

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 'honor' our father and mother and we leave them to cleave to the wife of our choice. Old love is honored, 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 transportation problem, 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 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. God has been from the beginning. 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. Because there is One God for any beginning and any end, not two.

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

3. Man must love the man who fell among the thieves. Man shall start new fellowship incessantly. Any new neighbor offers me the opportunity for projecting the same relations that prevail within my lonely self and its inner processes into reality. We are less ourselves 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. Man must love himself. 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.

Not the individual scientist, science itself has lost direction and has to change its mind. And our training of future scientists must express this change.

Science is going forward in a straight line of specialisation. Investments in laboratories limit and restrict more and more 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; neque 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. Science is eracial when it is alive. The scientist must be nailed to the cross of reality as any layman. He must forget his science, sufficiently. He must face the problems of his field sometimes as a layman, as a novice again. And his training must teach him how to take off his glasses as well as how to put them on. The physicist needs a poet's eyes, the historian a founder's sense of values, the philosopher a geometrician's coordinates, to refresh their senses, to give them back the common sense of real men.

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 up-bringing of our future scientists and college teachers, and to offer them the opportunity which hitherto the existence of Europe made 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 candidate for science 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 at the same moment because of their action as madmen and unfit for service. Their cross examination ranks with that of Joan of Arc. One boy was left off because he had pull, the other because he was on the ski team. When science begins to meddle with the souls of men, the training of the scientist is shown up as too pagan, too primitive. He knows more things than his own soul has experienced. He is not aware of his own evolutionary potentialities beyond his science.

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

"Tantum habet homo de Scientia quantum operatu" is an old saying. Man's science can never go one step farther than the field of reality which he has paced off, as a person.

And for this balance of soul and mind, the cross of reality, offers guidance. This balance is a prerequisite for any 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 over fed 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. Instead 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.

Gautama 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 contradictions. 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 re-direct 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 four-fold 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 illiminate the confusion by two great sets of precepts

In the occident, the theologies have delt with creative and last judgment, 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 "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 wooer offers her. In evolution, we all are trajected from the past, or prejected 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 civilisation, 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 merely 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 adjectives 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 in experience, they would proceed with their propaganda for the end of all history. Human relics who starve us, terrorists 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 IMRI, 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 forever. 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 the 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, rationalism, 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 for 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 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 them, 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 Buddhistic 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 despair 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 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 beam 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 skiing 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 worldview 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 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-tze 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 labelling 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, 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 hum 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 over-productive, 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 namelessness 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-zu 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. When 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 Maurois' 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 and waits for

the Messias to restore this divided world, finally.

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 1389, 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 smoothing 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 1789. And secondly, his experience that his son need not be sacrificed for the father, but had to reexperience 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 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 1339 (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 representation 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, *then Jews could be reconciled to the nations which ceased to be Gentiles.*

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~~ *according to the ra, 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 ~~time~~ *once more* ~~of the future~~, as Israel has redirected the "fronts" that looked toward the past ~~and the future.~~ *Israel protected all boundaries between men which obstructed the unity of creation. It overlooked the present in their messianic hope.* 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."

Abraham's seed perched on the beam of light which unites the first and the last day of creation. Which we call time. It defied space. Israel has no land; it has time. g. 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 ~~the~~ *the* 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 ~~anything~~ *nothing* 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 Christian

The whole idea of ~~our~~ the Christian 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 his 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.

Here Insert 45a

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 freashness. We saw that the eternal abuse of the liberties offered by language produce cynics, nomads, petrified relics, and mystics; and produce overreaching 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 ~~spaceless~~, so ~~present~~ 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

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 anticipating 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 this usefulness. "There shall be science," is the imperative which alone makes his work meaningful, to them and others. This imperative today stands isolated. Therefore it must fall. Vis consilii expers mole ruit sua. Force without fellowship or consultation is doomed. Only as one commandment is 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.

When 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 nor 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 Carmichael, 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 an express 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, prehistoric and subconscious man whom he so eagerly describes today. I am not afraid of man in his completeness and vitality. I am afraid of scientists 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 "prejectivity." 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, but 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 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 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.

i. Conclusion

It is 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 teaching 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.

THE SOUL ON THE

HIGHWAY

The Soul on the Highway

1. The Suburb

I come from a region where we have to deal with submarginal land, with subzero weather, and with suburban people. The suburb has been added to climate and soil during the last years. I still well recall the transition from town to suburb in my own community, step by step, year after year. A last flare, a last attempt to regalanise the Town Meeting, to do some thing in common was made three years ago. Then a false investment in a town Hall. After that the summer people and Main Street drifted away from the back hills in the suburb direction for good.

We now are a suburb and we are surrounded by suburbs.

In our work, we have found that subzero cold is not insuperable. Taking the line of hardest resistance on purpose - the line of least resistance, to me, has always been uninteresting - we started our experiment in living at 28 below zero, with no woodpile for the poor stove we could heat one room at least in the house, and with all our cars refusing to start, in the midst of the Vermont woods.

We have found that submarginal farms are not insuperable. They are very good places. We even have convinced some fine economical and agricultural experts of this fact.

But the suburban mentality comes near to being insuperable.

The human soul of the future will have to reconquer the suburban mentality of she will die.

What is a suburb? A suburb is not a city nor is it a town. It is a place where unfortunately a school and a church lend a false lustre to an agglomeration of houses and a sewer system for people who do not make a living in this community but elsewhere; the people huddle together because they are of the same income group.

A suburb may be a slum, or it may be Tuxedo or Scarsdale. But it is a residential section of one and the same type of people. All these people have to entertain important relations to other types of people who live somewhere else. In fact the outside relations are far more essential because the people depend on them for their livelihood. Nevertheless, these relations do not enter the suburb, especially when they are unpleasant. You may invite your business friend for the weekend. But you cannot meet the boss who has fired you, or the secretary whom you have insulted, in your suburb.

The suburban mentality results from its being the residence of people who live their conflicts elsewhere. Unfortunately, our church and school are in the suburb. Hence we talk about God and King Lear and Hamlet with people with whom we have no conflict because we neither collaborate with them nor fight with them. And so the teaching and the preaching become verbiage. The suburb emasculates the word. As the minister's wife said naively, "My husband really is quite a radical and reformer. But since we moved to this rich parish

three years ago, he had no occasion to mention his social ideas in his sermons."

The suburb ignores pain and conflict even where they are meant to bear fruit in a more energetic, more vital relation. Girl meets boy, in the suburb. Girl is usually more mature than boy, because of co-education. This eliminates already one chance of adventure for the slower developing male. They go together since high school days; so they get married. No Romeo, no Juliet can come to life in a suburb because Montagues and Capulets do not wage their Homeric battles in suburbs. Loves labor is lost. No Miranda is courted on an island after a tempest. To me, these are nearly incestuous marriages. They are cases of spiritual inbreeding.

A special word was coined for this lukewarm atmosphere which expresses adequately the prudence and kindness and the barrenness of the suburb. The suburb has a mentality. Mentality is a marvellous word for the residue of the soul which remains when you deduct as luxuries the tears and moaning and groaning, the yelling and cursing, the weeping and crying between jubilant joy and black despair.

Children are not born in this "mentality", but in maternity wards. Thus, husbands do not realize what it means to bring a child into the world. How can a man understand himself who has not seen his wife bear him his child? How can a man be challenged to go over the top, in the fight for mankind, if he has not quaked when a child was born, under the shattering experience of travail, in the corresponding fight against death taken on by the women? Men are excluded from the most fundamental event of their family existence. Sick people are isolated. And if possible, death is not to occur in the suburb. people mention death as little as they can. It is so embarrassing. The bereaved themselves remain inarticulate about it. But if you have not seen the last breath come out of the body of a person whom you loved, how can you appraise the miraculous unity of mind and body? How can you escape the sterilizing heresy which makes the body a mechanical and chemical factory instead of a creative process of incarnation? How can you believe in the spirit if you laugh off the spirit's physical expression in breathing in and breathing out, if you separate inspiration and respiration? The relegation of our body into a scientifically treated realm of physics and hygiene, the exclusion of death and birth from the suburb, shakes the belief in incarnation utterly. Most people today have not the faintest idea what this term may mean. They do not have any opportunity to see the inspiration reflected in incarnated processes, they do not see that the creative energies of faith hope and agape, love, build the body of the child as well as they integrate society.

The suburb is like the grey matter of the brain. It cannot realize beginning or end, birth or death. It is organized. And for that very reason, the suburb is no living organism but its imitation. The imitation of life is the great dream of the machine age. And all dreams of men come true. To man always is given that in what he believes. And so we have the perfect imitation of life.

When I got forty-five young men to revitalize the fiber of the unemployed and of a decaying town, I was attacked under the slogan: "He is no organizer." The attack was correct. I thought that there were so many people who organize beautifully, but that the techniques

of organization do not apply to the stormy processes in which living groups are born. An organization will begin with ten people, and grow to a hundred, to a thousand. A living organism will begin with one, then two, will grow slowly as in our case to forty-five, then a tempest will test it and when we came out of the tempest with twenty-five, I knew that we had won. And won much more easily, and with surprisingly small losses. Our losses were exactly what the men killed in action constitute for a nation the very condition for being born.

When our group seemed to be crushed under political hate and indifference of the suburban mentality, when we lost twenty out of forty-five, and did not know if it could survive, we wept. And the old farmer who presided over our meetings was so crushed that he said nothing. But his wife told my wife: "It is as though our next of kin had died." But when the movie Peter The Great was played in which the empress Kathrine throws herself in despair over the dying Tsar, the whole audience of the suburb laughed. At my request, the students made up their minds afterwards why they might have burst into laughter. And the most important among them said after a day's reflection, 'Yes', he said, 'we laughed because we felt perfectly sure that we under no circumstances would cry so desperately.'

I believe that the suburb is the example of a superb organization the only defect of which is that it is too perfectly organized. It works admirably as a tool, for that is all that any organization can hope to achieve.

Organisms are not tools. The United States, The Society of Friends, and any real family, are what they are. And they are O. K. in the way they are. They are without further utility because they are a way of life themselves. They are alive. And therefore they are in any moment in danger of life. Their greatest danger is that their members may forget that they are in a daily struggle against death. This is the danger for the United States today. The era of corporations has lost sight of the frailty of human living groups.

And it is true, that living groups are frail compared to our mammoth organizations, limited and incorporated. Our corporations are much more powerful and much more efficient than a family. However, the living group has one inimitable advantage.

When the Duke of Plaza Toto, in Gilbert and Sullivan's comic opera, sings: I am the Duke of Plaza Toro, Limited, Limited, we all laugh because he says in so many words that he is bankrupt. To be limited, means to be in receivership and to be treated like an estate or a corporation. A person that is not bankrupt, is unlimited. "The Unlimitable Heart" is the good title of a French play which tried to make peace in Europe on the only possible basis, that of reality instead of imitation.

The unlimitable heart of man hinged upon the future whereas any organisation remains pinned down to its purpose and its limited aim. The so called groups which are organised with a telephone and a desk at \$2.50 a month on Fifth Avenue, can serve limited purposes only. One thousandth of the whole person enters any such alleged group. These associations may expand in numbers for the original purpose.

But they cannot grow. Our mass organisations are determined by the insight of their most indifferent and most stupid member. Any organisation like any machine depends on its weakest member because it depends on numbers. It cannot afford to lose them. The quantitative organisation is exactly that what it has been, purposive, manipulated, organising an agglomeration of individuals around an identical rational and partial goal. Is it not funny that we call the increase in numbers "growth"? Would it not be equally valid to call it cancer?

But a living organism allows its members to have an infinite variety of mentalities. The United States are God's country because men are promised there any number of incarnations. No family is purposive, it is a way of life. When a French writer described the Palais Royal in Paris, he worked himself to a frenzy to prove that it was not just a house or a palace or a commercial organisation, and he exclaimed: it is a world, a microcosmos. Now, any microcosmos has in its center not the typewriter and the telephone and the letterhead but some gesture and movement of every cell. Like the fact that our blood runs through our heart, makes our body into one microcosmos, so the Palais Royal was a world because people proceeded in a constant flow through it. And the United States are an organism because we all move on the highways of the Land. On the Highway, the soul recognizes itself and her sisters as Americans. The organisation has paper in its center, The organism must see movement pulse through the arteries. The cells of our body, moving through the center incessantly, understand their function in the body incredibly well. Church members who go to the services regularly, proceed to acquire an understanding of the needs of the congregation. Americans who are found on the Highways, become "ensouled" with the American way of life. You must do something that exceeds a membership registration in order to understand the group of which you are a function. The gist of the matter is that any cell of an organism must for one moment at least be potentially the whole body, a citizen must feel that he is the city. A Christian must feel that he is the Church. It has been said that if one soul survived a great catastrophe, she would resurrect the Church since the Church was nothing but the self-realisation of the healthy soul. If all the laws and judges and legislatures of the United States suddenly disappeared, the one American citizen left would rewrite the Constitution --this at least would be the test for its wisdom and its right to survive. An organism is potentially alive in every one of its members. It is based on daily acts of its members, on actual movements. Thereby, the members acquire a new form of knowledge which is called with the beautiful word "understanding." It unfortunately requires a commentary in days when we promise students to let them understand life before they have lived. Members of the C. I. O. of Jehovah's Witnesses, of a family, understand that only by standing under the roof of their house, do they keep the ceiling from coming down. Their understanding still has the power of a unified stand of the whole man, body and soul, guided by reason, a stand as we see the British take it. To understand the British Empire you must be willing to prevent the building from tumbling down, Understanding reaches its climax where the souls of men are the only building stones which prevent the edifice of life from vanishing.

The suburb - let us leave it now to its peace of mentality. Let us now observe its strange contradiction: the absence of any peace of mind in the inhabitants of this same suburb.

We often hear today of split personalities. The rift goes deep in all of us. We all are torn. We all belong to so many organisations, from family to the World Foundation for Peace, from the local unit of a Union to the International Harvester Company, that denomination, class, family, craft, club, nation, party, make our own inner man their battleground. The thousands of organisations outside to which I belong directly or indirectly, are contradictory in their interests. We belong, every one of us, to mutually exclusive pressure group. This makes a government by pressure groups impossible. They cancel each other out, in every single person. People no longer can possibly know what they want if they try to find out about their wants by listing carefully the innumerable pressure groups and the claims put forward by them.

Subconsciously, these men move forwards to the rapids of a complete disavowal of their officially still valid code of values. Officially, they worship personality. But no personality can admit that any one or any ten pressure groups represent her, the personality, adequately. So, the inner man asks himself where the power of integration can be found, perhaps. His old Christian or Humanistic spirit simply has not got that power any longer, he discovers. But spirit without power is meaningless. Spirit is proven by power, by the power of integration as the modern mentality holds, by the power of incarnation as the few last Christians hold.

We torn men must either go to hell and worship any wild desire that empowers us again at all, as stark naked power, or we must re-establish the power of the spirit.

My friends, in their lukewarm mentalities, always tell me that this is dangerous. They think that man can live without the powers either of hell or of the spirit. They try not to live at all. But since they are torn, they no longer can make any decisions. Others make these decisions for them. "The decisions over America's future," as a great American patriot and friend of Woodrow Wilson wrote me a year ago, "are made outside America. Our pusillanimity means that others decide for us." All the people who exclaim when the spirit is mentioned: "how dangerous," do not know that life cannot be lived without decisions. Pressure groups do not offer decisions. Torn people cannot decide as long as they remain torn. Therefore, either blood or spirit; tertium non datur. Why is there no choice outside a decision for a new Christian spirit or the devil of power for power's sake?

Torn men are dangerous men. They are alive; they have awakened to the truth about man that he must stand under, share a part of the sufferings and pains of humanity lest, without his understanding, it will devour itself in convulsions as we see them today. Man is nailed to the Cross of Reality, as Winston Churchill has said, pitying the youth of Eton and Oxford who were only allowed to play.

Christianity reveals to man this fact, that he is torn and that this is his human privilege, because no society could originate among people who are self-contained. The cross fulfills its meaning when it is shared.

But a man or woman who is torn and remains torn inside of himself between body and mind, between the conscious, rational Puritan

conscience and his subconscious, irrational desires, between peace and war, kindness and brutality, mere speed in space, and the longing for barren fruit in time - this man or woman usually remains alone with his agony, in our days. We live in a suburb and work in an office. Our agonies are strewn on the road between. We burst for lack of fellowship. Now, if a man is torn but does not know and is not told that this is perfectly normal, that there is a power that surpasses this torn, riven, rent, and cleft state of his mind, he will surrender to any man-made power that seems to promise unity, fixity, harmony and security. He will buy a fixed order at nearly any price. Division within is too much for the individual. He was divided so that he might cease to be an individual.

But the division cannot be overcome in small, piecemeal purposes, acts or steps. An infinite liberty and infinite devotion are given man so that he may save the race. Whereas we can move in space inch by inch, the division between people must be overcome by the same infinite effort by which we throw a rope across a stream before we can build a bridge foot by foot. The heart must give itself with a singleness of purpose to its trust in the fellowship of mankind; a heart that is told that it must never give itself wholly to anything will remain split and without the reward of fellowship. Man is free only because an infinite effort is expected from him. As soon as he does not make such an effort any longer, he forfeits the right to be free.

Modern man, however, is cautioned by his academic advisors against any "all out" movement of his heart. Psychologists tell him that one must go about marriage, friendship, politics, and business in prudent moderation. Man is completely secularized. This is a high-faluting word for the very simple fact that a staff of experts tries to persuade man to make an infinite effort for organizing his life outside his heart, by infinite little inches. He avoids putting his heart into any of his activities fully. In other words he uses his infinite liberty for the one purpose of destroying it.

Now no man does put his heart in any petty partial action. But a real man puts his whole heart into the incarnation of his soul on earth. The cleft and torn men of our days will surrender to false gods even knowing they are false gods if he is not allowed to live wholeheartedly.

We said before that the agonies of modern men are strewn on the highway between business section and residential section. The highway of course is the symbol of the temptations of our times. They are speed, constant change, the treatment of the world as a motion-picture. A man drove out from New York 290 miles to call on us and I actually know that he likes us very much and thought of his visit for a long time; when he arrived he tried to stay 10 minutes. Modern man is haunted by movement at all costs. We are dragged along behind the news, the telegraph, the airline. Modern man has rooted himself in change. The individual is treated as a bundle of nerves which respond to green and red lights. A former student of mine was handed back a paper in the graduate school with the remark in ink: "Please rewrite. You compel us to think, and for this we have no time." When we leave our houses at night, light bulbs blind our eyes, now a man who does not see the stars loses one-half of his environment. In the daytime

the stench of gasoline numbs his sense of smell and the man who numbs this faculty suffers more than just the loss of physical orientation. When he is at his office every activity is cut short by the telephone. When he is at home somebody dials the radio. An "Uninterrupted interruption" is the fate of modern man as an individual. In his daily produced nervousness he looks to some organization that would make him a smooth-running machine, that would allow him not to be interrupted. And since man always gets what he believes in, modern man is told by powerful groups that some "ism" is the right panacea. A classless society, four thousand years of the swastika. "History is the nightmare from which I must wake up," cries James Joyce's Ulysses. He grabs the End of Time in despair. Modern man, be it Joyce or Karl Marx, Hitler or Aldous Huxley, proclaims the end of history, the end of time. Fed up with historical grandiloquence, he wants to become as ants or bees or some other animal which seems so much more reasonable and orderly. Man is too upsetting and incalculable.

We have been through different ages. Christianity has seen the end of the world before: the end of the Roman era, the end of the "Dark Ages," the end of the Gothic rebirth, and today Christianity is confronted with the end once more, the end of modern man. The end of the world has come into the horizon of the living in a new manner. Europe? - There must be a united Europe. The world? - There must be one society, over the whole world.

In the light that shines from the end a revolution of values is inevitable. So far Christianity has survived the temptations to misconstrue God and misconstrue the earth. The new temptation for men who think that the final solution of all questions is near and pressing is the temptation of the short-cut, of moving too fast, the idea that time is over. As men found and testified and fought for one God against many gods and heroes of men, and as they discovered and declared and fought for God's one earth against men's little, local, homes and holdings, so now they must find and testify and fight for God's one time as against men's private individual plans for history. 'Time' must be conquered by the Spirit, as we have conquered space. The new plans for immediate world peace and prosperity defy the belief in a dispensation of time that "from the start until the end of time God is taking care of his world." Impatience is the greatest temptation of our time, in the fullest sense of this word in its Latin derivation: "impatience," inability to wait, to undergo, to suffer! It is not man and the divine, super-natural powers, or man and the soil and land that must be kept from demons and obsessions. It is man's indolence to give birth, his unwillingness to pay the price of living with his fellow men in creative and profound relations that start men on abstract schemes of formal world organisation.

From childbearing to teaching, from government to handicraft, man's relation to man has become a separate, segregated, "impatient," non-committal relation in the machine age. We meet so many people in our journey through life that we cannot take the risk of belonging to any of them. Man does not belong because he cannot afford to put roots into a society or private times and histories and interests, as he did once in the local private castles and private gods. So we love without children, we have friends without inspiration, we have schools without disciples, we have factories without skills, we have government without succession. We have no time. Consequently one aspect of human relations, which depends on it, is twisted: their reproductive fruit-

bearing quality. To be non-committal means to keep all relations without consequences. "So what?" is the danger of every effort on the stony surface of our cities. Tremendous ado and not even a mouse born. Everything is over so quickly.

We may now look back upon the strange dualism of our existence.

The suburban situation creates a peace of mind which is fictitious and against this fictitious peace, the spirit in us must wage war, by calling the bluff, by making us despise this kind of peace.

The uninterrupted interruption creates a war of the body which is superficial and against this war, a war of nerves, we must rebel, by making us despise this kind of war. The suburban peace, has occupied our attention first. Uninterrupted interruption, the war of nerves, has been our second topic. In both forms, the devil spurs us to new ways of life. And the Christian must always dive into the Sulphur Lake of Hell before he can bring up the pearl of a new way of life. Those who do not taste hell, won't go to heaven. Christianity is not made for angels or devils, but for men who because of the devils despise to become angels and prefer to remain men. The business man, the accountant, the factory manager, in short the rationalist is alive in all of us, and the father, the child, the gentleman farmer are so strictly separated from the business men that the separation marks the divorce. We have found pleasant names for the divorce. We speak of labor and leisure. But by this divorce I am afraid labor and leisure both may become unpalatable.

One of the funniest results of the divorce is that we have side by side an "education for leisure" and unemployment for labor.

The divorce cuts into every person; downtown, the men will say, "In God We Trust, all others pay cash;" and as a deacon in a suburban church he will gather some symbolical dimes for some alleged poor. The mechanic and the flier within ourselves live separate lives. Perhaps we could take a leaf from any textbook on aeronautics: in our airports mechanic and flier must form a team. The challenge of such teamwork inside our soul, between the believer and the unbeliever, is a tremendous innovation in the evolution of our faith.

Man discovers within himself his two qualities, as a believer and an unbeliever, as a Christian and a pagan, daily. But if this is so the convert and the converter will have to live on united in one and the same person. A new situation arises in which nobody may claim to be 100% Christian and 100% pagan. The infidel and the faithful, the Christian and the Pagan are in all of us, like the two movements of our respiration, like a constant dying and coming to life again of our faith.

Let us survey the meaning of conversion in this new society of the machine age in which even the most orthodox Christian must humbly stammer: "I hope to believe." The love of Christ and the faith in God must be strengthened today by our hope in the Spirit. A third Christianity, the Christianity of Hope, has always been prophesied in the story of the Good Samaritan. Some have called Johannine Christianity. But whatever its theoretical basis, this primate of hope is thrust upon us by a word in which the Spirit has become powerless, in the suburb.

Let us survey the meaning of conversion in this new world of the machine age. A friend of mine, a minister, had a woman in his parish who became so immersed in religious activities and busied herself so much with converting people and reading theology, that she made a nuisance of herself. So, one day, he talked to her seriously. He told her that religion had become a cancer for her system. "Cut it out," he suddenly shouted, "Cut it out." She was frightened to death, but she obeyed his orders, left the Church, secularized her life completely, and became an enterprising horsewoman who was liked everywhere.

When the minister told the story, he added: She has found peace since she dropped the whole religious vocabulary. As long as she used one single term of Christianity or religion, it would turn, in her mouth, into some weapon of criticism or attack against her neighbors. She had to weed out the whole language of Canaan.

The great phenomenon of our days is the fact that people may have to be converted away from Christianity as much as towards Christianity, and the wise ministers will have to admit that human souls are incalculable in their various needs, one needing the Church, or Christianity, or both, badly, another needing to turn her back on the Church, and to live at the periphery where only the indirect results of Christianity surround him. It is not revolutionary that ministers and laymen leave the Church for more secular activities. They have done this for the last century. From Norman Thomas to the smallest college college in the land, innumerable examples may be given where politics or teaching have replaced the preaching of the Gospel. And the laymen who turned their back on the Church, were sometimes great human souls and leaders. It is equally true that in the last few years, people are flocking back into the Church and churches again. This has always been so in uncertain times.

That which is new and unheard of, is that the minister can sympathize with the person who thinks he has to leave, and that the man of the world can approve of the return of his best friend to the Church. That we can understand conversions towards us, needs no explanation. But that we can understand conversions and tendencies away from us, is a new event in the history of Christianity. It shows that our world is understood as a Christian, a unified world far beyond the pale of official Christianity. We know that the soul is not lost which seeks a less transparent light and walks on more obscure paths. Modern conversions are more universal than the conversions of former days. The conversion includes steps to more remote forms of Christian life away from the limelight of full Christian consciousness.

Paganism and Judaism made no converts. Christianity must be mission and conversion. In fact, Christianity is nothing but conversion of the soul, mission among the people, away from the world towards the life of the First Christian. Christianity has the four tenets that man must give up a part of the world which holds his mind or body too closely, must find a new fellowship with a growing, widening humanity, must become aware consciously of this turn from his blind life to the good life and must recognize the good life in the beginner and perfecter of our faith. The four tenets cannot be given up without giving up Christianity. It is essential, if we wish to progress from where we started, that we recognize 1. That the good life began in Jesus, 2. That the good life is obstructed, 3. That we are free to reject,

to say No, to this obstruction, 4. That our rejection our No, will be futile if we do not mix with another crowd than heretofore.

So if and when Christianity now dares convert people away from Christianity, it means two things: First, there is no longer any really pagan district of our existence, and no fully Jewish district, either. To Judaism or Paganism, my friend would not have sent his parishioner when she became a "cantankerous cuss." Obviously elements of Christianity are now germinating in the secular forms of life just as much as in the Church pews.

Secondly, it means that we no longer are safe in any form of hereditary Christianity. Hereditary Christianity is a contradiction in terms. But it has become a bad habit. Ministers have been ministers through three hundred years. And now, they do all kinds of secular things to refresh their minds. For these people, new forms of conversion must be made available.

Paganism as completely separated from Christianity is vanishing rapidly from the surface of the earth. With the disappearance of the Chinese Empire, the last pre-Christian civilization has ended. Christianity today is older than any existing form of sovereign government, except perhaps in Japsn. This makes new forms of conversion possible and necessary.

A friend of mine who had been completely worldly turned to the Church under the influence of his wife. He finally was called by the Episcopalians to a newly created rather important post. It was a kind of mission among the secularized masses. In the very days when we celebrated his appointment, his wife, the source of all this development, turned to me in conversation, and said: "I come from such a long line of clergymen. But I feel that all the values which I have been taught, I perhaps should not hand on to my children any longer. Kindness, charity, sacrifice--the future needs other people, hardy, brutal, selfish.

She was touched by the wave of the future for her children after having landed her husband in the Christian past.

These examples could be multiplied. We must not shrink from them. They disclose a new era of our souls. Mission and conversion will remain as long as the Spirit of Life is with us because conversion is the regeneration of our soul when she has lost her path. But conversion will happen in a more human, more intimate setting than ever before.

If we wish to know where the life of the spirit is to celebrate its triumphs, we must become aware of this change in the forms of mission and conversion. The spirit moves on and old forms of life can only stay with us as long as new forms unburden the otherwise clogged channels that exist already. Hence the development of new forms of conversion must never be considered a defeat of older forms of our faith; quite the contrary we may see here a triumph of our souls.

The original situation saw a few Christian converters among the vast majority of Pagan religions. The Christians too on the whole world and they therefore seemed 100% Christian the Pagans 100% Pagan. The converter and the convert shrank from each other. They were different persons, different people.

After the first thousand years, the missions and the conversions went on as of old, but they could continue only because Crusaders and reformers were busy counteracting any relax into paganism or corruption at home.

I am afraid that our trust in Crusaders and reformers has dwindled: we have seen too many of them and they have dabbled with too insignificant problems. As a millenium of conversion once ended because the converting church decayed, so the millenium of reformations draws to a close because reformers are as plentiful as blackberries.

What will be the task of the final millenium? If he trusts the newspapers, it will be hate, lust for power, the blond beast, racism, primitivism, tribalism.

However, the bad news is always the wave of the future on which the raft of the good news swims. The ark of bullrushes which contained Moses, swam on the very River Nile whose idol corrupted Egypt. When Caesar Augustus was mad a God for the whole Mediterranean world, Jesus was born. What is the bad news? Our bad news is the idolizing of men's origins in his class or race or creed or color or nation. He is said to be a derivation, to be caused by causes in the past. He is what he has been before. These bad tidings worship men's carnality, his flesh. His lusts and fears become respectable today because they testify to his vitality. Vital, vitamins, vitality, dynamic, powerful, alive, terrific, thrilling, exciting, stirring, stimulating are the medals which modern man bestows. I consider them all as insults. To call a speaker stimulating, for instance, is a triumph of Pontius Pilate among us. The truth no longer matters. "What is truth?" The bored public grumbles. We wish to be tickled to death; we must be stimulated. Give us a new sensation, a "rriison nouveau" as it was said of Baudelaire. The good news distorted into a sensation! It is a stark fact of our times that life is worshipped by people who suffer from soul erosion. Shriveled up in their refrigerator, they will pay any price for stimulation.

What shall these poor people do with conversion or reformation? There is nothing to convert them from. The stagnation and indolence of people who are bored and neurotic needs another cure. The one cure offered is by the cults which preach "More carnality." And we may take our cue from this and its sensational successes. We will have to compete with them. For Christianity is always competing with the quacks. The first church which converted the Gentiles was rivalled with tremendous success by the Gnostics. Gnosis offered immedated short-cuts. Gnosis was the quack which placed conversion of the heart by diversion of the brain. You thought out a cosmic system. You were allowed to envisualize a gigantic picture of the cosmos in your mind, and you were spared the trouble of incarnating yourself. Gnosis held that truth was alive anyway; the Christian knew that it had to be lived by him. The Crusaders had their quacks in the Vikings who conquered quickly but did not know what to do with their conquered Greenlands. The Reformers for a similar reason were almost outdone by the Humanists. Luther by Erasmus, Calvin by Bacon, St. Paul by Plato. A Platonist is an idealist, a Christian must incarnate. Incarnation always includes a crucifixion. And while the Humanists held that life was good anyway, the reformer knew that he had to make his promises good himself.

The Vitalists and Tribalists are the quacks of our times. They promise you life eternal because you are a proletarian, because you are a German, because you eat Vitamin B. The racist holds that life is beautiful even without the incarnation.

It is quite an astounding sequence. The gnostics thought that truth was alive without the incarnation. The Unmanists thought that life was good without the incarnation. The Tribalists think that life is beautiful without the incarnation.

It is always the same trick and therefore the new Tribalists actually defeat the Humanists and Platonists of the Erasmus type with their own arms. "You read Plato and Homer," they say. "And you think that these Classics give you a good standard for men. We go farther back to the cruelties of Ninevah and to the dances of Bali; our behavior has its classic models among the primitives. That which you have assumed to be right for Pericles cannot be wrong for Sardanapal." For against this attack the Classicist has no weapons. For four hundred years the worship of a classical civilization have used all their wits in order to dispense with Christianity. They have enthroned humanity to the place of God. They have humanized all the history of God with man. A good example of a Platonism that has lost its orientation within the Christian era is a little booklet which you probably all know: The City of Man. In it my Humanistic friends have expressed their hopes for mankind. The title, The City of Man, is a victory over St. Augustine's City of God, but what a victory! Our Augustine checked the gangsterism of the many cities of man by the one universal city of God. Our modern friends steal the thunder from Augustine by humanizing God, and the result is the title, which implies one world state. But the tragedy is that we do not know whether there shall be a plurality of states or one world state? All Platonists draw a picture of the best state instead of facing the fact that our liberty depends upon living in several states. One world state is the most terrible abomination of tyranny. And on the other hand many states leave the door open for wars. Thus in real life we have tragedy from unity as much as from plurality. Humanists, idealists, Platonists, cling to their conviction that life is good without tragedy, without the cross. And so they write on the City of Man in the abstract. They have strange bedfellows. For the Serbs who started the first World War were all in favor for democratic cities of man; only they favored a senseless number of them. Thus they exchanged Hitler for Austria. Hitler who started the second World War is all for the singular of one city for all men. Only it is despotic.

Humanism dreams of a city of Man the Good. And wars must be waged between cities which rightly fear the one City of Man before liberty is possible despite unity. But "The City of Man" does not even mention this eternal dilemma. In comes the Tribalist, laughing at the Humanist's dream and boasting: I shall build you the city beyond good and evil, The City of Men Alive because all life is beautiful.

The new Christianity faces the cult of crude life without allies. Humanism is no ally in our battles against the new cult. Platonic humanism has no argument against the new Dionysians because Humanists have deserted the Christian era. They have made the goodness of men their God, just as the gnostics made the truthfulness of men their God.

The Humanists believe in civilization as something apart, and outside the history of the incarnation. They enjoy the civilization in the suburb, and for their goodness at home they make up in the cut-throat competition down town.

Against the new hordes who make vitality their God and stimulation their Goddess, we can only conquer with the sword whose steel contains no alloy of gnosis or Humanism. The sword of the spirit against crude vitalism must be cast by man the creature, not by man the thinker. In the sweat of our brow, in the chores of our animal existence, in the vitality of our body, must be found the place for renewing spirits, for the divine origin of man. Incarnation must supersede carnality. The Tribalist is vital at the expense of some other tribe. The successful lives are lived on the failures and the starvation of the unemployed. The Christian must forego victories and employments which are given him at the expense of other members of the great human family. You will have to decide where you stand in the new battlefront between a tribal vitalism and a comprehensive incarnation of man in all his brochures, through common work and suffering from his brother.

But why should we begin to speak such an unusual language today? Why is the language of incarnation now preferable to the language of conversion and reformation? Why is the ritual of the mass, this flawless creation of the first thousand years, or the sublime language of Canaan in the Protestant tradition? No longer enough to create peace between men?

The languages of Christianity can be abused and secularized. We today have Christian fascists, Christian communists, Christian snobs, Christian scientists. These four abusers cover all idioms of Christian language and they all use it in a secularized manner, for the state, for society, for the private affairs of the family, or the health of the body. This same secularization happened at the end of the first millenium when the King of this earth converted old peoples by conquest and when the chieftain of the tribe commandeered his clan to accept the new faith. We all know how the violent conversion with fire and sword abused the church of the martyrs, in the times of Charlemagne. We don't call these abuses then secularism. But it is exactly the same deprivation by spiritual growth for quantitative expansion.

Now when we see this happen again and again, we may well have to admit that whole streams of Christian language cool off into geological stratifications. When the Word has become a mere routine language, then it is time for a new transsubstantiation. A new outburst of language is needed although the existence of the old outbursts may give us guidance and comfort. The language of the soul is one universal language over the earth. The Christian language must always be universal, unifying, and it must always also be personal, and bestow on its speakers and listeners concrete singleness of purpose. This is the difference between the Word and the words from the dictionary. All mental language, in contrast with the language of the soul, is either universal and abstract like mathematics, or it is concrete and idiomatic like Pennsylvania Dutch, but the Christian soul wakes up only when it is spoken to in a language which combines universal validity and the concreteness of a here and now situation. The secular mind is either universal or it is particular. Christ died for all men, but he did it here and now wholeheartedly in words spoken to his neighbor, for this and no other occasion. Two and two is four for

all men, but it is abstract. Maryland, My Maryland is concrete but not for all men.

However the soul succeeded, through the ages in creating out of these two different languages, one universal and yet concrete language for men and women, parents and children, again and again. If we can find the source of our strength in the past, we may rediscover it for tomorrow. If we walk humbly in the shadow of our bankruptsy, we may hope to hear the Word spoken again.

Whole languages of the human soul, in which such life was expressed for centuries, and which were the speech of undivided faith and devotion have dried up. Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress no longer moves man's heart; the "Last Puritan" has been written and proclaimed too often for that. However the Christian soul for centuries has expressed her divinity by the name of "pilgrim." And the Christian fellowship added a second name to that of pilgrim. The second name signified Western Christianity for nearly nine hundred years now: it is the name of "crusader." Western man took the cross for a crusade, first against the infidels in Spain, a little later for the reconquest of Jerusalem. And how many crusades have been undertaken after the first crusade for the Holy Sepulchre got under way in 1099 until the crusade of the Star Spangled Banner was waged?

Pilgrim and Crusader are two incarnations of the Christian soul on earth in the millenium which now draws to a close. Both have this full cycle of life. They are commonplace today. They will remain with us; for no Christian way of life is wholly destroyed by time. Our grandchildren will still see "pilgrims" and "crusaders", but you will agree with me that they are not new buds on the tree of Christianity; and that they will not be vigorous enough to support the tree's life. If man's soul expresses itself in Christian terms with full vitality in the future, such a new dualism is needed between the worldly way of life and the faithful way of life, the life of undivided devotion.

Do not be skeptical about such a rebirth of Christianity. Do not say, "Oh, well, crusaders and pilgrims had their time, and they have finally become cheer." Do not lose faith, because William Jennings Bryan as a crusader and Lord Halifax as a pilgrim seem hardly inspired with the Christian spirit. Before burying Christianity together with its crusaders and pilgrims it may be wise to ask if these incarnated the Christian way of life before Bunyan, and before Godefroy, Protector of the Holy Sepulchre. Godefroy lived the truth that no earthly king could gain a firm foothold in the kingdom of heaven. He, by the way, gave the cue to the first Lord Protector of the British Commonwealth, to Oliver Cromwell. The pilgrim renounces the home, and the Protector, the powers that be. They are consummate in their denial of this earth. However, Christianity had expressed the eternal chasm between this world and God's world by another dualism. In the church of the first millenium--best preserved for us moderns in the Eastern church--man dies to this world of false gods. The pilgrim and the crusader were lifted beyond any part in a false earth. The hermit and the martyr of source Christianity were lifted beyond false heavens. These Christians of the first millenium lived among people who worshipped Caesar as God, who prayed to idols. No wonder, then, that the first expression of the Christian "otherworldliness," from the founding

of the church to the tenth century was not in the pilgrim or in the crusader, but in the "witness" of the living God. The martyr was a man who lived in another world without the false gods of men. Thus, he could not burn incense before Caesar's statue, he could not shout, "Heil Hitler." Testimony was the first form of Christian "otherworldliness" under the false and man-made heavens of the Gentiles.

As the Crusader was supplemented by the pilgrim in later times, the witness was balanced by the saint. The martyr of the first millennium fights the wrong heaven by his neck-breaking testimony, as the crusader fights the wrong earth by his life-taking knighthood. The pilgrim, too, has his counterpart in the church of the Fathers, whereas he fights the temptations of man's earthly possessions, the saint fights the temptations of man's diabolical demonism. St. Anthony wrestles not with material goods, but with the Titan and giant, with the magician and sorcerer in himself. In those days the individual's supernatural enemies had to be subdued. The spiritual demons of a wrong astrological and magic heaven had to become members of one fellowship under God. Just as crusader and pilgrim fought the numberless powers of earth to establish the one Christian world, "God's world," so the saints fought for the living God against the many evil spirits that existed in the minds of men. The martyrs defied the statues of Caesar and Athena on the market place, but the saints fought the spirits of these deities within their own souls. We shall never understand the miracles of the New Testament as long as we do not appreciate the demonic obsessions of the pagan mind as real processes in a man-made heaven.

Once more, then, let me repeat four types of Christian "otherworldliness" that have preceded us: the martyrs and saints fought the idols and demons of man-made heavens; the crusaders and pilgrims fought the powers of a man-made earth.

This is the meaning and importance of "other worldliness." When the flight into the "other world" by hermits and monks and saints had driven the demons out of the sky, the next step became possible. In the church of the Crusaders and the church of the Protestants, the two more recent forms of our faith, and soul, stepped forward. The emphasis is no longer on martyrdom or the fight with false gods, but on the constant movement which would conquer the gravity to which all earthly matter succumbs. Man's inertia is fought by an uphill fight, his localisation by a vision of crusade and pilgrimage in a large world.

From the comparison between the church of the Fathers, now preserved in the East, and the Churches of the West, as lived by Roman Catholics and Protestants, we may learn that Christianity has once transformed its former incarnations. May it not be that the future of Christianity will lead to a similar transformation? Let us try to point to the new possibility for the soul who must find again the incarnation of her faith.

The temptations of our time are neither false Gods nor false maps. Man is not blinded by magic or old charts any more. What is wrong with modern man?

What is required is the yoking of the believer and the unbeliever in us. The factory and the suburb are unrelated. Their divorce leaves no room for the unifying language of the soul that marries mind and body again. Labor and spirit must be related to each other, or both wither. Out of their perpetual interplay, every true word of our soul is spoken. The source of the soul's universal language never is in a merely bodily or merely intellectual experience. It always stems from their synthesis. All life is two-fold. For instance, all life is two-fold in the world outside us. Zoology and evolution treat the same life in two different ways. In space we see the fishes, the serpents, lions, and sheep live side by side, but change your glasses and consider them not as contemporaries, dissolve them into events through time in historical evolution and you suddenly see that they have followed each other. The different types seem to be contemporaries in space. But when we wish to understand them we must look at them as distemporaries through time. In space, the creatures are enemies, through time they are phases. And one is not without the other. They are rungs of a ladder, no rung can be omitted. In a sense one has called forth the next.

In space, the spirit of the suburb and the spirit of the business district are antagonistic. If we could learn to look upon them as a sequence of times one and the other can be made fecund. If the suburban peace ceases to be mere leisure, if it can be used as a light for our work house, if leisure is transformed again into worship, the right relation between rest and work, spirit and labor would be restored.

This seems the whole old idea of our week with workday and Sunday. You all know that Christians make no revolutions and are no reactionaries. These are secular divisions of human attitudes, they are too simple. The soul always places future and past side by side. The yoking of future and past is the history of the church. Whereas fearful man simply undergoes the future and fanatics bring in the future by violence, the Christian puts the future of his Sunday in front of the work week which is always the organization that has resulted from the past. For this sublime reason, Sunday is the first day of the week, not the last. Since the Christian lives from the end of time, he begins on Sunday to live or to anticipate this very end of time and this act of faith slowly melts the frozen forms of his week day routine. Even the Puritans who called Sunday the Sabbath again did not mean to say by this that they gave up the incarnation of the Word heard on Sunday during the week that followed.

Interpolate the suburb into the worker's experience, interpolate the factory into the suburban mentality, and you will have taken the first step to overcome a birth and deathless mentality in our apartments, and a spiritless physical toil in our center of production.

It is true that we shall have to stretch our ideas about Sunday and the week for this new reform. It will not do to think in these short time spans only. Man lives year weeks. There is no reason why we should not insist on the power of the sabbatical year. Everything today points to the task of opposing short term thinking by long range living. I advocate a year week.

For thirty years, I have advocated an "all out" experience for every young man. Soldiers go over the top to defend the life begotten in danger of death by their mothers. And the soldier grows to manhood in the task. Christianity is nothing but warfare in peace. It replaces the bloody sacrifices of the battlefield, of the battlefield by an identical relentless spiritual attack. A genuine "all out" fellowship is the condition for man, especially between eighteen and twenty-five, following up mentally their physical growth. At that age, a man loses his virility if he remains the playboy.

The separation of labor and leisure, then is a misunderstanding. The word from the end precedes the actions from the past. In our lives and in the great life of mankind, the promise must precede the fulfillment. Or there is no fulfillment. Our next form of conversion must promise the birth of the great human family and the death of the suburb. On Sundays lived by individuals, we must anticipate the Sunday of the human kind.

Christianity always begins with a new form of Sunday, when it rises from the dead.

On the train from Vermont, I traveled with a young man from Park Avenue, New York, and Harvard, who only a very short time ago has joined our experiment. At my request he jotted down on his Pullman bed a few points of his experience. They were written in haste, but here they are.

"First, rich and poor fellows are given the first chance in their lives to feel that they are really a part and a necessary part in the community. The rich have had everything done for them and given to them "in apartment 3C," the poor have been ignored or kicked around or been given charity in tenement houses. Now both have a feeling they are helping to keep the community alive--doing work that is necessary to the farmers and outside society and that would not otherwise be done BECAUSE society has so overvalued modern mechanized "improvements." (Symbolized in factory and in city) that not enough recompense in pride and money is offered to keep farm labor there.

"Second, as a result of the above, and also as a result of getting out of the rut and pattern that society has laid out for them, these boys received a spiritual as well as material reward and inspiration which almost none of them would have otherwise received.

"Third, a year of this experience (above) will inspire in both of them to plan their own lives and values which they would not have otherwise done."

Every one of the men would have used other words to express his experience, especially the boys from the farms. But this is just the central point of our new year week. The coming millenium of incarnation must believe in a Sunday of Pentecost, in a Sunday of all languages. The one sacrifice that Christians should have to make if they wish to celebrate the new Sunday is the labor of their denomination and even of their Christianity. The year week supplements the mass and the sermon. We may hope to be Christians. I sincerely hope to believe. But I cannot use a Christian label for a work service. Because I may exclude a real soul of God and I may include the pagan within me or within us. Here you see what the yoking together of the

believer and the unbeliever in ourselves actually means. We are not God Almighty. At any moment, in such a fellowship we may play the role of Judas or the Pontius Pilate, of Peter or of John. You never can tell. The soul is incalculable, God is incalculable. It is enough that we should all offer our souls as black and as white as they happen to be. Curses are in order in a work camp. I wouldn't trust a work camp if it did not bring out into the open all the smallness of man as much as his greatness. I am fed up with false pretenses about our nature.

Now that we should sacrifice our respectability, our Christian self-consciousness, seems to be perfectly in tune with the principles of Sunday. Our service in the Church has been built around the sacrifice of one kind or another, time and again.

What has been the sacrifice in the communion service of the early Christians, in the eucharist? It seems to be forgotten now what a tremendous sacrifice of human pride this eucharist required, and the smooth running services of today do not hint at the real act of faith originally involved. So let us recall the essential price, paid by the converts first, and later by the Pilgrims. The Church of conversion prayed in the name of Christ. Everything was done in His name. All the private and national names were taken away from the members of the new body. Their private, national, clannish, and civil identity was confiscated in the name of the Son whose Body they constituted. Having lost the power of the name, we no longer realise with what awe people stripped themselves of their identity as Gentiles to become the people of His Name. A new sacrifice was made in the church of The Reformation.

The church of pilgrimage prayed in the world. It abandoned the certainties of visible cathedrals and relics and pictures and sacral order of priesthood. In a dark world, in the night of a secular world, the Pilgrims threw themselves on the faith of God. A third transformation of the Sunday dawns. And it is the last of the cardinal virtues which will govern this new form. The cardinal virtues are three--love, faith, and hope. Love, or what the Greeks called Agape, the love of Christ, made the convert give up his old name, and the mass was built around this sacrifice of every individual name. Faith made the Protestant give up his visible churches and his visible homes. He became at home in God. Hope must make the future immigrant into God's world give up his Christian denominations.

Thus yoking of the believer and the unbeliever in ourselves will require one more sacrifice. Our faith, love and hope must prove themselves again as the only creatures that matter for our growth as souls. The secular mind thinks that man has will, intellect, and feeling. We know that we live by faith, Agape and hope.

He who is blessed by knowing this, knows that the church was created by the love of Christ. In the first millenium the Church was revealed by the faith in God in the second millenium. How then can he doubt that the church must be redeemed by the hope for the spirit in the third millenium? Does he not know that creation is the fruit of love, revelation the fruit of faith, and redemption the fruit of hope? How can he then delay his giving thanks for his creation by the Father and for his revelation by the Son, by entering upon the great Sabbath of hope in the spirit?

The church of hope, the Johannean church, rests upon the proof of the spirit by his power. For this reason she must let go the labels, Christian, Catholic, Protestant, Jew, Pagan, as though they were totalitarian labels. The Jew, Gentile, and the Christian all participate in the soul, with faith, hope, and agape, as the creative energies for our incarnation.

After Jesus has been sacrificed, after our natural names have been sacrificed, after the visible church has been sacrificed--can our pride still reserve for itself the privilege of the certainty that we are Christians? And not one of these sacrifices that has not been awarded a thousand-fold. Jesus has risen from the dead, our nature has risen from the dead. The church has risen from the dead. We may believe that even Christianity may rise from the dead if it now disclaims its own self-centeredness.

Our times have been rightly called the Good Friday of Christianity. Good Friday is the center of our faith. And there can be no Christianity without the celebration of a good Friday for all of its members. But drunk with "civilization," Christianity has not evolved its own good Friday voluntarily. And so we are surrounded by the horrors of an actual good Friday on which our faith is denied; in Europe and Russia Christianity is sacrificed; hence our reasonable service must initiate the faithless masses that are drunk with material hopes, into a new hope. When a famous German refugee physician was asked what we should send to Europe first, he answered, 'the twelve apostles.'

On Pentecost, the spirit began to rule the Apostles so that all praised the great act of God, every one in his turn. Allow the worker, the farmer, the student, to praise God on the coming Sunday of the church of hope in the language of His words, strip it from all the dead language of the suburb, and our work will then praise God again.

Forty-five young men from thirteen states of the Union, decided last year to move up to a Vermont town, and to represent in this community the one age group that was sorely in decay there, the group of 18-25 that our school system drives from the land; they then and there began a vital process that has made over the community and the boys themselves. Both groups became mutually interdependent; the old people in town got a new vision of the future and were rejuvenated, living over again the aims and purposes of their own early manhood, and the young men themselves grew up to a virile and mature stature which is observed by everyone who meets them. "These boys are men, now; and will never be childish or emasculate," a friend told me after I had taken him to our last camp meeting. They had put down roots. They now firmly belonged in the chain of generations not just as physical individuals but as the proper representatives of the spirit contributing to the other age groups in town their own spirit as a tonic and essential ingredient.

Now, a strange thing has happened to this group which after all on the surface seemed to be a strictly local venture: they now have established an outpost 4000 miles from Tunbridge, in Mexico, in the most conservative part of the country, in the province of Jalisco. Because the same indomitable spirit that made these boys put down grassroots in a conservative Vermont town, required the parallel test of letting an international community grow up, between North and South, New England and New Spain. Camp William James has broken the suburban

ice as well as survived the subzero weather and the submarginal soil of Vermont. And it has broken the spell of uninterrupted interruption which governs our carefully planned annual schedule of appointments, work, vacations, of our factory system.

The group accepted the organized society of individuals which is our basis of production, loyally. But it served them as the limbo for a collaborating family of persons. The fact that the William James group--in its two posts 4000 miles apart, but working in one spirit--took root and made boys mature to manhood, and hoary heads hopeful again has proved to all observers that spiritual immigration into the world is not a dream but has become reality; this fact has encouraged me to give these lectures. It proves that the world surrenders, today as always, to the wings of the future which formerly were called spirit. The wings of Future are actual instruments of life even when the world seems submerged by the waves of the future.

New immigrants into creation will have to pay their initiation fee by linking together two or more groups, classes, generations, nations who are drifting apart. To be initiated into society, in the future, must mean again to be a knight and soldier in the war against death. War must be waged against the indifference and indolence, the coldness and barrenness of human relations.

It will not be an easy war. The profit motive is so deeply instilled into our hearts that "wings of future" seem either scandalous or ridiculous to these people who cow down under the waves of the future.

But the division is ineluctable. Either we initiate the young into bombing and strafing and flame throwing and torpedoing and quilling, or we must allow them to initiate a new cycle of human fellowship. We have to choose between tribalism and the Great Human Family. We have no choice except between these two orders of life, and the pilgrim and the crusader, the saint and the martyr will not save a society that has no roots and that is suburban.

You may easily see why the choice is now between crude trivial revivals and the initiation of the Great Family. The pilgrims and crusaders of the 1st thousand years lived in states, but ran their private economy. Their work and property was left free from the state.

But now the state becomes a superstate by interfering with our daily bread more and more. And bread is not earned by individuals but in cooperation with others. In a state, I could be a voter and be on my own. In the modern tribe with the Chieftain as the hero who feeds all, I am a collaborator. The spiritual power, which I must be given, is a collaboration that will be creative, and that will give me roots in the succession of generations and in the interplay of classes and nations. If the Spirit shall make us free, we must counteract the close-knitted tribalism of the economic superstate. Camp William James, for instance, now runs a farm and sends out its members to work on any farm in town that is in need of labor. The boys are the choir in Church and the hired men in barn and stable. The words of their mouths and the acts of their hands and feet originate in one and the same orbit of life. The men from the town go to the Camp for

for maral refreshment. They accompany their hired hands, after their evening chores, up to the William James place. It is not a worker's church that you find there, neither is it a church factory. It is a home of employees to which their bosses go, to get new faith and hope; and it is a cooperative of employees who go on old time farms to get the tradition and experience of centuries in church and barn.

The faith and the hopes of the young remain unminted and uncoined today in our country clubs. However, the faith and the hopes of the young were given them by God's fairies at their birth. They come from heaven. But we let them lie round on campuses, uncoined and unminted like the gold in Kentucky, Faith, agape, Hope, the three victors over death, must be coined and minted. They have been treated as the cardinal virtues to be conquered by martyrdom and saintliness. They have been treated as free grace to uphold us in a sea of troubles on our supernatural pilgrimages and crusades, our wandering and reforming of a natural world.

Let us treat them as creatures, as given energies. These energies which constitute the lifeblood of society, are distributed in such a way that hopes have to be rekindled among the old, and faith has to be ignited among the young. But it seems true that it is preponderantly important for a hoary head to show his social integration by still having hopes. For that means that he hopes not for himself old as he is. And it is preponderantly important for the young that he should initiate society on faith since his first step outside his self and outside his native environment is thus established.

Faith and Hope are great social energies laid out on the shoulders of different social age groups.

Together with agape, love, they are the secret energies for all fruitbearing processes in society. Faith, hope, agape, are no luxuries, but the chemicals, the catalysts for the immediate social processes of integration and survival. They flood the old with new hopes, the young with their first faith, and together they enact the order of agape.

These three creatures, Faith Agape, Hope, must be part of our world and must be made part of our world of suburbs and factories, if the soul on the highway shall ever incarnate.