

by

EUGEN ROSENSTOCK - HUESSY

1941

In the spring issue of Christendom, Frederick S. Grant dealt with "realized eschatology" as the basis of the Church. Genuine Christianity realised an end of the world. And Grant pointed out that it took the theologians fifty years, after 1892, to reclaim this completely abandoned "eschatological" position. Before that, for more than a century, the life of Jesus, had been the subject of research, with eschatology, like the miracles, a point of omission or of embarrassment. Eschatology was a stranger to the frame of reference of progressive Christianity.

When it was readmitted to the fundamentals of source Christianity, men like Kirsop Lake, in all honesty, concluded that thereby Source Christianity was divorced for ever from reasonable modern man. For could reasonable man believe in an end of the world?

In this way, the specific "historical" enlightenment of the 19th century after inheriting "natural Christianity" without Last Things from 18th century enlightenment, finally refilled the empty cup of eschatology, for the founders of the Church, but only by widening the gulph between these Founders and our modern world, by 1900 years, simultaneously.

When I taught at the Havard Divinity School, I once asked everybody in the room if he believed in a Last Judgement. Everybody laughed; I hope I did too. And ever since, I have been told, there has been jesting about the mooncalf who litterally believed in the Nicean Creed. The belief in the Last Things was left to mooncalves and jesters. G.K. Chesterton was allowed to sing the majestic verse in his immortal Ballad of the White Horse: "And the End of the World was long ago." Who would take such a phrase seriously, as the stark truth of every day life, among progressive christians?

However, in Europe, this progressive theology is at an end. Before me lies a great document which I received two months ago from a famous historian of the Church, somewhere in Europe. In this letter he simply asked me to read up Nrs. 10, 832, 1771, in Rouet de Jouvenel, Enchiridion Patristicum, and he added that these were the texts of actual interest to the peoples of Europe. His quotations, Didache 16, 3; Cyril's Catecheses 15, 11, and Augustine, are the most solemn and violent descriptions of the last Judgement, the Antichrist, and "eschatology realized" before our eyes.

This theologian, then, lives at present the truth which F. Grant's essay presented to the American "professor of the crucifixion" as a fact 1900 years ~~ago~~ way. This truth of eschatology realized is not a theologoumenon to be rediscovered scientifically, and put on our desk in the form of a book. It is an event of eternal truth, of our own times, to be recognised on and by faith.

Three years ago, I was allowed, by the Ecumenic Council of Churches, to state this position in an essay "Heilsgeschichte = History of Salvation versus Theology.

Although Theology now rediscovers the source eschatology of the Church, Christendom at large, and the States in particular

The End of the World 1941

15-c

ARGO BOOKS ARCHIVES

is still living under the anti-eschatological bias of 19th century criticism. The lag between research and laity in any field is considerable. But in the case of eschatology realised, the lag has reached ominous proportions. And the lag is not altogether on the side of the laity. No people can live without eschatology. And while theology slept, the laity betook itself to other sources of Last Things.

And how could it be otherwise. Should the whole world wait patiently for 150 years until the theologians might have untied their knot? What can the laity do during the erratic brainstorms of the scholars in the deserts of their hypotheses? The layman cannot live on the latest scientific news. He needs complete faith, hope, love. Hence the overthrow of eschatology by the enlightenment had tremendous repercussions, especially in Germany, the center of theological studies.

The Church used to administer two eschatologies, one of the Old, the other of the New Testament. The Old Testament eschatology is ethical. The New Testament gives an eschatological faith. Now, during the times when eschatology lay dead inside the Church, these two eschatologies were taken outside and lived there, the ethics by a mass movement, the faith by one man.

The essence of eschatology is its infinity. It has no place among finite things. It asks a complete surrender to something outside the existing order of things. Liberal Christianity denied the existence of such infinite forces. Into the finite bourgeois world, the infinity of social ethics was shouted by Karl Marx and his communist friends. He restated Old Testament Justice in secular terms. The infinite faith, the mad faith of the New Testament, mad in the eyes of contemporary Churchmen themselves, was reinstated by the life of Friedrich Nietzsche.

The difference between ethics and faith is the same as the difference between Marx and Nietzsche. Ethics can be preached; faith must be lived. And ethics always will have to take second place to faith, for this reason. Marx's book made an epoch. But Nietzsche became the first philosopher whose existence meant more than his "system" and who therefore exploded the very notion of a system. Marx and Nietzsche kept the flames of eschatology real in a world in which the schools of theology believed in progress\*, in evolution\* and expansion, ~~instead of~~ resurrection, creation, revelation, i.e. outside the only frame of reference within which it makes sense.

Now, a Christian can be neither a Marxian nor a Nietzschean. However, he may be led to believe that ethical eschatology was saved by Marx in the market place when the temple allowed the flame to die. And we have among us post-marxian Christians like the Dean of Canterbury, like Reinhold Niebuhr, Paul Tillich, Karl Barth. They have been saved because they humbled their theological pride before the infinite challenge of communistic ethics, without succumbing to its finite political tenets.

It is less recognized in this country that we might have to humble ourselves before the eschatological faith of Nietzsche. I am not, never have been, a Nietzschean. But Nietzsche is not merely a tonic in an otherwise Christian world. Nietzsche is a central event

---

~~\*Note that these terms are employed in this chapter in a different sense than in Chapter I.-~~

in the history of Christianity (and to me, there is no other universal history). Hence, the reader may understand why when George Morgan published his book "What Nietzsche Means"\*\*, I asked his and "Christendom's" permission to state the position of post-Nietzschean Christians. This, then, is not a book review.

Post-Nietzschean Christians recognize each other as living in a world completely transformed. The experience of Nietzsche means that we have learned to distinguish forever between the Nomen and the Numen Christianum, between the label Christian Church or Christian World or Christian Spirit, and the powers of the Spirit. We understand why the nomen Christianum could decline without refuting the promises of the New Testament lest the numen Christianum, the powers of faith, love, hope, die. These powers bridge the abysses inside of "Man" whom we little men have to represent through the ages.

In other words, I believe that the Church is a divine creation and that the Nicene Creed is true, and yet I believe that the Church and the Creed of the future will depend for a new lease on life upon undemoninational, nameless and incognito contributions of faith. The inspirations of the Holy Ghost will not remain incarcerated in the walls and partitions of the visible or audible Church. A third form, the listening Church, will have to unburden the older forms of worship, by assembling the faithful to live out their hopes in services within unlabelled, undemoninational groups. In these incognito and undemoninational situations, we shall have to do repentance for the generations in which theology slept, in which the nominal churches abandoned the eschatological positions of Christianity. By doing so, we may hope to save our places of worship and adoration, and our creeds and hymns, from the powers of this world, in times to come.

When the Churches stripped the "Last Things" of meaning, especially the "End of the World"\*\*\*, Nietzsche saved the meaning and whipped the nominal eschatologists. Nietzsche has not abolished Christianity; he has, however, re-invoked the anonymous and incognito life of the Holy Ghost as a power in human society.

This turning point of our era was explained one day to Archbishop Soederblom by an old farmer in these terms: "There has been the Church of the priests. And it came to an end. Then, there has been the Church of the Levite; it is coming to an end in our days. And we are now entering upon the Church of the good Samaritan." Nietzsche is the Great Divide between the Levite and Good Samaritan, in the realm of our thinking about God, Man, and World.

As Abailard invented the term "theology"\*\*\* to whom we all have been subservient for 800 years, so did Nietzsche demolish this term.

---

\*Harvard University Press, 1941, XVIII and 408 pages. \$4.00.

\*\*For the failure of historians to grapple with an eschatological term like Vicar of Christ, the reader finds evidence in my "Out of Revolution, Autobiography of Western Man," New York, 1938, pages 552 ff.

\*\*\*J. Pare, A. Brunot, P. Tremblay, La Renaissance du XII.<sup>e</sup> siecle, Paris and Ottawa 1933, p. 307ff.

Friedrich Nietzsche ended the existence of either theologians or philosophers by fusing both into a higher unity. While the theologians slept and the philosophers surrendered to science, Nietzsche annihilated the separation between a pre-Christian, natural reason, and the Christian, supernatural faith. For anybody who knows what Nietzsche means, there is no mind which is not a believer and an unbeliever, both, there is nobody whose mind does not contain the Christian experience of a breakdown, instead of a clean slate, as the basis of his thinking processes. Nietzsche has made both the philosopher's reason and the theologian's faith into parts of one great mental health, one great innocence of the soul. The so-called philosopher has died away in 1900 years of Christianity.

There is no such thing as a purely natural mind or a purely supernatural soul. The mind also is supernatural or the soul natural. And so we had better cancel the whole vocabulary dealing with Man's Nature. Man is the being that has no nature: Ecce Homo. Man, instead of having a nature, is nailed to the Cross of Reality being by establishment in conflict with his nature. Man's reality is greater than nature.

Morgan's book starts therefore with the portrait of the real man and he ends the book again with the portrait of real men. The first part gives the features of the "value-making philosopher," "who lives his experiment," "writes in blood," "turns life into flame" and gives his time a bad conscience.

Only when the division between philosophy and theology has been destroyed, when the new thinker singlehanded "outbelieves" his theological confreres by showing more faith than they, when he has proved his Ecce Homo, only then can his philosophy become important. In the light of this horizon, Morgan gives the details of the doctrines on the Will to Power, Last Man and Superman, origin and revolution of morals, art and artist. (Pages 59-237). All these doctrines are temporal, passing, even fleeting. It is here that Nietzsche's attacks on Western morality are found, his anti-Christian bias. But Nietzsche himself said that his anti-Christian positions were only for the outside popular opinion.

They are marred by too much scientific positivism of the 80's of the last century although, in Morgan's presentation, I was struck with admiration for the certainty of selection and intuition which guided Nietzsche through this darkest tunnel of crudeness. In Morgan's book, the reader is spared all purely contemporaneous allusions; I mean the allusions to Nietzsche's own time and country. Morgan, feeling that Nietzsche should become our own contemporary, has succeeded brilliantly in making his book the standard text for our own times. In sifting all purely temporary or German material, the text--and Morgan has evaded the temptation of turning the text into a system--may act as a fresh challenge. Nietzsche always is specific. And he is not casual. And so he affects any specimen of the type whom he has called "Last Man" like the stroke of a whip.

Morgan keeps equally far away from smartness as from blind admiration; he simply states: "Concern with his philosophy is not a matter of philosophical curiosity. It is a necessity of life." For Nietzsche has our own predicament, to live in a world without roots, "with weak and fast disintegrating traditions, all broken or about to break." In our uprootedness we depend on the latest war news, the last fashion in

medicine, the stock market, the fastest engine,--and then "turning to Nietzsche we gain a new dimension of depth." (Page 5)

After the middle part, Nietzsche's doctrines about a withering civilization and how to put down roots again, Morgan's text again turns towards the "anthropological" theme of Genesis I, 26; the theme that led to the formulation of the trinity: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." The orthodox will wince under this comparison. However, it is a Jesuit father, no less, who says about Nietzsche's avoidance of the term God: "The word 'God' is so spent that we do not intend to haggle on its behalf with Nietzsche."\*

I do not make my juxtaposition of Genesis I, 26 and Nietzsche light-heartedly. It may turn out that nobody, between 1870 and 1917, has done more to resuscitate God. Nietzsche did it with the one saying: God is dead. To say that God was dead seemed the apex of godlessness, to the clergy of our departmentalized religion. They shuddered not because of the accusation against the times but of the alleged blasphemy against God. Forgotten was mankind's source tradition, of the God that died and rose again and of the God who was killed by his worshippers so that he might be reborn, or of the Crucified who had to be slain that he might raise us all. Like a red thread this faith of Man in the death and resurrection of God runs through the ages. Before Christ, the Gods were thought to die in the doom or twilight of blind fate, or in a frenzy of tribal ecstasy as Adonis or Tamuz or Osiris. Finally, in Christendom, in the Crucifixion first, and in the Mass thereafter, and finally in the services of the Word, in Protestantism, God was shown to die from the hands and the unclean lips of his own followers. Man participated in the slaying of the God, and the whole Christian worship of 1850 years centered around the final and full revelation of this fact that links Sir James Frazer's Golden Bough to the most enlightened Divine Service in a Congregational Church. 1850 years centered around this, first bloody and later unbloody, sacrifice of God the Living Son from the hands of the unbelieving minds of natural man. Our faith is based on the fact that all men's faith is intermittent and that at times, we are without faith. Nietzsche simply acknowledged that the Church as well as the State of his times, that especially the theology of the Life of Jesus, Liberal theology, had forgotten this danger. Children are accustomed to call their Jewish classmates "Christ-killer;" but are they ever told that they themselves by saying so kill the God in their hearts? And that the whole meaning of Jesus' forgiveness was that we all do so at times.

It would take a special article to expound on Nietzsche's act of faith, in a world that no longer feared to be forsaken by God. The problems of his insanity, his "anti-Christian" position could be seen in proper perspective. I here only wished to insist that Nietzsche sees the creation of man as in full process, with the highest reverence for what man should become as the new "law giver" and "highest man" (Morgan 241-373). And when Nietzsche speaks on this subject, he avoids the mistake of the theologian who simply quotes the Bible, or the philosopher who reasons about man as though this future were not listening in at this very moment of his reasoning process. Being more

\*Ürs von Balthasar, Die Apokalypse der Deutschen Seele, 3 vols., 1939, vol. II, P. 379.

than theologian or philosopher, Nietzsche in the solitude of his heart yet speaks as the man who should be overcome, to the man of the future who should take his place. He speaks as the last man of the whole infinite past to the first man of an infinite future, and so, speaks with the power that buries and vivifies man, that makes people die and rise again. Real speech makes over humankind. It is, to use a patristic term, the making of man, "Anthropourgia." What Nietzsche means never are ideas--then he would be a theologian in disguise as our modern Platonists--nor facts--then he would be a scientist in disguise as Aristotle. It always is Man, as which, of whom, to whom he speaks, and all three qualifications are equally essential. Nietzsche, by considering the processes of the spirit to be the heroic act of founding and refounding society, creates for himself the role of a universal, catholic, "medicine man," in the old tribal sense of this word, but this medicine man now cuts and heals on a level commensurate to the Christian era. Every word that he writes is written in the process of unmaking and remaking man. But we cannot unmake and remake man without believing in a perpetual "End of the World."

Christianity holds that the Word is man's matrix. That is the reason why we talk not of our mother's tongue, but of our mother tongue. Language itself is maternal, is our womb of Time through the thousands of years as the words I am using in this sentence are thousands of years old. Idealism, Materialism, Realism are hopelessly embarrassed by the place of language in man's creation. They hate it because it makes our mind into a creature. They certainly are not Christian, but Nietzsche is a Logos-thinker.

Nietzsche is a Christian in two other ways. And I intend to use the rest of this essay to delineate them. First, and most important in the midst of American society, he keeps away from the cheap sociology which identifies man with any one of his specific functions in society. It is here that we shall see him provide for the new clergy, the new ministry, the new leaders of the spiritual world. Secondly, he restores to man, in a world all too well known and explored, his realm of freedom for future growth. In both cases, Nietzsche's existence may be formulated, by the post-Nietzschean Christian, in terms that go beyond Nietzsche's own terms because his existence itself has added meaning for us, and we can act in fellowship again, an advantage denied him.

To understand his preparing a new spiritual office we must appraise the old Christian clergy. The original attitude of the Christian clergy put them beyond rich and poor, sick and healthy, grandparents and grandchildren, farmer and banker, soldier and civilian. The clergy were in charge of the delicate point of coincidence between the opposites of poverty and wealth, joy and asceticism, aggressiveness and meekness, health and sickness. During the last century, the ministry has abdicated in favor of the experts. These experts are not kept together by any common "oath of Hippocrates," by any common faith or ethics. The diseases of society, such as pests, crises, wars, revolutions, have come under the care of independent staffs none of which acknowledges any other ethics than its own. The ministry has lost its "gyroscopical" significance. No longer does the clergyman tell the patient that sickness is a great event in a positive sense. He himself now calls in the psychoanalyst. He despairs of the idea that poverty might be creative--30 chaplains at a meeting last year agreed that man was the product of his economic



circumstances--or that Jesus carried the sword; he thinks that only the generals carry it. The minister rarely dares to correct the professional man in his profession. He leaves him alone in his field because he is told that his own field is a field called religion, and he does not wonder particularly over the strange fact that "Departments of Religion" are established as Nr. 47, on Campus. In this way the only meaning of the ministry, which is to check all temporary tendencies, has faded; religion is something like the arts and sciences, in the eyes of our educated masses.

The professions have grown up into independent clergies. And the professions hold that their worlds last forever. The criterion of the professions is their belief in progress which is a correct view for any specialised activity of man but which is in contradiction to our Christian Faith about the whole of man and society. When religion was departmentalised, this representation of the whole ended. Some man had to jump into the chasm as the good Samaritan, as the incognito bearer of our faith in a period living merely on Science.

Nietzsche tried to reestablish the creative center beyond these clergies, beyond these sovereign groups. In this center the fixed mind of society, the temporal horizon of a nation, could be broken down and die and be reborn, and in this way the new staffs would not run amuck as they now do.

Since the staffs seem to be innumerable--we have some 250 sciences and their respective professional experts today--the first move to prepare for any new mental regeneration must be to attain some understanding of the functions of these staffs. If we can reduce their numbers to an understandable and necessary minimum of indispensable professional attitudes, we will be much nearer to the central point at which Nietzsche himself made his stand. And, more clearly than Nietzsche himself, we may reduce these staffs to four actually sovereign mentalities, as follows:

1. the economists (with their annexes of sociology, psychology, etc.)
2. the military group, generals, strategists, admirals and their super-brain of "general staffs."
3. the scientists, doctors, eugenicists, hygiene men.
4. the political perfectionists of all descriptions.

Popularly speaking, they are the staffs for 1. wealth-making, 2. strength-making, 3. health-making, 4. changemaking. All four groups are indispensable to any society.

That these sovereign clergies are real, any American can verify by remembering how this country has worshipped science and medicine, how it bowed to the economists, fell into the hands of political 'isms' and is in the hands of the generals today. The wheel of fortune has one day proclaimed the latest vitamin doctrine, the next day the living on the instalment plan, after that some revolutionary panacea. And today the building of bomber planes seems to solve most of our problems, psychiatric, economic, political, besides the boom for the army and navy.

A wheel might have been the symbol of our lives for the last forty years because we surrendered to economists, doctors, generals, Huey Longs, alternately. Nietzsche rediscovered that man should protect his independence better. He should stand beyond these four sovereignties. It is the merit of the Jesuit mentioned before to have pointed out that Nietzsche has enlarged our understanding of the Cross. The Cross ceases to be a particularly Christian symbol when we can see that Christianity only uncovered the truth of the Cross as man's form of life.\* If and when the economists, generals, doctors can be put in their place, on this cross, there at least is a first beginning for healing the absolute confusion of tongues that reigns among us. Actually a profound order and complete chart of our social cosmos exists, putting us in the center of a cross of existence. The four staffs divide our time and space in a perfect order.

It is easy to see that perfectionists try to plunge us into the future head over heels, "novarum rerum cupidi" as the Romans called the reformers of all sorts. And it is equally plain that our fighters, our armies, are headed towards the external space of the world outside of us. It is less familiar to think of the physicians and scientists as dealing with the created world as it has come down from the past, that doctors try to stave off the decay of already created beings and embodiments. Also, it sometimes is difficult to remain conscious of economics as an art which makes sense only within a given society, as an inner organization, a division of labor inside of an operating unity which economists take for granted.

Hence, the most important step is to recognize the front of medicine and of economics. The sciences of the physical life always face towards a world already in existence, face backward to the causes and origins of this world of the past. Such a world always is mortal, doomed, going to die from entropy or from decay. Doctors should not dream of abolishing death; they may procrastinate decay. The race will not be made eternal, undying, by doctors. The future is not under the powers of science but of service. Hence, the question must be asked; How do we get people who will sacrifice for the future? No studies of the already existing world as it comes to us from the past, make sense when there are no people who are pulled forward by our destiny and who are willing to prepare the future. A purely scientific nation as we try to be today would have no future because all people would be busy dealing with facts; as one of my colleagues told me: "after all, we deal with facts not with meaning."

The group which is impressed by the needs of the future must be considered as a second group that should check the scientists group and that must bring the pressure from the future to bear on the times.

Real time, then, we discover, is a delicate balance between future and past, and the result of their conflict we call present. Our time we live suspended between future and past, and there is no such thing as a present that "precedes" the future or causes the future. Nietzsche and any Christian knows that the future precedes logically the present. If God should not be who he should be, the presence of God would make no sense whatsoever. And everybody can verify that when people consider God as having been our "maker" in the past only, and abandon "eschatology" and a belief in God's Future, their belief in God's presence disappears too. Our real time situation is under pressure from two sides, end as well as beginning.

\*Urs von Balthasar, Die Apokalypse der Deutschen Seele. On the Cross of Reality, see my Soziologie I (Berlin 1925); A. Meyer Bios I, 1934.



And the same is true of our place in space. Here, too the idea of a three dimensional space is quite misleading. External space has three dimensions. But first of all space always must be conceived as divided into an external and an inner space, facing inward and outward. A purely outside space without its inner corollary is a contradiction in terms as a body without a mind and vice versa. Space is ambivalent, always presupposing the twofold unfolding of space into an inward and an outward tendency. The whole space concept of science is coping with one half of experienced "space" only. And man just as much as he creates his present "now," under the pressures from the future and the past, from ends and from causes, also creates his "here," his horizon in space from striking the balance between his inward and his outward trends. His place is where he "draws" the line, this line possibly being his skin, his clothes, his house's walls his profession's boundaries; in any case, he must live in two spaces, as any living organism must. Inside, economists may be of service, and outside, our tanks and bombers may help. But where to draw the line, never is the business of the business man or the soldier. It always must be the people who create outer and inner front. The people of the heroic age found the city, draw a new line and create a new horizon, and it is to the spirit of the founders that the business man and the soldier must bow before they can give service. This is the whole idea behind the "clerus," the inspired "laos," the people of God. Under the domination of mere experts, our powers to create a society decay. Nobody knows how to draw the line, where and when to draw it. In my college, next fall, 900 boys intend to take Economics One. They believe that this course will take them to the center of reality inside our little world. It does nothing of the kind. It operates, on the basis of an inherited horizon, on the inner front of a world kept open for trade by the British Navy. It is no "Great Economy's" to teach how, eventually, to refound the city with the energies of the inner front (fellowship, collaboration, integration). The experts whom we have on the inner front, do not reproduce our horizon. They can only exploit a given inner group life, they rely on the founding fathers to reproduce it. And this is true for all other three fronts of life and society. The sovereignty of the experts is of a purely expanding character. They take the horizons and decision over what shall be past or future, inner or outer, for granted, and they use up these highest values of the race, in their specialised actions.

In this cross of professional ambitions which serve the desires for health, change, strength, wealth, Nietzsche recognized the Witches Sabbath of our times. He saw that man had to recoil from any one of these ambitions to save his soul. We must wish to be healthy, yet illness is a blessing. We are for peace, "and yet, when we speak, they are for war." And so Nietzsche proceeded to call great the health, strength, wealth which would contain their opposites, sickness, weakness, poverty, too. We can live the "Great Economy" of all these forces, when we see through them as conditioned by their opposites. The term "Great Economy" embraces the patristic and the modern meaning both, and it is especially important that the term should be assimilated by American thinking. Morgan has taken pains to give this concept the central place which it has never gotten before. (186 f., 309 f.).

"Making Man" and the "Great Economy" are two Christian traits; the third Christian trait in Nietzsche is his practise of the incognito. Man cannot be known beforehand, and he shall not, despite I.Q.

tests, eugenics, etc. To try to know man beforehand meant to kill Christ, in the old Church; it means to deprive life of its essential conflict, for Nietzsche. We "translive" into our opposites all the time. All classifications of man are disastrous; because science classifies, the era of science had to lead to atrocious world war. "A Yankee, a German, a Frenchman," we say and go to war. Nationalism and Marxism are based on this diabolical application of science to man. To be called with any one permanent name is an insult to a living human being. The son must become a father, the bride a mother, the conquerors and martyrs must become "more than conquerors" and martyrs if they shall interest us as human beings. As long as we are alive, we also are undisclosed. "Eschatology" says that the world is at an end, is yesterday, but that you are a beginning, a tomorrow. Eschatology rents and cleaves the identity between you and the world. The world has a fate, you have not. The world dies because it is calculable; you rise if you are incalculable. And against all systematic philosophizing, Nietzsche created the new type of thinker who would think the deepest and profoundest things as he went along, and thereby always be far ahead of his readers and acquaintances, in his inner growth. His incognito, when he died, was nearly complete. He had not seven friends to whom to send his most important book. Millions read him today. Incognito is a condition of growth.

Friedrich Nietzsche then is a figure in the history of Christianity not because he hated Christianity but because he lived it on four levels. He believed in the transformation of man, of the speaker as well as of the man spoken to, by the power of the word.\* He believed in a free people which need not rush from the wealth-makers to health-makers, to the war-makers to the revolution-makers, because they may accept the privilege of the cross of reality. He pleaded for our incognito in the healing shadow of which we may incarnate the Spirit in unforetold forms of future life. And he anticipated the end of a world that called man a product of his environment. To him, as to G. K. Chesterton, as to Albert Schweitzer, as to Nathan Söderblom, the end of this world was long ago, and we may begin all over again. While theology slept, he realized Genesis I, 26, realized eschatology.

---

\*The propagandist does not know that speech changes the speaker himself, too.

15b

XI

which when this birth is incorrupt, forces itself upon the  
'm/neme", the impressionability of man, his plasticity, with  
such major momentum, that from then on, this birth is repeated  
regularly, through a spiritual succession of typical  
representatives, through the ages. The Puritan in this country  
is, of course, the best known type of this spiritual origin.  
Ground out under Elisabeth, by her executioners and handmen  
who killed the Non-Conformists, thrown into Holland for four-  
teen years or more and running there a secret Pilgrim Press,  
the Pilgrims set themselves up as a new order of man, in their  
first report, in 1621, to the homeland. And they have sur-  
vived for 300 years.

Anybody who says "the Last Puritan", or "Catholic",  
admits the physical, bodily resurrection of a soul who had  
a definite historical birthdate and continued to incarnate,  
after that birth, generation after generation. Now, our ideal-  
ists and materialists, in their -isms, never care to ask what  
makes man reach the higher stages of mankind. They do not ask  
how these men are born and reproduced. But the Fathers of the  
Church did care for the making of new men. They called it  
with a good name: anthropourgia. this like metallurgy, means

156

XII

and XIII

the refining process of winning truer man, working out the real "stuff" out of the coarse grain of the physical substances man, just as metallurgy refines metals out of the ore.

And they called the Christian ambition and goal "anthropourgia" because God had said in the beginning "Let us make Man"; and now, we, his children and images, were allowed to participate in this "man-making" process.

Hence, biology was the Christian vision and dream, the re-creation of man in a constant succession.

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ This much had to be said about the daily life of Christianity to understand the term in the Creed as their guiding star through the ages. The first Crusade, we said, was an overwhelming experience as is borne out by the fact that we have so many run-of-the-mill 'crusaders' today. And I know of the Last Judgment as a reality because I have seen Last Judgments passed on Proust's France, on Rasputin's Russia, on Wilhelm II.' Germany, President Harding's America.

7) Genesis I, 26 with Origenes' profound Commentary.

15<sup>th</sup>

XN

Similarly, I believe in the resurrection of the body because I see resurrections of the body, all through history, on earth. Any ~~hitherto~~ genuine soul will be incarnated time and again.

"The daughter in Europe, Nausicaa-Austria, destroyed by the World War, will find her resurrection in the world."

Now, the abstractionists of our days, of course, say that is a figure of speech. But after all, ~~hitherto~~ William James who denied the existence of the soul, said in the same breath: 'Some day, indeed, souls may get their innings again in philosophy. But if the belief in the soul ever does come to life after the many funeral discourses preached over it, it will be only when some have found in the term a pragmatic significance that has hitherto eluded observation. When that champion speaks as he well may some day, it will be time to consider souls more seriously\*)' Now, I cannot see anything more pragmatic in the very task of education, politics, production, than the term "soul", as used in the incarnating processes of 1900 years. I defy the philosophers to show me that.

\*William James, A Pluralistic Universe 1928 p. 210f.

XV

their minds have ever been able to create anything but mechanical bodies, locomotion, artificial hearts, planetariums, utopias futuramas and the like. The mind can make bodies. But only souls can give life to them. My belief that the soul of Austria is an eternal category inside the human family since she, Austria, once had been created, is a pragmatic principle which shall guide my steps in teaching, politics, actions. Just as much as the principles of free teaching as represented by St. Paul, and represented for four hundred years by the German Universities like Heidelberg and Jena, are eternal categories of the good society which must come to life again in other forms, in our days after they have been destroyed in Germany. Beyond the physical appearance of Homo sapiens, his soul has grown into new and higher stages, in every millennium, and has donned the bodies of living men and women and shaped them, into new types and specimens.

I have written on Austria and on St. Paul as the model teacher who conquered the pagan Platonic ideal of a fixed school terminology, by his liberty from the mere words of Jesus, not by figures of speech but with the utmost precision of which I felt capable. Why should I not accept my radical



XIII

and nothing but the pure metal will show in the resurrection.  
the

I may then say that history of human metallurgy, that the Christian anthropourgia, has gone on and does go on before our eyes. Now, these visible processes before our eyes are the reflection and projection of our faith on this earth. They anticipate and foreshadow the ultimates of our Creed. Because we believed in the son, we found ourselves growing up in a Christian World, because we believed in the Father, we invested all things in heaven and earth which we had made. The communion around us in the name of the son, we called Church, the communion around us in the name of the Father, we called Nature.

Because we believe in the Last Judgment, we can interpret the fall of France as one Last Judgment. Because we believe in the end of the world, it makes sense to sing of the end of the Roman Empire: "And the end of the world was long ago and all we dwell today like children of some second birth like as strange people left on earth after a judgment day."

The Christian astronomers, chemists, doctors, monks, preachers, missionaries, painters, masons, have populated the earth, in anticipation of the Last Judgment over our corruptible flesh. Taking the end of this world seriously, they all

have come into the flesh, out of the spirit, in a tempestuous resurrection from the dead. The astrologists of antiquity, the Chaldeans, came to life as modern astronomers, the Hippocratean doctor in whose tradition Socrates sacrificed a cog at his death, came to life as the modern doctor\*.)

In the light of the central dogma of a final resurrection, we have seen many partial resurrections accomplished, and this - and nothing else, in the Christian Great Economy of our salvation.

The story of Man for 1900 years is the application of the Nicene Creed to every day life. It shows that the Creed was never meant to be statement of external facts but a command originating in the command at baptism, and describing three things: One, God's trust in man, two, God's liberty, three, God's creativity, and assuring us that we may share these three attributes, if under certain conditions.

\* on this complete transformation see Victor von Weizsaecker, Hippokrates and Paracelsus, Schildgenossen 1927.

15 b

XX

The people who have destroyed Christianity , by degrading Jesus into a nice man saying niceties in Palestine and being a good boy, do not use their five senses. "either do they use common sense. "otherwise they would discover that under certain conditions , they have trustworthiness, liberty and creativity and that under others, they have not. This , however, is the whole content of the Nicene Creed. Now, my friends go to doctors, ride on trolley cars and send their children to schools. Hence , they live by trust in street car conductors, by faith in the science of medicine , a new creation, and by belief in the liberty of educators to influence their children in a way they would not be affected automatically. In all three actions, they represent the faith in the three qualities or aspects of the divine life, first that it is trustworthy and this is the most correct translation of the Greek word "pistis" which we translate by the term "faith", second that it is free, and third that it is creative.

When we speak of God as trustworthy , we turn to him as <sup>the Spirit of truth</sup> ~~the Spirit of truth~~, when we call him free, then we turn to him as the Son, and when we call him creative, we turn to him as our maker and father. Man has the powers of trustworthin-

155  
225 Liberty, Creativity

Xx

Wherever men try to live without these three qualities, they can't have peace, vitality, or progress. They are killed in wars, hurt in the jungle of society, disintegrated by mechanistic repetition. The opposite of trust is suspicion, of creativity mechanisation ~~mechanism~~, of liberty fatalism. And we live in a society at this moment which rapidly seems to slip into fatalism, mistrust, ~~mechanism~~ mechanisation. But in looking around, I perceive immediately that my whole environment has been created by men in the image of the trinity, by people who believed that they were capable of creating trustworthiness who trusted in their creative powers, and who acted as free men. They worshipped, then the father as the guarantor of their trust, the Son as the Guarantor of their liberty, the Spirit as the guarantor of their creativity. They said our father and our firstborn brother and "Veni Creator Spiritus", come Spirit the Creator, repeating the three qualities given to God in the very first verse of the Bible when God creates heaven and earth, as our trust for order and unity, where his spirit is ahead of creation, directing it to new ends, above the void, and in which he speaks, as ~~speaking~~ allowing us to hear and to listen to him as our brother.

And I should find fault with the Nicene Creed which

sums up the trust liberty creativity which every important contributor to the life which we lead has enacted and believed in? Why, it would be ridiculous to contradict everything that I see with my eyes and that I understand of life around me.

In fact, if the Nicene Creed did not speak of the trinity of the last Judgment, the resurrection of the bodies, the communion of the Saints, the descent to hell and the ascent to heaven, I would have to invent such a statement, however haltingly myself. If it were not there, in its perfection, I would have to stammer it, in my imperfection.