We have always been told that it is a joy to learn something new, but ~~it~~ ^{it is} ^{talk} is a little like music when we march to battle. When a speaker is very enthusiastic he will carry his audience by his own fervor. But the other side of this experience is what I have likened to going into battle, but people are too polite and do not admit that so far as their own living is concerned that are all the time fighting something off. As I said, of the music when we march to battle, the music is there to overcome the pain, and men march, sometimes to death, with a cheerfulness that they might not otherwise be able to show. But since I have challenged you about a new ground-work for the society of men, the classicists, the theologians, the natural scientists, may feel that after all we have lived a good many years, we have had some good poetry and some great ^{theology}, and isn't it all nonsense to say that anything really new can happen in the world of the mind?

I meant what I said about a new thought in the society of men. I am quite in earnest when I say it is a thought which must ^{us} carry on for a number of centuries. It is a real addition to the things we know. It is important for

all of us, for you as well as for me, to get the next and the second and the third generation to go on. *with his new science.*

I was helped very much by a quotation which Mr. McCarthy handed me last time about men and beasts. It is from Chesterton, who said it would be all right that people should say that man is a beast if they only would say that man is the only wild beast. Other beasts are very decent and respectable. Man is the only wild beast; he can be a profligate and he can be a priest. ~~So if you start at the East you arrive in the West.~~ In this sense man is the crown of nature if you lift up nature to the full sense of the cosmic knowledge. Man transcends nature by being a profligate which no animal can be, or by being a saint. But we must not get lost in words. It is not frightful to be called a beast if we enlarge the concept.

On the other side I made a mistake myself. I had announced that I would speak of a little paper of A. E. Housman, and since I omitted this the classicists were for some reason scared because I had omitted from education the values of reading the Greeks and Latins. Housman is an outstanding example of the values of classicism. ^{paper} ~~This~~ (is called An Introductory Lecture, and is the only one ever printed by the University of ~~London~~ because they were so proud of it. The title is a typical English understatement. It is much more than an Introductory Lecture; it is a debate on science and knowledge. In this paper he gives examples of classical education. He says, Oh, what a poet would Shakespeare have been if he had only have read Virgil. It is a rather ambiguous compliment to the classics. And he says, "I can imagine Virgil himself, in the year 1616 when he welcomed Shakespeare to the Elysian Fields, saying, "What would I have made of you if I had found you in life, you greatest of poets!"

This same man advances the thesis, which I tried to combat last time, that knowledge for its own sake in old age ^{is} ~~was~~ a comfort which one derives from

reading and studying. You remember that I said ^{to recommend knowing because of} the consumption of knowledge in old age is like postponing everything to the last hour of life, whereas life has to be lived in every hour as though it was the last hour. Mr. Housman, having said all this praising the classics, praising knowledge because it will ^{in later years called himself relecture} comfort old age, ~~in the same lecture calls it~~ insincere. It is here in the Preface. He did not like it after all. ^{We may say generally} That is what happens to books mostly.

~~But~~ The classicist ~~who~~ thinks that there is an island of beauty, an island of immediate value, and that he does not need to care why society should allow him to read the classics; ^{He does not understand his own role} ~~feels safer when he is omitted from a book~~. He misses one central fact; that what we call classics, poetry, the summary of the past, which we give to our children, are read for different reasons. ^{by different generations and the classicist should represent this change.} (The classics in the middle ages were read very carefully. There was never a contempt of the classics. They were the introduction to any knowledge of Christianity. Later, when the church was made by Luther a part of the world, they ^{poetry classics became} were the outstanding sources of knowledge. In the age I have called the age of natural science they were read because they were the finest achievement of the ^{nature} of this world; they were called secular. But you must not think they were then read for the first time. ^{now} They were read in the light of nature, because ^{they} had ^{been} produced ~~them~~ following in the wake of this world before they were admitted by the ~~creature~~ ^{as products} as powers of this world. ^{now} ~~Here~~ they were read as the greatest peaks of man's achievement. I think they will keep their place in our study ^{for a new reason} because they ~~are~~ ^{are} the finest explanations ^{articulations} of man's sighing and moaning. We are beginning to read Homer in a new way, because he is the first step from tribalism, a really new man, and because we look on ~~him~~ ^{him} as the first achievement of higher life, because we begin to understand how difficult it is to ^{end a war by its epics} become aware of such facts, to become conscious ^{of common experience} of society. My declaration was / a new science, starting with the articulate so that we may understand the ~~in~~ articulate, because I am a classicist myself. interested The people in natural science and in classicism, which we may call the two

arms of thought in the university / ^{during} the last 400 years, have lost interest ~~and faith~~
 in ~~a~~ ^{any radically} new start, in the very new start which I have tried to recommend or to
 prophesy. The greatest German scholar in the classics, *Wilamowitz*, was a
 monster in failing to understand the greatest prophet of the future, Nietzsche,
 the greatest prophet of the downfall of civilization. I am talking to one
 member of this group especially, to show him that the philologue, if he does
 not allow us to base his own activities on our present human needs,--
 and it is the same with the expert on Shakespeare,-- to base his teaching on a
 new groundwork and to get in touch with the moving thought of our days,
 will lose his public. ~~He~~ will not be able to find people to study Greek or
 English just for the pleasure of the study, of reading nice, pretty, beauti-
 ful literature. ~~It~~ ^{*the study of the classics*} must be based, it must be specialized, established,
 derived in every generation from a new feeling of society about it. *And the laws*
of his change are one chapter in the new science of humankind.

When you have an endowed chair you may think for a time that it will
 carry you through the centuries, but ~~when~~ ^{*before*} the endowment is gone you may find
 that the study is gone. A man will not endow a chair of Greek because it is
 an expression of worldly thought, or he may endow
 There are certain processes not involved in the process of change, which
 depend on society, a ^{permanent} ~~new~~ ^{base} ~~basement~~ on which this first, second and third story
 of dealing with your subject can be solidly based.

This science of society--and this perhaps has been my mistake--is deal-
 ing with one very simple new principle, the principle of time instead of space.
 It is possible to say in a simpler way, perhaps in a more radical one, that the
 topic, the problem of the future is not man but time, and that the problem of
 the last 400 years ^{*has been*} ~~is~~ ^{*Hilbert*} ~~space~~ ^{the} (Everything has been put in space, man too,
 as a part of nature. It was perhaps wrong to draw your attention to this
 division between Creator, creatures, and creativity. We may say also ^{*more aptly*} that the
 middle ages dealt with the Eternal, hence God ^{*was*} ~~is~~ in the middle. ^{*center*} Logic neglects
this

~~Time. The theologians tried hard to make us despise time. Overcoming the time limit. It is true always and forever; it is timeless. If you will look at this blackboard: (Outline on board:)~~

The Three Scientific Eras

A. Eternity. Limiting concept: mortification.

Phases of this science:

1. Soliloquy. Cur Deus homo? *(creation) life giving idea*
2. Summa. (Aquinas) *production 2. science.*
3. Imitatio Christi. *distribution 3. education*
4. My religion. (Tolstoy) *consumption 4. knowledge*

B. Space. Limiting concept: vivisection.

1. Monograph: Where do we find? *creation as science*
2. Academic communication. *production as science*
3. Popularization. *(collaboration) distribution as education*
4. Encyclopaedia. H.S. Wells. *consumption as knowledge*

C. Time. Limiting concept: vivification.

1. fellowship: What is it time?

A is represented by the sequence:

| | | | |
|---------|----------------|-----------------|---------|
| Anselm | Thomas Aquinas | Thomas à Kempis | Tolstoy |
| Abelard | Bonaventura | Ekkehard | Emerson |

B by Vesalius (anatomy)

Pascal

Faraday

Wells

Copernicus (astronomy) Newton

Humboldt

encycl. Britannica

Torricelli

The science of space is based at best on mathematics, dealing with weight and expansion. It is dealing with measurements of space or of weight in space, and mathematics is its groundwork. Now Mr. Salvemini made a remark to defend his own science, history, which is the science of time, but *he thinks* it is so complex that you cannot use mathematical formulae. We are in a state of alchemy about it. Miss Taylor also made some apologetic remarks about education, which has to do with time also. She says it is a science *but* not quite a science. She ~~is~~ ^{is} too apologetic. I had to apologize also because I do not believe that it is a natural science which will teach *with history or education* for the future. Isn't it strange that we should have to apologize to the powers that be for doing something quite different from the *claim* ~~title~~, doing something for which they never asked?

I am going to distribute a pamphlet this evening, dealing with the

1)
 scientist, his own feeling of hope and despair. When you get a man stretched out between the future and the past and between loyalty to the future and to the past, you get our problem, you get suspense, you ^{need} get a decision as to which part of the past you must keep. That is the historian's work. He digs out things. I must say ^{to} Mr. Salvemini, you were ^{for too} very polite last time. You said there is one scientific logic; there is not. When you recollect the fall of the Roman Empire you narrate. This is not to be measured in expansion of space or inertia; it is a problem of suspense in time. We are involved from the beginning of this world to the end in knowing how much we are identified with people who have lived before us, how much we are identified with the races to come, and ^{how we wish not to be mistaken for} with the dictators who come up today. ^{live with us today. And} it is ^{it is the threat of identity and discrimination that makes historians.} History and education are new sciences, special sciences in their own right, with a different kind of logic which I ^{could} call the science of embodiment or of ^{if no new science} incarnation; But the name does not matter. The child ^{must} be born before it is baptized. But it is a new child who now tries to come. As soon as you begin to say that the time of man has three dimensions, past, present, and future, and that ^{the present is the suspense} the transition ^{must} is between the past and the future, you see immediately that the science of space ~~can~~ be superseded for our purpose by quite a different groundwork and logic, a very reasonable one.

PH We have to decide what is education. What do parents do when they send their children into a school, into a university, into business? What do they wish for, by doing something to their children or by not doing something to such their children? You see, every decision is ^{always} only between two questions. Shall he anticipate the future by putting the child in ^{the} school, or shall he have faith/ ^{The child's future} and let him learn his own lessons by not doing anything? / has to be coped with either by faith or by anticipation. The past has to be dealt with either by hope or by despair. Hope means that we think the past can go on; we know things as they are, and we hope the patient will live. ^{longer} Hope we can only have about ^{an order of} things

(Dr. Fisher?) Faraday and Paracelsus a Classic and a Founder
 Please ask me for it if you did not receive a copy.

as seeing here. ~~If we despair of it, we should destroy it.~~
 we appreciate and know. Faith we have in ^{future} things unknown. When I left ~~home~~, I

believed only that my life would go on somehow when I came to this country;

the only thing I had was faith. ~~My hope was shattered. I have buried my ships. I must now live on faith.~~

In this country everybody mistakes hope for faith and faith for hope, but they are opposites. Hope is derived from the past. We hope God will be merciful and let our government go on as before. Faith means that we will

accept something perfectly new. We do not keep our own old car but buy a new one. ~~These qualities disappear and we have faith and anticipation, love and hope.~~ ^{our attitude towards the future is twofold also: as we have hope}
~~and despair.~~ ^{are not involved} Faith and hope ~~do not emerge~~ in the anatomy of Vaselius, in the Anatomy

of Melancholy, nor in the anatomy of the human body, because nature is under-

neath our human hearts. We are free to dispose of what we call nature. ~~It is~~ ^{also occasionally} a word which we can apply to human beings, and I admit that we could with great success look on man as a part of nature, so far as it goes. ^{too} I go to the dentist.

But when we look on our equals, we can only love our equals, anticipate our ~~work with~~ friends, or we can despair of them or have faith in or hope for them. In nature

we treat men as objects which we can overpower, which we can treat without telling them our plans, because we can manage them. ^{by revelation} In St. Thomas's Summa he deals with us as living beings who are overpowered. Anything bigger than ourselves is a

theological problem. Anything smaller is a natural problem. Anything on the ^{level with ourselves} same scale is a human problem. A Bonaventura reflected all the time ^{on the} elements of the superior, an element of revelation, of adoration or worship.

The science of man faces our opportunity for co-operation and collaboration, for marrying or divorcing, for generating or for political assassination, which means that you anticipate what is going to happen to the dictator some day.

Ordinarily they will die one day; the question is whether you should anticipate ~~their~~ ^{tomorrow}

So with these six terms and six qualities I have tried to make clear ^{a science of past, future and present.} that I am talking about ~~something which is~~ ^{something which is not} ~~materially different~~. History has always looked into the past and shown us

1 With the world as present we communicate by our reason as nature, by our love, as needing our care, our love. Hope and despair for the past, reason and love for the present, faith ~~and anticipation for the future.~~

as being the two with us on being to be buried.

the things which have happened to us. When we speak of the fall of the Roman Empire we are despondent and we examine why it had to go. ^{Probably} Because it had served its purpose. *The historians should tell us why it had served its purpose; not why it ended but why it was finished.*

In education we have to know how much must the parent anticipate and he must

how much have faith in the child's own future, knowing that parents can do

very little about it. *Nobody here, because he is a son and a daughter, a man and a woman, a father and a mother, can evade the problems of our new science mistakes, parents sacrifice their fortunes for their children's future.*

III

I wish to talk to you this evening of the Ten Commandments which I last have been have put on this paper. These remarks ~~were~~ a little wild because I wished to answer the different demands, and I have probably sinned against one remark which was made to me. that I ~~have not been~~ ^{should be} clear at all.

It is because ^{now can be before I see it} the child is not baptized, because we are trying to baptize it here together, that I am not clear but only becoming clear slowly.

I should be a very bad speaker, I think, if I ~~had to be~~ ^{could} be completely clear from the beginning. It is one of the difficulties of ^{thinking in groups} common thought, that it is not ^{desirable} possible to be clear in every moment. That is I think a wrong expectation

about thought. I think any two people who live together go through this confusion before they can explain how they feel; that is the content of their love story, that it takes great difficulty to ^{articulate it} explain. We begin

really with fixing the attention of the audience and trying to fix this

attention long enough so that finally the contours of what we have seen will

become ^{to all} clear. And That takes some time. And That is why I had to insist that we should meet several times, because it takes some time to get things clear.

So I must ask our friends to think that I am trying to be as clear as possible, but cannot be clear from the very beginning. This example of children and

parents, what parents ^{can} ~~should~~ do with children, I think will have the merit of

being pedantically clear, perhaps too pedantic: Parents must be patient,

And that is the great lesson for every one who lives with

people. His knowledge must grow in communion with these people

A child from birth to death runs his ^{independent} course as much as his parents, biologically, physically; but as a human being, ^{But} as a ^{social} successor of his ^{him} parents and the generation before him he is something quite different. In the cradle he begins a process of education, and These ten commandments are imperatives which the parents hear and apply to the child, - a strange situation in which two people hear an imperative. The parents could be godfather and godmother. ^{But} they can't do it themselves. So We have a bifurcation between

two people who love each other, the parents here and the child there, and the parents trying to establish channels or institutions which force the child to a certain run this course but never ^(as they) touch ^(compels) the child ^{as a historical being} directly. So There is this complicated social system, whenever we have an ^{social} imperative, whenever we have an

institution, and a child is expected to volunteer in going through the institution. The parents are never allowed to accomplish ^{for the child} what only the child ^{himself} can do, - to live. But the parents can try to make it relive ^{certain} those stages. They can put a frame around the child's life. and that we call civilization. The list runs simply in three paragraphs; for the sake of brevity I have

made the two later circles, the "hoary head" for which you have not even an expression in English, I have abbreviated them into three. The names, perhaps, are not the final names which you would like to apply but they mean

that any child who ^{is} meant to become a member of society, of the human race, must, ^{in phrasing} must read,

One, ^{must} listen, must think, must play. Here it ^{stops} ^(not first phase) ^(since) that is all we can ask from a

child. When we anticipate him as an adult we must ask the child to doubt, to protest, ^{i.e.} to call attention to one of his doubts, to formulate ^{no} doubt, to put it before society. In your doctor's thesis you are expected to do this, and

then to suffer the consequences, to take the brunt of having put forward your thesis or your idea or criticism. The last three ^{phases form a triad} chapters or ^{three stages} ^{they are} did not

very poor in language I know, but I ~~don't~~ want to go any further before we had

talked here together. The child, the adult, is followed by the phase of no being parents, ancestors, beginners of a new era. The

first step, we, is to Return. When you have made plain where you stand and where you are by

fixing your attention to what you think worthy your spirit, when you have become what you will be for the rest of life, the man as whom you wish to go on, you are in one or other ^{way} finally tolerated by society; you are received. I could have said "Be received," don't be sullen, don't stand in a corner, but let them know who you are. When you have left no doubt as to your principles, you can hope for the kind of patience which society has for everybody who is what he is. So

you returns. It means that ~~man~~ ^{man} is called back, that he is received ^{after having} ~~become a real, unmistakable and individual person.~~

The freedom of teaching, of course, has very much to do with this problem, because most people today are not ^{appointed} ~~called~~ ^{really} for what they are, and later it is found that the man is inconsistent with his supposed ^{type} ~~topic~~. It has nothing to do with

his teaching. The problem is, can a man be tolerated for what he really is? *Most people love despite what they really are or mean, this is a lack of pers.* Christianity has presented this challenge for 2000 years. If he is approved then ~~we should try to unmask ourselves and then try to be received as we are~~ *he is allowed to be a teacher, he is allowed to teach the old and the new in its special combination. represent the typical tradition and a personal contribution.* *It is, in a way, a vital combination.*

Devolution is the great problem of society: you cannot find men to be ^{next} ~~President~~ President of the Steel Trust; ^{easily} very soon you cannot find men to be the President

of the United States; because we have not learned that society must prepare for ^{de-} ~~volation~~ ^{elsewhere} ~~Somebody~~ is turning out teachers in a special institution, and ^{there} are

the schools. But there is no connection between these ^{two} ~~institutions~~ ^{instruct} directly, because the people think that you can know how a teacher can be formed and how a child can be taught. But if you think of yourself as an undivided person, you ^{How shall I devolve my best powers?} must ask yourself, Who shall take over my job? As Jesus Christ said to his mother

and St. John, Here is your son, here is your mother. That is what I mean by ^{devolution} ~~designation~~, handing to another the ^{personal} ~~place~~ which I have held in life. In the old days, fifty percent of a man's life was taken up in preparing his successor. Now

no one does this, and the neglect has gone so far that there is a real loss of capital when a new man comes in, because he does not spend any time learning from

his predecessor. You remember at the end of Mr. Hoover's term, Mr. Roosevelt ^{was} asked ^{for} his help in facing the Bank situation. It would have spoiled Mr. ~~Roosevelt's~~ ^{Roosevelt's} political future if he had co-operated. *We have lost sight of the process of devolution, of social and spiritual*

Succession.

These articles are not so simple as they look at the beginning.

Listen and read are today confused although they are opposite. By listening we mean the summoning of parents and friends to the child to learn the language. ~~The natural environment can ask to be disrupted.~~ The child is listening all the time; listening is ^{being} the most general term. We have lost sight of the fact that even looking at things is listening. The Old Testa-

ment knew that the beginning of humanity is in listening to the Ten Commandments. ^{Hark, Israel, it says.} And you can enlarge this, because listening is the first introduction into society. ^{however,} Read is the opposite. It is ^{implies a} the resignation of the parents. ^{that}

It means, Go out of your environment. It means ^a a child is made a citizen of the whole world. ~~Because~~ ^{Reading} is the power to conquer everything which

has been said anywhere in the universe. It is the invitation on the part of the parents, ^{let the child} to look where they have not been, to read where they do not know, ^{To read is the child's struggle to listen.} to instruct

There you get, in the second commandment. ^{read for their child.} the self-abandonment or sacrifice of the parents. They know they cannot/

To teach anybody to read is to free him from bondage, and ^{restricted} loyalty to his ^{family} ~~parents~~ ^{only.} And therefore The Bible is the great deliverer of society, because it

is the invitation to read the history of man from the beginning, ^{beyond race and nation and natural environment.}

The third chapter, Learn. (thinking, remembering, or memorizing).

It is not enough to listen and to read. That a parent ~~would~~ ask from a child ^{when he asks him to remember, is the power} ~~is to learn~~ to speak for itself. When a parent says Go, the child must answer,

I go, or I go not. To take up the language of his environment is to show that he is free. When a child says I won't, it only tests out this freedom of the third stage, of entering or not entering into it. So please correct the word to learn, which I think is better.

By the way, in the Summary, might I correct the statement about 19th century natural science. I mean, of course, that natural science begins in the 16th century with Copernicus.

~~Forget~~. First, the parents themselves are parents and have the power

(*emphasizing the 'read'*)

to explain. Seek means, go to school. Learn, when it is repeating a lesson, when it is learning by heart. When it is answering the parents' commands it is really learning to use this expression. The greatest miracle is that two people are able to ~~learn~~ *from the tables*. People never learn the secret that when we talk together the person changes. I can say, I like you, and you can say, I don't like you. You say, Do it, and I can say, I will, or, I will not. Two people take up the same ball; language exists and ceases to be just a means to an end. When two people speak together the whole ^{of} society begins to move, to live or to hope, to co-operate or to be ruled despotically. Because the moment the child answers and says Yes, the faith of the parents is rewarded. By saying to the child, Don't climb, and the child answering Yes, the parent has shown some faith in the freedom and righteousness of the child. The parents have left to him some freedom of choice.

Forget. The fourth point is very important, and it is again a misnomer (play). We have to give the child freedom. We have to give the child *because we don't know who he will use our message.* the right to forget. It is not in the Constitution, but he has a right and ^{Try.} duty to forget. After the child has played--and you can take this as a weekend, a yearly vacation, a dismissal from school, a wanderjahr-- there will be some doubt whether he will take up the profession of his parents. Take any doubt, any scientific doubt, which makes for a division or discussion within yourself. The child is now listening and speaking both. He is beginning to become a ~~man~~ ^{from} a son; he is divided within himself. This is doubt, to be split; that is the literal meaning of doubt, *debito, being in two.*

Choose. Then you have to shift your emphasis on one side of the issue and to protest, which perhaps, in plain American is ^{that} you must be ^{come} a rebel. It always means to ^{assume} ~~show~~ responsibility, without knowing the outcome (~~to shun convenience~~). Any doctor's thesis shows this. ^{out} ~~adherence~~ to a political party is the same thing. Of course it goes much further. Your choice of a mate is a

protest, mostly to your family. You must make up your mind, if you are not satisfied with your first cousins, that you ^{will} take somebody else; you take criticisms and reviews of your bad book; better take also contempt for society.

~~The university is just a mirror of the things that take place in real life.~~

^{Bear} Suffer is not a word much liked in this country. But parents ought to know that nobody can have a full life if he has not learned to suffer. Not that we ~~must~~ wish for suffering, but we must learn how to suffer. So education must teach that amount of suffering which is the minimum requirement for happiness. I wish to be in harmony with the Constitution and the pursuit of happiness, but I must make this qualification, that without having learned to suffer a man cannot be happy. So, to ~~the~~ bear is what man has to learn.

The question of ^a thin skin is ^{important} ~~one~~ for the modern person. ~~He~~ ^{Most people} cannot ~~the~~ bear to see the ^{criticism of his} ~~vision of his~~ contemporaries turned against ~~him~~. So what my word ² ~~suffer~~ means is that a man must be able to be ^{patient and independent} for an indefinite length of time. He would go to pieces if during this time he ~~would~~ ^{were} be unable to forget. This ^{quality} comes back to the adult. I told you the teacher's credo, that we must try to teach as though you had never known. Every friend

whom you meet, every pupil whom you have in class, must be told your form of seeing things. ^{afresh} So if you ^{must restate} ~~point~~ your philosophy as if you had never known it.

Think of the young teacher who is so successful because he knows so very little more than his pupil. ^{He still is curious himself.} The ~~better~~ principle is that a man must know very much and yet,

be able to act as if he did not know anything at all. You have met people who have written a book on a subject & with an outcome that you are very familiar with. ^{in again} You will forget that you thought so before, and learn it ~~in a new way~~ ^{new way} ~~It dawns on me in a moment, and I have found myself in awkward positions, not~~ knowing whether I should say I had thought of it before.

We have in ourselves the paradoxical power to be at the same time forgetful and ^{aware} ~~knowing~~. It is very strange, but we are capable of looking into the chalice of a flower as if we had never seen a flower before, and still ^{we may} know everything about it. ^{It is} the same with a child or an adult whom we meet and

who tells us about ^{own} his own field. So I hope some of you may use this virtue of knowing and forgetting at the same time and not be hurt when I say something ^{old quite} "fresh." ^P Again this ~~forbearance~~, this attitude of patience, is a middle voice, as grammarians call it, between action and ^{passivity} ~~passiveness~~. You can turn it both ways. In one way you keep what you have said, but you are willing to wait until other people have seen your point. That is what is meant by suffer: you carry the yoke of life. That is really what suffering means: it only means to carry on. It is a mixture of forgetfulness (play) and ^{can blot out} ~~unawareness~~. You ~~do not sacrifice~~ what you have done but you can forget about its actuality. You can for a moment give up your restlessness about success. It is the only way to achieve success.

I have just read the life of Wilkes. The great wisdom of Wilkes ^{and in the} ~~and~~ time of Fox and Pitt was ^{his patience}. He had been thrown out of Parliament because he had written an article against the government; and when he was taken back he declined to annoy the king by walking with the aldermen to the palace. He waited eight years, and after eight years he saw that he could ^{present} ~~present~~ himself, ^{then} ~~then~~ all the ^{parliamentary} ~~parliamentary~~ records of his expulsion ^{were} ~~had to be~~ destroyed ^{by a unanimous vote.}. His waiting was his political triumph. He forbore to protest ^{immediately}, and without this forbearance the whole thing would have been missed, the safeguarding of free elections in his constituency. Forbearing for eight years made him a hero.

Now we come to the three last stages, ^{and then, we can} ~~because then we can~~ approach the question, how parents individualize the ten commandments.

Accept. To be received, to accept a call, not to withhold your special interests, not to become a free lance, is in two ways a difficult achievement. The poor man will return too early, just as an indefinite No. X who gets a job ^{a type} ~~as a mere figure~~, (before he has explained to the future boss who he really is. Few people achieve this perfect revelation of what they are really.)

Most people put up with this ^(typicality) at a very early stage. Very few people achieve this harmony between their early affections and ^{and their final job and learn} that they should ^{past rejection} push this past. So you see Education should encourage this, that you should wait until you ^{can} do something that you really like. There is somebody in this room who got his real calling rather late in life. It is a middle-age problem, to be loyal to your real vocation.

Then teaching: I appeal to all the teachers to understand that teaching is a natural function of every human being. ^{who has gone through life} Every parent must think of his child as a future parent, and that means this ^{future parent} must come into a position, also, where he can say, Listen. This principle that everybody should teach is now imperilled when ^{we} you make teaching ~~into~~ a special vocation. ^{We} ~~you~~ deprive it of its real educational meaning. It means that ^{of man} any child must always try to reach the historical ^{the teaching phase} position of devotion. That is why it ^{all that} comes so late in life, because it must be saturated with this ^{as a Specialist} one change which has come into your own experience. If you go straight from learning into teaching, ^{and dignity} your teaching you ~~do~~ derives its virtue from the very few individuals who have learned ^{teaching} teaching. ^{the intent of} ~~their teaching~~ ^{and personal} ~~from teaching~~ their real experience. It cannot be helped. Our life is too complicated. Not everyone can go ^{so directly and originally} in this way through these ten commandments. But so long as we do not recognize that parents have to teach their children ^{as will} teaching can never become aware of this problem that every generation ^{life's} ~~is~~ ^{too besides} ~~combining~~ between its own language and the old language. Somebody has told us, ^{now have combined} ~~after~~ that we have protested and ^{discarded ourselves. And} ~~discarded~~ ^{been} ~~and~~ have ^{now} ~~received~~ back and ^{are} ~~produced a point~~ between the old doctrine and our own contribution. It is not ^{data} our own contribution. Teaching is always going beyond our own contribution, containing ^{to} ~~opposite teaching~~ ^{wholly} ~~from~~ our own experience. Every teacher knows that he is not ^{as is not original in any} in this sense original; but woe to him if he cannot say what he has attained. ^{part of} ~~part of~~ ^{teaching} ~~teaching~~.

Solve, designate. Now the problem of abdication. You have the old age

pension problem. I think it is quite ^{essential} ~~adequate~~ to see that we must find a new word for this situation in which we are preparing our own successor. It is ^{terrible} ~~tremendous~~ that Mr. Justice Holmes should die at 94 and ^{we} ~~to~~ have to say, Who is his successor? That is an example. Our whole society is built on the system that somebody else ^{somehow} ~~appoints~~ a successor, ^{because he has had an excuse.} But if he does so, if President Roosevelt and President Conant appoint a successor, they only take over a function which the generation of people who retire have handed over to them. It is a division of labor between people who ^{really act as one person.} ~~must be identical, must identify~~ their interest. The ideal would be that every generation ^{should} ~~thinks~~ all the time about how to prepare ~~a~~ ^{S.} successor. Teaching the young does not do it, because when you teach the young you have not done anything to get a real successor. ~~The man whom you have taught to harken, to seek, even to try, has not borne your own aversion against his innovation, your own fear of his novelty.~~ The great problem how a man can generate independence and still be liked by his predecessor and be invited to succeed because he is different, is before us. I think society and universities ^{will be} ~~are~~ not able to show any continuity ^{with} ~~in~~ the future ^{so long} ~~when~~ we rely on ^{as our successors} ~~just~~ disciples, or people who say just the same things ^{as we do.} We must invite people who do not say the same things, who have ^{fought} ~~borne~~ with our doctrines and been under our disfavor, ^{to succeed us just for that reason.} ~~may will~~ ^{mean} ~~be~~ ^{the same in their} ~~as we did in ours,~~ Let us look now at the institutions which perform this form of channeling every man's function, every man's life, the real men who live together, speak together, and fight together.

Listening (harkening) is largely done ⁱⁿ ~~at~~ the family. The father comes home and doesn't read the newspaper only. It sometimes happens that even the father does some of the talking. I do not know how far the family has to be regenerated. If the family has any meaning it has this mental or spiritual function of making the child listen, and whoever does it is the parent. It may be the church. The institution which does this governs the child by asking obedience, ~~by asking hearing,~~ by asking repetition, by asking him to conform

either to his family or to this other institution. And the question is today, who is this? The church had great misgivings about parents and ^{so} had godparents ^{brought in}. The child was taken from the parents because they could not do ^{the job}. ^{Reading (seeking)}. This education is mostly done in the schools today, and in the movies. The movies are very scholastic because they leave the human mind so passive. I think the movies are a remarkable piece of children's education. I do not wish to go into the detail of it, but to say that whoever teaches the child to read (harken) is the school. Again it would be a verbalism to think of the school as the only institution which really does this.

To memorize (learn) is today practically ^{gone} out of business, ^{because we now} anticipate the experimental stage of doubt by writing poetry, by writing a paper. I think memorizing has gone to the dogs. But insofar as little duties are carried out in the home or in the school, this memorizing does exist in a sense of the word. ^{Memorizing is} But ~~again I should like you to feel that we have to look~~ ^{where the memorizing really takes place.} It may be right that we do not insist on verbal memory today, although I think that to learn poetry does no harm. But the memory can be exercised in different ways. I think the great ^{bulk} of progresssive education is largely based on this change in methods from memorizing to ^{free inquiry} ~~this step~~, which came in through the natural sciences, of ~~doubt~~. We have ^{introduced "scientific"} ~~institutionalized~~ principles in the schools. Everybody is invited to doubt. Anybody is invited to protest.

Beginning with the sixth commandment I am afraid to say that ^{the institutions of} society ~~are~~ still in the cradle. The first five commandments ^{are} in a way educational ^{agencies} ~~courses~~. We have liberty, we have experimentation, we have an invitation to make irresponsible remarks. ^{But at the sixth commandment,} ~~a~~ protest is a responsible criticism, to identify yourself so far ^{with the proposition} that you are ready to be addressed as the man who says this. When you speak in class ~~and~~ ^{now} doubt that you are acting as a person. It is too early. You are wavering. When you come out with ^{a true protest} ~~something~~ the situation has changed, ^{now} because society can ^{attack} ~~take~~ you on ^{and} ~~this basis~~, may nail you down. ^{When} Admiral Sims, as a lieutenant, challenged the whole navy, he really and actually protested risking everything.

In adult education how far can these steps be exercised or changed? How far can we develop in our social consciences ^{later} the five stages through which a person must go to become a man in the full sense of the word? They are not represented in our schools, ^{or in our universities,} and I think the way we train teachers shows the ^{lack of these stages} difficulty. It is done in some way but not by conscious or scientific method.

I ran into the history of the teachers' training in New Hampshire, and the haphazard way in which the training of teachers has been built up is quite astounding. Something has to be done. You get some good superintendents and good teachers, but ask them how this is to be done, ^{there is no answer -} Still I must not interfere with the educator, ^{as a specialist, here.} This is, so to speak, a by-product of our specialization. ^{I am concerned with the few commandments of education} It is not the result of all the thinkers in a university, ^{is the as valid for all and everybody.}

This problem of building up a society of personalities, of people who have gone through the fire of a test and not only an examination: You may imagine that I am not in favor of the Nazi Party, but I remember that in their beginning they insisted that a man could not be promoted in rank in the party if he had not at some time revolted ^{against his superior} with full risk of being fired; that a man who did not dare to challenge his superior in a way to risk his place in the party, could not be any good. ^{This} ~~It~~ was the rediscovery of something in human life which we really, in Germany, owed to the Lutheran party. It is a strange idea that something has to ~~be entered~~ ^{whereby} into the life of the individual, that he has to expose himself to the danger of losing his head. The teacher ^{of educating a free, a rebel teacher} difficulty then, ^{not} which had to be solved for the primary and secondary schools, has never, I think, been tackled for universities and scholars, ^{in America} (The whole five ^{later} commandments are left, ^{in the lunch. independent} People are scared away, so far as higher learning is concerned. You are not invited to protest, you are not invited to suffer, you are not called back ^{to} your own college. There is no break. Therefore the strength of American life I think is outside the college. In any other community outside the college a man can come back after being defeated.

I think this is a great advantage ^{of American life and} of this society, ~~but~~ it shows why the uni-

versities are not reflecting the whole of American life; because whereas outside you can come back after you have suffered defeat, inside the normal thing is promotion within the environment of your scholastic field. *The college man, usually, is a timid man who plays safe.*

The last step, designation of your successor, is given up completely in American society. *Formal* abdication is not all *is* abdication. It is a misfortune that Benes did not abdicate until he had been used up completely. In good abdication *may be* *Henry* *abdicated* *in time* *and so, he appointed his successor.* there is power. An abdication at the right moment is something which is efficient, which forces people to ~~come back to~~ *by him* the thing believed, the thing for which this man stands. It is the same as the violent death of a person when his office is really needed. Julius Caesar was killed but Caesarism became eternal because he was not an accident but a necessity. *this* is a violent abdication, but *it reaches us* ~~it only means~~ that we have not found out how to produce a successor, how to attract, to pull out a successor, so that he will fill the gap. Most people are afraid of the ~~the~~ successor. They do not know how they can make a living ~~even~~ if the successor is already awaited.

I think our problem today is to find institutions for these five steps of a full life. These ten commandments cover three generations, - man as a child, as an adult, and as a testator, if that is the word. You have no word for "greis".

? We have the word elder.

R-H: Isn't elder nearly always used in the plural?

? You can use it in the singular.

R-H: In this pamphlet on Faraday and Paracelsus I have used the word founder. Not every individual perhaps can act as such; but I think the quality of leaving something behind, although the emphasis shifts, should find a name. I have used the term designate because the Roman Emperors *designed* their successor, the designatus. *designator was known ahead of time.*

I wish to invite your attention once more to the situation of parent and child *with regard to* the ten commandments. The child runs his course rather unconsciously. He lives in a family, he goes to school, he learns a trade.

He is then challenged by circumstances, by abuses, to do something about it, to make his point, to say who he really is, what he stands for, to make his contribution. Then he has to experience suffering, then he has to forbear. He must learn, and everybody tells him today that it takes a long time until society can put up with him. But ~~today~~ everybody is impatient, and if he is not received immediately then he ~~must~~³ throw up his hands and disappear³, or he becomes a permanent rebel, the eternal protestant who can only criticize.

~~Again~~^{It is} the problem of knowing what it means to date acts, to act at the right moment, or not to act when the right moment has not come. *Not to be a rebel, a conformer always, but be back at the right moment.*

~~Whereas~~ the parents, believing in the value of the freedom of the child, having faith in the child, anticipate choices and opportunities. The parents do not enter into the process of education themselves, and therefore I have put Ideas as the title of this whole lecture. For the parent the phenomenon is tremendous, that even when he thinks he has no religion, no principles about life, he has willy-nilly to do something about his children. He has to bequeath some legacy. Wherever he turns he does something to his children. To let them go to school is exactly as much a decision^{of faith} as not sending them to school. Not many people will act like my boy, when he was a child and was asked what a father was for. He said I was there to govern him. And I am told that it is a perfectly un-American expression. He said a father is there to govern his son. I think he had quite an unusual idea about government. The father is a governor, but, of course, a governor who has to abdicate. All the time there is an authority ^{above} ~~before~~ the parents, ^{not} ~~an~~ ^{idea} ~~idea~~ ^{of education}. I have been told that perhaps the word ideal would be better, but it is not an ideal. It is an overpowering force. The only religion which people have today is the idea of ^{educating} ~~of~~ their children. Nobody can do without this respect for what should be when he acts for his children. He does something to the children, showing ^{his} ~~his~~ faith in them, ^{or} ~~showing~~ incredulity in them.

Let me end with one example where we see how this ~~past~~ era has lost *patience* and faith about ~~the world~~ ^{for its children}. When you get the child prodigy,

you get the parents who have given him everything, who have tried to do everything for their children (that they know.) ^{By doing so they} They have betrayed them, edged them out of life, by making them into something instead of letting them grow. I think most schools are taking time today, and not pushing children.

? Certainly in the public schools in this town there has been a very great change. They have quit pushing them entirely.

R-H. The idea of a post graduate course in high school is something very new. Certainly the parents have realized their ^{wrong} ambition. Faith and anticipation are always struggling in education. When you get the child prodigy you get the ^{child who is unable} ~~unwilling~~ ^{later} to become the parent. He is the opposite of the functional heir of a father or mother. The limit of anticipation in education is clearly established when you think of the ~~possibility of the power of the child to~~ ^{'s power} live through ^{all} these stages. When you teach a child, ^{so as to} taking away from him the power or capacity to run the whole course, and letting him arrive, for example, ^{at} ~~in~~ teaching ^{himself} before he is ready, you take something away from him. And the child prodigy is the limiting concept. From it we can see that the parents have to obey something ^{idea} here, something which goes beyond their understanding, beyond their knowledge. They cannot give everything to the child ^{at any} ~~moment.~~ I know some parents who thought, ^{that} because they married in old age they had to ^{on} hurry/their children. You cannot, of course. It takes great faith to let somebody run the whole course of ^{his, slowly} life. Without this bigger ~~idea~~ ^{idea}, which cannot be mastered by the parents, there is no education on the side of the parents; whatever they do they hand out their children to a course of events ^{this} which can only, from their point of view, be called faith. What man should be--it is not even should be; it is just a factual statement, what they ^{parents} ~~themselves~~ are, what they themselves must be, ^{they must let their children} ~~become gradually: it is parents.~~ I hope I have given you an example of thinking in terms of time, the ^{regulating compound of faith and} relation of parents and children with this ~~third role between them to which~~ ^{anticipation between them to which both, parents and} ~~children~~ ^{children}

~~they~~ have to conform because it is the way a natural being becomes an historical person. In terms of space there is no such problem, no problem of suffering or testation. Neither of these exists in terms of space ^{or of} natural science. In nature, nobody is asked to

decide how much faith and how much anticipation he should apply. ~~The~~ Every single human being must produce a unique and new compound of these two powers which ^{represent} ~~produce~~ genuine future.

DISCUSSION

? I should like to ask what you make of the child's experience in the second category: he suffers (forbears). It seems to me the child has something of that when he gets into the group of his contemporaries; it is not reserved for the grown-up.

R-H: I have appointed a successor very often in my life, and abdicated; and so you are perfectly right that / ^{suffering} is met with at every moment in a life. Still I think the emphasis shifts. I am very glad that you mention it, because I should have made clear that although I tried to divide it up it is all simultaneous. But still I think there is some reason to cut up a biography in this way, because the emphasis shifts.

? I am a little in doubt as to where you are going to classify seeking?

R-H: I thought under reading. You may not read books intelligently, but still you are ~~looking round, going out of your way.~~ ^{discovering the universe} You are a man of the world and you may use that way to progress. I have no objection if you would say that the father tells his son, go out, seek, instead of read. The school in this sense is a substitute for the discovery of the world.

? It seems to me that is the most natural tendency of the child, to seek by means of experience.

R-H: What we could do would be to write this list out in two nomenclatures, one looking at it from the world at large, and the other from our scholastic training. Listen is obey; read is the process which goes on in the school where we send our child; seek is the invitation to discover the world on their own account. This is another point to which we must go back: when you think of this hunger of the child you ~~must~~ ^{usual method} call it seek. Thinking of ~~the feeling of the child, I called it read.~~ ^{We also read in the book of life.} But you are quite right that the appetite is the first thing on the side of the child. But there also is this plastic quality of the child. We have a child at home who is retarded because he is living with a grandmother who is deaf; he cannot speak because he has no

reason to speak, but you feel how he is craving it. ~~Therefore~~ I think listen and obey is an appetite in the child. He wants to be moulded. It is not true that the child wants to be active only, ^{He wants} ~~but~~ to be led, to co-operate, to be asked to do something ^{as} when you can make him work or do something in the house. There you have appetite, not for cooperating but for conforming.

? In view of the fact that the larger part of the effort of mankind has been to alleviate suffering and if possible to do away with it entirely, and that progressive education at the present time tends to remove as much old-fashioned drudgery as possible, why do you consider that learning to suffer is such a valuable part of the development of the child and the individual?

R-H: I think that is a very comprehensive question today. Look at these ten commandments. There is always a cheap way and a costly way of doing things. If you had to listen all day to a gramophone, it is an indiscriminate way of listening. Again, you have cheap suffering from toothache and you have agony because your friend is not responsive to your love. You cannot do anything against this agony except not to care for friendship. That is a wrong solution. You must care for your friend. Love is not to be abolished, but to be put up with. What we have done is to abolish some physical pain. The real sufferings are quite different. They cover a larger field. I think this whole science of time today is needed because we all mistake memory, events, reading we mistake listening to the prayer of our parents. Listening to what it means ^{all this} to be somebody of the name of our family, ~~we mistake~~ ^{for what it means} to listen to a gramophone. What we have done is to deal with these cheap things of the moment, but we must deal with the things that will last for the rest of our lives. No one of the stages is superseded. They all stay with us. *The oldest we must listen, seek, suffer etc.*
 ? Do you conceive of suffering as a necessary part of the child's development too? Do you put suffering more in the middle decades than in childhood?

R-H: We will put it in this way. It is probably more difficult for the man of 25 to be patient. It is very easy for a child to be patient with his parents. As a rule it is not difficult; the thing becomes difficult when it is against his nature. Nobody has to establish a reformatory for this apparatus. But ^{later} a young man grows impatient. He wishes to have a large income immediately; and then you have to teach him, to make him conscious that it is immoral to ^{try a} ~~short-cut~~. ^{Suffering restores the proper length of time to one timelessness dreams.} Wouldn't faith and anticipation run together? Would there be a bifurcation in the case of most persons? Wouldn't a designate be a product both of faith and hope, of faith and anticipation. Those two processes would be running together in most cases.

R-H: It is the secret of man that he is a believer and an unbeliever. We had the problem this year of a boy two years old coming to live in our house. We had a staircase without a baluster. Must we have a baluster? And how safe must the baluster be? That is an anticipation, you see. It had just one rung. It was a very poor anticipation. The world asks from us mistrust. God asks from us trust. It works both ways all the time. But if you test yourself I think you will find very clearly in your own feelings you know exactly in every action that there is a decision between the amount of anticipation, of stopping or hurrying, of telegraphing or writing for the ordinary mail.

one of a series in the "Atlantic"
 ? I wonder if somebody saw a letter, one of a series of communications from the younger generation, in which a woman ^{she} said that she and her husband ^{she} were completely in the mood of anticipation and looking after them, and utter lack of readiness to take a chance on the insecurities of life, ~~without~~ which the race has always had to take or go to pieces. Until the thing could be laid out by anticipation they were not prepared to have any children. That seems to be a tragic streak in our life. I do not see how we are dealing with it. It seems to me very much on the increase and not a product of ten years of hard times.

R-H: What Nietzsche calls the last man. He can only think of life in terms that he knows.

? I think the answer is that so many young people get married now without waiting for security.

R-H: But I think the first attempt ^{of an answer to them} would be to split ^{the future in faith and} with anticipation, not ~~just a monopoly for~~ faith. If we turn it round and say, we are as un-believing as you are at times. That is what I tried to express in putting the scholar's and the other view side by side.

RCC: I wish you would tell us what is on the blackboard.

R-H: It is very simple. I do not think that all of you will have read the first chapter which I sent you, "Farewell to Descartes". I have given you an example today of how man is treated in education, not as an equal but as somebody to whom somebody tells something. They are acting under imperatives, which makes them into addressees. Somebody is talking to us. That is what I call an idea, an overpowering impression that we cannot help doing something. They are not asked what they want. They are not asked what nature wants. But they are summoned, and they are in the disposition of responding to a chance. They do not find themselves at liberty to say, I am the universe, nor to take orders from a policeman who tells them how to regiment their children, or takes their children away and decides what to do with the children. But the parents have to listen to something which talks to them very decidedly, and they have to answer, and it makes for change in their lives. Here you get this application for the first two sections of our history of science in the Occident. Dealing with ^{as} eternity and having our basic analytical method (See p. 5.) Thomistic logic, they had The thing has run its course through these four phases. Why did God become man? A discussion of the problem of God, who is not a divine but is an elevating power in life. The second thing is the different assigned the Summa. You get co-operation all

through the extent of scientists and scholars. Between these is Bonaventure and the others. Then you get the Imitation, the famous book of 1394, which means ^{was} that everybody ~~is~~ trained, ~~and~~ introduced into some way of applying the content of theological science. Today you get books like My Religion. That is knowledge, that is private practice. Theology has run its course. If everybody has ^{his} religion nobody has a religion, no religion would be possible. You get the same ^{evolution in the philosophy of} space, the science of space, anatomy, astronomy, and Copernicus. Immediately you see what they are out for, the largest and the smallest. The second stage, Newton and the Academicians.

The Italians leading, being the pioneers in this, you get co-operation between the scientists, and philosophers. You get for the first time the expression academic. Then you get the first attempt to popularize, Faraday, History of the candlestick. Then today you get the toys which everybody can produce, and the encyclopaedia in which you can inform yourself. All these things co-exist. There have been encyclopaedias in the middle ages and some co-operation between scientists before the time of the Academy. Still it is worth while to see that the idea starts with Copernicus, to deal with bodies, and Copernicus writes a book on the revolutions of the bodies in space, weight and expansion. So it goes on to academies, ^{onto education} on to popularization and Faraday's book. That is the discovery that they had to teach everybody about science.

Browning has a poem on "Paracelsus," and Faraday was involved in a terrible discussion. ^{scientific education for the common mass} In 1869 a paper about the education needed now by everybody in natural science, ^{from his pen} because otherwise they will become well as in England, ^{was printed here also}

Let me sum up and try to find a starting point for our endeavor of tomorrow. We ~~could~~ see that the limit of the ^{first, theological university} adventure was the mortification of the person, celibacy, etc. They were worrying: how can man discover God if he mortifies himself. In the second stage you get ^{vivification} cutting up life in order to study it. And the content of the next stage ^{of our stage} is vivification, which is a vision between mortification and ^{is} vivification, and perhaps it can ^{become} be as

stupid as mortification in the middle ages and ~~dis~~section today. Vivifica-

tion may be carried to an extreme as much as the other two, can be abused *when all*

And yet, these eighty year olds insist on behaving like high school girls.
But only to show you that ~~this~~ whole proposition is highly practical, it leads

to doing something. It has behind it the feeling that we are not ^{enough} vital, that

something is lacking. Vivification is the general denominator under which demands

all our ~~things~~ have to be summed up, which means that it is a risky thing, *dealing with*

life. But it is a demand. It is a thing which counts. It is not the interest in

cutting up, in anatomy or analysis, but in—I don't like the word, economic

reconstruction—vivification. Now the means of this. How do we vivify men?

By re-inspiring them. That is why the science of articulation becomes so

important. Here is where the classics come in. We can inspire people when *they grow*

up to use words with the full power of being moved by them. And this vivifica-

tion will be based on this power of being inspired again, of becoming vital

again. This is only done by going through the whole process of incarnation...

Let a man run the whole course from the outburst of his despair to slowly

being able to express what his outburst really means. We do not begin with

the perfection of formulae or with definition. It takes time to go through

such a process of re-inspiration, of vivifying the commonplace.

? Do you think that the present glorification of the State, and the metaphysical concept of the state which is somehow greater than the sum of its parts, is an abortive attempt at this re-inspiration of which you speak? It gives inspiration to lives which were empty before.

R-H: Yes, they should have been empty. They have been too impatient.

It is just putting into space, into visibility, what I have tried to show *as a* question of faith. If you have *by visible powers like State Church, class,* ~~mere~~ anticipation *the* next generation is doomed.

? There must be this idea of a *construction* of which one is a part?

R-H: You are using mathematical and space terms, and that is what we do. Thinking is today derived from our senses, which cope with space and not with

time. There is no time sense. We even call it time-span. It is a disease *to use,*
~~use~~ *of space.*

? Am I right in assuming that the letter A stands for Creator, B
 for creature, and C is creativity? Is that vivification also? If so, what is
 the discipline that corresponds to logic and mathematics under letter C?

R-H: If you look at the syllabus, I never said that I owed it to you
 to let you know that I know something about this groundwork. But articulation is
 what I call it. I might have called it grammar, but that would have been misleading, *at*
~~this stage.~~ *I, to myself, call it higher grammar.*
 I am sure of one thing. All these centuries there has been a treatment of the
 liberal arts. What do they mean? They have been the prep school in the middle
 ages. Geometry, arithmetic and music have been able to build up mathematics
 in modern terms. And I am sure that the grammar of the ancients will be super-
 seded by the higher science of articulation. So I would say, if you will allow
 me to say, the term *grammar* has the secret of human speech which would not
 be wrong though it ~~may be~~ *may be* insufficient. Any social intercourse means that we
 are willing to have this exchange, and the other person has the right to answer
 or question, or to answer your command. It is his role, his birthright as a
 human being. *that we may use, broad us, the whole grammar.*

PRIVILEGE AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Lecture IV -- Summary

I.

The child is the prehistoric man still repeating the routine of nature.

The adult is fighting and exploring to find his place in society, and then, in due time, keeping silence and waiting.

The elder is the man of lasting value, new upon earth in some respects, a witness of divinity.

The ten commandments of education reveal a process which goes on in the child, the adult, and the elder.

These three groups pass through the four facts of the grammar of the human soul. First it listens to commands. It is in the stage of "You" or "Thou." It is not told specifically what acts to perform, but only to listen, later to read and answer.

The mind is the "Ego" and the body is the "It." In school you get the "We" and are cleared of patois. In play the child returns to the unconscious and becomes "It."

Thus the child conquers and assimilates his environment.

II.

In the second, adult stage, man conquers space, acts, protests, asserts, and then endures the result. In time he hears the command to be silent. He cannot fight a single issue forever. He should bury his cause at the right time. Then he is in the third stage. When society finds out at last who he is, he becomes a teacher, a judge, an interpreter, and so a ruler. He mixes his personal experience with the wisdom of the ages, his second stage with his first.

Then he has conquered time, as in his prime he conquered space, and is ready to hand on his task to his free successor, and so to unite the generations.

III.

The first stage in our life is plastic, the second active, the third objective. History shows the same changes on

a larger scale. Ideas move through time to become science, then education, and at last knowledge. An idea through a man like Paracelsus has first to create faith, an imperative. He created the faith that truth could be found by observation and experiment,--the modern popular faith in science. It did not exist 400 years ago, and so Paracelsus, its founder, was persecuted. Once it is established, people all over the world can cooperate to forward science.

Science has no lasting truth, only a lasting method. Its beliefs are born, die and are replaced like the cells of the body. Thus science is between ignorance and knowledge, admitting the one yet claiming the other.

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------|---|---|------|---|
| The stage of ideas and faith is the "You" stage. | | | | | | | |
| " | " | " | science | " | " | " | " |
| " | " | " | education | " | " | "We" | " |
| " | " | " | knowledge | " | " | "It" | " |

Now science tries to conquer the future by educating everybody. In the 17th century no one tried to popularize science. But popularization never teaches men how frail, delicate, and questionable are the results that we spread abroad, nor proclaims that the method of science and not its results, deserves reverence and trust.

In theological terms the child shows creation,
the adult shows revelation,
the elder shows salvation.

IV.

The essence of the scientist's faith is that he can go behind the apparent to the real, beneath surfaces to the energies and atoms which underlie them. He does not believe what others tell him nor accept his own impressions. The sun is not beautiful for him; it is a center of attraction. Such a reduction of everything to causes and formulae is the scientist's sacrifice. Such a sacrifice gives the teacher authority, as celibacy gave authority to Thomas Aquinas. To go behind the surface of things as science does you must be freed to some extent from their temptations. The modern laboratory man is a monastic.

V.

To recognize the movement from "You" to "I" to "We" to "It" is to take part in the logic of life, the science of time. Scientific logic is never practiced in any important matter. The science of time makes us recognize what stage we are in (child, adult, elder) and act accordingly. Today we are keeping adults childish and inarticulate.

PRIVILEGE AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Lecture 4. Facts.

October 28, 1938.

The opportunities of scholars: the question of their trustworthiness. How ideas are changed into sciences. The transition from faith to science through work, which must be

- (1) of universal significance,
- (2) detached from the environment,
- (3) vouched for by concrete persons,
- (4) exposed to constant criticism.

The forgotten principle of the occidental universities: Paris, Bologna, Salerno, and their secret.

I see no illustration
Re.

There is a nice story by which perhaps I may illustrate my "science of time." Last time Dr. Cabot said to me after the lecture that he would write out another ten commandments of education. Of course I was deeply depressed, because if everyone could do that it would be just a way of talking and wouldn't have any importance. Therefore the question today is, is it possible? Are the ten commandments of education capable of being recognized by you as things which you yourself could ~~not~~ say, perhaps in other words and in another way and another sequence? And ^{*that's*} the topic is that I have to answer, and to challenge and to fight Dr. Richard Cabot.

The second story is a more exhilarating one. For the last 30 years my work in Germany was concerned with the Youth Movement, trying with all kinds of activities to re-inspire the youth. There was a remnant, of course, many of my students, ^{*not becoming nazified.*} One of these finally turned up and asked me to help him get out of the country. It meant for me that there was some inheritance, some German students who approved of my work over there and wanted to join me. So I tried for a whole year to get him over. It took a whole year. He went through the month of September in Prague knowing that he was under suspicion of high treason. Now he is on his way to this country. ^{*You will meet him next Friday, here.*} There was my life ^{*to rescue him*} in Germany; there is one year of effort; there is the last suspense of a month ^{*when*} ~~was threatened~~. ^{*30 years; one year, one month. These are*} all sequences of time hanging within each other and getting ahead of each other.

I will read his letter. He visited a relative of ours, my wife's sister, *in Zurich*. He says, "I am breaking my long silence, but you know letters over the ocean take eleven days and in the meantime everything changes. Now I am sitting at the railroad station. My mother has just gone, and we are waiting for the train. The train is leaving at eight minutes past eight." Where my wife's sister lives is about half an hour from Zurich. I do not know when the letter was written, whether in the afternoon or in the morning. My wife remembers that the train goes in the morning, so we with great difficulty verified what he meant when he said, "The train is leaving at eight past eight."

You see there are thirty years, there are ten years, and there is this one day. Yet the boy is perfectly right in *asking to imagine myself him* putting me *at this point where* we can see him waiting at the railroad station. He made me realize the suspense, because he did not mean space but time, and he put me in the small time universe, *together with him. People who can shape one time or, even the shortest, in its suspense, its expectation, live together. People in the same space do*

hot of live together The problem of time is so difficult because man is living at the same moment in so many organisms of time, and the man who wishes to make another person share his time must show him where it will lead to, where it will end.

A doctor does not do so; a teacher does not do so. They withhold from *himself or her* what they *are going to do* *next*. I think this little story illustrates what I was driving at in the *commandments*. They are a sequence in time, a sequence of man's *entering and*

giving up, and the new shaping of an hour in our life. We only share the life of the moment with other persons when we are able to divine where we *are* lead to, what is going to happen next. *Today we are going to*

We all meet in space, but nobody knows where we are going next. We are all very nice here, but we never share the life of a person unless we know where *he is* *(The future only gives meaning to our present.)* *we are going next.* People are very nice when they are with you but they go off into the night and they have, of course, to make friends where they are.

So if you take the small unit of one hour and the next, or the peak unit of a human life, the problem today is to restore *its* proper glory, *the*

Time, between days and years,

the arch which leads on. The bridges between ~~are~~ today the secrets, the mysteries; everybody tries to make everybody happy, for the first time but plunges him into misery because he does not care for the change. This is the metabolism of the human soul. As election comes along, we elect somebody new and there is a break. There is an abyss between. This is the time ~~mystery~~, and my commandments are an attempt to show you that the next step has its repercussions ~~for~~ the previous, that you must know when you educate a child that you tend to educate an adult, and an adult must know that he must prepare to become an elder. The child, the adult, and the elder, I wish to take up once more and to develop something like a scientific terminology.

These Theses are ~~just~~ scientific attempts ~~to give you the feeling that I am developing point after point.~~ The first could read also, There is no science of time today. We have ^{causal} ~~causation~~ and we have great pictures and we have vivification as in educational theory and in politics. We do something with time all the time. As one of you said, it is an art. But not a science. So this negative statement is meant to set us on the track and you see again the difference between an idea which may inspire us and a science which makes us work together, co-operate. Everybody, so to speak, works today in these fields on his own responsibility. ~~The co-operation is more perfect in work.~~ ^{The great religious redirection of life} or less technical. The great historians ~~are~~ perfectly lonely in their work.

~~It has never become a technical co-operation. But the history is always written by a man who does it out of himself. This logic is the bridge from this idea into this process. I would like you to see that there is something that has to be done, that two and two is four in time as in matter.~~

It is a pretentious thesis. I say it can be done.

(3) The ten commandments are addressed to three cycles, three generations in human life. You know I am not saying that there are not vestiges and traces ^{of all ten} at all stages, but the emphasis shifts and there is a decided diff-

difference in the way society treats the child, the adult, and the elder.

The child is treated as a natural growth; it is fed, sent to school, sustained.

It must not fight for its livelihood. It is supported in the home. So it is

still pre-historic. We speak so much today of the pre-historic because here

it is around us in the child. The adult: when a boy gives you a shoeshine he

is treated as an adult, but essentially the boy who enters life at a later

stage is a pure adult. The elder is already a man; he leaves a mark, an im-

print on the ^{age} We can call the adult a fighting or social being, and the

elder a historical personality. Or if you wish another expression of the

division of the three groups, perhaps we may say that in the child we are

dealing with a recurrent facts of nature, in the adult with the fighting,

changing spirit who has to place himself in society, and only later we get

the situation of a man who becomes of ^{unique himself} value. We talk so much of values to-

day because we do not like to speak about God. We must not forget that there

is ^{not only} the true, the beautiful, and the good, but there are men who are witnesses

of divinity. But mostly in the theory of values the human being is left out

of the ^{last}. The elder is the man with lasting value, somebody who is going

to survive. So the child is the ^{natural} individual; the dignitary, the fighter, the

carrier on of function, is in the middle generation, the adult, ^{as he is a social individual} and the elder

is the man who has now become a part of the created world and to whom we all

can look as something which has entered creation as a new thing. The world

does not only consist of the globe but of the country where George Washington

and Lincoln have lived ^{as men} and by whom we still are led in certain respects. ^{they are} ~~historical personalities.~~

I only wanted to emphasize the differences of the three stages because

in order to become scientific these ten commandments must become comparable

among themselves, ~~and~~ the comparison which every science ^{allows to} leads to, the dis-

solution ^{which is isolated} of an idea into a process, like the idea of God ^{into a process, living and}

^{we} ~~historical within~~ the Trinity, ~~(must)~~ operate on the fact that these ten are repetitive, that

they are revealing a process that goes on within the child, the adult and the elder. I am stressing the difference that goes on between these three generations lest we are not ~~shored up~~ ^{shored up} enough by the changes that are recurrent.

(4) These three stages, of child, adult and elder, or, as I would prefer, Children of God, brothers on this earth in the fight, so to speak--the idea of ~~as a comrade in space and looking~~ the elder the last century, the brotherhood of man ~~as a comrade in space~~, as a person-
ality, the father and mother of future generations, ~~The father is the parent of himself.~~ ^{a torch bear, a mile stone on the road} ~~We all are our own being's ancestors.~~

There is a grammar of the human soul. In my first paper, which was sent out too early and which most of you therefore have not read or have not understood, I make the point that man in history and in childhood does not find himself as an ego, an I. (Will you kindly see this as if it were written I.)

As you know, the ten commandments in the Old Testament begin with Harken.... God is the only I. No one else can claim to be divine, and no one else can speak of himself as divine. Only within the last few centuries have we the word ego. Plato and Aristotle did not know it. They are modest. In anti-

quity the gods or heroes ^{talked to their heart, not of their ego. When Odyssseus tells his story, he begins with his own experience in the first} In the ultimate emergency, when a man is bereft of his home, he must speak

of himself alone, but that, so to speak, is a misfortune, a deprivation of ^{normal} the (human) character. Because we discover our opposition to our parents as a will when we first say No, ^{that happens as a second phase in life} I know a person, very close to me, whose first spoken word was selbst, which means myself. It meant that she would do it

herself; ~~which means that~~ her self moved in opposition to the forces which

tried to hold sway over her and mould this plastic infant; and an infant is

a plastic character. ^{'Self' is an answer to the overreaching environment of self, at first we simply are a part.}

We overlook today this tremendous process of learning to speak. From so many stutterers, etc. you know how often this process fails, because, I think, in this country the children do not obey long enough. The parents

are not willing to talk business. They do not say "Listen," but "Wouldn't it be nice if you would do this?" They express everything in the third person. It would not be nice. They miss the point that there is in every human being a demand for this imperative. Of course the imperative must be in freedom of the spirit. There is no mental command except the one: Listen.

The mistake of modern ethics is that it tries to have ^{specific} contents. You can ask ~~for~~ a person to listen, to read, to respond. These are all pro-
cesses, free of any qualification of what you shall read... These commandments are ~~negative~~ ^{ascetic}. Nowhere is it said what you shall do. But the modern ethics

tells you what you shall do, and they land in fascism and communism. This is not meant to bring up adult people, parents. They are free and they do what they do under the guidance of the plasticity, the education which has been

given to them. ^{eternal} The only ethical command of eternal validity is: *Be good.*
Off we go, we are free; every generation has its own ethics.
The only ethics which the science of time can demand is the ethics of ^{of the ten commandments} undergoing all these spiritual experiences. The exposure can be asked from

any member of society, but not an implication of the content of his response.

The important thing is that the child should know that there comes a stream of intellectual wealth to him when he ^{people speak to him in} hears a language, and most children are very glad to be allowed to speak. You know your cheek bones are formed

by the language which you speak. Many parts of our body are formed by our speech. And if you want to heal a patient, a nervous or neurasthenic person,

let him learn another language. Immediately his brain is forced to work in another way. This is a sample of the importance of Greek, ^{or rather} In the first stage of life the process of birth is continued. ~~It is an inhibition.~~ A man who thinks in a certain language—it is the same in shorthand—what he would speak aloud he innervates certain parts of his system.

This is a by-remark to enliven the importance of the plastic mind in the situation which I have called here you, and in any normal language I would

call thou. By abolishing the second person, ^{singular} thou, you have thrown out the soul and kept the mind and the body: the mind is the ego and the body is the it. It is a grave operation, performed by Bacon, Hobbes, etc., that they have thrown out the soul, the thou, from the language. The normal situation in which the ~~healthy~~ human being must find himself ^{first and again and again} is that he is an addressee: someone is telling ^{him?} ~~him~~ what to do. Then ~~you~~ ^{respond}. Mr. Dreyfus advised ~~us~~ ^{to read} to use the word seek, and I took it up because the child goes out ^{indeed} (to verify this ~~what~~ language ^{is, indeed} tells him). Going to school is to discover that what you have heard and what you read is all one, and you discover it, educationally speaking, by being in one room with different classmates and speaking the same language. In every moment the ^{from your house} slang (and the language ^{of the universe} are being ^{confronted and} unified. For every person speaks an idiom at home, and thus the language must be unified by effort. But do not believe that there would be such a thing as English save by this common enterprise by which people give up their private way of learning the language. There is a permanent ^{vacation} effect. Every language has dialects; every moment there is patois and unified language, and this must be in equilibrium. ^{language is listener} ~~To, and searched, too. Hence it is a forced direction.~~ When we give a child vacation we believe in ~~this~~ process of forgetting. We can speak of the child after dismissing him into his playground. He disappears from us and we can sit down and consult what we shall do with him. We let him go out of sight. When parents are able to let the child play without controlling it, it is the first effort of independence. It is ^{not} now a little animal. Playing is already returning into a state of unconsciousness as an educated being. The first form is over. This is the movement of the human heart and human mind through these four stages.

I will take it up on the second level. If you wish to sum up the first level you write: The child assimilates his environment; and the way the child assimilates his environment cannot happen without challenge from people who tell him. Then he discovers his equality with others and then he is dismissed into vacation or leisure, - the assimilation of the environment. The second

stage is the fighting man in society, the conquest of his place in society, the conquest of space. He sees something in the teaching, in the tradition and order of the universe: Is there a God? Is there truth? Any question, any abuse, first love, any injustice with which he meets, makes a boy think. How can he bridge this situation? Thinking makes him into an independent separate being. It comes very late in life. I did not discover that I was separated from my *family* ~~life~~ until I was fourteen. In this country I think it happens at three, and there is something lacking therefore in the rest of the life of the child. *Later,* The doubt or question makes again a plastic situation or a middle voice. You are in this wavering situation where you cannot decide whether you will be the animal or the *god*. The act which we decided to call the sixth commandment is the emphasis which you decide to throw on one side of the question. Is this wrong? I am going to criticize it. Is this superstitious? I am going to protest. In this moment you invite, and you are going to endure the reaction of the outside world. You endure. This means, this process of enduring, that again the world and you become awake, and you fight your opponent. You and your opponent are in the same boat. Curley and Saltonstall are both in the same boat, both playing politics. Generally speaking, the two candidates running against each other are in the same boat, fighting for the same faith in society. They discover *themselves from* each other. You must not think it only comes when they are a good team. It comes from *the* practical wisdom that we have to love our enemies. Our enemies are very useful. They mould us and we stick together. How often have people been made by their enemies because the fight took them ten years. They got stuck with their opponent. It is very dangerous when you challenge somebody. The greatest fool may become your adversary and the world simply nails you down to this one issue. *Your dual-partner really makes you yourself.* It is true on this second level of the conquest of space, of making your way in society of the normal being who wants to live, to raise his

children, I have omitted one thing which is a mental process,- when you have to put up with your opponent there comes over you silence, and I could have said, Be silent. Which means that your fight, your act, the mental criticism which you made, ceases to take possession of you and you get free of this pressure which history or society has made on you. You are the man who has fought for this. After a while you say, "That is not all of me," and you give up, and this is expressed by this situation of silence. It is not the sense of forgetting, but you are not going to do it again. A fool only can fight for the same issue all his life. I think many people do not feel when their time is over. The whole problem of modern society is today with the seventh and eighth commandments. Doubt and fighting are allowed to people. Enduring is disagreeable. It is bought off by escapism. The eighth commandment, Purify yourself, let years elapse,, is simply not known. Many people, corporations, newspapers, magazines, like the "Atlantic", simply do not know when they should die. We have no way of advocating the death of institutions today, which is in the mental sphere so dangerous that it has produced in many countries revolutions. Because the greed of the acquisitive man in society is such that he does not wish to reconquer his freedom. He does not wish to be allowed to become plastic again.

The curse of the modern man is that he thinks he must speak and speak, and of course he is ~~only expected~~ ^{all his life} to speak about the subject he is asked to speak about. I think the burial of the things which should die is the problem of the university too. If you do not get young scientists who shift from ^{the} departments in existence to new departments, in time, you will get the population shifting from one ~~set~~ of governing classes to others in no time. I am quite serious. I think the shift of emphasis for every adult from the thing he has done to a situation of silence, where he is willing to give up what he has done, is lacking today. The bridge from one situation to another is too much to

take. Suicide ^{and breakdown} is preferred today by the average man in middle life to a ^{mental} change. But the greatest sin is not in business, I think, but in the mental occupations of our colleagues in the departments. The laziness of the departments, the possessiveness of the departments, means that the moment of silence, when the thing is over, is not accepted. President Conant is not here, so I may perhaps say that the thing which has made him President is one little thing: that at 35 he said, "I think I should have a different form of ^{profession} ^{after 40} life when I should cease to be a chemist." ^{There} He was inwardly prepared; he saw that to be a chemist is one thing but not everything. Every man gets the fulfillment of his inner growth. It takes something to know that your success is not a temptation.

Hence the sixth and seventh commandments carry over to the problem of the elder. When Daniel Webster was offered the vice-presidency of the United States he said, "I have waited for the Presidency," and he refused it. The president who was elected died within four weeks. Webster died a broken-hearted and dispirited man: ^{just as Whittier's ode pictured him. This is contained in the 7th commandment.} (You must not be sullen. John Quincy Adams was President ~~in~~ 1829. In 1838 his constituents of Quincy elected him member of the House of Representatives, and he accepted it. I mean by acceptance the power of the grown-up man to start all over in the way ^{Adams} ~~he~~ have accepted him, as, after you have been president accepting this little shop-worn office in congress again. Many people sulk in the corner and think they don't get what they are entitled to. But civic honors are the response of society to what you have fought for, and you cannot know where this is taking you. The only thing for the elder is that ^{personally and not invite him under a misapprehension.} people must know who he is. They must not take him for just a Harvard man, or a typical individual. He must have put up his fight; he must have set down his foot. Of course, his problem is, Do they buy me for what I am or do they buy me under an illusion? But if he is a public character he need not ask on what level he is asked to serve. Because the call comes now, not from the world

in its outer stage of negation and abuse, ^{when he was} as ~~in his~~ fighting for life to make his place in society, but when society calls him as a public character he is asked to leave an imprint on time. ^{in his own right} The conquest of your environment was followed by the conquest of space. You conquer society as to its means. You must make a living, put up a fight. Every civic honor means this trusteeship, even serving on a committee. The Greeks thought so highly of such an authority that they put such people among the ancestors of society, and that is what every elder is. He is allowed to conquer the future. A judge today is an example, or a president or a teacher. He is responsible for the molding, the casting of the future forms of society. Man as a law-making animal is an elder, as a fighting being is the adult, as a growing being is the child. *The elder teaches and rules.*

The teacher then is the ^{principle} ruler. You get rule and teach very closely connected. He can only rule in a legal form; he can only teach because he is given power to teach. The whole problem of the teachers' oath is that Harvard offers the opportunity to teach and the teacher has accepted it, and the problem is not invited under whose authority is he teaching. Whenever an elder is entitled to influence the future (and young teachers are ^{artificially} anticipated elders—we have so many young teachers because we have no elders), or when a business man in former days taught Sunday School, he must mix his personal experience which he had acquired in ^{as adult} his second phase, with the wisdom of the ages, with what he has heard from his forefathers, his parents. For the elder represents the personal experience and the wisdom of the ages, and has to blend both. Some people think they must only hand over what other people have thought. Today the modern situation is that a boy goes to college and then is turned out a teacher. It must be done perhaps today, but we must warn people that this is not meant.

The second thing is that they have to have the courage to blend these two things. A sailor who tells his yarn is not teaching. To tell a story is not the whole wisdom; that is only personal experience. But a teacher must

tell his story in the light of universal wisdom, and ~~in the light~~ ^{speaks of the universe} in the light of his own life. This is important because immediately you see that in every society the three generations must be represented. In this moment we are here the three generations. And if you analyze any situation of society, these three situations, of the listening, the pushing or fighting or powerful, and the signifying, the interpreting old age are mostly present in every mental endeavor. Man has conquered time, has conquered the future, when he has accepted in the light of his predecessors a ~~thing~~ ^{personal possession} which he will carry over and hand over to his successor. The action and reaction follow each other. The elder, the parent, the ancestor, the founder, the teacher, thinks of his predecessor and of his successor. He has quite a different proportional point of view. His problem is to unify the different generations. The whole problem of space and of time is divided this way, that space connects the three generations ^{quite externally, in one room} whereas teachers, rulers, governors, priests, always have this problem of apostolic succession ^{of unity} ~~of unity~~ ^{the togetherness real}. How can I ~~function~~ ^{phase} with the apostolic succession without destroying the creation before me and the creative power of my disciples? It means I must create successors, dream of successors, and leave room for free successors. Democracy does nothing. ^{of making} Dictators are resolved not to let ^{successors} them come. That is why I call this ^{phase} designation. Fifty percent of a good man ^{thought} must be his fear that the thing he stood for will not be carried on. It may be carried on by different forms, but the successor must be there. He must embody the same thing. Nothing of this, I think, is discussed in modern comments ^{on politics}.

In No. 5 I have said that the teacher's education is today the point on which it becomes clear that something has to be done in this sphere. It is the subdivision of the much greater problem of how the fighting adult is entering this level of lasting significance, where he is reconciled when his fights are over to all the predecessors who have fought from the beginning of time and will fight to the end of creation. We are between the people who have done this before and the people who are going to do this later.

Now may I break off here and jump over quickly to the same movement from the plastic to the active to the reactive or to the objective on a bigger scale, in order to exploit it to the fullest. What goes on in the private life of a man happens at large in the history of the world. The life of a man and the day of science, for example, are intimately connected in the sense that these four movements appear on the greater level just as well. What I have called the problem of ideas, science, education, and knowledge, are nothing but these four phases of the life-giving idea through mankind ^{instead of biography}. And these problems are more easily recognized in the great movements of the ages, in the history of Christianity, than in the small atoms of an hour of education. When a teacher wishes to understand what is going on in his classroom he must look at the history of the last two thousand years, because the big things are the simplest. Why is this day of science, from 1500 to date, exactly the same movement, showing the same phases as this curriculum of one person? Because this process of mankind ^{simple and common human} always needs an imperative of faith ^{from faith}. A scientist must take his orders, and all I have tried to show is that a man like Paracelsus was simply unable to go forward ^{to success} before he had ^{too} spread this universal phase. He did not make discoveries but he discovered the country in which people can make discoveries. He simply showed that space, creation, nature, contained all these ^{future} miracles and wonders, and he tried to rouse enthusiasm for the whole movement. But in a sense he was crippled because the general public ^a did not believe there was anything to get in this way. The founder is in ^{so} this situation in which the imperative becomes audible first and has to be lived, ^{so} that nothing can stop this command. That is why the founder has to undergo difficulties: because if he would not act as every decent person of course must, without any thought of reward and without any success in the outer world, it would not be clear that he did act from this invisible command. Everybody could say that he only acted like a modern research man who acts because he gets a Guggenheim Fellowship. Research ^{for creating a new faith in the public} is not enough. I do not belittle research, but you must see that as the

teacher is the elder, ^{he is} but only one case of the situation of everybody who wants to be a personality. In the same sense the research is only in a small way repeating the situation of Paracelsus, who had to do this although nobody believed him. He leaves an imprint just by the fact that he was able to ^{stand} alone. The man of faith is always alone. ^{faith in science} The ~~man~~ was created in the 16th century, when people did not believe and some people went ahead and created a faith. ^{in happier times} ~~Or~~ we are created in a faith. I do not care so much, ^{which faith was created in 1500} as for the fact that they made people listen. Today everybody is shot through with a faith which did not exist 400 years ago, and it is most interesting to know that all the theologians and ministers are shot through with an incredible faith in science. Of course they are afraid of it. They believe in it whether it is the devil or not. It does not matter. Some people believe in the devil. ^{For science} ~~The phase of the life giving idea was the 16th century. It created the faith~~ in science.

The second phase, the scientific phase, is when you can recognize what you discover, and this discovery follows certain rules. I have tried to show that these movements ^{for eternity space, and, today, time} ~~betray a human duty of conquering space and of conquering time~~ ^{spiritual adventures} are the three great powers of man. We establish ourselves in eternity through these three processes. Science ^{followed its course} ~~followed the same~~. It became from a faith an actual process in operation when people ~~could~~ cooperate. To cooperate is decisive. The second stage meant that the ego ~~was~~ ^{is} entering a body of scientists, a staff; what we call a staff are people forming one ego for some-~~ain~~ thing. Two scientists living in China and in New York are acting as one man. They have completed the solidarity through space of all their members. The international republic of scholars means that you can be a physicist or a chemist all over the globe.

? I think that right now one of the great tragedies is that one can no longer be a mathematician. One is a German mathematician.

R-H: There is a break. The Germans have got tired of carrying the burden of the world. That is why I am talking of a new science. But the day of faith dawned when Paracelsus taught that all over the globe

in spite of the difference of time men are considered as one ego. I do not wish to bother you with physiological terms. The fact is that a body of scientists, as soon as you enter the process of scientific thought, you exclude your accidental self and enter a process of operations which are going on for hundreds of years with collection of facts, and are exactly like a living body. No one truth within the scientific process may last for ten years. No body of science contains lasting truth, but it is an established process by which truth is born and given up and replaced, as in the bones the cells are made and moved forward and thrown out again. They are built up and destroyed every moment by millions of cells. In the same way the body of science is not actually sure but in every moment somebody says, "Mr. So-and-so is wrong," and he of course is wrong too, but that does not matter, because you are due in science to take this as the truth of this moment, and as a good physician, for example, you have to act on the assumption that this state of the science is the true state.

Today the truth is changing rapidly, I fear too rapidly, and the history of science is taken up by people of deeper insight because they think there is more continuity in the problem than these modern reviews and weeklies make you think. This makes it clear that this science is not a body of fact, but a body of operations into which thousands of individuals all over the globe enter, which in no moment claims to be invariable but in every moment is between ignorance and knowledge, - a very delicate situation because you must admit your ignorance and you must assert that you know. If he admits he is no scientist, and if he denies that he is no scientist and certainly no teacher. So science can die of luxury, of being overfed and too conceited.

The hour of the scientist runs into the problem of the *education*. Every man tries to conquer the future by educating the people. Education then

is the situation in which you conquer so that you have the right to teach, to influence the future. In the 17th century they never taught. They had a secret society. *Leibniz* never thought of his problems even being published. It was enough that they circulated among the people who could read them. Today we take it for granted that everybody is to be taught a knowledge which is, as I said, the objective form of the science, which is its conclusion. He never looks at the process, he wishes to know the result. And of course he gets nothing, because the operation is as important as the result. This delicate balance you can never convey when you write a popular knowledge article. When a man gets the knowledge he does not know how delicate, how frail, how questionable this knowledge is, how bound up with certain antagonisms and certain polarities, and that when one thing comes another will go immediately. So today, where knowledge has got hold of science, people struggle to get back the faith. I think at Princeton there is this deep feeling that you must try, at least. You must have the primadonnas, you must have the best, in order to initiate in this country a repetition of all the four phases of science. If you have no people who can represent the faith of science in this country the other three phases cannot go on. You would have no faith, you would have no endowments, you would have no policies and props for your building. The other phases then lean back. ~~The~~ The problem of the history of science has less to do with the finding of faith. You get an attempt to keep the cooperation going by not allowing too fast acceleration in the declaration of scientific language. Everywhere technical language is developed to such an extent that the same problem in another country has a different name. Every group of scientists labels things with a new term. It is incredible how new words are destroying the power of cooperation. When economists speak about the state they all use a different language, and how can a student recognize that the thing is the same. The deprivation of scientific language has run a terrific course. The most simple movements from faith or ideal to science,

to education, to knowledge, are things which throw out certain ^{things} as superfluous. No new thought is justifiable if it does not simplify matters, I would not offer this if I did not know that certain things become impossible² between education and religion and politics. What the child does on the educational level, what the minister preaches about Christian freedom of the spirit, and what the adult does in politics and society, you can label with one word. This is progress. This is building up a simple language for one thing, and you get a process of integration. I have used this famous word, but I want to ask what it really means. It takes today the place of a science of time. It means everything, it means God Almighty, salvation, and everything. It is really very funny. What is integration? It is something mathematical, I am told. Probably it means to be grafted upon the tree of eternal life.

Perhaps it is worth while ~~that we then~~ state these three levels once more, in theological terms. It may show you that there is a translation and a negation and a simplification. When a child and an adult and an elder conquer, they do something in the terms of the Bible. The man in society discloses or reveals himself. The elder tries to save the world, to save time from oblivion. The creature within the child is the full creature only when he is educated, assimilating his environment, a poor expression for becoming really a creator in the glorious sense in this world. So I am willing to say, creation, revelation and salvation as really meaning these three stages.

I have promised to show you that the scientist is depending in a very delicate balance. The faith of the scientist is ^{behind} that he can go beyond the facts of space. That is to say, the sacrifice ~~of~~ the scientist makes in honor of his faith is that he does not believe in parents, he does not believe in things as they seem to be. The of life is nothing to him, to attack a such is everything. And the whole sacrifice of modern science, the mechanical

discovery is that the sun is not beautiful but is the center of gravity.

The Scientist
He reduces everything. We may call it the scientific sacrifice of the modern age. Now go back to the middle ages and you will understand why I am asking this question about sacrifice, and how modern man will trust the scientist. In the matter of poison gas and of the vitamins in food—during the war food was suddenly full of vitamins—the doctors simply lied; they sold out their science. And today science is held not to be less good in itself but looked on as something you can buy. Faith in the scientist is gone. It does not depend on the single scientist to restore this faith, because society has other reasons to disbelieve the individual. The scientist has to go outside the monasticism space, outside the appearance. The celibacy, / of the medieval man allowed him to educate the children of God. The childish situation of monasticism was that the child of the people was taught what the fathers of the church had created. Our problem is how to educate parents, not how to teach children. We must look into the parents today, as the scholastics would look into the child, as the child of God, to know what has gone on before in the church. They made a sacrifice too. They did not marry. They cut themselves off from time and space, and lived in eternity in a very radical way. You cannot understand Thomas Aquinas if you do not always remember that he was a monk, and that his right to teach was dependent on his being a monk. 100,000 people, all friars, and the university of Paris was run by monks. It seems to us today incredible, but at that time it had the effect of making people trustworthy. They did something to be teachers. If you wish to have a science of time you must have people who are not dominated by time. We have no science of time because the science of space has developed a complete for the current events, and the solution in some colleges today is, Give the boys everything they can get in your time anyway.

The temptation of every science is its own subject-matter. To go

behind the things you must be free from these things to a certain extent.

I wished to show you the detailed operations of Paris, Bologna and Salerno, but I am afraid I have overtaxed you. You must allow me then to take up this problem of the organization of the universities the next time. In our syllabus it was thought that today I would finish the situation of the scientist, but it seemed to me that I had to go back to the science of time. Let me finish with this one remark.

I have not only announced that parents and scientists,—one has to have faith in ideas and the other has to operate; but I have tried to take myself the same step in moving from the ten commandments to something inside which allows for movement analogy over all the scientific operations which are really created. Logic is seldom created. There is a scientific logic, but it is never practiced in any important matter. We teach logic but it is far from what everybody does. To recognize these movements to the first person and the second person plural and to the objective is an experience of life, of a process, is an intuition which we can share and any historical group can understand and recognize the other. We can know on ^{which} ~~such~~ level of the process he is at this moment, and this can help him a lot. It is for every man himself to know that to be an adult is not to be an elder. We are keeping people childish today, because we do not recognize these different processes. We recognize this and can talk about it with somebody else. You can not only help him but you begin to establish a cognition that you can express in a universal form. Science exists where you have universal expression for something specific. The logic of the science of time is an attempt to articulate something of which everybody knows some parts and must be reminded to know it again and see that he can hand it down. The science of time exists and man with his private experience is connected with the tradition of all the ages and can recognize what has gone through human hearts and brains always and must go on in the

future. The science of time is the universal recognition of this process by everybody. I have called it the new grammar or the art of articulation. We must know that people have articulated things and that our children are inarticulate and shall be until the time comes when they will articulate their own experience. The science of time is opposite to the science of space. Space is in the delicate stage between science and knowledge, and ours is in the stage of having articulated. We must know that we are articulate and have articulated, and they are not, and we must have the wisdom to let them. So that ignorance is before us and knowledge is behind us. It is difficult to master. How far can we let the forms of life go on inarticulate? When is the moment to make them articulate?

DISCUSSION

Q. That last description you gave of the connection of the past is the best description of integration that I have heard. One feels oneself as an I and a we, a you and an it all at once. Integration has a meaning and it is a good word.

A. At the end of the lecture I will admit it. Without all that commentary it is meaningless.

Q. Why do you call designation one of the commandments of education? Isn't that something that goes beyond education?

A. If you look at education as something which comes under the sway of your parents in the sense that they must do it, they cannot. But if you think of parents having faith in the educational process, ^q that they send children out into the world so that they know what is waiting for them, they cannot help thinking of their children as full personalities. ~~That is to say,~~ They ^{may} think that the greatest thing they can ask for their children is to reach a peak of fame and glory; that is not right. Beyond the conquest of glory there lies this wider aspect, that they must look out for reproducing the very best thing they have done in the future. Very few people want more possessions, money, success. They cannot really use these if they are parents, at all, because as parents they love children. Why deprive their children

Q. You substitute the teacher for the parent.

A. I had to. We have no word for this authority of the father today. I should like to replace the word teach by the word rule, but in a democracy I am not allowed. You are right that ^{parental} teaching is discarded today. I am perfectly willing to sacrifice all these terms.

Q. I only desired to have it made clear, because it seems ^{ed} to me that you were suggesting that a ~~business man~~ or a teacher would designate his successor, and it seems to me that is a fallacy. I do not think a teacher should designate his successor.

A. Again this word. What shall I do? You take college presidents today-- there are 400--where you have to look out for ~~a~~ new college president.³ The problem is have they done everything in their power as a group to let people grow, who have this broadness and of training^{so} that they should become president. There should be opportunities to prepare themselves, and it is harder and harder to get people who have administrative talent, it seems to me.

Do not demands, *the needs*
Q. ~~Did~~ the times change?

A. Yes, but there must be something wrong when you have to get people who are mere scholars or mere executives. What I am advocating in this whole book is that all these qualities must be in the full person. I am advocating that a teacher must designate his successor. 500 years ago actually every man in society gave 50 per cent of his dreams to the question to whom he should bequeath his place. ^{now} We think of life only; I have tried to make clear that death happens in every stage of our life. We die to ourselves ten times in our lives, and we can discover ^{that} the last station ^{is} one more change, and a change in which we ^{should} have a part. I think the 19th century has been a century of supermen who have left weeds after them. Bismarck weeded out all possibility of government after him. He crushed every independent mind in Germany. He made them quail. Wagner in music was a superman; there is no other music ^{after him.} Marx, a third superman: not a word must be touched of this bible, ^{or his. He has} no successor. So we have these three men, and the brother of these men, Nietzsche. It is no accident that there has been no designation. Everybody is the last and supreme phase of humanity.

Q. In your definition of designation you mention a man who is not a disciple... A. There is an application here to Christianity. It has been a question on which I have wavered, whether it was a coincidence or simply inevitable that the rock on which Christianity was placed

Q. I should like to bring up a very minor point and inquire whether your remark concerning the "Atlantic" etc. was purely facetious or whether you would advocate a decree of death for such institutions? And if so, would not such a decree be more dangerous than a lingering death?

A. I think the question before the editors is how long ^{the magazine should live}. That question is never asked today. They think that they must keep on ^{forever}.

Q.two movements ..

A. We have these little attempts of small groups to do something for a day and nothing comes of it. All these things come up like mushrooms, they have one spring and then it is over. Then you have things like the "Atlantic" which never die because they are no longer alive. In Germany we had what you call fraternities, and on the other side these floating groups who dissolved themselves in two years. I think both are extreme. You get the ^{such should} on one side and the solidified on the other. I think things have perhaps ten, fifteen, thirty years, but ^{then} we should ask the question. I ask for a mortality in which we know that the life of the spirit also is alive. But ^{ordinarily} the man has established himself in a timeless way, never asking himself should he go through the Good Friday.

Q. But would you agree that it is one of the institutions of democracy that they die as lingering a death as they choose. Perhaps a better morality on the part of the public would force them to die more quickly.

A. I think that when you do not get the death ^{by the action of our minds} in its mind you get the death ^{from} in society. If people do not see that the powers that be are destroyed or reformed in the laboratories of the universities or colleges, they will ^{be} destroy ^{ed} ~~them~~ outside in politics. That is the issue in fascism. Fascism is a destructive, and the principal idea means that you The first thing the fascists did in Austria was to abolish the two socialistic faculties. If you have younger generations who are allowed to shift from de-

partment to department—that is lacking in our professorial equipment. The departments themselves have their limitations. They grow up in the departments because that is the only way they can make a living. So we have departments and departments and department stores, and our modern universities are department stores.

Q. You said that science at one time ~~had~~^{was} rather a secret society and that in America this was no longer the case. I wonder if that is so. I wonder if you are not thinking of the efforts of certain scientists to popularize science. But science itself, I think, is a limited society. A scientific article is written for such a society. The writer has no idea that it is going to be read by a large number of people but writes it for the four or five people who will read it and whose opinion will mean something to him. Don't you think that in that sense science is a secret society?

A. I can only say that this summer a mathematician was living in our house and writing an article. He said he was writing this for 150 or 200 people but I think this is sometimes a process of When I read the Speculum or some other such publication I cannot help feeling that there is a secret society but no public *because it* ought to be a secret forever. I believe this is true in mathematics. I am not sure in other fields. I would also say that so long as it is done and people are ready to sacrifice themselves in this secret cooperation, probably the thing is alive.

Q. The so-called popularization of science is peculiarly difficult because people are asked to do things which cannot be done, that is, to make something intelligible to an audience which ~~has~~ not at the moment or probably never would be able to understand.

Q. There is something of a difference, though, between the cryptic secrets of the alchemists as a guild in the middle ages, who were unwilling to reveal their secrets except to the initiated, and the scientist who believes in pub-

licity and is willing to reveal so far as he can. There is certainly a distinct difference. He is willing to reveal so far as other people are willing to have it revealed.

A. One is really proud. Mr. Spengler is boasting

Q. Even in the old days you were very unwilling to use words until the word was understood. Don't you think that even the Papacy did not want to explain these things when they were using words which meant nothing to the untrained public. The Pythagoreans

A. I think there is a difference between inadequate and Everybody is a potential member of the group of knowledge, - a potential member only.

Q. When they were holding back, weren't they very fond of doing just what you do—they would refuse to use a word until it was understood.

Q. The church did that, didn't it, to protect theology from the untrained? They made no effort to have men read the Bible because of the danger *(misunderstand)*

A. They became suspicious only during the 16th century. There was a tremendous effort of the church to give the Bible to everybody. You must not think that the Lutheran Bible is the first. But *church people* they came to the end of their wits. Mr. McCarthy will tell you that this dogma that the church presented of the reading of the Bible cannot be stated in this way. So long as they had faith that every man is a child of God and a Christian they were quite democratic. Only when they saw what could be made of the Bible turned away from tradition they became exasperated.

Q. You said science is a body of operations, as I understand. Are there in theology intellectual operations which are not in your sense scientific?

A. Any science must be universal. Democracy and Christian Science are the only ones that are open to every believer. If you wish to believe in the of nature, you are a potential member of the group.

Q. I have seen the statement made that the scientific method and the general search for truth should be equated, because they are the same; that if there is any valid method of arriving at truth, that ~~that would~~ become ^s a part of scientific method, because of the fact that it was a valid method of arriving at truth. Would you agree?

A. Yes.

Q. I was a little puzzled as to whether the procedures by means of which values are apprehended or renounced are in reality scientific procedures or not.

A. The difficulty in the matter of historical figures is that so long as George Washington was just a rebel against the English Crown they could not see that he did something for the British Commonwealth. But Lloyd-George put a wreath on his tomb because he had saved the British Commonwealth. There you have the recognition, that he could see that the man who had opposed his little group ^{was a good} as somebody who had supported it. This is the equation the human mind arrives at rather late. It takes time. But I think today you would admit it is universal. The lesson can be learned by everybody, not just by America.

RCC: On the other hand, most scientific men would say ^{today that} science is one way of getting at truth, not all ways.

A. Exactly. It is a cooperative way of getting at truth, whereas many truths are discovered in the solitude of the human soul.

Q. Now I am a little puzzled. Which did you say?

A. Since we are all trying to establish a universal language of mankind, there is no truth which cannot also be found through scientific operation. Science is a valid language and makes up for the confusion of tongues between classes and generations.

RCC: You might have a ^{scientific method} ~~thing~~ that was entirely international and yet was only one of the ^{methods} ~~ways~~ of getting at truth.

Q. Isn't it true that the modern definition of science tends to be that it is ~~apt to be~~ a public affair between some one individual, ^{and all the world} that

scientific procedures ^{are} ~~have some~~ operation^s which is performed by some one individual ~~and that there are such~~ ^{but have} values that are ~~subjective~~ ^{no}, belong to one individual. If such values do depend on the individual then perhaps it is impossible to call that value ^{really} science, because the individual has no operation available by which he can demonstrate to other creature^s his experience.

A. But in every moment every man has a practical relation to the universe, and in every moment tries to cooperate with every other man. You get art and then you get admiration and then you get aesthetics, which are an attempt to have a science, to have a Fine Art Department in Harvard and in Dartmouth.

Q. But I do not think that is a contradiction.

Q. It depends on what you think your values are, whether individual or common.

A. But so far as they are your values you insist that they ^{real} are values. In this sense you are always waiting for recognition. The followers of an artist are perfectly certain that his pictures are art while others think they are just color. He must not wait till all the others have recognized it, but he believes that the others will recognize it in eternity.

Q. Emily Dickenson never published a word during her lifetime... There was no desire there for public recognition. She was writing for her own experience.

A. But the first reader did not ^{create} her poems. The creative act ^{may} ~~does~~ ^{over it} not invite the cooperation of the universe, but as soon as you read it it becomes a part of the universe, Most authors are their own best readers. You must look into all the different situations of human beings.

Q. Miss Dickenson was rugged individualism carried to the nth degree.

~~HCG: Didn't she think she was justified by heaven~~

Q. Do you think that the prime motive behind the activity of the artist ^{is} ~~would be~~ social recognition, or eventual social recognition?

A. I know nothing of motives. I am not interested in motives.

Q. Do you think that the drive in the artist when he creates is ^{for} immediate or remote social recognition?

Q. Would you be willing to change that to intercommunication? I think art normally is a form of communication, and it is one of the unfortunate signs of the end of an era that you get poets who write for their own criticism... That is the art of human ~~decadence~~ compared to great art, which is essentially a noble form of communication and desired as such by the artist. He wants to create something which others can share with him.

A. I think Mr. McCarthy would disagree, because he thinks art is a process in which the artist is discovering himself.

Q. I think that is an excellent example of the art of James Murray.

A. A fin-de-siècle art. The self which the poet discovers is much bigger than his real self. When he speaks others speak through him. You read a poem because the poet says what you would like to say. So before he writes a poem he has taken into him a part of mankind.

Q. You said you were not interested in motives. It seems to me that ^{are} motives ~~would be~~ inextricably woven into the whole problem of the social sciences.

A. Motives are a form of carrying over the ^{idea of} causation ~~problem~~ from the natural sciences into the science of time. I certainly know that we live because we die. In order to survive we must face not only that we are born but also have a destination. Man is between death and birth. In motives you go back to the problem of rebirth. But in living you are faced by the fact that this hour is hours, this meeting is our property. It will be over. We are acting under pressure, either of the ^{future} ~~past~~ or ^{or} of the past or ~~both~~. This hour is an attempt to balance, to bring these two together, what we know already, what we have done before, into an equilibrium of past and future. You cannot cut this problem by motives because it is life itself. I have heard a preacher say that Jesus went to the cross

because he could not help it. That is to say he has no motive in the sense of rational. But the whole movement of his life went to that and he faced it. But is it of any value to speak of motives? ~~Is it~~ ^{is} the important fact ~~that~~ ^{is} that he did it? I do not care for the motives for which Lincoln freed the slaves. He freed them. Don't forget the effects on history ~~of~~ seeking for motives. That is the disease of our time. People want to have causes, whereas I have what I call movements through these four phases. Life asks us to listen, to suffer, to be reborn. Do you know our motive for living?

Q. That is the historical view. It does not give much basis for prediction.

A. I am sure that I can predict more than you; so long as you are looking for motives you will not achieve very much. They have to look for facts and then they can go on.

Q. Did Jesus have any values?
difficult

A. That is a different question.

Q. Would you say that he had values or that the values were just what he was?

A. The achievement of a man does not depend on his good intention, so his value does not depend on his purpose. The purpose is again something which you hang out before yourself to comfort yourself. What you are to be in life does not depend on you. It comes when the times are ready.

Q. Cannot the same principle be applied to the work of an artist? That is all one wonders about, - that a man has done it and it is done, just as Lincoln freed the slaves or Christ went to the cross.

A. In this curriculum of life going through the motions, the only sin is not to die in time. It has nothing to do with the breaking of law, ~~and~~ or a mistake in position. On a childish level you make mistakes, on the social levels you break the law, but on the level of a man who has an eternal value

you sin against the fulfillment of your life. The only thing is ^{that} a man must not stop, he must go on. This is sin and the remission of sin consists in this, that all ^{the evil} he has done in his former life means nothing if he takes his next step. All is forgiven; the blunders of youth and the breaking of the law are forgiven him if he keeps alive. As I understand it it is all tautology.

RCC. You talk as if motives always had to be behind us; why not ahead? Why not live for the future as you want us to and by that motive?

A. If you would accept the impetus to live the good life all through and you call this a motive, I would call it a tautology.

RCC. ^{We} ~~You~~ don't merely want to live but to live a certain kind of a life which ^{we} ~~you~~ see as an ideal ahead of ^{us} ~~you~~. Only you want to tie down the motive to the past.

A. A motive ~~which~~ shows a lack of faith. If you say Conquer the future, you give up the real motive because that is just ^{to} ~~keeping~~ going.

GC. You don't consider ^{that a} ~~the~~ Final Cause ^{is a} ~~the~~ cause?

A. The Esquimaux have sleighs with very long poles sticking out, and at the end of the poles they bind a sausage, and the dogs run for that. That is an ideal. I do not think people should run for such an ideal. These dogs never come to life. They have no faith, no transformation of their whole vision, ^{so} ~~that~~ suddenly their values become much bigger than anything they have thought of. Motives do not reveal anything. I do not think I can give in.

Q. If you have the fact that A killed B, is it wrong for the ^{legal} ~~legal~~ process that they should ask Why did A kill B? What was A's motive in killing B?

A. When the thing has happened, yes. I ~~only meant~~ ^{about} in looking backward when you dissect a thing, Life stops. By every crime society is blocked in its process. History cannot go on so long as this crime is not taken up. Every recurrence can be analyzed in this way; but you have asked me ~~for~~ ^{about} motives for future acts. Anything that has happened may be assessed. If a man has killed for passion it is different from a murder for greed. But that has very

little to do with a man's situation in heaven or hell. We are not God Almighty. Most people try to be. Really when we speak of motives we try to sit in judgment in the sense of the last judgment.

Q. Where ~~is~~ this thought of mine is going is ^{this:-} ~~that~~ you have said that Lincoln liberated the slaves, and I have said that the artist has created a picture. In addition could I say that the scientist has found out something because it gives him satisfaction to find it out. Now whether it is nitroglycerine or a new serum is apart from the question. Is that logically sound or not?

A. The important fact is that a scientist is acting within a body of science. The whole meaning of invention is bound up in this whole process, ^{which} and since it depends on the faith of the layman ~~it~~ allows him to discover something, the thing is not so simple. The artist, on the other hand, represents the child of nature. He does it all by himself. So in this sense the artist is more responsible ^{for} whether he produces poison gas or not than is the scientist. The scientist is depending on a very special moment when science is asking this question.

Q. Then would you say that one should admit the complete ^{of the} individual, the total submergence of the individual into the group, rather than any personal satisfact^{ion}/ whatsoever to the individual?

A. I do not know, because if you wish to become a scientist you just do it. Some people cannot do it.

Q. You don't think about the responsibility to the group when you are working on something that you want to find out about just because it puzzles you and it would be a great satisfaction to find it out.

7 A. But think of this problem of socialists. Missing it has nothing to do with science but they thought it had. If you get such a situation the whole man is greater than the fact that he is a scientist.

that is why scientists

Q. Yes, and ~~they~~ fail by and large to develop any emotional maturity.

They are incapable of responding in a mature way to the problems of civilization.

A. I am glad you said it.