

I. The Cross of Reality

Anima naturaliter Christiana. Man was meant to fulfill himself as One Son of God, from the Start. Hence Christianity is as old as the world. This is forgotten only when and while people forget what the words "God" or "divine" actually mean.

But if their meaning is kept in evidence, it becomes clear that man was created as a pagan by birth, and a Christian by death. Man's power to overcome death has always been divine. And man's soul always has represented just this his divine power to overcome death.

Historical Christianity has added nothing but the recognition of this fact.

Any power that is not simply the 'life-force' or physical energy, but which is victorious over death, is divine, in the eyes of mortal men. God becomes known to us in all the processes which triumph over death. Antiquity saw a God in the power that kept together a tribe after all the individuals died, it saw the God of the city triumph over the death in peace or war of all its citizens. Using this definition of the divine that it summarizes all the powers which are victorious over death, we may survey the growing knowledge of God.

God became known to man first when warriors sacrificed their lives and when victims were sacrificed for the immortal spirits of their tribes. Through this act, God

was known as "spirits" surviving the death of human bodies.

He became known once more when his stars began to reveal a cosmic eternal order of millions of years to the priests of the temple-city. One of the oldest terms of the Egyptian tradition is "millions of years," for this reason, whereas primitive men can not count with precision beyond a hundred or thousand. Through his firmament, God became known as order everlasting, surviving the disappearance of every one star, aye, of every one thing that the eyes of man could see, or that his hands could touch, or that his mind could classify.

Finally, God became known when the first perfect man gave back his spirit into his father's hands. Now, the spirits of mortal men, of tribes, ceased to linger on; The walls of cities and whole civilisations now could fall. Jesus had given up his spirit, his inspiration, his mind as well as his body and had survived, had risen. And in Jesus, God became known as victorious over the minds of man as well as over the objects in heaven and earth.

Men rejoiced that death had lost its sting. But what did participated in God's victory over bodies and spirits? Let us analyze this carefully. It is important because our idealists, realists, pragmatists, because all philosophers dare not make this distinction.

Jesus died completely, body and spirit; he cleansed his and our souls from all mental ballast. The thoughts and concepts and abstractions and notions that fill our minds, were now thrown into the melting pot of evolution

Man's soul triumphed over the death of his 'mentality'. The Soul dissociated herself from the mind.

Ever since, common sense has retained this triumph. Neither our minds nor our bodies are divine: they die. Our soul is divine in that she can triumph over the death of both.

This penetration of God into man's soul, this emancipation of man from his body and mind, is man's final evolution on earth. It is his history, personal as well as universal history.

It is a double movement: one from man towards his soul and fighting off any attempt of mind or body to enslave him. Here, man conquers the organs of his incarnation, his physical and mental world for this process of the incarnation of the soul.

The other movement shows God conquering man's soul into the service of his history with man, into the creation of life eternal. The two movements are in every one of our actions. A man taking to drinking, does something to himself: he is defeated. But his defeat has historical consequences also, in prohibition-legislation and similar social acts. Every act has personal and universal significance.

The duplication of the movement, one from man towards his soul, the other from God towards the soul, cannot be illustrated by a straight line or by a circle. The Christian symbol is the cross. The crucifixion of the first complete example of this double movement, started man on an

understanding of the cross. The cross became to mean more and more things, besides the crucifixion. The penetration of the cross into more and more fields of human existence is the history of Christianity. The soul of man was Christian, was in a double movement from the creation of man; but the penetration of the cross into our social relations, into our arts, sciences, politics, - this is the history of the Christian era.

Of this penetration, a new chapter requires to be written. Before turning to it, let us sum up the full meaning of the double movement. It will then reveal itself as crucial, as fourfold.

The Crucifixion verified four biological or revolutionary facts:

1. Man knows God not by birth but by death.
2. Man by giving up his body, creates the social body of solidarity between men. Warriors create tribes: Jesus and the martyrs create the Church. A body politic for which nobody will die, collapses.
3. Man by giving up his mind, his self will, cleanses his soul from all transient features of his mentality and its concepts.
4. A soul which triumphs over the death of body and mind, is divine.

In this manner, the crucifixion is the climax of all former knowledge of God. Man became perfect to the extent in which he participated in these four truths.

But these four truths are paradoxical. They seem to delay man's divinity indefinitely because his body and

his mind have to live, and they will fight for their lives desperately against the soul. Their inertia will tie man down to a static situation either physical or mental.

The penetration of the cross, then, had to surround first the minds and later the bodies of men with appropriate sign posts to keep them moving. To give an example: Whereas in Athens and Rome, local Gods were filling the minds of the faithful with the glory of their statues, in no modern nation anything else is worshipped than the one God even in the most nationalistic communities. That is to say, any earthly city has admitted one building at least into its midst - in fact many more - which is not of national origin, and thereby keeps the minds of man in some detachment from from his immediate environment. The mind sees two worlds, one national, one divine, when he moves through the streets between State House and Meeting House.

The examples could be multiplied: Nobody is any longer irreplaceable, in our work. We work in shifts. We go on vacations. These are innovations of an era that makes man's body a transient, temporal, quickly passing function.

The cross has penetrated every field of human activity, nearly. Obviously, then, a straight line would not describe correctly man's curriculum through life, or his position in society. We must alternate ~~between~~ between our being conquered by God and our conquering the world of our bodies and minds for God. We must alternate between serving and

manipulating, between organic and organized existence. We need plumbing and loyalty, bantering and direction.

The penetration of this paradox cannot be expressed by a circle. The symbols of the circle, the wheel, the orb, the sphere, have been used in competition with the real symbol, frequently. But all the round signs exclude personal defeat and victory. A circle degrades our life to sheltered unreality. On the wheel of fortune, in the sphere of the business cycle, in the orbits of astrology, man is the product of the never failing automat. The circle deprives us of our divinity. It does not allow us to triumph.

The cross is the symbol of our reality. And the cross is as personal as it is universal. The cross, in its horizontal and vertical arms, testifies to the double movement of our life history and of all life history. The one arm of the cross stretches out from birth to death, from beginning to end, and it places us so that we face backward towards our loyalties and background, and forward towards our aims and destination. The other arm stretches out into the two worlds of our daily existence, one towards the people we speak to and communicate with, the other towards the objective world we do not speak to but speak of, which we manipulate and conquer and acquire and work. These two worlds are as distinct as past and future: Only in the fellowship of the world of speech do we crave for agreement; the mute resistance of the external world has to be broken by force, or cunning.

The cross of reality orients us all in time and space.

Whereas the line-and-circle-worshippers cannot distinguish between past and future, or between inner social and external natural relations, the cross makes us aware that beginning and end of man form a body of time that may pull us in opposite directions. And it also shows that society (the space in which we speak and are spoken to) and nature (which we work and eat and exploit) are two contradictory attitudes towards the world. Time and space are fourfold, as beginning and end, society and nature. Every man, then, is nailed to this cross of reality. He comes out of a background of thousands of years; he is woven into the common destiny of all, willy nilly. At the same time, he must, on one hand integrate himself into his group and society; and he must have something to eat, that is, he must struggle with the world of resisting hard objects, with outside nature, for survival. Man is nailed to a cross from which he faces backward, forward, inward and outward. Our history books imply too often that we can know the story from the beginning towards us. This is impossible: all history looks backward from our times into the past. God created heaven and earth in six days because man created the sabbath on the seventh when the chapter of Genesis was written. And our historians do exactly the same; only, unfortunately they do not know it. Also, ^{we do} look inward into our own and our brother's inner thoughts and feeling, But we look inward, and not from an inner center towards us. Some mystics and sentimentalists are apt to forget this direction. They try to make us believe that we look from some inner center

upon ourselves and begin to go didactic. We look outward. That means that there is no possibility of seeing ourselves objectively from the outside inward. We can objectify the external world more and more, but this constant estrangement and externalisation is done towards the outer world, not towards ourselves.

And we are pulled forward, by invisible forces; the essence of future is that it acts as a magnet upon our heart. But since we cannot look or express the future, but are projected into the future, our scientific ~~methods~~ and poetic and historical methods fail to predict or to produce the future. We do not "look forward" ^{lightheartedly} to anything except to social occasions which are perfectly safe repetitions of the past. To all other events we should look forward not without stagefright and faith or fear, if our heart is really engaged. And without our heart, no future is in the offing.

Every direction of the cross has its specific sense and way of being lived. And yet, no one direction can be omitted. Time and space, in their four dimensions, and there are neither more nor less, are imperative for any creature that wishes to stay alive. Would we run forward only, all the acquired qualities of civilisation and character would vanish. If we looked backward only, we would miss our destiny. If man did not reflect with his fellow men in fellowship and communication on his life consciously, if he did not build up insight, for consent, unanimity, harmony, in his mind and in the group, he would have no peace of mind. Finally as to number four, if he did not look out for the where

with all, he would starve. Death surrounds him, at all four fronts, starvation on the natural, physical front decay when he is not drawn towards the future, barbarism when he gives up his gratitude towards the classic, madness when he loses the peace of his mind. The cross of reality signifies mankind's fight against the death of body and mind in starvation and madness, against the death of heart and soul, in decay and brutality. The two dimensions of time and the two dimensions of space are no harmless environmental casings. They prey on us incessantly in an attempt of disintegration.

To miss the future, to lose the past, to be exiled from society, or to be imprisoned by nature - are our four gorgos that verily may frighten us out of our wits; and the number of people who quit this battle cannot surprise us. Physical death and disease, mental collapse and lunacy, moral cruelty and hate, indolence and decadence are the price paid by a high percentage of human beings, for the rest of us. They warn us off the edges of the abysses that open at our feet. Our hospitals, prisons, asylums, loneliness, are our signposts.

But man has made his dangers tolerable by fellowship and the more fellows can share the cross, the better we can man the four fronts of reality, the more health and the more eternal life can prevail. Civilisation and evolution are the two processes of acquiring the fruits of the cross. Civilisation is man's safeguard in space. For, a civilisation makes a reasonable distribution of natural and social energies and assigns a share of both to the average citizen.

Evolution makes a similar order for time. It times the growth of events upon the individual so that the transformation from the past into the future does not break him.

Civilisation and evolution, space and time, are in a delicate balance, and often they are at war. Civilisations may have to die, or new ones may come in too hastily.

Civilisation may serve evolution, or may defy it.

Now, how do we survive this clamorous battle on four fronts? The order in this confusion comes through the love imparted to us and imparted by us. To be loved, marks our movement from birth; to love, marks our movement towards the end. That love makes the incompatible compatible, is known to anybody who marries and now has to live with his own family and his in-laws, both, at peace. It seems incompatible; it often is. Yet, in many cases, the ~~all~~ contradiction is conquered. Thus, when we wake up to ourselves through love we already have been pushed a considerable length of the road by love; our background, our society, our place in the world are largely determined; our destiny, however, depends on how we hand on the love that has reached us before, from now on, and in which direction.

And only when we do not deny this transfer of the love received into love tendered, do we accept the cross of reality and allow it to permeate our lives. Only in this transfer, do we accept the facts of birth and death, of evolution into our otherwise timeless, spatial mentalities. Fortunately, most people do accept the challenge. And they make history by subjecting their spacial embodiment as bodies and minds, to the discipline of evolution.

The penetration of the cross into the minds and bodies of men and women by our acceptance of the cross, is the history of our souls in this world. A new penetration of the cross into a new sphere of our minds or bodies, marks a new epoch in history.

I claim that a new penetration of the cross is required today from our souls, a penetration that draws together, in our mortal danger, the hearts of men in the East and in the West.

Under the explosive catastrophes which we undergo in the West as well as in the East today, we would have to lose heart without a new realisation of our soul. If Abraham and Jesus can be made to meet with Buddha and Lao-Tzu, we would gain immeasurable strength. Now, they face each other! They seem to contradict or to caution us against their doctrines. Can all be right? Must at least three be wrong?

The burden of a world-wide civilisation on our heart stems from this contradiction and fatigue of too much co-existence, too many coexisting beliefs and great traditions.

America, a New World, placed between two old worlds, one in the old Occident, one in the Far East, is in danger of losing heart. The cross of reality is man's conquest of himself. But the conquest seems so difficult today. So let us speak of the cross as a scientific fact that need not frighten us, let us accept it as a common place from which to start, not as a far nebulous goal from which to escape. Let us say that every new form of this cross repeats the double truth:

1. that man is a Christian from the beginning of the world.
2. That man must become a Shristian even to the end of the world.

And the organising tendencies of the cross of reality which invites us towards the end of the world, become clear in the relation between Abraham, Laot-tzu, Buddho, Jesus.

~~And the organising tendencies of the cross of~~

A collaboration exists between these four creators of the higher life of mankind. They all depend on one revelation; and whoever can be won over to this relation, will have penetrated one more thick layer of disbelief within our own tradition.

The East and the West created for each other? The East and the West creating for each other?

Are not the faith of being created for each other, and the love of creating for each other, our only hopes of survival?

When the stream was in spate, when faith still spoke with power, the Old and the New Testament agreed in the torrential statement: "Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is One Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all mind and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is no other commandment greater than these." 3.Mos. 19,18; Deut. 11,13; Mark 12, 29ff.

In our days, we must translate this torrent into the descriptive language of the world, in plain rational terms. But then, the two commandments do not suffice but must give

way to four descriptive sentences. In translating the two foremost commandments into four scientific statements, we obey the laws that distinguish discursive argument from oral personal speech. And we lay the foundations for a logic which will be penetrated by the distinction between soul and mind on which the perfect life rests but which is repudiated by philosophy even to our present day.

Let us explain first why two sentences in the Bible must become four, in prose. Then, we shall proceed to give the translation and thereby recognize the cross of reality once more.

1. The difference between the Bible and modern speech is similar to the difference between imperatives and indicative sentences in grammar. "Rise!" is an imperative; "we rise" is an indicative phrase. The obvious distinction between the form of "rise" and "we rise" lies in the addition of the "we" in the second phrase.

An imperative may consist of one single word; an indicative has at least two words; compare: 'go', 'hear', 'stay', against: you go, we stay, I hear. Why is that so? In the imperative, the doer and the act done, are still undivided. When I shout: volunteers, then the man who listens and volunteers, gives life to the act itself, volunteering and my volunteerings are undistinguishable for me who called into life an act of volunteering now only embodied by the man who volunteers. In my command, the listener and the act to be performed by the listener remain united.

, In the indicative, a greater distance has been reached

between act and person. It no longer is true that the act is embodied in this person exclusively, or that this person is incarnated in this act exclusively. The person who acts, has other qualifications besides; and the act may happen to other subjects. The person, you or we or whoever it is, in the indicative 'we hear', and the verb, are taken apart in two separate forms or words, and then, put together again for the special purpose. In the imperative, person and act are committed, in the Indicative they remain non-committal.

The cross of reality is given, in our Biblical texts, as commandments. Therefore it appears in a dual, twofold statement. But the first and second of these two greatest commandments really say something about the past, the future, about nature and society. The time and space of our lives is illuminated by the commandments.

Jesus repeats the two commandments of old. The words in Mark repeat that which has been said in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. We have an old and a new law. The old law contains the two rules. The new law although apparently higher than any other law. It selects them, and that is new. The relation of future to past, in evolution, is in this selective power. Since Adam and Eve, man has not added to the creation of this world one bit except selection. Human evolution consists then in a constant recognition of the whole past, and a constant selection of pertinent elements from this past as determinants of the future. The cross of reality knows, for the time being, of no break between past and future, and it knows of mere continuity. The heart of man is in the middle between past and future.

Looking backward and being projected forward, we must select. And choice is not a question of argument, or of will, but is a competition between old and new love, or - at least - should be a choice between two loves. We 'honour' our father and mother and we leave them to cleave to the wife of our choice. Old love is honoured, new love requires to be included. This settles the relation between past and future against all political theory of reactionaries and revolutionaries. The choice must be made with heart, soul, mind, and strength. The soul is master of strength and mind. The cross of reality appears in the second commandment with its arm of inner and external space, of society and nature. We are told: Incorporate your neighbor with yourself into one body politic, and we, in the same breath, are expected to love ourselves as much as our neighbor, which means that together the fellowship of men may live from the earth and its materials. The man who fell among the thieves and the good Samaritan, staved off the sickness, the transpiration, the bill, the loss of time, together. But nature had to be overcome, by their teamwork.

Our rational analysis of the two greatest commandments has transformed two imperatives into four indicatives. In doing so, it introduces the distinction between soul and mind into the one field into which the cross so far has not penetrated, into the science of logic itself. Philosophy of the Greek tradition has tried again and again to confuse the ~~soul~~ soul with the mind, to give the choices which love alone can make between our heart's past and our heart's future, over to the timeless mind which never knows when a

thing is dead or alive, because birth and death are hidden from the brain.

The four sentences are dealing, two with evolution, two with civilisation.

The two statements on evolution say:

1. Man has been created in antiquity, before Christ, to his full stature. Nothing can be asked from him which has not been asked before. The past is complete, and good creation.

2. Man is destined to hear new commands, to make new choices. He is destined to participate in his own evolution by responses.

3. Man shall start new fellowship incessantly. Any man offers the opportunity for the same relations that prevail within the lonely self and its inner processes. We are no better integrated when we remain within our own shell than when we incorporate our neighbor. In fact, the man without this growing fellowship remains and becomes more and more a split personality. Inner unity within myself is only achieved by outer unity with others.

4. Together we shall overcome the external obstacles of the world outside. As one man, one body politic, man is master of nature; fire and water, crime, and famine and sickness, can be mastered and shall be mastered, as in the case of the Good Samaritan. The Cross of Reality has to penetrate our lives, more completely in the future, because it has enlivened our souls from the very beginning. In order to keep the soul alive in a curriculum of circles and trends, and blind alleys, and speed highways, today, we need a redirection of the mind.

need a redirection of the mind.

Science is going forward in a straight line of specialization. Investments in laboratories limit and restrict some of the choices of scientists for their future research. The past of science, by these investments, encroaches on its future.

Any new incarnation of the soul of man combines old and new territories of our lives. When Jews became Christians, they invited the gentiles in, when Western Man crusaded in the East, he discovered and settled America. When man reformed the world, he industrialized China and India.

When Science is redirected, it will have to admit elements of life into the scientist's evolution that now are not recognized as elements of the life of science because they are outside the workings of the scientific mentality. It will have to encompass these elements because they are the sources of scientific creativity, and social significance of science.

Spiritus nascitur ex spiritu; non ex derivatione sed ex virtute nativitas est. (Hilarius of Poitou, De Trinitate VII, 28) The Spirit is begotten by the Spirit; not because of derivation but by power does his birth take place. The sciences as much as Christianity are beginning to believe in derivation, for their "systematic" progress. The redirection of the scientific mind must fight the conception of a science ~~line~~ that ~~hopes~~ to go on in a straight line, by mere mental derivation from one scientist to the next. Scientific progress is thus sterilized.

The Redirection of the Mind

a. Soul and Mind of the Scientist

What must the rich young man do, in Mark, when he asks for life eternal? He must forget about his great possessions. The health of scientists depends on their capacity to forget the great possessions of their minds. Jesus never wrote a line, never printed a book, never became a best-seller. I sometimes think that this was his most divine feature.

It showed that his soul triumphed over his mind. And his victory is not only interesting today because of the private conscience or salvation of some private individual scholar or research fellow. This personal aspect of a possible conversion of science does not interest me here. The fruitfulness of the human mind is at stake. Not the individual scientist but science is the rich young man with too much interest in great possessions. And because the fruits of knowledge become bitter, we must ask ourselves if the type of mind which is represented by scholar and scientist, cannot be disciplined by giving us a clearer insight into our specific mandate in the league of the human race against death.

I shall try to lay the case before science with this one intention to rescue science from the attacks upon it by a justly disappointed society, and from its own vicious circles.

My hopes are that ways will be found to change the upbringing of our future scientists and college teachers, and to offer them the opportunity which the mere imitation of European models seemed to make superfluous, for evolving the

strength, the mind, the heart and the soul, of which the commandment of Deuteronomy and Mark speaks, and of which we protect the scientist, as best we can. I speak here of the ways out of an impasse because I wish to see science resurrected.

The nearer science comes toward the investigation of living processes, the more dangerous becomes a relentless drive in one direction by the scientific fashions. Everybody remembers excesses of medical fads like vitamins and calories. I can testify to the fact that a group of young men, on whose sacrifice and devotion a minister preached on Sunday before a College congregation, and who, by their parents were considered models of health and moral strength, were treated by two expert psychologists as madmen and unfit for service. When science begins to meddle with the souls of men, the training of the scientist is shown up as pagan, primitive. He knows more things than his own soul has experienced.

Hence, his training must include experiences of his own soul, not of his mind only, in the future.

"Tantum habet homo de Scientia quantum operatus":
Man's science can never go farther than the field of reality which he has paced off, as a person.

And this balance of soul and mind, the cross of reality, offers guidance. The balance is a prerequisite for a science of the living.

b. The Religion of the Scientist

The scientist usually has a good conscience. He works hard. He harms nobody. He thinks that the truth of his

enlightenment will bring about the greatest happiness of the greatest multitude in the end. He abstains from violent action. He does not raise his voice. He inclines towards stoicism. At least, he will not weep, not think to be himself as much a partisan as others in the community. Does he not understand everything? And so, he condemns nothing.

So runs the scientist's official religion, be he Albert Einstein, Bertrand Russell, Count Keyserling or Lawrence Henderson. Their practice, however, is different. We find them benevolent children, frivolous deracines, or passionate political and administrative fools.

As to their abstract vision, I think that our resume is quite fair. I have heard College Presidents subscribe to it. And my challenge today runs: May a college president subscribe to it as a goal for education without destroying the future of mankind?

To externalize and rationalize the acts of men into mere objectivity, to hold everything before our eyes as though it were only what we can see, means to turn life into "nature". What our eyes can see and what our hands can manipulate, is outside of our living system. We have lost its solidarity with us, our loyalty to it; and the mutual responsibility between us as members of one body is replaced by an impersonal attitude towards somebody else.

When life is contemplated "scientifically", we leave it to itself, and to its power to impress itself on our registering brain by clear sight, numbers, definition and classification. We also know already that the living universe contains four directions in time and space, all of

which represent necessary processes of life. A University either faces the task of recognizing the incessant movement between the four "fronts", forward, backward, inward, and outward, - or it is false to the full truth about life. We must condemn. We must be partisans. We must mourn and weep. We must know that truth engenders hatred, not unity. We must not work too hard. We must have a bad conscience as scientists. We must not try to understand everything. We must become inarticulate in despair, and raise our voice in joy. Otherwise, we shall never mature from emotional childhood, never verify by real incarnation our Utopian ideas, never root ourselves in our neighborhood and town. And teachers either speak in all these four tongues to their students or they do not meet them.

The momentum of four hundred years of scientific eye-worship cannot be overcome by a purely intellectual protest. We have to build up equally colossal energies of enthusiasm in another direction. Our future obsession by the right "times" of man must outweigh the natural scientist's obsession by the true nature of things. Otherwise we shall not re-create a scientifically overfed humanity. For this purpose, we must show up this momentum of science as something far more general than an academic process. The academic fatigue with life is only a section of a greater and more sublime attitude. When we can reduce or, to speak more correctly, retrieve the academic and Platonic world of ideas, it will become easier to assess it as an eternal ingredient of life. In stead of making it into the goal of life, we shall be able to equip ourselves with it as a tool for attaining health and sanity and vitality. The scientific

drive is not the attitude, but one attitude among others and depends upon the existence of the other attitudes for its own meaning.

Gautamo Buddha seems to me the natural sponsor of the scientist's detachment from the struggle of life. When a scientist is perfect, he is on both sides of the fence at once. In his heart, the fecundity of doubt makes the very best thoughts spring up to defend contradictories. He is victor and vanquished, object and subject. What if science had built a house for the universal element of Buddhism inside the Occident, quite unknowingly? The increasing popularity of Buddhism during the last century may have something to do with the increasing popularity of science. Darwin and Theosophy are contemporaries. Science, perhaps, is Buddhism, integrated upon the cross of reality.

As a question, this may open up a vista into an interplay between human attitudes which we wrongly exile into West and East geographically. In fact, they may just be eternal requirements of any human form of life. And this question may help us to see the scientist in the light of a more general attitude. The scientist's religion may be a very real religion, if we can only understand what religion is.

I should not carry much conviction if I went on comparing Buddhism and science. Such a comparison might be undertaken as a piece of mere rhetoric. I wish to remain subject to your criticism. Let us redirect our steps towards the central insight. Society puts man on one of the four "fronts" of life at any given moment. All division of labour in family, nation, business, church is based on this fourfold necessity. The individual human being is

enmeshed in a quadrilateral of tendencies and trends. What shall we do when we have to face into history, future, nature and society, as the garrison of the fortress of life beleaguered by death from all sides.

Obviously, we should use our right and power to live a complete life and to integrate ourselves as the garrison that strives for eternal life, by using articulate speech and literature, for all the four aspects of our existence in time and space. That means that we must cultivate our loyalties toward the past, observe and classify the facts of the external world, give expression to the inner life of our group and person, and be humble enough to get started on a new life towards the future. But these four trends are so opposite that they affect us like a maze. And the occidental mind has tried to organize this maze and to eliminate the confusion by two great sets of precepts.

On the occident, the theologies have dealt with creative and last judgement, the philosophies with nature and society. In other words: Religion and science have divided their labors; religion has preached on beginning and end, baptising the newly born and burying the dead. And science has copied with the political and economic life of the body politic and its social contracts and contacts and with the technological and scientific explanation and exploitation of nature.

The "Religionists" and the "Scientists", the "Theologians" and the "philosophers", have competed with each other without a clear line of demarcation. Neither one has admitted the sovereignty of his competitor. Neither one was

aware that the person to whom they talked and of whom they talked, was a different addressee for the theologian and for the philosopher.

In science, we talk to subjects who can observe objective facts and we talk of objects which can be analyzed and examined. "Subject" and "object" are the only two aspects of existence known in science.

In religion, we talk to "sons" and "fathers", to "daughters" and "mothers"; we also talk of sons of God, of God as a father, of the daughter of man, the handmaid of the Lord, the mother of Jesus. A daughter or a mother are neither subjects nor objects. If they must receive a technical label, the persons talked to and talked of, in religion, might be called "tra-jects", and "pre-jects", more logically. Any mother represents the past compared to the children to whom she has given life. And any daughter represents a promise for the future into which she is thrown, by the love that her woer offers her. In evolution, we all are trajected from the past, or projected into the future. In civilisation, we are objects of nature, and subjects of society.

So there can be as monopoly either the advocate of evolution, the theologian, or the advocate of vicilisation, the philosopher. Both will never do as long as they pretend to be self-sufficient. Philosophy deals with reality as divided in space; Theology, with life as moving through time. Religion and Science, up to our days, have divided reality between them cautiously, and in a queer and meticulous compromise. Philosophy has admitted two out of the four "fronts"; religion has preached the two others. Mind and matter are nerely philosophical notions. And no sermon

on the mount or in a valley, need necessarily ever mention them. Past and future, the creation of Adam and the fact of a Last Judgment are theological notions; and a philosopher may live ninety years, and never find any reason to give a thought to these two embodiments of backward and forward trends.

Here you see the western mind's present paralysis. It is split. The arts and sciences form one realm. Churches, synagogues and politics form another. Education, which should be a choice of direction, is frustrated. Wherever it turns, it gets only a half truth. What shall we do?

It would be perfectly hopeless to dig up the old big controversies of Faith and Science. They all have ended in a stalemate. I personally do not believe in mind, and I do not believe in matter. I think that man is not unknown, but that Mr. Carrel is ignorant. That does me no good; for Mr. Carrel does not care. On the other hand, most of you don't believe in a Last Judgment, the Second Coming of Christ, or the Fall of Adam. They are no longer meaningful notions for the sophisticated. For instance, Dr. Richard Cabot finds Adam completely superfluous for modern thought. And I believe that symbolic logic is an obvious case of mental aberration. Since we might go on in this way with every word of our vocabulary, using them as bullets and as expressions of contempt, we may as well abandon the direct task of reconciling the philosophers and theologians. Our gigantic visions of God or of Nature with a capital N, lead us fascinated in directions which never meet.

c. Personal Education

Let us try going less far in either direction. The cross of reality centres in every human heart. Hence, a union which is impossible between Religion and Science may be possible as personal communion. That would, indeed, be education, because it would give to the son of woman a direction for all his push and pull, fight and din.

We have seen that Jesus was "perfect" when he said that it was done; that action ends in man when he says: "It is finished", or "God created the heaven and the earth.", and that it begins in the same man when he invites others by saying: "Come." Movement starts in man and leads to expression. And movement runs on in man's being when he records what has happened or registers the telegrams of his senses. Man is never on the bank of the stream of life; he always swims in the river. His sayings and thoughts are the crests of waves which move on. In his words the waves rise, the waves break. Our words are parts of the event itself; even an experiment includes our taking down its results.

But the four powers of man -- staying power as loyal, creative power, power of expression, and power to think - these are overwhelming experiences. While it is true that man's life accumulates, begins, reveals, and reflects itself in illuminating language, it is also true that man is often overwhelmed by every one of these situations, so that he predicates his whole being after some one of them, the one which impresses him most. For every human being is tempted, or led by others, to call himself a conservative, a

radical, a rationalist, or a mystic. In doing so, he identifies himself with one tendency which he thinks he should over-accentuate. This is not a bad idea as long as we know what we are doing. But all the horror in the world seems to come from the fact that most people believe that these four labels are mutually exclusive. They fight all their lives on the level of the question: "To which of the four groups,--progressive, loyal, rational, sentimental,--shall I give my allegiance?" All the battles fought over this puzzle, are fought for nothing. The majority of people do fight their intellectual tournaments on this level. That is why their thought does not make the slightest dent on the body of their times.

To educate, means to protect a person from the dangers of futility. Education must show the mousetrap constantly in wait to catch us and keep us out of the metabolism of the social process. I do hope that I may prove to you how lack of faith and energy in speaking destroys this world in small bits daily.

Last fall, I was asked to help reorganize a circle of students and professors called the Junto. We spent two hours in discussing what name it should go under in the college catalogue: club, society, or organization? Every one of these nouns seemed slightly to pervert the character of the group. Another question was: "Shall the Faculty and the student body be mentioned as separate parts of the whole?" Our first formula was: "The Junto is an organization open to Faculty and Students." Finally, we said: "The Junto unites Dartmouth men, interested in the arts." That was voted unanimously, because it was true. Neither the

word Club, nor the word Society would have permitted the Junto to be itself.

Nouns almost never tell the truth. Verbs do. When I say of the past: "I have been to war." "I have paid taxes." "I have tasted the sweetness of a home," reality makes me its mouthpiece. When I abstract from these facts and say: "I am conservative," I cease to be the voice of concrete reality; only qualify myself, -omitting the taxes, the home and the war. But when I take the next step and proclaim myself "A Conservative", I establish myself at one "front" of life for good. The historical acts of which I first was the mouthpiece, qualified me, in the second phrase; but now they stamp me into a type. Thus I become a fixed type, not because of any other influence, but by an act of my own consciousness. A man who calls himself "A Conservative," does the only thing a conservative should not do: he changes the world by humiliating a part of it, himself, into a being of his own making. That is the reason why "A Conservative" is as unnatural a product of life as "A Revolutionary." And the constant erroneous change of mere adjective into nouns is the content of most of the secular struggle between men. "I love my home"; "I am conservative;" "I am a conservative", are rungs of the usual ladder on which we descend into the hell of abstractions.

When we begin to abstract deliberately with the four elements of our social existence, we may go very far. Nouns hunt one another. The loyal man becomes settled for good, establishes himself as a conservative, then a pillar of society, then superstitious, a reactionary, finally, a relic.

The man who made progress, becomes progressive; the progressive becomes a Liberal, pink or red, a radical, a nomad, a revolutionary, and may end as a terror-ist and thrower of bombs. The observer disciplines himself into a scientist; but on he goes to rationalism, scepticism, and finally cynicism. The cynic is not satisfied to hold everything up before his reason, in detachment. He trespasses on a field where our eyes don't work. Like the political reactionary, he denudes the world. And the mystic, who revels in chewing the sacred and mysterious body of the universe, is as violent as the cynic. He stands as the extreme of his arm of the cross of reality. An Intentional illuminist, he exaggerates the inner aspect of poetic and musical feeling; the playing, meditating, sentimental and imaginative romantic does not exaggerate.

I have seen communists of an extreme violence. A veil before their eyes, cotton in their ears, without any roots inexperience, they would proceed with their propaganda for the end of all history. Human relics who starve us, terror-ists who kill us, cynics who make us blush, mystics who pamper us, are evildoers. For man, it is wickedness to establish himself as a type, on one "front" of life. When we can no longer return into life through the three other doors, we have murdered our own souls. We shall kill other souls. We must cease to exist. We have acted too early (revolutionary), too late (reactionary), too cynically (rationalist), too sentimentally (mystic).

Perhaps you now perceive the deep humanity of Jesus, who contrived neither to be a success, nor to be a martyr.

To be unconscious to the last minute of the label that we might choose for ourselves, is the only way of keeping alive. The one great sin is misunderstanding the old Greek imperative, "Gnothi sauton," know thyself. It meant: "Measure your distance from the gods." It never must mean: Know your self by heart, plan for one form of your existence is evolution or civilization, in time or space.

Reaction, Cynicism, Romantic indulgence, and Terroristic Politics, are the four universal possibilities of any human being stranded on the experience of one vital situation. It is easy to denounce these possibilities here. It is nearly impossible to escape them completely in the course of life.

For, the problem is not only one of my own, or your own, making. Every man, by the very fact of finding himself, for example, in a family, is pushed toward one "Front" of life with more energy than towards the three others. When you analyze the coordinates in a family of four - mother, father, daughter, son - you may remember the clever "ad" on a car. In this advertisement, the mother asked for safety, the father for a bargain, the daughter for beauty, and the son for speed. That was excellent psychology - ascribing to the mother historical continuity, to the father the struggle for life, to the daughter dreams of the future, and to the son the playing attitude which is so characteristic of the years of sport, verse writing, and adventure in ideas. These four members of one family think in different directions, because each is challenged, by the very existence of the three others, to stress his own point of view. Destroy this family unit, let a lonely

individual buy a car all for himself. He must try to balance all these four interests within his own heart. That is too complex for him. He is unable to represent the group. He makes up his mind, smart? prudent? romantic?

Living in families, man facilitates his task of uniting four opposite tendencies. But even so, the evil is not eschewed. The black magic of changing verbs into qualities, and adjectives into nouns, continues. Men label one another. It is not enough for me to avoid calling myself a thief. What if others do? "Once a thief, always a thief." The whole proletarian and Nazi ideology makes it a virtue to label other people.

The famous ghost of original sin may be laid here, perhaps. The nineteenth century has poked fun at it; I always thought, very poor fun. With the devil and hell, original sin was banished. But in one form, it remains. We practice this sin daily. It is sin forced on the innocent. When a man is righteous, but everybody else gives him a "bad name", he cannot act innocently. As a basis for our actions, innocence is not enough. Because his neighbours labelled him INRI, the Perfect Man could not survive in innocence. Original sin consists in this fact: that in society we have a name long before we become visible as what we really are. For this one sin, Jesus died. He was without sin; but they called him, in original sin, Joseph's the carpenter's son, and that grieved him. Yes, before we ourselves discover who we are, others know all about our background, our chances, our money value, etc. All good party names, nicknames, pet names are given man from the outside. At best they are given us because our

acts really point in that direction. But once the name comes down on us, it stays for ever. If men are Jews, Negroes, Armenians, their story is written before they exist at all. By speaking in nouns, man kills all the time. For instance, by calling everybody after his nation, all Europeans are ill today. They cannot wear their nationality, "like a raiment, carelessly." America differs from Europe in this fact: here, we still use the adjectives, Irish, Italian, Polish, etc., whereas in Europe men believe only in a past of nouns and participles: "The Germans," "The Italians," "The French." They do not say, "he is Polish"; they verify him into, "he is a Pole". Men cannot live together under this form of statements. Qualities don't kill. Nouns do.

That is why "natural" life does not exist in society. The constant weakening of speech from verbs into nouns tangles the individual in a historical process of which he is as much the author as the victim; because he gets a name, and because he talks. For every wrong name, a whole political program must be created. A name results in injustice; a political program heals this injustice. For every bit of cheap talk, a new great poem must be written to save genuine feeling from loss by cheapening. For every resentful memory, true memory must be restored by schools and colleges and libraries. No individual "nature" makes you and me rational, emotional, loyal and changeable. Society delegates these functions to us. Only in this way does the body politic extend so much farther than any individual's physical body. Smell, vision, touch, and hearing are physical capacities of our body. Radicalism, rational-

ism, conservatism and mysticism, are social attitudes taking advantage of these physical possibilities. But I am not a radical by birth. The imprint of society shows itself in the radical, the mystic, the conservative and the rationalist. And in-so-far as no individual, but only the group in its division of labour may represent the four "fronts" of life effectively, these four types are one-sided societies shrunk into one individual. "Every man a king" means that every man has a kingdom to himself within himself which he has inherited from his group, from society.

Perhaps it is well to remove any doubt about the social character of these individual features. I, as a body, as an individual, have my physical past, my physical future, my physical inner and my physical outside world. But these physical aspects would only equip me with habits (past), instinct (feeling), impulses (future), impressions (external). A constant misunderstanding identifies this bodily horizon with the social. Nowhere do habits, instincts, impulses overstep the frontier of my physical self. Hence, all these four aspects are speechless. Only as a member of a group older than myself do I speak. Only as a member of a group with a longer future than my own life do I create. And only as a member of a brotherhood unanimous in more than my poor self, do I sing. We all represent the Great Man, Society, whenever we use language, logic, literature. Not as a physiological body, but as a man speaking to, and spoken of, do I get stuck on one arm of the cross of reality. Not as a body, but as a speaker within a big society man blunders. And only society can put him right. We cannot heal our blunder in speech except by fellowship.

The individual, as an individual, is unable to cope with the demand on him to select 100% correct choices. And it is not enough for society, to educate people in loyalty, harmony, fighting power and restraint. As wisdom, courage, justice, and temperance, these four natural virtues are well known. They are not enough. We need an encouragement to survive our wrong choices of all of them. When we have become disloyal, unharmonious, weak, hardboiled, how do we get back to normalcy??

In this quandary, we may take two lines of action. One is: we may play safe. Every one for himself, may adopt a minimum attitude; always acting with a sideglance in the other three directions. To become more and more non-committal is the curse of modern man, in his fear of going too far in any direction. Golden mediocrity, ne quid nimis. This doctrine means; no real devotion, no real excitement, no real fight, no real love. It invites us into a future in which all the energies which made possible our own existence have cooled down. This future would see no children born, from sheer precaution; no sorrow felt, for fear of pain; no loyalty exerted, for fear of going static; no struggle brought to an end, for fear of growing violent. Who will deny that we are on this path to glory? Man, in solitude, cannot do much better. If we tell the individual that he is and must remain alone in his choices, the poor man must stop making choices. The consequences of any sorry choice are too terrifying.

If an atom in the universe really cannot do better than play safe, life must come to a standstill. Are we condemned to extinguish the fires of life because it is

too dangerous? Is prudence really the last human word? I do not see that we should have much need for education in that case. Yet I am flooded with information that this minimum life is the quintessence of most philosophical, psychological, and sociological teaching. Not one work of art, not one free constitution, not one song, not one discovery, could be made under an education for this "minimum life". The doctrine can raise its head only because there exists already a world created by maximum effort. The teachers of aurea mediocritas would have no jobs, had not their ancestors, predecessors, teachers, testified to infinite loyalty, infinite love, infinite justice, and infinite energy.

Man's problem is maximum effort on every "front", yet selection of the right deed, the directing act. This requires a strengthening of man in his single handed battle. And the only way to strengthen man is to take the curse of loneliness from him. In the struggle of life, in division of labour, in our historical group, in political movements, we are united already. Man, moreover, has these four "fronts" in common with every living being in the universe. If men could unite in warning each other against wrong choices, in sharing the temptation (and the victory over the temptation) to wrong choice, wrong speech, wrong memory, and wrong demands, the individual would not have to grow weaker and weaker. He could keep his red blood, and still be correct. The fellowship would cover up his blunders, minimize his failures, maximalize his wits.

At this point, the four refounders of Human nature become significant - Buddha, Lao-tzu, Abraham, Jesus.

What have these four nature-changers done? They have traced one of the four directions of reality to its ultimate end, and in aiming for the East like Columbus and Magellan, they have reached the West. They learned that even the most radical attempt to proceed on one beam of the cross of reality would lead back into the life of all. And they took all of us to the nadir whence we may unify our effort to choose our next step. They united mankind outside the cross of reality, so that we, after then, are masters of it, returning into life from an unworldly experience.

How was this done?

We shall analyze the method of all four, one after the other. But don't forget, in the meantime, the fact that their four directions are exhaustive; and that, in the end, we shall have to assess the relations between all four, because they are not just four interesting personalities or founders of interesting movements. We shall study them for two reasons which must not be separated: First because they have changed human nature. Man is not the same being as before. Second, because the changes are exhaustive. They cover all primary potentialities of change. My purpose in the following considerations is to make you realize the unity of these four re-founders of human nature and the stupendous and, so to speak, organic order among them.

We may hang out a sign for every one of them, at the beginning: (1) Buddha identifies the whole world of appearances, of cause and effect which reason defines. (2) Lao-tzu identifies everybody with everybody else through identity of cooperation and of social function. (3) The Old

Testament sponsors one and the same original loyalty for all men. (4) Christianity centers around all men's identity in conversion or rebirth.

d. Buddha

1. Let us begin at the rational "front". Here, a man looks outside himself into the objects that move around him in nature. This "nature" is exactly the universe proclaimed by Bertrand Russell, as the last "Scientific Outlook" of emancipated science: "I think the universe is all spots and jumps, without unity, without continuity, without coherence or orderliness or any of the other properties that govern love. Indeed, there is little but prejudice and habit to be said for the view that there is a world at all." Buddha knew this. Many worlds, many lumps of world tumble over each other, follow each other. The worlds of appearance are confusion. Everything struggles, pushes, sweats and murders, in an atomistic universe of parts and parcels. Man is in the fight himself. But his eye, his vision, his enlightenment, his concentration may become so completely the rallying centre of his being, that he can leave the world of appearance. Buddha renounces his own partisanship in the cosmic struggle. He keeps out of the fight. And this undoes the fighting. By sharing the Buddhist penetration behind appearance, all men are united, not as renunciation, the absolute character of the fight is made relative. As wonderful as a machine would be that produced its own oil, so wonderful is man's power to balance his whole being on his eye, and thereby mitigate the des-

pair of raging warfare. The self-annihilation of one particle of will mitigates the tremendous pressure that heats the struggle between all others. We all know that asceticism is a way of making life less terrible. One drop of asceticism has entered the life stream of us all. We are all monks today, in our work, our sex life, our diet, and the character of our pleasures and sports.

Now, the central grandeur of this negation of life is that it is illogical. Albert Schweitzer, in the introduction to his "Indian Thought" (New York, 1936), pointedly says, "The difficulty of the worldview of world-and life-negation consists in the fact that it is impracticable. It is compelled to make concessions to world-and life-affirmation."

This is obvious. Buddha himself had to live a long life to proclaim the negation of life. And this was deemed his greatest sacrifice. Buddha is illogical. Only, the rationalist who smiles at this man for so obvious a logical refutation, forgets that perhaps only his own mania for logic and reasoning is challenged by the Buddha. Because too many men move on the outward beam of the cross of reality, reasoning about everything, treating all and everything as mere objects for exploitation, fight and conquest, Buddha comes down to the host of lost souls on this part of life's battlefield. Minus times minus results in plus. If Buddha had tried to show the rationalists that it is impossible to balance life on the visibility of the world, he would not have made any impression. But by making the eye absolute, by condensing human existence in the very organ which had done the damage, he outwitted the cynic,

outreasoned the reasonable, and drove the logician who said: you can't negate life without affirming it, out of his logical hiding place. Logic is silenced by resolution.

When we, as soldiers of life, move on the beam towards the external and objective world, we feel that resistance and fight are our duties. We may, however, be called to order by our own absolute zero. The absolute zero of struggle is non-struggle; the absolute zero of resistance is non-resistance. The absolute zero of violence is non-violence. These three "nons", to be sure, make no sense in themselves. This, however, is true for zeros. Absolute cold is meaningful because it is related to warm. Absolute black is meaningless except when related to colors. And, at the bottom of zero, as we already know, there is death. And death, too, is meaningful only when understood of my life and your life and our friend's life where it gets its full meaning and weight.

As mathematics had to discover zero and infinity in order to become mathematics, so man as a fighter must discover non-fighting genuine zero suddenly characterizes all human activity as essentially of the same pitilessness. Acts that never before had been thought of as containing elements of struggle, were disclosed as being full of violence. Think of family relations. The executioner and the butcher are violent like the soldier or the hunter. The hunter no more so than the cook, the cook no more than the eater, the eater no more than the bacteria in his bowels. Struggle, struggle, struggle everywhere. The cosmic struggle, when increased unlimitedly by man's violence, becomes

unbearable. Man is the only being that can step out of the mania. And so it is his mission to stand "au dessus de la melee", to Renounce, Renounce, Renounce.

In 1859, Charles Darwin proclaimed the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest as the most truthful statement about the universe; its maxim was "eat and be eaten." In Darwin's period Buddhism made headway in the West. "Eat and be eaten," "Beat and be beaten," are the only rules that science can discover. But the discoverer must remain pure eye, unmoved. Darwin's externalised enlightenment is pure extraversion into a world of objects. Buddhism is the natural antidote for a staff of scientists that stoops to gaze into the microscope. The more general man's education as a scientist becomes, the more this army of scientists must be trained like one gigantic Buddha. Then, and only then, may science produce means to mitigate the world's pains. (Buddha was haunted by them.) Modern science is out for soporifics, drugs, anesthesia. The scientific Nirvana is a chemical Nirvana which we all are on the road of accepting to a perilous degree. We all are second rate Buddhists in our escape from pain. Jesus on the cross rejected the drug which would have diminished his pain. Who even understands his rejection today? Genuine Buddhism, I think, has more depth than our chemical Buddha called pharmacology. What is important is the existing parallel between science's new jungle of objects and Buddha's worlds. When Western man faces the chaos conceived by recent science, he cannot help accepting a drop of the Buddha's blood, who healed the eye of reason by

purifying its lense and by emptying it of any content; by making man - as Schopenhauer said, into "Vorstellung", - into a gigantic, crystal-clear eye without any pictures in it.

If we all could get those crystal-clear eyes and recognize each other, not in what we see (which is different for every one of us) but in the fact that we can see, then a community of non-natural beings would be established. And any classroom represents, in fact, such a community of people who look into the world from outside the world. For what draws people together in a lecture hall is their united effort to have no bean in their own eyes. This has become our nature to such an extent that we rarely think of it as a very, very late achievement and change of nature in man. We have abolished the cosmic law that the eye and the object seen by the eye, are one. We have emptied the eye.

e. Lao-tzu

2. The empty eye is the undoing of objects in their over-whelming power over man. The empty ear is the undoing of subjective din. When we walk through the streets of a city, we receive an impression which differs widely from the chaos described by Bertrand Russell and Buddha. We admire a colossal degree of integration. The functioning of the services in a big city is breath-taking. The cogs on the wheels fit into each other to perfection. Sewers and food stores, real estate agents, theatrical managers, electric power, hospitals, museums, railroad stations, and the sking at Macy's, - these form a well organized world,

to say the least. And we ourselves are integrated into its innumerable services and functions with irresistible kindness and force. Nature may be fighting. But society makes an overwhelming impression of coordination on a perfectly colossal scale. A city-dweller must be put before the microscope before he can understand nature, in the sense of Buddhism. Society is a huge machine or organism. The wheels may squeak; there is friction, exhaustion from playing the game too eagerly. But it is a game in which all may hope to make a living.

In China, the social system saved man from exposure to naked nature. He saw nature only as the background of the Son of Heaven, because "heaven" was a social and imperial institution itself. Here was a heaven caught and drained to the temples of the empire on earth. Everyone in China had instinctive faith in this society. In contrast to the innumerable city-states in Greece, China was one world outside of which nothing really asked for recognition when man began to reflect on the universe. The Chinese had no chance and no reason to stand off and look at themselves, from the position of another civilization. Montesquieu's desire to stare at France as though it were Madagascar was quite inconceivable in China. The Chinese lived a social monism. And as we mentioned before, heaven and the seasons and the demons in the fields were conceived as mainly concerned with lending the finishing touch to society. The present social life of man was the center of attention. Nature, earth, and the celestial powers formed an aggregate complementary to the One Great Society, but

were never contrasted with human society.

In China, then, - and this is the logical contradiction to India, - society was all inclusive. When we see castes in India, cutting man from man like separate natures, we understand how the Hindoo world-view carries objective chaos into the very heart of society. In China, the trouble with the individual is not too much war, but too much peace. It is no accident that war and militarism were despised in China. China created a life that turned "inward" exclusively.

The Great Society is so eager, so busy, so industrious that we all are in it for good. We must keep going, increase our effort in order to overcome the friction which results from constant functioning. The tear and wear of functioning itself, make mere equality of effort insufficient. We must add, in order to keep the result even. Nervous breakdown is the only way for modern man to keep from being dragged on and on, - to always more acquaintances, more telephone calls, more appointments, more committees, more memberships and more bills. In any society the first rule is: "Keep smiling." And the second is: "When you can't smile any longer, step out." On the inner "front" of life, only joy is legitimate. You remember the two doors to the "front" of feeling, joy ushering us in, sorrow dismissing us. What we call society is based on a unanimity of effort, sympathy and emotions. And without this cheerful unanimity, society takes on the ugly aspect of brutal nature. The newcomer into a city like Paris or New York sees it only from the outside, as a monstrosity. After his first hard times, he gets into the game; and it

becomes so much a part of himself, and he a part of it, that his smile is like a ray falling on him from this whole solar system of a cheerful social harmony.

To the eternal Chinese within us, "service first" is instinctively true. We all love functioning smoothly. We crave harmony of movement, rhythm. The first thing any socially well established dignitary has, is a certain rhythm of daily routine by which he realizes how well he fits into the buzzing and humming universe. We try to dance as well as we can.

Obviously, the Chinese viewpoint is as plausible, and as illogical, as the Hindoo. We may study everybody as being outside everybody else; the result is that we begin to see everybody as an animal in the jungle. We may think of everybody as inside one body; that incorporation makes itself heard like a wheel with myriads of cogs, or an orchestra of innumerable instruments.

In this state of affairs, Lao-tzu enters the scene. His contribution, like Buddha's, is a reductio ad absurdum of this social industry and noise. He builds in the absolute zero, the famous "hub of the wheel". Since the mere continuance of social industry also means a constant increase of social friction, since the same result would not be possible without more and more effort, man has to return from functioning into non-functioning, from being filled with social importance, to lacking any importance. The return to zero is a safety valve for the human heart, within society. Society lives on two anti-social possibilities which man must practise: anonymity and vanishing.

These two qualities are Lao-tzu's biographical data. That he had not the name under which his sayings went, and that he disappeared, are the minimum dates of his heroic life. He created the potential minimum of business biography. Buddha also had two great biographical experiences, the Great Renunciation and the Great Enlightenment. Lao-tzu, who tried to live the social zero, the hub of the wheel, was as little able to live the illogical, as Buddha. Of course, you have to live in society to teach people to be outside the noise of society. And yet, this illogical attitude of Lao-tzu is much more logical than Confucianism, since it purifies the organ by which man is able to share the life of the society around him. Lao-tzu's two achievements, anonymity and vanishing, deserve our interest especially today. We all are more or less obsessed with the idea of record, fame, reputation, being in the know, not being left out in the cold, etc. Our copyright, coming late, came with all the more violence. And it expresses the importance that we attribute to being named. Inevitably the "Who is Who" is a yardstick of our social importance. Rare are those who, when asked for their coat-of-arms, answer with Charles Francis Adams that his family does not have a coat-of-arms, and does not care to have one. Our whole economic system is based on naming and labeling our services to society. Unrecognized service is possible only when a livelihood is guaranteed to would-be good Samaritans.

Lao-tzu is anonymous. In his real life he bore another name, and was not what tradition says of him. On

the other hand enough of his true personality went on record to make his act of becoming anonymous known as his own. If his giving up his name had not been recorded, that important act would have left no impression. The educational, revolutionary changes in human tendency had to be kept in evidence in these changers of our nature. Buddha had to go on record as a former prince; Lao-tzu as "Erh", (his true name). Only by this paradox could his life be summed up, in the book Shih-Chi, chapter 63: "He aimed at self effacement and namelessness." And his death was like a vanishing, leaving no room for sorrow or ceremonies. "Men all seek the first. He alone sought the last. Men all seek fulfillment; he alone took the empty. The early Han emperors, following the tenets of Lao-tzu, ruled through acquiescence and non-activity." A cannot be B. Tao, the principle of the way of life, can be both A and B; it is not in one thing only. "Without sound, it stands alone." Without sound, indeed, the ear of man is purified, and frees itself from the speeding-up of society.

"It is truer to call Tao Non-Being than Being." This again is the discovery of zero, without which society cannot instill into itself a new rhythm. "It is eternally nameless and is concealed in the nameless." The road which man's living soul could take, within the walls of the One great and inescapable Society, was into an unconquerable "in". As "the hub of the wheel" he describes this inwardness. "The world is invariably possessed by him who does nothing" (chapter 48). Hence society can use this

zero as a new spring for its functioning. "The more laws are promulgated, the more thieves and bandits there will be." (57) "The practice of Tao consists in subtracting, day by day."

Our World Society is as totalitarian as China. It does not take dictatorships to make a society totalitarian in its impact on man. Hence Chinese moral problems have been introduced into America. Just as we found that the microscope is very close to Buddha's gigantic world-eye, America's schools of Behaviorism and Environment are very near to the optimistic teachings of Confucius. The very word "adjustment", the pragmatic value of truth, the avoidance of conflict, everything except the lack of filial piety among the virtues, reminds one of China. But the one corrective of Chinese tradition that cured the Chinese from mere Confucianism, Tao, subtracting day by day, is not to be found in these American traditions.

As Darwin needed some Schopenhauer to become palatable, so the American "Keep Smiling", followed by a nervous breakdown, is pruned today by the author, for instance, of "The Art of Living". Our overproductive, overcreative society is in a strange danger of not ripening the fruits of creativity, because it strives for them too feverishly. When I see how thousands of college people, professors, wives of professors, boys and girls, find the solution of their problems in writing, I am sure that their next question will be how to find creative rest. Respect for the question when to be creative and when not, is so little known that people who have once published a book simply

go on writing to their life's end. The question of anonymity in important spiritual influences is another profound mystery. I have found at times that anonymous authorship was asked of me. and at other times, just the reverse. From these experiences, and from the question of anonymous giving which everybody knows, I draw the conclusion that the choice between namedness and nameless ness has a deep significance. I once gave a whole course on names; and found the problem of infinite diversity and importance. And in Tao it comes to us as the center. In our first lectures, we met it when we spoke of articulation. The greatest courage is required today to stay long enough silent among the people with whom you live in order to make your voice really become theirs when you do speak.

Lao-tzu seems to be as significant for our artistic fever, as Buddha is for our scientific scepticism. Now the arts and sciences are our earthly, our pagan heritage. They are our roots in the earth, outside revelation. Outer observation and inner sympathy recur in any age, irrespective of this or that Era. They are timeless recurrences to man's heart and brain, ear and eye, in space.

For these two extensions in space, Buddha and Lao-tzu found a zero position which frees man from his allegiance to any accidental art or science. It is hard for young people in America to grasp the creative freedom reached by Tao and Nirvana. A friend asked me: "Do you mean, then, that man must not be ambitious?" I tried to show him that the potentialities of man simply have been doubled by allowing him the tendency both towards zero and away from zero.

Then Daniel Webster clung to becoming president and declined the vice-presidency, he lost his great chance (the elected president died in his first month of holding office); he showed the sterility of a single track mind which finds that only straight lines are successful. To make failure a success, non-resistance a victory, suddenly creates a fantastic number of new curves and possibilities in life. The minus, once made as meaningful for the health of the community and the salvation of the world as the plus, Theodore Roosevelt faced Webster's chance quite differently. In him, we feel much more versatile vitality. When he swallowed the bitter pill of becoming vice-president, his sacrifice made him president. It is not enough to be a conqueror. It is not enough to be a success, a martyr. The many who want to become president do not succeed. Al Smith would have won had he been heroic enough not to run in 1928 as people advised him to do. It takes more than ambition to become the man of the hour. He must have ambition and non-ambition as well. The arrow of his life must swing freely away from zero and toward it. (The picture of Gladstone chopping trees in his times out of office is painted deliciously in Vaurois' Disraeli).

Now let us turn from the creators of the pure World Eye and the pure social Ear, to the changers of space, the changers of our times. Abraham created man's destiny, Christ his history.

f. Abraham

3. Abraham told all loyal people that a supreme loyalty exists, by which all earthly loyalties are measured, and found too cheap.

Why is that so?

The fact that Abraham and Jesus are parts of our ~~own~~ struggles spreads a cloud, even today, over their sober achievements. Let us concentrate on the obvious and permanent results. They boil down to something tangible and definite. And I ask you to forget all partisanship or denominational embellishment of the simple facts.

The first sentence of the Bible, "In the beginning, God created heaven and earth", turned against the disruption of the universe and the wars raging among the heathen, between the gods of heaven and earth. The humanity of Abraham's days worshipped, in divided loyalty, different parts of the world. Abraham left the place of divided loyalty, his own home country; and this exodus out of the country of idolatry, of loyalties divided between many antagonistic deities, remains the catchword of all Israel.

Egypt and the exodus from Egypt, only repeated the story of Abraham's exodus from Ur. Faith in the unity of creation is Abraham's only merit, as the Bible so strongly asserts. "For the rest, he is just a man!" Royce, in his philosophy of loyalty, describes Abraham's position literally when he discovers "loyalty to loyalty". Royce says that only that loyalty deserves cultivation which includes every loyalty (of other men and in other men), that is not at war with other people's loyalties. Abraham

says: "At the beginning, the earth and heaven were created as one. Man has divided them and the parts of the earth. I am going to pierce down through the crust of tribal memories to the moment of complete unity." And the final outcome is the Jewish era, which simply counts from the creation of the world.

This may seem unscientific to you. But it is exactly as effective as a drug against the false logic of the heathen, as Lao-tzu with his subtraction, or Buddha with his extinction. All pagan history starts somewhere within time, for instance, with the founding of Rome, or the Olympic games in 776 B.C. That is to say, they all must start with a divided loyalty. The only way to lower the walls erected by divided loyalty is to go beyond any historical past. For we know already, the "tra-ject" in man, his being heir-at-law of the experienced past of former generations, makes him worship the language and the values which come to him as his mother tongue and his fatherland, beyond everything else.

Don't believe too deeply that your Puritan ideas of Jehovah, Etc. are pertinent to the understanding of Israel's eternal function. I decline to talk Theology in this matter at all today. As a function in society, the role of Abraham's seed before 1879, simply was one of waiting, till the Gentiles should awaken out of their dispersion. The so-called dispersion of the Jews over this world of Gentiles corresponded exactly to the dispersion of divided loyalties among the Gentiles all over the globe. Abraham waited. In

this, his waiting attitude, he made all existing loyalty relative. No living order was divine, no monarch a God. Daniel and his King Nebuchadnezzar agreed in this same devaluation of royalty; only the courtiers wanted to deify their King. And Daniel went into the lion's den. This happens today in Japan or Germany with the same exactitude as then. Israel is a dangerous interrogation mark, for any specific loyalty.

When I talked with a student about this creation of a common denominator for loyalty, he got excited: "But, then," he said, "they really have the right religion." I nodded, but I disliked his use of the word religion. He saw the function and used a static name for it. But the word religion is worthless when it makes its believers into people who have something. Buddha and Lao-tzu are not founders of religion. Neither a Jew nor a Christian, nor a Buddhist nor a Lao-tzu disciple, "has" anything. To speak of the religion of these four is a refined way of eliminating their function. The heathens "have" a religion.

When Israel and when the Church were founded, neither was called a religion, but rather a new kind of man. And that is exactly what they were. Israel cannot have a religion, because Israel has a meaning only as an antidote against existing religions. If you call an antidote by the name of the corruption or disease of which it is the antidote, you make it rather difficult to understand its role. Israel came to cure the world from religions. It had to give its members some religion, too. But the worldwide meaning of Judaism is found, not in its own religion,

but in its establishing itself, with danger to life, in the den of the many lions called religions, in every country. Every "religion" tried with might and main to wall itself up in an empire. The weakness of Israel was its only strength. It had to keep so disarmed, so small as a country, so scattered, so leaderless, because it had to face, literally face, all the innumerable loyalties that make people die for a particular cause, a particular land, a particular language. Whether we like it or not, we first must see why Israel transcended the average meaning of religion, by challenging all religions as divided loyalties, and inviting them to a messianic kingdom where swords would become ploughshares, and the lion would lie down with the lamb. And heaven and earth would be one, and the individual pride of one group, the serpent, would have to admit it. Buddha and Lao-tzu conquered philosophies; Abraham and Jesus defeated religions.

A zero situation was created compared to which all particular loyalty looked very precarious. The unity of man was not to be found in any specific historical loyalty, but in his loyalty to loyalty. The life of Buddha cumulated in two insights. In self-effacement and namelessness, Lao-tzu created a soothing oil for the social machine. Abraham also had two experiences. One in being called out of his country and his friendship, sacrificing his mother-tongue and his fatherland. (This pertained to Israel through the ages, till 1879). And secondly, his experience that his son need not be sacrificed for the father, but had to re-experience the same fate, and so on from generation to

generation. When the Reverend Musselmann, a Mennonite minister in Pennsylvania, was on his deathbed three years ago, he called his son, a minister also, and said to him, "My son, in 1680 we came to this country because we did not think it right to bear arms. Promise me that, in this country also when conscription comes, your congregation shall have the moral strength to emigrate once more." Here you have the eternal function of Israel. I use the example of the Mennonite sect because it is important to see how the creation of the Traject - Zero has become our common property today through the Christian sects.

Outside of Israel, men first had to leave their home country, for freedom of religious worship, in the times of Calvin. New England, of course, was founded by people who discovered the religious meaning of emigration. And in this way, during the last centuries, loyalty to loyalty became our common property. In 1879 (or 1804, or 1776), all these dates may be quoted), loyalty to loyalty seemed so much the common denominator for every one, that its specific and constant rerepresentation by Israel was abandoned as unnecessary. The emancipation of the Jews had simply this meaning, that the Traject Zero was now inherent in every nation. When this country and France went back to "the Nature of Man", proclaimed the "Rights of Man", exclaimed that "All Men are Born Equal," and that all men were reconciled in Adam, then loyalty to loyalty detached itself from its specific carrier, Israel, for the first time. Then every nation's own return to nature became an

antidote against the intrinsic paganism of divided loyalty.

Hitler makes himself a reactionary by insisting again on a divided nature of man; he literally nullifies loyalty to loyalty, the unity of heaven and earth for all men. Hence he tries to compel Israel to take up her old watch on Zion once more. He denies the incorporation of the Traject-Zero into the life of all men, and deprives man quite logically, of his right to purify his loyalty, to deepen his understanding of "mother-tongue" and "fatherland" to a point where both human speech and earthly habitation reappear as one for all men.

Not her own religion, but her protest against religions, is the significance of Israel. That is the meaning of her messianic or prophetic character. The rotten method of driving a wedge between the later prophets on one side and Abraham and Moses on the other is still as popular as in the times of the vicious circle in Biblical criticism. But Abraham and Moses, in their exodus, did exactly the same thing that the prophets did. Every generation had to act differently in order to represent the same thing. We have to act differently from our forefathers because, and when, we wish to be loyal to them. Since this simple truth was forgotten in the nineteenth century, the complete unanimity of Israel through the ages was denied in favour of petty discussion of the many layers of expression of this unanimity. When the Temple was built, prophets had to ascertain the perpetual exodus which Jesus, Abraham and Moses had lived. The role of the church was shredded to pieces in the same way by modern criticism as the function of Israel. In the eyes of modern man, it was tantamount

to a felony that the church had changed during her two thousand years of existence. Paul was called the first deserter, the bishops followed. And on it went, from depravation to depravation, until 1789, when the role of the church seemed as definitely superfluous as the role of Israel. And yet the role or function of the Church is just as specific, perpetual and tangible as that of Abraham's seed. I am interested not in Christian men's religion, but in their function in the world. And it can be proved that they have redirected the "front" of the future, as Israel has redirected the "front" that looks toward the past.

The last word of the New Testament is that simple Imperative which we found, last time, to be the future combination between speech and act: by the imperative, human beings create a new situation, a real future. The last word of the New Testament is "come".

F. Jesus

4. The meaning of the Christian Era, the years A.D., is that the time of divided loyalties is coming to an end, that the reunion of mankind has begun. Our moving "A.D." means that every year from now on, another part of creation will find its home in lasting unity. Every Anno Domini, i.e. year of the Lord, has the same intrinsic importance as every other. The pagan eras all harked back to one big event, like the founding of Rome. Against them, the outcry "In the beginning" reached out into the purified past; In Israel every part of the world died to itself and rose again reborn, to join the march of time. In the Christian

Era, every human being is addressed, "projected" into the future of the whole race, made responsible for the future of the whole race. We die with the first born and rise with him. The Son takes the place of the Father, the Daughter or Bride takes the place of the Mothers of old.

This is the origin of all our modern faith in progress which was, and is, so perfectly unknown outside of Christianity. ~~Neither Gentiles nor Jews~~ believed in ~~any~~ thing but cycles. The philosophy of the "cycle" is inevitable for that state of affairs which (in the power given to us by the Christian Era) I call the vicious circle. This is a clear line of demarcation today between the heirs-at-law of the Christian Era, and those who desert it once more. In our discussion of the vicious circle in the sciences, somebody asked; "But isn't this circle inescapable?" It is quite superfluous to discuss any sort of theology, when the whole issue, in our own times, is compressed into this doubt. To give up the idea of progress in the sciences, in human understanding, is today's form of "obduration", of relapse from our Era. Labels don't tell today who is who. Many 'christians' are heathen today; many heathen Christians.

The whole idea of our Era is one and one only: "This is the time." "The day has come." "Today, the prophecies are fulfilled before our eyes." The two acts of Jesus that made him the beginner of the new Aeon, were his death for being the Beginner of the Messianic kingdom, and his resurrection as a spiritual body for all who wanted from now on to die with him and to rise again with him daily. With his life, he had to pay the penalty of bearing a father's

name, and being his mother's son. To be rid of his duties as Abraham's seed, he had to use up his whole life. Thus, death was the only investment in the future that actually was at his disposal. But his death, as we have seen, was a personal, historical and human death, containing the full power of an act achieved in the face of the whole world, by speech and sober suffering, by inviting and accepting himself that suffering, and dismissed by himself in the "consummatum est." In short, we see here how any act, clothed in the full power of language, bears fruit, even death.

The founder of our progressive nature made the realistic and scientific discovery that future can be contained in death as much as in life. By calling death his accomplishment, he invited us all to understand one dying as much as a personal invitation as one living.

Since it is all important that we should not get lost in any emotional or verbalistic discussion, please remember that the genuine imperative has one quality. It finishes the former consciousness of the addressee, because any command puts a man in a new situation: he must go forward, body and soul, mind and matter; as a pilot in the spin of his plane is drained of all his blood in his brain, so a man under an imperative has no power to reflect idly; and as long as he is under the spell of the command, a regrouping of all his former prejudices takes place. Future had one demonstrable quality. It shows things in a new light. (The man who lives on his appointment Book, years ahead, is booked up; and the past infringes on his future till he goes crazy.) The man who can accept a command

wholeheartedly, may see things in a new light. This alone is that dying and rising shared by anyone who understands the meaning of death and resurrection. The New Era happens to man in the middle of his life, at any time and in any place. Our Christian paraphernalia are a promise that this may happen to us too. They relate to our real transformations, as promises or prophecies relate to fulfillment. Now, today, personal rebirth has become of minor importance. Our huge machines of sciences and arts must die and rise again. This is not the hour of individual conversion, but of breaking the vicious circle in the arts and sciences by showing them up as processes of life, death and resurrection.

Why are the sciences, and not individual souls, the great sinners of our era? Why does the future depend on perpetual redirection of the mind, in the artist's work, and in scientific research?

The four redirectors of human nature have all established an illogical zero, because the individual gets lost in society, on one of the four "fronts", by weakness, misunderstanding, fear or freshness. We saw that the eternal abuse of the liberties offered by language produce cynics, nomads, petrified relics, and mystics; and produce over-reaching nouns in the place of honest verbs. We saw innocence killed by labels from the outside, and understood the social sin which prevents the best of us from being what we should like to be, loving and beloved. For we are a constant target for labels.

Hence, the redirection had to be equally illogical, by transcending every possible blunder on every beam of the cross of reality. Our four sponsors of humanity held the secret of being so inward, so outward, so forward, so backward that no mystic, no rationalist, no reactionary, no revolutionary, could escape. They concentrated on the organ by which one of these four false tendencies is possible. And by emptying it of its accidental content, they assured the perpetuity of movement in time and space. Eye and ear, birth and death, in themselves, defied abuse. However, one drawback remained - Buddha and Lao-tzu ruled the East, Abraham and Jesus the West, in a kind of geographical separation. Hence, our West retained two elements of a "natural" character, reason and the arts. And the East retained two elements of unbridled nature, politics and history. In other terms, Science and Arts, in the West, would not bow down before the Church and Israel. They were Greek. In the East, history and politics were not mastered. The caste-system in India petrified history. The emperors of China made politics, like progress, impossible.

At this moment, East and West meet under the challenge that nothing can stay outside the integration of social forces, lest chaos result. Either Western Man's sciences and arts must cease to be academic and become parts of the river, instead of contemplating it from the bank; or else the political and historical life of Europe and America is doomed too. And China, India and Japan must go historical and political, or no trace will be left of

the purity of Eastern eyes and ears, their arts and philosophies.

We witness today in the West a fight against Jews or the Church, a war raging against the very best in India and China. This war challenges the insufficiency of all four, in their separation. We perceive their necessary interplay and their complementary character. For that same reason, in educating our children we cannot help trying to give them all the liberties and powers created by all four.

h. The Convergence of the Sciences

The education of our students, in universities, must have in view the catastrophe of a world divided in its loyalties, without common imperatives, with din and struggle all around us. Only thus can we know whom to educate. Man finds himself as a multiform being, a cog in the machine, a citizen of the historical world, classified as human material and last but not least, he remains all his life, a child. Man must learn that he created his liberty in time and space, by overcoming the visible and the audible, the beginnings and the ends of social institutions. He can learn this only when the arts and sciences of the West take him outside himself, when they teach and educate and do research in equal freedom from routine, from their vicious cycle and from historical casualness, and when the state and church of the past are shot through with our Western power of exile and resurrection.

Since we deliver our children daily into public schools, since we read and write and depend so completely

on the arts and sciences in every day life, we have a right to ask people to share our grave misgivings about the goal of academic education.

We see that no teachers today are let loose without some training. The exception is made for the college and university professors. The fact of their being trained scientifically, or artistically, allows them today to lack any communion, any common future, with others.

A scientist working in my own department may be more removed from me, in faith and in conviction, than the last coolie in China. In our various scientific conferences at New Year's time on Philosophy, Romance, Languages, History, etc., the so-called "slave-markets" disintegration is as much an accepted fact as that Hollywood is empty.

I insist that this is not at all indispensable. Anything to which people give time can be changed. Albert Schweitzer went to the Congo to show his theological friends that science needs balance. Our Congo is right here. It is no accident that the Christian missions have come to an end. Our own thought, our own sciences need salvation much more than the Africans or Chinese.

But among all the conventions of our world, the scientific conventions are the most sacred. When people pronounce the words "science", "research" or "art" today, they kneel down as on a carpet of prayer. Now, I am tempted myself; I am a scholar for good. In the past again and again, when I have had to give up my reputation as a scholar in favor of the truth, it has almost killed me. Today, I hardly understand why I was so afraid. But I

was afraid. And it may not be wrong to assume that others are afraid, too. Because when we give up the code of unanimity about the absolute value of the special science, it is hard to see what would be left inside a university.

As you know, the so-called history of science is cultivated today with a kind of enthusiasm. For instance, the History of Biology, by Emanuel Radl, is a marvellous work that combines the power of selection with historical understanding. In other cases, this movement is more an attempt to wash our scientific fur coats without wetting them. For, what we call 'history of science' today is misunderstood as an attempt to treat science as an object of nature in which there is neither darkness nor light, neither good nor evil, but facts only. Without evaluation, the history of science shares the risks of all historical work. For it adds to the feeling of inescapable mechanism and machinery. In it nothing is wrong; hence, nothing is right. We only have a history when we have a future. Our question is: Has science a future?

Nevertheless, the fact that some people believe that the salvation of science lies in writing its history, may mean that those people feel that the salvation of science is at stake. That in itself is valuable. But I fear that too often their response is merely a symptom of the stimulus called bad conscience. The wrong traditions about Paracelsus and Bacon show how this history is simply the ideology of the scientific fellowship. And then, the histories of the sciences are like the divided loyalties of the pagan world, boasting of achievements, not haunted by an-

ticipating catastrophes.

The sciences, as such, represent as much confusion as meaning. They do not indicate 100% progress just because they exist. They need to be purified as much as Buddha purified the world of appearances, or Lao-tzu the world of social functions. Before the scientists can integrate the thoughts of man and evaluate their own historical role, they must meet in that emptiness of ear and eye, in that loyalty and love which former generations labelled otherworldliness, and which you, with Nietzsche, may label "overmanliness"; however you call it, it actually means a trans-scientific and trans-artistic attitude. Restore your faculty for listening to the invitation to thinking! This can only be achieved in a zero situation of dying completely to our problems as we find them in our special science, and of meeting others who come from other fields of science, and who experience the same willingness to forget the definite role of their science for a moment. Research depends on our taking root in the universal future of man. All the research today is done with a stubborn defiance of any such connection of imperative with indicative. Hence, the connection must be lived again, in a special effort, by the future teacher, scientist and educator. Before we do this, I shall challenge the monotonous assertion that scientists love the truth. They love their science. It is very simple. Today the scientist has forgotten that all his work depends on society's recognizing his usefulness. "There shall be science," is the imperative which alone makes his work meaningful, to them and others. This imperative today stands isolated. There-

fore, it must fall. Vis consilii expers mole ruit sua.
Force without fellowship or consultation is doomed. Only as one commandment in a whole series of others can this imperative be respected by society. We have devoted this course to saving science, by assigning to it its relative place among the many commandments in the life of the individual and the race. And as long as scientists fail to convert themselves to a rediscovery of the other commandments of education, they will destroy the future of the sciences, and this, indeed, will be inescapable. Our friend in the discussion was right; ruin and death are inescapable, except by courageous anticipation. When we die voluntarily and in time, we may conquer the death of our sciences. We may break through their lignification and departmentalisation. We may redisintegrate them.

Then a friend of mine, in biology, wrote a book on the central significance of death for life, another friend, a physiologist, exclaimed: "What, does he think that he can stop these huge and powerful machines of the sciences, with their momentum? They will crush him." He thought exactly as our friend in the discussion here a fortnight ago when he exclaimed: "Inescapable." Both sentences ascribe to man and to society a "nature" which does not exist. Neither man or society can live on a bad conscience. I certainly do not underrate the tremendous momentum of these machines of special sciences which we have built up. Certainly, they will run their course for a long time. They will crush many of our most vital efforts. They, however, are perfectly uninteresting for the future. When we sent

out our invitations to you, somebody said: "Grown up people don't want to change in their activities, and they actually are too afraid for their social future. And therefore, they cannot listen to you, and they will not listen to you." This is an obvious fact which became very clear when President Carnichael, with some irony, described the successful man in an academic career. No doubts of the fundamentals in his science are permitted to this type. And that in an era which boasts of being founded on scientific doubt and the duty to doubt. "Doubt within your science, never doubt your science", seems the dogma. There is no such thing as a particular science. They all live and die together. Einstein's destruction of nature has undermined the foundations of scores of sciences. Words, sentences, speech, come to science from society; and no science can survive a change in society unregenerated. I was compelled to introduce the time of the historian into history by looking backward admittedly, because I have seen the downfall of a world of pure space.

Lack of respect for the formative character of language deprives history, sociology, philology, philosophy, and other sciences of their foundations. They prefer the vicious circle. In physics, Einstein had the courage to admit the time element. There is no reason why we should not admit the time element in speech and teaching, why you could not retain, from these lectures, the fact that your words and thoughts fulfill or start reality, and never escape responsibility for the future of the human race, that teacher and student represent more than one age. You may hide behind the authority of your science. That

is no excuse for a monistic approach to the life of the spirit, which is a vital process of four modes. One of you said here that his science still hopes to stay monistic, and to avoid dualism. The science of time invited you to give up this antithesis. In becoming aware of the universe, man uses four methods of orienting himself within it. These four methods are four combinations between word and action. No reality can be experienced by one method only, or by one method coming at the wrong moment. No scientist can do his work except by entering all four moods: Any man who writes a book invites people to read it; that is an imperative. He is impressed by the existence of a question, an "If"; and he insists that he can think of and express an answer. He hopes to take his readers, a plurality of people, over the stream, and to become a "we" in his readers. Neither for sociology, nor for history, nor for economics, nor for psychology, is it permissible to call monism scientific and dualism unscientific. Because, by dealing with reality, we all have to behave as living beings, who have to risk their lives and their thought by plunging into the river. The idea of standing on the bank of the river and observing facts is an idea which the monist and the dualist both entertain. And it is wrong, in both. The medianists were right against the vitalists, in biology; they are in the wrong against the transscientific reality of the man who becomes a scientist.

The problem of humanity is the coexistence of times. Then, our generation quite naturally has a scientific

task - to rescue certain parts of the universe from neglect or oblivion, because they are vital. The scientist must hear the questions put before man by objects otherwise overlooked and treated unjustly by our memory or consciousness or habits or instincts. Scientists hear the questions of objects before us, so that we gain a new access to them, and so that they may be invited to share our life again. The genuine dignity of psychology lies in all the dangerous, dark, and startling phenomena which it has brought to light as parts of real life. It has prepared a re-invitation of the subconscious into the life of the race. As long as a scientist does not recognize that he prepares invitations, by showing the object as a real question, he remains irresponsible. He will plunge us into the slaughter and magic of the primitive, pre-historic and subconscious man whom he so eagerly describes today. I am not afraid of man in his completeness and vitality. I am afraid of scientist who refuse to recognize what they are doing.

Much more than the laborers or workers, the scientist is a cog in the machine today. He honestly believes that the state of objectivity is meaningful without regard to the seasons of subjectivity, "trajectivity," and "pre-jectivity." He does not see why the questioning sciences crave feeding, overruling and overhauling and checking by the other combinations of speech and act. And so he cannot meet the common man, and do justice to the invitation before us, to be more than scientists. He does not know why his science must die just as any Christian

formerly had to die to his nature before he could rise again and be a free man. And so the confusion of too many academic sciences prevents the integration of science. Sciences must die, daily, bit by bit, so that the consciousness of mankind, called science, may come to life again.

Now, it is true that sciences are not persons. Hence, no personal repentance, no individual's contrition of heart, is required when sciences are "junked". They do not undergo a conversion. They converge. Our sentimental misunderstanding of the process is best opposed when we become aware of the four trans-scientific attitudes which the four rebels against religions and philosophies have made available.

Although Buddha, Lao-tzu, Jesus and Abraham are labelled philosophers or religionists by the modern monists, we have seen that they directed all their efforts towards man's freedom from his own tendencies and nature. They tried to protect us against philosophies and religions. They went beyond mere nature by showing up man's abuse of the methods of language, thought, and literature, his slavery under religions and philosophies. As little as these prototypes can science go religious. In this, Bertrand Russell, the last knight of "Natural" Science with a capital N, is right. As "one" religion, or as "one" philosophy among others, Christianity (or any other creed) will not break the proud neck of the Greek tradition of arts and sciences. Because the scientist himself is a trans-scientific reality in history and destiny, in fellowship with scientists, and conquest of the objective world, therefore

he should free himself from the superstition of his own method, and should keep his science in a state of convergence.

In every scientist, the whole cross of reality must be alive. Tao, resurrection, renunciation, loyalty to loyalty, are general standards for any scientist. Discovering that he speaks, he may discover also that he speaks to people of the future, hears from people of the past, rallies with people after his heart, and manipulates the world with his eye-born hands.

From now on, these four attitudes or combinations are every man's liberties. All four together are needed to unshackle him from his slavery to time and space. Silence and asceticism in space, and in time the loyalty to loyalty, and the perpetual surrender of any special science to the universe of science, become the basis of scientific education. For that, universities cannot help setting up standards.

The four redirecting sponsors of the human way of life have lived the pure eye, the empty ear, the simple heart, and the fire of new love. I cannot imagine that any man can live without longing, at times, for all four of them. If this be so, we have found our goal of education in a world-wide world.

1. Conclusion

It is not true that science can keep aloof from education, that science is void of values for human character. For, true research renews the bonds between the scientists themselves, or it is not research. True teach-

ing renews the language of society, or it is not teaching. True education is responsible for the future of the full grown man. And since the scientist speaks, reads and writes, he is in research, in teaching, in education, all the time. He may deny the power to speak; then he will destroy. He may recognize what it implies, with every word that he selects; then he will renew our lives. The power to do research is the power to review; the power to teach is the power to select. The power to educate is the power to inspire.

In these last sentences, the essential unity of research, teaching and educating has been stated. What is the unity, discovered in the three diagnoses?

The concept of nature broke down, with respect to science, to language, to man. Research itself, even of nature, could not be called natural, because nature followed no direction. At best, nature will move in recurrent cycles. This would annul the idea of progress in research. The idea of progress is at the base of the scientific process. Hence, research has no basis in nature.

Teaching is not natural. Nature does not converse with the observer on terms of brotherhood. The language which any teacher must use towards his student, is that of freedom, so that teacher and student, at any moment, might exchange roles. The teacher's language must be classified as "literature", in our definition of this term. The teacher's language amounts to inviting, selecting, testifying to personal experience, whereas nature only is registered as a mathematical hypothesis or equation.

Education is not nature. Nature is not free to say "no" and to swing in the opposite direction from its inertia, or entropism, or death. "Human nature" is a creation of historical times. To be human means to have control of natural tendencies. At every "front" of our vitality, we are free to select our direction. And we have this freedom through the power of speech, which allows us to meet with all men in the zero situation outside of the cross of reality.

Science, then, can not be derived from a monistic "nature", because of the scientist. The scientist must live. To live is to survive in time and space. And in order to master space and time, he not only must follow opposite tendencies; he must also use those redirecting energies; absolute loyalty, absolute silence, absolute renunciation, and absolute re-inspiration. In passing through these eyes of the needle, we recover our freedom as scientists.

On the other hand, the sciences are in no position to take orders from theology or philosophy. There is no need for that. It is enough that the scientists should realize what they are. The time has come in which science must see itself as a temporal, a creative, a historical process of reviewing, reselecting, and re-inspiring the life of humankind.