

JAN. 1980
[NOTE: MASTER COPY IS
FAINT, ACCOUNTING FOR
RELATIVELY POOR
LEGIBILITY]

Edin Seminary, St. Louis 1952
EOEN SEMINARY LECTURES
Lecture I - 452 1952

The Mind Outside History, or
The Nature of Man in 1750, 1850 and 1950

EUGEN
ROSENSTOCK-
HUESSEY

You may have heard of the famous man who was allowed to spend eighty-nine million dollars within fifteen years. He was the President of the Carnegie Foundation, Frederick Paul Keppel. This privileged gentleman was also very proud of his big sons - and he had five of them. When they were all full grown, he took them one day out on the front lawn, laid them end to end and measured them. The total was thirty feet, seven and a half inches.

We are very well able to measure space and to do it even in this funny fashion - that five living beings are laid end to end and measured ... with very gratifying results - imagine the average was nearly six-feet-two! May I compare with this a story which I could have picked up daily twice, out of any newspaper - a letter to the editor of the newspaper - a kind of "Emily Post" letter:

"Dear Mr. Morse: I was married when I was sixteen. My husband was four years older than I. We soon outgrew each other and each found someone better suited. However, because of the children, two girls and a boy, we decided we should stick it out until they were through school. Now all our children are married and there seems to be no reason why we should not go our separate ways. I have been looking forward to this and have prepared myself to take a position which will support me. I am forty-six and want one last fling at life."

Would you compare for a moment, this measuring of living beings in space, so successfully done by Mr. Keppel and this poor woman living thirty years before she has lived - and never adding the thirty years into any kind of unit; never seeing that thirty years are more than just thirty years? I reasoned over this with a friend who is a Professor at one of the theological schools in this country, in the south. (At that time, however, he had a parish in Vermont.) I tried to tease him about his sermon and I said, "Before God, fifty-two thousand Sundays are as short as one Sunday." He resented it and said, "That's not Biblical." I said, "It is - a thousand years are as one day, and one year has fifty-two Sundays so - fifty-two thousand Sundays." - Well, he didn't like it at all! Isn't that strange, that when it comes to time-binding, as it has been called by Osipov, that there suddenly people of even great theological vigor, stumble?

Here is this woman who says, "thirty years" - and now she has to have a fling at life, and it's too late. Take our workers: they tell you that they work; they don't work a year, they work two thousand four hundred hours a year - and they are paid for two thousand four hundred hours on an average. So what has happened to time, that we have become unable to see time add up into any considerable unit? So that the quality of a year, the quality of five years, the quality of a generation, the quality of eternity is felt again. And so I decided, gentlemen, to act as a "quantity surveyor" of time today and in these four lectures. Quantity surveyors, you know they are found in every big city directory, they assess and estimate coal and wood. It seems that we need a new profession with regard to time: quantity surveyors of time. I am going to try to do this for you in these days. It has been my concern ever since I broke with the academic tradition of thinking of the mind as a timeless agent in some second-hand world. (They call it a second world - but it is only a second-hand world.)

Now, I am quite serious. I do not know if it is too early, or if you are too unwilling or unprepared to listen to this. But what I will try first to do today

Lecture I - page 2.

is to show you the incredible abyss into which we all, including all the theologians, have allowed time to disappear. What is called time today is the corpse of time. It isn't time as God created it, and as all generations of men from to 1600 thought time was - something living, something working, something organic, something that could stand up under the eye of eternity and be one of its elements - an eon of the eons. But after we have seen the degradation of time today, and that we no longer live in the Christian era, but in this dead space-time of Mr. Einstein, I shall try to build up the real time as God created it for us. So that in the end we can understand that the liturgy of our church has always tried to remind people and to make them experience real time. We will steer clear, as far as possible, from all theological misconceptions of time because what the theologians say about eternity (my friend Tillich, for example) is just as bad as what he says about time. Because theologians have been the enemies of time, of the temporal in its fullness... that's why I had to call it, "Liturgy versus Theology."

We shall try to build the atoms out of which the necessary essential, indispensable Christian liturgy is fed and built up and re-edified, generation after generation. Without this liturgy all our services would just be lecture clubs. Sometimes they are. They would just be attempts to beautify the service, and that is going so far today that I sometimes wonder when the first incense will be burned in the Lutheran Church.

This is nothing to play with - the liturgy is nothing for beauty. It is not for ornamentation. It is not for sentiment. It is the truth about our nature, in time as temporal beings and we have, therefore, this rather sober, rational reason and scientific task before us to concoct the elements - the time elements which are called epoch and generation and eon. I could have added, era, out of which the Christian liturgy has re-emerged in every century, so it is re-born whenever people have been serious about knowing something about the form in which they can meet their Creator, and go before Him.

So you understand that the build-up of these lectures is perhaps very primitive, but it is also quite severe. I have tried to take the minimal steps by which I wanted to bring the liturgy out of the rusty and dusty attic of memory and relics.. of niceties and prettinesses of sentimental antiquities ... and show that it is the outcome of our life in politics and in families. That it is the real life of the community. Which leads to the necessity of purifying ourselves in the life of the liturgy. I say "life of the liturgy" because that is opposed to the mind of the theologian.

Liturgy takes time, thought. (Some people think that thought shouldn't take any time - so they listen to the Quiz Kids.) ... The whole problem being time, I am well aware that in four hours (even though this may seem to you to be very generous) it is very difficult to finish this job. So I have tried to find some way in which you may not find me so impertinent - to put such a big bill before you. I, myself know very well how difficult it is to apply such doctrine to our services in the church - and so I think you will find at the exit three hundred copies of the liturgy and sermon which I have applied last Trinité Day in my little village.

So, if you will bear with me indulgently by looking over this service, you will ease my task for tomorrow - and even more for Thursday - because in the content of the sermon is something anticipated of the content of tomorrow's first lecture about living through an historical epoch, and what that means. In the form of this liturgy, in the proportion of its parts, in the choice of the hymns, there is also something I would like to debate and discuss with you on Thursday, because

Lecture I - page 3.

I really feel that the liturgy in our Evangelical and Reformed Churches is today, so to speak, "afloat". Many people feel that liturgy is at the core of everything, but it seems to me that it is possible to lay down certain fundamentals in a very severe and strict and demanding manner (and then, of course, I shouldn't try to do this if I had not shown you that it could be done in a practical example.)

So, today I promise to show you the deterioration of man's relation to time. It all, of course, began in the 18th Century with the enlightenment - when the life of Jesus was taken out of context and the Master's relation to His apostles was suddenly scrutinized and people began to say that they had misunderstood Him. You can say that the deterioration of man's attitude toward time as something dead was necessary and inevitable - as soon as the yardstick of the relation of living time and living people in time, to each-other, was discredited in the simple form that people began to say that Paul had ruined Christianity. Jesus was all right, of course. You find this already in Goethe; you find it, not so explicitly, in Lessing; but you find it all through the 19th century and you can imagine my amazement: The grand-daughter of Trevelyan - the nephew of MacCauley, the greatest English historian - Catherine Trevelyan - traveled in 1927 to 1928 - hitch-hiking through Canada. She went on foot, she bummed a ride sometimes, but all told she went really as a hitch-hiker all through the whole continent and she wrote a book about it. Well, it's all very interesting. Being a Trevelyan, she was received in the house of the Governor-General of Canada and the next day she was standing on a locomotive with the engine driver and on it goes... and of course some farmer immediately proposed to her (in the vast West, out there where he never sees a girl!) and at the end she is in Vancouver. She goes to the college there - the University Library - and then there is just one paragraph in this book which says there was a very nice man in the library. He was a graduate of Oxford. "We sat down" (perfectly innocent in 1928). "We sat down on the steps of the library, in the sun, and discussed how Paul had ruined Christianity."

This is, by and large, permissible and has been permissible for a hundred and fifty years since the Tübingen school. "How Paul has ruined Christianity" - What has this to do with time? You may remember that there was a first World War and that it was forgotten and had to be fought a second time, because the second generation didn't think that they were the Apostolic Church. I think we pay, by the neglect of the identity of Paul's generation, with Jesus' life, a terrible price. It may be that in cutting the life of Jesus loose from its moorings in the future ... (that's how we have to put it. Man has not only moorings in his past, but also in his future,) - and by cutting the moorings of Jesus from the future which He has created, we made it impossible for modern man to realize the meaning of time, and we lived it. The story of the Biblical criticism of the first century of our era is exactly and precisely reflected in the history of our own time by the breaking apart of the generations and by the fact that, as we shall see tomorrow, President Roosevelt was not allowed ever to mention the name of Woodrow Wilson, in politics, without danger of wrecking his own political career. It would have been the same if Paul had forbidden himself ever to mention the name of Jesus ... and to preach the same Gospel, just the same ... a hard thing to do.

Now this perhaps comes as a surprise to you - but I thought that you should immediately try to bring together the story of our Evangelical teaching and our theological training and our Biblical criticism with the real history of our time. The real history of our time is the ineptitude, the incapacity of seeing that what one generation does is only articulated in the next - and that there IS no life of Jesus for this very reason; and that there is no time in flux - time, that is, just cut up when you go and are buried, or when I come and am born. That isn't time.

Lecture I - page 4.

So I wanted to force something upon you which you don't want to do, I know very well. To see the unity of God's time as astronomical time that flows from year to year and century to century - as the time in politics from election and war to war to election and the movement of scientific progress, so called, leads to the complete collapse of the times. But this collapse of civilization, western civilization, doesn't consist in the loss of the victory in the war, but does consist in the existence of archeology ... That's the collapse of western civilization. It is the nucleus, the core of this ruin - this famous sentence, "how Paul ruined Christianity". Because we know of Christianity only through Paul, obviously, and obviously there is no Christianity that could be ruined if Paul has ruined it. It is all very simple, you may say, "Well, we are orthodox - it doesn't matter" - but if that is the official status, after all, of our schools - of our colleges, our universities and it all amounts to the crude treatment of time ... that you and I are (how should I express it?) yard-sticks of time to ourselves ... that your and my life runs, from birth to death and that it begins when I am born, that it ends when I die and as the man of the famous dictionary, Ambrose Bierce, has expressed it already seventy years ago - that the ceremony of Christening is the act of ceremoniously afflicting a helpless child with a name. Is this Christening? That's a rational idea - The ceremonious affliction of a helpless child with a name?

What is time? If you see time, the use of the term "nature" goes out of the window. Your time and my time are unique and living here this hour with you, certainly will never come back. It has no nature - it has no super-nature; it is just out of nature. That is whenever men speak of nature, they take men out of God's time. That is dead time. Now, this is exactly what has been done. First in religion in 1750, or in theology - then in 1850 in philosophy, and finally today in sociology. The three natures of man which have deprived man of his Godliness and his God-likeness and his Divinity at first were talked about in the language of religion. They have later talked in the language of the Arts and the Sciences, of poetry and then finally treated man's nature in the terms of analysis, in the terms of plans, in terms of science, in terms of prose.

What do I mean by this? If you think of the greatest souls around 1750, you will allow me to point to a man like Zinzendorf - the Moravian Brethren. They were vital people, Jonathan Edwards or Gilbert Tennant - the man who preached the great sermon on "The Dangers of an Unconverted Ministry". Today I would like to preach a sermon on the dangers of students who don't convert their student days into real time.

What were these men doing after the half-way covenant - after the half-heartedness of the early part of the 18th century? They wanted to speak of God, as Zinzendorf has expressed it, with "naturalness". That is, they wanted to have natural lips and I think it is that in the revival they wanted to lead men so to this, that his own nature would articulate and voice once more the great miracles in his own words - in his own "naturally" determined articulation. And I think we don't do them any wrong if I say that the great central core of the message in 1750 was naturalness in our relations with God.

Theocracy, you see, the clergy, the ministry, should be (so to speak) warmed up - and whether you take Pietism or whether you take Zinzendorf, or whether you take the Revivals, whether you take Wesley - they had their criticism of each other, as I well know. You see, they weren't satisfied with each other, but they had something that binds all these men together and that is the naturalness as you have in the hymn-singing of John Wesley and his followers. Naturalness... Of course they didn't know what they were saying by naturalness - what the

Lecture I - page 5.

consequences would be - but they wanted to initiate, institute a natural relation to their God and they succeeded. No one must of the hymns we sing, those we still have, to these days. They have revived, then, the ecclesiastical and revealed order by naturalness. God became a natural. Man became a natural in his religious sphere - so we say that in 1750 (I have to simplify matters, as I'm sure you know quite a bit of this yourself and you will supply your own evidence) - so, in thinking this over, we can say that what was meant primarily, before the Revolutionary War in this country, was that religion was something natural ... that we could speak cordially and affectionately of all these experiences and that we didn't need any artificial manner about these things - so we can say that in 1750 the religious nature of man was preached, or his naturalness in his religious relations.

When you come to the year 1850 you find one last fling at this religious nature of man - of his naturalness when you read *Hoby Dick*. That is a Biblical book in many ways. But he was not a success: nobody read him at that time and today it is meant to be a book for youngsters, which it certainly isn't. It is a very serious book, as we shall see in a minute. Certainly Emerson was the man of the day (in 1850) - and obviously with him nature meant something quite different. It's really the world - the natural world - our sentiments with regard to the nature of nature. You really have to duplicate the word to get the emphasis of the middle of the 19th century with regard to nature. We had a natural relation to nature, that was the great dogma and the poet seems to express it best. Lyrical poetry, instead of hymn-singing, shows you that the front has changed - because the poet is powerful when he can deal with the flowers, and the water and the clouds and the feelings of the human heart when the sun rises and when the sun sets. It's the nature of nature which was in the forefront, and therefore it wasn't the religious language which seemed to express it, but the language poetical and you can say that all through the 19th century the poet was the high-priest of the good society and they think that the poet is the Divine messenger. I think this was all exaggeration and you'll find traces of this among us and there are still desperate folks that think that the artist is the only vestige of the Divine life in our society today.

Now, in this year 1850 - 51 - 52, something very terrible happened. We had one great soul in this country who did not fall for the Emersonian decision that nature was poetic, beautiful and to be revered. He still thought that the language should either be natural language about God and His enemies, the devil - or if this language had to be forsaken and had to be thrown out of the window - that the language could not possibly be the Emersonian poetry. Not the Walt Whitman optimism, not even the caustic humor of Mark Twain, but that America and the whole western world, by the loss of our naturalness in our emotions about the Divine, would be thrown into an era of speechless arithmetic and analysis. I am speaking of Herman Melville very seriously now because you can study with him the death of time. In *Hoby Dick* it's all the wrestling about God's time; what to do, when to act, how to save yourself in this limited period on earth. It is still a great story of revealed time. *Hoby Dick* was a complete flop, it appeared, and it must have taken the life out of this man. One year later Herman Melville published a book which was a prophecy of the times in which we live today. It is called "*Pierre*" and it is the first psycho-analytical book of the pure brand of psycho-analysis. A man who is in love with his sister and has a bride besides, tentatively, he is finally driven to murder his cousin, to hate his mother, to be imprisoned and is about to be executed - the book ends,

(imagine, by the author of *Moby Dick*) - - it ends with the incredible out-cry, "It's speechless, sweet to kill you." This man is alone; this man has lost his speech; this loss is ripe for analysis and for an institution. That is the way the modern sociologist looks at us, all of us, by and large. If he could be of speechless nature, he would be perfectly satisfied. This, then, is a third nature.

Because we are all sick, we can't live - we all have nothing to say. Now, you can always say, "Well, what has all this to do with time?" - The time of God is only to be experienced when we can speak. Man has received from his Creator, the power to say what the hour has struck. That is our strength. We date: we say when and we say now - we say 1750, we say 1850, we say 1950 in order to save our souls. You under-rate this; there have now been very serious people who for the last seventy years have said, "there is no such thing as a Christian era." It makes no difference if you say 1750, 1850 or 1950. I invite you to see that only because I can tell you that in 1750 people fell for a naturalness of God; in 1850 they fell for the naturalness of nature and in 1950 they fall for the beastly nature of ourselves, that we have a chance to get out of this.

What do I mean by these three points in time which I have mentioned? Well, man had blindly moved from one to the other and to the third extreme. Here is God - here is the world and here is man. They are like three points of a triangle; God, world and man have existed since we speak ... since we know of ourselves... and the point has always been to ask, "Where does man stand, between God and the World? Is he something, is he a God? - is the soul just divine? or is he just a speck, this famous little grain of dust on our planet, part of the world?"

What have our forefathers, then, done during the last two hundred years? They have not kept simultaneously this triangle; they blindly rode through this triangle from one point to the other - thinking they could abandon one and keep the two others or one of the others. The absolutism of the Moravian President, for example, of the Revivalist. If you think of the story of Jonathan Edwards, it is his absolutism of his theocratic attitude that deprived him of his success. It was God in naturalness and not other nature.

With Emerson it was nature and nothing else. Even God, the over-soul, became just a part of the world. And today it is man's nature and nothing else! - not even love for your parents. - That is not love, it is just beastliness in man, we are told. So - when we allow ourselves to be swayed by the year in which we live, by the spirit of the times, obviously something terrific happens to us. The simultaneous elements which must remain with us all the time: God, man and world, have been used one after the other and now we have none left of those things. Time has been allowed to drift in a mechanical movement, time has become accidental.

Yesterday I had the privilege of talking here to the Jesuit Fathers and even they felt that they couldn't tell their pupils much in metaphysics - that it had all been spent ... and that we have to begin from scratch. We can, of course, introduce the despotic ethics, but these children are such individuals, they no longer understand what the centuries are talking about ... when they quote St. Thomas. "Now, that is here at St. Louis University - they ought to know.

So, I turn to the unity which is still binding together 1750, 1850 and 1950. It is so primitive, that I am ashamed to say it - but I tell you that I want to re-conquer the Christian era in our own life and consciousness by saving that obviously the points on this line: 1750, 1850 and 1950, existed and shall exist

Lecture I - page 7.

after all these heresies and aberrations, these extravaganzas have passed away. Today it isn't my task to be positive about this, but only to show you that we have no longer much to say about a Christian era. We can't pretend when we compare the Jewish era or the Moslem era that your and my feeling about the Christian era is in itself Christian. I am also offering a kind of dogmatic formula for your benefit during these three days, that you may feel, after all, it is no improvization what I am saying - but that it is something I have tried to think out for many, many years, and not I alone, but other friends, very systematically.

First, may I offer this formula. I shall, for those who want to write it down, dictate it in Latin (it is better to say it in Latin - and in English, I shall translate it - but I have a reason for the Latin.) I have said to you that whenever we speak of man's nature, he is deprived of his time - and therefore, he cannot be in the state of grace. Natural man has lost grace. That is, after all, something quite important to consider. The Catholic church expresses this, as you know, by opposing nature and super-nature, and it says (and that way I must first say, says the conservative, scholastic, reactionary) - it says, "Gratia naturam non tollit sed sublevat. I would like to translate, "Grace does not destroy nature - but lifts it up." Instead I would like to propose as the fruit of these considerations here, some understanding of this, that we might better say in the future, "tempus gratia non tollitur, sed plenescit." "Time is not abolished, by grace, but it gets its fulness." The fulness of time comes about by grace. Time, as given to modern man, is not full. When grace enters, time is made full.

The more abundant life in this Gospel is a very serious temporal problem. Temporal as a definition of our times, has very little to do with "two cars in every garage." So, may I say once more, "Tempus Gratia non tollitur sed plenescit". "With the help of Grace, time comes into its fulness". Grace, then, enters time. Nature destroys time.

So, you will see I have avoided the term nature - and the term supra-nature, (super-nature) for good reasons. Because we have surveyed the last two hundred years - three hundred years - we should bury the use of the term nature with regard to men, whenever you are seriously speaking of men, because when we speak of men at all, with understanding, we cannot speak of them without speaking of God... or without speaking of time, into which God creates us and sends us.

There is no natural man to begin with. Any beginning is in time!

The Moravian Brethren (I take this as a very affectionate group) to make you see what has happened - the Emersonian tradition of the liberal - or the Liberal Arts colleges of this country, and finally and third the modern, momentary praise of psycho-analysis - they all have agreed on one thing: They must make life natural. The sects have made the religious life natural. The liberals have made the worldly life natural. The analysts are making the psychic life natural. In each case, the times went out of joint.

The only answer can be that this cannot be done - and that, therefore, we have to quarantine the term "nature" and I assure you it is very easy to get along without the term, once you try to do it. You will see that is just what the Bible has done. The term "nature" doesn't exist in the Bible - it is not a Biblical term. It is an entirely un-Biblical term, from the very beginning. We are creatures, but we are not "nature".

Lecture I - page 8.

A creature is something that the Lord is in process of creating. Nature is something that He did create, long ago. And this is the result of our putting ourselves out of time. If you speak of your own nature, you think of putting yourself into the past. You think of yourself as you have been just before you opened your mouth. If you speak of yourself as creature, you speak of yourself as you might be after I have made the speech ... and long after that.

May I make some remarks which might interest you, at the end of this, with regard to era: Since there are serious people, and I think I must admit that there are good people, who say that there has never been a Christian era - it is just an illusion: when Jesus died, absolutely nothing happened after all; he died. And that it took three hundred years before they climbed out of the catacombs, and then all Christianity was corrupted by Constantine - well, and what afterwards? Then the papacy was corrupted, and then Lutheranism was corrupted and now we are all corrupted ...

So - the whole story of Christianity is one great disappointment. And therefore, it is perfectly arbitrary to speak of a Christian era. Nothing has happened; that can be called the result of the Crucifixion.

Overbeck, whose name you may know - the friend of Nietzsche, Franz Overbeck - has written, in 1873, this terrible accusation against Christianity - against theology, saying that it is a myth, that there ever has been a Christian era. It is a myth! Mythology! Now, you today know that we are all being de-mythologized, so the first thing they want to rob us of is the Christian era.

I believe that there is a Christian era, despite the theologians. That is, despite our complete indifference to the miracle that is expressed in this term, that you and I are allowed, in every service, to renew the fact that there is this era. That is, if you don't take into account the fact that in any communion supper when the Sacraments are given (and I still believe there are Sacraments) - that there we create the Christian era. We shall, however, not be allowed to say we live in a Christian era as long as the Lord would say the way you use the term "Christian era" is Islam - that's Moslem! And today most Christians are Moslem.

Mohammed left Mecca and fled to Medina, as you know, in 622 and in 637 already, the Caliph Omar introduced the Arabian Hedshra, the Arabian chronology. Now, you think the Christian era is much older than that? You are quite mistaken. The Christian era, the Jewish era and the Moslem era all were introduced at exactly the same moment; in the 6th and 7th Century - between 550 and 650 it was that people thought of the necessity of determining time by era, in terms of religious foundations.

As you know, the Jews today count in such a manner that their era begins with the creation of the world, and it is well for us, for a moment to take this quite seriously. It would be 3760 years before the coming of Christ - that God created the Universe ... and after that, then, today it would be 3760 plus 1952 years - and that is how the Jewish calendar goes.

But I have to tell you that in Byzantium, which after all was the foremost orthodox center of the Christian religion, from 500 to the year 1100 they counted from the creation of the world - they did not count from the incarnation.

Byzantine documents and Byzantine Bibles will be signed in such a manner that the year 0 or the year 1 of our era, corresponds to the year 508; five hundred and eight years since the creation of Adam. I mention this because I think it is a very wise counting. I think that we can say today, with some conviction, that the

Lecture I - page 9.

History of speaking man - of the man with a soul - of Adam and Eve - is not older than that.

I can't prove this today, but it is my conviction. I think that Byzantine calculation, by and large, of 508 years before Christ as the matter relevant to the history of the human race stands up well under any test.

However that may be, it shows you only the difficulty of defining what the Christian era is. Do we really mean that Mohammed and Jesus are just alike? That one is a Prophet and the other is a Prophet? that one did one thing and something occurred to the other? Do we really mean this? Obviously not - because we do not count from the Crucifixion; we do not count from the Christening in the Jordan; we count from the taking shape of the Divine one in humanity - we count from the first year - from Bethhlehem - from Christmas!

So there must be some secret ... What do we really mean by the "coming of the Lord?" in the year 0? - The Christian era, then, I say - does not count from the Creation and it does not count from an event in the middle of time, like the Endshra.

We have the three eras, we might say, as the only ones that matter. However, the Byzantines said it was perfectly innocuous to count the years from the beginning of Creation too. So, perhaps it is true that we may have to re-conquer against all modern paganism the Christian era - then if you and I from now on want to say with some conviction: 1952 - then we have to do something about the notion - what we mean by the lapse of time of 1952 years. Everybody can understand the Jewish and the Islamic era, but do we understand the principle of Anno Domini?

I wanted to show you that the ambition must be to place all smaller units of time in one large and unique process of God's creation and of God's history with men. If we cannot save the Christian era - then all the partial fragmentations, the appearances which are as short-lived as the modern worker, or as the poor woman of her married life wrote, will remain un-illuminated.

If time is not one, then all time is dead. The question before you and me is a very simple one: Did God create the whole temporal process as one thought? or did He really give to every nation and to every man just his little prison-term: five years here and one day there - and two thousand four hundred working hours there?

Do we all live in factories? Do we all live on vacation? Do we, all of us, live on schedule? There are now calendars proposed by Chambers of Commerce, taking out all the miraculous out of life - out of Easter or do you still believe that God is Lord of the times... that His new moon and His sun rises over the just and the unjust - and tries to tell you and me what the hour demands?

LECTURE II -

Experienced Epoch: 1905 to 1950
or Time as Revelation.

When the Napoleonic Wars were finished, the old Austrian Empire received some of the countries and provinces - especially in Italy - which had been under Napoleon's domination; and Napoleon, being a very modern ruler, had introduced the telegraph of that time. That was like the search-lights for air-planes, you know, every twenty-five miles on a mountain or on a hill-top, you could signal messages rather rapidly from hill-top to hill-top.

These telegraphs found themselves in Lombardy, Venetia and all these beautiful countries which now the Austrian Emperor had to rule. And the first thing the Prince of Metternich, who governed Austria for the following thirty-three years, did - was to cut them down, these telegraphs. So he was approached by some of the citizens of Lombardy from Milan and told that this was a wonderful institution because it made the news travel fast ... and why did he cut them all down? So Metternich said, "It's bad enough that political news does travel, but it is the duty of the government to delay it as much as possible."

We, today, expect everybody to speed up the news; this is our religion. However, to accelerate life and the news may be just as arbitrary as to slow it down. In God's time, the timing, obviously, is a problem of great difficulty, and today I have to speak about the meaning of the word: epoch. I wanted to remind you that people who live like the Prince Metternich, or people who live as we do with the news, break up God's time either in the old things without the news, or into a world that consists of news. In both worlds you can never hear the GOOD NEWS.

The whole Christian Gospel is bough up, obviously, with the question of timing. The great two sins, the only sins, I think, that one can recognize as not moral, but sins in the theological sense, are the "too early" and the "too late". You can't be in a state of Grace, as we said last time - if the time is not fulfilled. So, if you miss the moment and act either too early or too late, you do not fulfill your time and there will certainly be a bitter or very sour taste.

We all live the same life. We all have to take breakfast - we all have to go to bed; the only difference you can find in people's lives is WHEN they do these things. It makes a difference whether you marry at eleven or at fifty-five! The quality of life is time, and time is a quality ... and that is therefore, for a quantity-surveyor of time such as myself, his first question: "how can I make the quality that is called time and that puts every event into one unique Christian era, - one unique and united time, which makes the years 1750, 1850 and 1950 parts of one time - how can I make, to eyes that do not believe this, how can I make time visible?" Time is not a quantity - still, you all believe it ... I'm afraid it isn't. Time is not a quantity. "When-ness" - time-ing is anything but a quantity to measure. It is your highest aroma of living. If you take a man and put him into a stupor by intoxication or by drugs, the first sense he loses is his time sense. You know very well for a long time, you may have been under the influence of inebriating liquor (but you won't admit it) - but the first thing you do not know is what the time is. You know everything else - everybody is your friend - it's a wonderful time - but it is not the real time.

So - time is the highest aroma of human consciousness. It is a clair - the politician has it ... he knows when to act, and the politician differs from the idealist in just this respect: that he is rooted in the time of the community and he knows when to move - whereas the idealist always moves at the wrong moment.

Lecture II - page 2.

So, perhaps I come nearer to my problem of the arena that time, real time is. It is very important. How does it enter the senses? - the insensibilities of the average man? How can we convince the hide-bound member of our congregation that time is of the essence of the divine life of man?

And so I turn to the way in which time becomes quantitatively visible, noticeable. It is in the form of epoch-making events. What is an epoch-making event? It is an un-natural event because, as I took it from a text-book here, most people think what time is just "flow" from one moment to another. The epoch is so un-natural; when you speak of an epoch-making event, you mean to say that one moment in time is more important than another ... and you can't prove it.

The world wars, I suppose, are epoch-making events. The Declaration of Independence was an epoch-making event. Why the 4th of July? There's the 5th of July - the 3rd of July - twenty-four hours, every one of them. Why is it reasonable to speak of an epoch-making event? You first have to venture into this recognition that it is at first sight unreasonable and irrational to speak of epochs. Before the whole Christian era will ever make sense to you and to the congregation, we first have to admit that an epoch is not found in nature. It is contradictory to nature - it is not super-natural. It is just un-natural. Nature doesn't contain epochs... that's why nature is indifferent; that's why nature is unreal; that's why nature is your and my obstruction. There is no nature, as I tried to tell you last time. Even Bertrand Russell admits this - but there are epochs! Every one of you knows much more about the epochs of his life than about his nature; and as long as you think you know about your nature you can't be saved ... but as soon as you believe in the epochs of your life, you can be saved.

We know more about our timed life than we know about all these abstractions. Nature is a big Buddha which we built up ourselves. Who has ever seen nature? You can only see it by taking yourself out of it, and that's not the real world anymore. Your mind and then the physical world - that doesn't exist, really. You are in the physical, in the whole world. That's the important and staggering part of it. But epochs exist for us, as for geology. The glaciers have epochs, you have epochs we KNOW that God created the world in six days because only of our own experience that we have at least six stages in life to go through - that's what Moses knew too.

The whole Genesis is based on personal experience. The people who keep the Sabbath say, "Well, the world was created the same way" - and a man who lived, like Moses, through tremendous upheavals in his own soul, knew that the world had come about in an epochal way just as much as he himself had come about in this way and was still going.

What is, then, an epoch? An epoch is a compulsion to raise certain moments in time above the flow of time in such a manner that the past and the future come under the cone of light irradiating from this special moment. You cannot speak of any epochal event without meaning that the War of 1776 and the Declaration of Independence explains the previous decades of America which all lead up to the Revolution, and if you do not see that from 1776 to 1860 the Declaration of Independence worked and worked itself into the consciousness of the people until equality had even been granted to the negroes of the south, (which hadn't been understood at first, but then came out by implication). So, that's an epochal event.

An epoch is the exaltation of one moment in the flow of time that suddenly other moments of time are magnetized and move in a field of force and are explainable

Lecture II - page 3.

as related to this one moment - backward as well as forward... It now takes time to form the epoch, and I'm going to speak today of the way the American people, under your noses but without your eyes, have been forced to accept an epoch in their national history at this moment. Much depends, I think, on the preacher from the pulpit, whether the modern man, allegedly, must be thrown into despair or whether he can believe that God is in government. Our rulers, our secular rulers, will not tell them this ... that there is an epoch-making event. They only go from one election to the next election - and it is your and my responsibility to open the eyes of the people to their own experience. To know what an epoch is and how it is experienced, we'll make a strange discovery: the compelling character of an epoch is very painful to endure. Those who know an epoch-making event has happened, are crucified. Jesus was crucified because he knew that the destruction of the Temple was imminent. It was only after the Temple was destroyed, that the Christian Church could be proclaimed as a New Jerusalem in Revelation.

John could say that the epoch-making event was there ³⁷ forty-seven years after the Lord had died; they wouldn't believe Him. He said it not too early; he said it first. In our time, in American history, it is very simple to point out in what the epoch-making event consists.

I have here the United States' White Paper policy in the Korean Conflict July 1950 to February 1951, Department of State: That is the non-epochal description of the Korean conflict. It begins after the end. In July 1950, as you well know, we were fighting. When war breaks out, time is out of joint and there is no epoch, there is no era. War is a collapse, peace is a re-bridging of the continuity of time. In war everything is possible. You think of Hitler's behavior during the war, and you know that 3000 years of civilization had just passed out of the picture

War may take as filling out some natural span of time. But war is something much more horrible; revolutions are something much more dangerous; they are moments in which the continuity of time is abandoned, in which we do not know when we live. The concentration camps and other horrors, you see, these are things whereof he boasted... they could have happened 3000 years ago in Nineveh.

War, then, is a break-down of chronology, and Peace is its restoration. The State Department's white pamphlet here is the attempt of natural reason to deal with events in a way in which our newspaper men deal with events - they always come too late ... or they come too early. As you know, this is the best-informed, most-surprised country. Not one event of the last forty years has been promised or expected or prophesied. All the men that kept us out of war, led us into it. The President of the United States had to make a speech on September 2nd, 1939, "there shall be no black-out of peace in America." Otherwise he wouldn't have been re-elected. It was not true. One of the features of this epoch is that people knew it was an epoch and were not allowed to say so. Franklin D. Roosevelt (to lead you somewhat deeper into this Korean picture) was a man who knew of seeds and fruits in politics. He knew, since he had been Assistant Secretary of the Navy in the first world war - that the first world war had not been finished. He knew that Marshall Foch had not dreamt and had not been a cynic when, in 1919, he said, "an armistice of twenty years". Those were words that the preachers did not allow the politicians to utter because the preachers had to preach Peace and Good-Will. It is a strange situation, when you think of the Kellogg Pact, that it was the pacifists of this country who disenabled the statesmen, emasculated the statesmen, to show the tragedy of the world.

Because the preachers said "by good-will we just can have peace - or we have it already" there never WAS a peace between 1919 and 1939 - this I assure you.

Lecture II - page 4.

I have lived it, after all, and paid the price of this insult and I was haunted by this fact since 1918. It was too difficult for a man who had been a soldier for four and a half years to know that the war had not ended, and at the same time to live amidst benign pacifists who pretended that only wicked men waged war.

The Church is, at this moment, in a bad way morally, because it has not prophesied. It was a statesman, Woodrow Wilson, who in 1923 in his last speech before he died, said to the young people who congratulated him on his birthday - that the next war would be more terrible, more expensive and more disastrous because people had never made peace. NEVER. This country has never made peace after 1918.

It has said, "the war didn't take place". It has never happened in the history of the human race that a great country, after prodigious effort and great success, went home and literally (despite the formula of a so-called peace with Germany,) said, "we don't have to make peace" - "we say, the war just never took place." Return to Normalcy!

So - I am building up the elements of an epoch-making event. I have rejected the notion that in the twenties the churches were right to say, "let us keep the peace", that they were blind when they didn't prophesy. They would just have had to read a little Isaiah to know better ... But they just read Amos about the social Gospel. You never must forget foreign policy!

Well, I found when I came to this country that nobody was taking Isaiah seriously. Everybody quoted Amos because of Social Security, I think. After all, Amos is only a small book. It is this singling out - this arbitrary singling out - of some prophet and the omitting of the great prophets and the lack of any continuity of prophecy in the church which has made it impossible for this country to realize epoch.

The liturgy of the year of the church, informally, proscribed the reading of all the great prophets through the year for this very reason - because the fulfillment of the prophecy is impossible if the congregation doesn't believe that these prophecies have foretold it. You cannot pick and choose among the prophets. Well, this lack of historical sense in the church, this idea that the church had only tomorrow to give good moral advice and that there was not historical prophecy - was, then, coupled with the impotency of our political leaders to tell the people the truth. Wilson prophesied. On his death-bed, he said: "The fundamentalists are right." - Woodrow Wilson was sent into the wilderness; he knew that the first world war had not ended. But when did the first world war begin? Did it begin in 1917? - I'm again trying to enlarge the time span in which this country was suddenly removed from its splendid isolation as a so-called Western Hemisphere (a very unfortunate expression - there is no such thing, I'm afraid, as a Western Hemisphere) Honduras, plus the United States, does not make a hemisphere... You understand what I mean. You can't add up - even not Brazil and Argentina and the United States: It will never make three Republics.

So, let's go back a little further. Before Woodrow Wilson realized negatively that the world hadn't found peace, one other great event had reached the American shore: the fact that the world had become ONE... in a political sense... that there was no longer any way of having a localized war, that peace and war had become indivisible. The epoch of which I am trying to convince you as having happened, as compelling you and your children to serve in armies against their will and to unite the churches against the denominations - and everything you have heard Mr. Morrison proclaim ... and these reactions of churches, of young

people, of families, of nations to the epoch consist in one simple content - in one simple element of this new event... What any event today has, world-wide consequences and implications. A strike in a Borate mine in France slows up the process of Uranium-Fission in the United States... and so on...

As a quorum of the workers of the world had known all this before - for then the Revolution, the epoch, the change consists in the fact - (I had talked in Silesia twenty-five years ago in my first work camp which we founded then for workers and students and farmers - I had talked with an unemployed miner and he said, "You can't help us, Doctor, that is all nonsense. Canada is at fault! We have a crisis - we have a depression over there, and so I don't have any work." - He knew that there were no national sovereignties anymore in this world, you see - that the production of the Canadian wheat belt is intimately connected with a family in India. We had to ship some wheat there, you'll remember.)

Now, since when is one world rigged? When did the national myth fail? The world came into existence for the first time as real, in the attack of the Japanese in Korea on the Russians. That was, so to speak, the antipodes - the opposite world from the world in which the political struggles of the Europeans had been fought so far, all these centuries before. Russians and Japanese met, as you know, at the same harbor of Chimulpo which is today called Inchon. In the February days, 1905, that is exactly now forty-seven years ago, by a sneak attack the Japanese there surprised the Russian fleet - that feat was then repeated at Pearl Harbor in 1941...

The importance of this Russia-Japan War was recognized by Theodore Roosevelt when he offered to arbitrate and there is a very great utterance to be remembered - by this man - a Christian utterance, an epochal utterance of the President of the United States. Because I have found that the epochal utterance of statesmen are suppressed quite often in their collected works; (one of the most wonderful speeches, for example, Woodrow Wilson ever made is not reprinted in his papers. I had to dig it out from some archive and in a similar way the editor of the letters of Theodore Roosevelt, Mr. Morrison, wrote me that he had never heard of this utterance; it is an authentic utterance and he agreed it was.) He said, when he offered to arbitrate between the Russians and the Japanese in 1905 - and that is the epochal utterance which made this arbitration into something which belongs to us and our situation... He said, "It is against the interest of the United States of America to arbitrate this peace. We should let the Russians and the Japanese bleed white." - "Because if there is a later conflict between us and them, they will be weak. That is not an argument, however, on which the President of the United States can base his actions. He always has to act as more than the President of the United States." Because the United States are a human agency - his move lies within an orbit of responsibility that far transcends the responsibility for the welfare of the United States - you may be deeply shocked by such an unpatriotic, nearly communistic opinion - and you may report it to Mr. Senator McCarthy, that the President of the United States was a Communist in 1905!

What is Communism? What is all this stuff? What is a World War? and What is a World Revolution? - if it doesn't mean just this: that everybody acting in his own home town, is doing something within an order of the world. For the first time this became clear in 1905 and I think that it is to the credit of this great Republic, that the only man (the first man) to move into this orbit has been Theodore Roosevelt. He was keen enough to sense it - to do it - to articulate it - to see the objections against it - and so say, "it can't be helped."

That is not idealism, but that is an historical step, moving into a new arena, into an epoch in which the President of the United States cannot help acting as a member of the United Nations. You may say that on that very day of his arbitration, he became the first member of a not-yet-existing world organization. Can you see what I mean? I would like to enlarge on this if this is ambiguous. I treasure, therefore, this whole story very much, because it is completely unknown. The reporters at Portsmouth didn't report it. They only reported how much money was to be paid for the surrender of Sakhaline Island or something. I think we have to be very careful to state, that we have in this great race, although the United States and myself certainly are inclined to be sprinters - have acted with some perseverance, Mr. Nolte. I think we all are born sprinters - at least I am. We are made much against our will, into long-distance runners ... and that is exactly what an epoch is. An epoch is the transformation of an event in the sprinter's field into a long-distance event - to the surprise of all the people concerned. And it takes two generations - the second ignoring the doings of the first, yet both drawn irresistibly, however, into the same pattern and on the same race-track, before people know what has happened. It is a terribly painful process, an epoch, because an epoch only can be experienced when a beginning is made twice. That is why we have the Apostles and the Church.

Christ went to the Cross - but before Paul and Peter had been executed in Rome, everything was still in abeyance. He could have been forgotten. He was unforgettable, only after sixty-six, after the Neronian persecution in Rome, after Rome had done the same that Jerusalem had done, after "The two witnesses" had died in Jerusalem in a striking parallel to Peter and Paul in Rome. Hegel has said, "every beginning must be started twice" - and that is the Gospel truth. The proclamation of the New Testament is just this: that you have the four Gospels and you have the Paulinian Letters. That is not an accident - that's why I try to tell you that the abolition of Paul is the abolition of Christianity. If you abolish the second beginning, you abolish the first beginning and Christianity cannot have made epoch. If you abolish the relation of Woodrow Wilson to F. D. Roosevelt, if you abolish the relation of the first Korean War to the second Korean War, if you abolish the relation of the first World War and the second World War, you cannot realize the inevitability, the God-willedness (so to speak) of this event. Because even with the utmost resistance of the naive, blind, one-generation men, it came about that the same steps had to be taken, more or less. There's Woodrow Wilson and there's F. D. Roosevelt; there's Ludendorff and there's Hitler; there is Sir Edward Grey and there is Neville Chamberlain - (Edward Grey in England) - there is DeGaulle ... it is very strange that all these things had to be repeated. If you want me to - if there is time - (perhaps tonight in the discussion) - I would like to enlarge on the exact processes in which this has been performed.

The eyes of French, then, see that an event can only get a hold of the human race if it is proven to the second generation that it has to follow suit. I give you a very telling example of a French school-boy who was asked to say what the first World War was, in the twenties ... when memory, you see, was at a discount and when people wanted to have two cars in every garage. The same was true in France: they couldn't have two cars in every garage, but they could have three novels - yellow-bound novels - in every boy's room. So he said, "La guerre, posent nos peres: The war - that's our fathers." Well, I think any American boy might have said that - and is very much inclined to think so. "When the war comes, I take to the back hills, because I am not responsible for this stuff. My old man did it."

Lecture II - page 7.

The epochs, then, consist as to content in the fact that even the national statesmen have to act as agents of one world. The form of an epoch which is today perhaps the same as in all days, consists in the surprise experienced by the younger generation that it is caught by the actions of a previous generation and that very much against its liking, its "old way of life" is changed long ago. The Old Testament, as you know, ends with the strange prophecy of Malachi that the world will be smitten by a curse unless the hearts of the parents are turned towards their children, and the hearts of the children are turned towards their parents. Now, an epoch is based on the fact that the hearts of the children are not turned toward the hearts of their parents. That is, before the Christian era and indeed in antiquity, the hearts of the parents were not turned towards the hearts of their children. Since Luke quoted this one-half of the prophecy of Malachi, that now the time had come when the hearts of the parents would be turned to the hearts of their children, something strange has happened: the other half of Malachi which is not quoted in the New Testament and therefore did not seem to be fulfilled, obviously, to the Evangelist, (the problem of how to turn the hearts of the children to their parents) today is the problem of world history. Modern mass leaders, with the progress of science, tell the child that he is far in advance of his parents' problems, and his parents' knowledge - his parents' situation - and his mother urges the kid on and says, "you can do better things than your dad" and so the mothers of America form one party with their children and ruin them; take them out of history. Because they tell the child that it can choose and do as it pleases, according to his own talent, and so on....

The epoch is this very inconvenient event by which it is shown that we still live in original sin and that the misdeeds, especially of the parents, still are visited on the children of the third and fourth generation. Before we haven't paid the penalty of the sins of our forefathers, we are not free. All this is very unpleasant doctrine - it is very old doctrine, but it seems to me it is possible, it is necessary to re-discover in our own days, under our own noses - it is just happening.

Europe is destroyed because the United States declared that the first World War did not happen. Do you think there would have been a second World War if the United States had had a hundred-thousand airplanes in 1937? Impossible! Three times has this country disarmed and three times it was called back to do its bidding. Or to take another form of this problem: Korea is not a country in which interesting battles are fought, as you well know - the incredible thing that has happened is that the country is completely destroyed. Nothing will grow there. There have been living there, I think, seventeen million people. Poorly, but quite peaceably, yet they won't be able to live there peaceably now for decades to come. The destruction by our bombs is appalling. This lack of foresight - the lack of seeing the epoch as already having happened - has exposed us to a criticism that has nothing to do with a book on the United States' policy in the Korean conflict, beginning in July 1950 because before we had no policy - so you can't publish anything about it. But the public scandal existed before July 1, 1950!

All these are spiritual gaps in our armor because they are not moral times - they all come from the idea that time is natural; that time is running and after an event has been announced in the papers, it has happened. I come back to my friend, Prince Metternich. If the news of V-Day had traveled slowly, perhaps we would now have peace in Germany and Italy. It may have traveled so fast that people said, "unconditional surrender is victory". The news, indeed, can travel too fast!

Lecture II - page 8.

You will know from my sermon, and you care to look into it, that this isn't so. An armistice or surrender has absolutely nothing to do with victory ... because any victory implies a statement by the victor of who he, himself, is going to be in the future. Victory is not had for one side only - the victor himself must declare himself about what he means by being victor. We didn't. So this destruction of Korea, to me I think, will seem to be preached about for the next hundred years, because there is a real innocent country: it isn't Fascist Italy, it isn't bomb-bet Germany, it isn't Communistic Russia, it isn't Imperialistic Japan - no cult of an Emperor involved - just a poor country! For the last forty years, the problem of uniting the world into one responsible field of action has made this little corner of the world (here are the antipodes, you see), this little country, the Cape of Bad Hope.

I would say that, instead of putting the United Nations into this palace on Lake Failure, we should go to Korea with the United Nations ... so that the United Nations, the office and Mr. Lee (Mr. Trigg Lee) would be over-run first next time. I'm quite serious that this lack of imagination of what has already happened, of the fact that the world was already one, of the fact that Theodore Roosevelt had already to act as a statesman for the United Nations against the interest of the particular nation of which he was President - that this for forty years could be fought tooth and nail because the ritual, the preconceptions of the experience of time had been completely gone out of our system, and why? Because of the news.

I told you last time, you will remember, that 1750, 1850 and 1950 people had just shiftlessly turned from naturalness about God to naturalness about nature, to naturalness about man, the beast. And it had led from religious cordiality to poetical lyricism and finally to speechless mania. We have lost speech, certainly, at this moment. We can't talk to each other. But time doesn't exist where it isn't. Called out. God's all-animating voice, voiced its creative power first by saying, "Now", and then saying, "Later"

If you have the new only, that which He has created before falls to the ground... and the news gets all the spot-light. If you get the ketternich attitude, of course, nothing new happens - the world consists only out of yesterday. But tomorrow and yesterday are ONE in His creation, and all our mass media completely failed ever to bind the new and the old. The future of Christianity, the Advent of the King, is always the reconciliation of the old and the new. The Good News is good because it is old and new too, at the same time. The difficulty of our faith, obviously, consists in this fact that everything the nature of man tries to do with an event is to isolate it and to say, "this is it" - "this is what". The problem of epochal living in our own life is very different: to place it within the context of what has happened. Everybody does it in his personal life and so I want to offer you as an end, as a consideration for this problem of being liable to act in the epochal stream of events a sentence by St. Augustine - it is from an uncompleted book written against Julian. "So it happens that the whole human race, in some strange way (we can say, "by the Grace of God" - for whenever a man says, "in some strange way" he means God,) - "so it happens that the whole human race, in some strange way represents two people - the first and the second Adam." - To live an epoch is always to become from a first Adam to the second Adam ... to be Christened again - to be re-born. The regenerative process of an epochal event consists just in this common suffering and common undergoing until the uncircumcised hearts of two generations have to admit that God has called into being and called out over our heads the new day. This makes out of two isolated generations (the old Adam) one man in two generations and that is the New Adam.

In 1918 and in 1945 the external event - the stopping of the blood-shed, of the shooting, made such an impression all over the world that the churches were inclined

to speak of the state of affairs as a state of Peace. That was not realistic - because we lived under the power of the Word and so may I transform the first sentence of St. John (I hope, without blasphemy, I mean it) - "A new beginning cannot be made without a new name."

It is not only that "in the beginning was the Word". You must also see that God can only make a new beginning with us if there is a new word spoken. This new word was not spoken, neither at Versailles where they compelled Germany to sign its name without saying anything ... that is not Peace... it is an armistice signing. The United States didn't say anything - they had an "observer" there, treating the whole thing as a burlesque show where the other people were allowed to undress and the "observer" looked on.

The craziness, or the paralysis, of the human mind in the last thirty years consists in such papers as LIFE, and Esquire and LIFE - where you photograph life! It cannot be photographed! It can only be said and it can be said only by people who stand under what they say - and say "This is my peace." And the people here in this country said, "There is no peace in Europe". They had gone to war. Was there any word spoken between victor and conquered? - So you got, for fifteen years, the historian's feeling of guilt complex - trying to vindicate the German cause. They went too far, in the opposite direction. The reason of why this whole guilt complex - why were the Germans guilty for the war - you must know here in St. Louis about this whole craze of fifteen years duration, this trying to convince the people of the United States that the Germans were not responsible for the first world war. It was a kind of insanity. I have watched the spectacle in Germany. I have always told my colleagues, "Please don't waste all your time. You are sick because there is no peace - because the reconciling word was not spoken." But you project it now into the past, you see, you want to now find the reason for the first moment of the war ... because you can't find a solution for the end of the war.

So a churchman, a clergyman, should be schooled - not in the theology but in the Laws of the Spirit, to know that where the new word hasn't been spoken, there is no Peace. And when the United States are observers, they have not entered anything. Let me put it dogmatically: Space is realized by the individual, by sub-dividing it. The universe which a baby sees in its cradle only becomes known to him as space by feeling the cradle as his, as against the whole room; or the universe of the park in which the perambulator stands. That is: space is realized by sub-dividing it. Time is realized in the opposite manner: by binding it... by your realizing the moment, individually. When you speak of World War - when you speak of World Peace - what is necessary is that you bring about an epoch, as I said, or a period or length of time in which you and others have a common purpose.

This common purpose after the first World War was not established - and yet people, not knowing that Peace was one of the most Divine things then much related, after all, to our Biblical thinking - our greatest tradition - they glibly spoke of Peace because no gun was fired. Everybody talks glibly about space and time - and then I ask people, "how do you experience space? how do you experience time?" - they think it is the same thing. NOT AT ALL! You experience time only, after you have said, "I have been sitting here for sixty minutes, listening to this lecture." Here - these sixty minutes - is your present in faith to me. These sixty minutes do not exist in reality - they are sixty single minutes when you make them into one act of faith ... by giving me this time. These sixty minutes, then, cease to be just sixty moments - or three thousand, six hundred moments, you see.

Lecture II - page 10.

Space is experienced in the opposite manner: We move into this hall to be separated from the other people, to be able to listen here. So - it is the whole philosophy of time which is completely lacking in the upbringing of our theologians.

If they have logical distinctions about God and the Trinity, they think they understand what Peace is. God would never have given Peace in the matter of the Trinity in this manner.

He who binds time, always outgrows the existing world of space. He creates the next space!

It has come up that every man is more than he is by title. Here are you: students at Eden Seminary ... but you are more! Every minute you can be more. The President of the United States discovered in 1905 that he happened to be a human being. That his going to church involved a responsibility that transcended the legality of his position.

Any doctor who decides what he has to do in an operation, whether this child, born as a mongol, is meant to live... he has to make such decisions. Every minute - things cannot be put into rules - but every one of us in any minute cannot say, "I - as a minister" - "I, as a doctor" - "I, as a lawyer" - "I, as a President of the United States" ... If the church has any power - the only thing the Church has to tell everyone is that he never is what, which the other people think he is!

And he who realises this, is set aside for stepping into an epoch, for upholding an epoch-making event. The epoch as an interruption of the mere flow of time has come to pass when he who has acted first in freedom from the old routines, is upheld by a next generation; though many may uphold him willy-nilly, still he has created a new epoch because their will surrenders. Hence 1905 to 1950 constitutes an epoch by which our world has become one.

Lecture III

Experienced Generations, 1811 - 1910

63

Father and Son in the Family of William James.

I was told by Mr. Harrison's statement that today we had to look for 'amoral' sin. The sin of the church and of the spiritual people has very little to do with morality, he said - it is something different. If you have followed the first two lectures with some sympathy, you will find that we are moving in the same direction from two different ends. It is the re-discovery of the trans-moral sphere of great powers, dominions and principalities of demons of which I have tried to speak and perhaps I say this, to invoke in you some commiseration because I think I have simplified these tremendous mysteries to such an extent that you even could think I made it difficult!

If you consider the task, then you will perhaps admit that it wasn't too difficult. If you, of course, deny that there is such a sphere in which between us and our creator intervene times and spirits of the times and the powers of the academic theology which is one of the demonic powers of our time, then you cannot understand why I should make it so difficult, if you don't see this. If you see it, you will see that I have made it rather simple. I shall try to go on this way by now comparing epoch and generation.

Both are mysteries and therefore they have been shunned by the theologians. As little as you find in any theological book anything about epoch - although it is flagrant that the Church rests on our power to experience epoch. So it is with generation which deals with the problem of the father and the son. But today it seems to me that people have forgotten that the notion of what the father is and the son is, is a revealed notion - and that the apes, which we call sons or fathers, we cannot be certain that they are sons or fathers. We are so naturalistic today, that everybody thinks he knows what a father ought to be and what a son. If you are a father, as I have the privilege to be, you begin to doubt that it is a given thing. It isn't. It has to be re-conquered, and this whole topic today of the generations is also a re-statement of the problem: Is it so simple to know that our Father is in Heaven ... or that His sons are on earth? But before changing, I wish to make it even more simple. It isn't only the simple question of father and son which I would like you to look at for a moment, but in bringing together epoch and generation you may see there is similarity and there is opposition.

The epoch means, as we said in our case, a period of forty years or more than one generation and it certainly means the coalescence, the getting-together in one direction of two unwilling generations who have to do the same thing and who cannot say, "The war - that's our parents" ... So, in the epoch you have two generations, and perhaps you have also in two generations the epoch ... Perhaps two generations, an epoch, are two aspects of the same great mystery of time revealed, time exalted, or men deified - because God is omniscient, God is provident, God knows the future and if there is any truth in the statement that goes through the whole Bible that we shall be His children, and that we shall be like God, and that we were created in the image of God - obviously one thing is needed: that the eyes which He put in our head can see; that the ears that He put in our head can hear ... and Paul ends, after all, the Acts with the simple statement that "we have eyes and don't see" - surely there must be some eye-opener to be available to man and I wish to re-state this with regard to the epoch, first, and then to the generation second, by very simple analogy.

Today people, even ministers, seem to believe that the question of reading a book consists in reading it once. Now that would fall under natural reading as I have tried to state natural living in the first lecture ... that is, you would do something and drop it. Most of you think that a book that you read once has been read. This is true of all un-necessary books. You can't read a detective story twice ... that is why it is a detective story. Fiction, great literature, Hamlet is understood only by the person who knows that Hamlet will die, in the end. What does this mean? He must have read Hamlet once before he can enjoy it. Let me, dogmatically - because we have no little wine, but I think it is a very practical application to our situation today - state, the normal level of book-reading is not on the level that is today accepted in this country by the standards of the magazine literature. The standard of normal reading is that a book must be read twice in order to know its value. You can't know the value of the Odyssey or the Iliad or of Dante's Divine Comedy by reading it once... because you must have reached the end before you can appreciate the beginning. That is exactly what I tried to tell you about the epoch. Some new time must have been begun before even the unwilling can be made to enter upon it: epoch!

The book that contains the key to all the epochs of history has, therefore, to be read always ... what is the Bible. I recommend to you as a very practical application for your Sunday-School teaching and for your dealing with libraries (which will make you very unpopular) this simple, new level of evaluation: the normal book must be read at least twice - and we call those books "classics". The subnormal book is the book that doesn't come up to standards and therefore is read tentatively, experimentally, once and then thrown away ... thirty-five cents and never again!

The real book is the book that can be read in any epoch of history - classical books are all epochal books, they belong to an epoch and the Bible belongs to all epochs; the fiction story belongs to no epoch ... and you are "on the run" while you are reading it, in the subway, on the bus. It is a hobby, an avocation; it is a pleasure, it is a luxury, it is an un-necessary book. No - that isn't a book in any deep sense of the word - or meaning of the word - that has to be read once.

Our youngsters are only fed the books they should not read ... and the church is leading in this. When I look at the Sunday-school literature I think it is just scandalous! (ardon me for bursting out. I have no influence in the matter - but why shouldn't you know what I feel?)

I look at it, you see, as a man who would prefer to be illiterate to this kind of literacy which we are spreading today in this country. What a high-school boy learns is that every book must be read once - if it is assigned! And this is, therefore, the most illiterate country I know. Because it is illiterate to assume books for something they were not meant to be used for - to be read once; and the selection of a good book consists in the question a father has to ask himself, "is it worth the money? Will the boy read the book twice?"

Now, this flight of the spirit is ineluctable ... this little, basic truth about books, Bible, classics, fiction, is just exactly your and my realization of any process in time. Jesus' way, and truth and life, consisted exactly (as distinct from normal man in this fact) that the past and the future are enlightened by His willingness to suffer and to sacrifice. And since He didn't expect from life anything but thorns, He was able to see the future and to make an epochal turn in history. The man who reads Hamlet or reads any great classical book, by undergoing

the process twice, is purified... is lifted up to an understanding of human pain and human sorrow and human heroism which he cannot get by going to a movie with a happy ending. The moral value of reading the classics is only based on this tremendous clarification which he experiences the second time. It has never been discussed by all the essays on the reading of books because they have no religious foundations in dealing with the spirit - but Shakespeare was inspired. There is no division between this spirit and Jesus' Spirit, and the divine spirit - this is spirit! But of course it isn't very fashionable in our churches to select the best artist - or have two artists compete - we prefer to lump all the artists, the great artists and the wrong artists, together and call it all ART - then it is secular or then it isn't spirit. I deny this division. Hamlet is not secular - Hamlet is inspired, Shakespeare is not - but the books which are written for the Saturday Evening Post certainly (\$75,000 Mr. Chambers got to prove that God exists.)

But you see by lumping together the classics, the inspired poets with the best sellers, we have done what Mr. Morrison accused us of - we have made the denomination of the hierarchy the owners of the Spirit of God, of the real Church. No, Shakespeare belongs with the real Church; Goethe belongs there, Milton belongs there, and Dante belongs there - but how can we afford this if we lump together these poets, these speakers, you see, with the cheap people whose books we throw away after having read them in shame? When we do this, we have absolutely no criterion, no standard to distinguish between a classic and another book, and this is why I think we may theologically, religiously, liturgically speaking - realize that it is high time that every good spirit is brought out onto our side. We need all the good spirits, whether in the visible denomination of yours or not. And therefore the Church has to preach now how to treat Hamlet and Shakespeare and can not leave this to the Departments of English. The laws of the Spirit are our concern. The Spirit of a true book is analogous to the Spirit of history of creation.

Otherwise you can't say the Bible must. There is genius, spirit and inspiration, and mandates and delegations of power from our Creator have to be honored wherever we find them - and when do we honor them? When we listen to them twice ... when they come back to us ... when they can make speech. Because then we march with our eyes open into the known, into the revealed. The meaning of Revelation is at stake and it is one for all inspired words.

Let me offer this as perhaps the best practical application of everything I have to say: Our whole "mental life" - there is no mental life - there is no mind, or if there is a mind it should be sacrificed as our will has to be sacrificed. What is called a mind in this country is a part of that very will which we have to give up in the prayer to our Father. The spirit is something quite different, that moves the poet to write his great work. It is not a mental, intellectual fabrication. He suffers, he receives, he is overcome just like any prophet. So my three lines between the Biblical, the classical and the fictitious are just re-statements of what I have tried to say all this time, that there are times approaches to time.

The believer believes in the unity of God's time and asks only "when?" The unbeliever lives blindly and exaggerates every possible moment into its worst and most ridiculous aspect; the middle ground is given by national life as we have experienced it in this country from 1902 - from 1905 to 1952 and as I have shared it in the last twenty years - that is under great suffering and great resistance, you see, with many refractory elements a whole nation (which is always better than

Lecture III - page 4.

just an individual) is dragged into the post or fulfillment of a new duty. "In this case, we act as an agent of the whole world... (you remember our last statement about Korea.)"

There are three levels, then, and the three levels on which we meet time... God's time, ~~the~~ living time. But now the aspect of the generation may make it easier for you to believe that this is a very beautiful life, a very sublime life - because the life of the generation is rhythmic. We call a generation thirty years. On my program I had it printed that this isn't quite so. The two people who embody a situation which at this moment will have to be reversed, in this country and all over Europe, the two men - Henry James, Senior and William James, the philosopher - cover a period, I would say, from the birth of William James (the son) to his death, 1842 to 1910.

One generation is reciprocal to another. Generation in isolation is un-understandable. The generations are the parties of one conversation. This is no exaggeration. The first thirty years of the father we cannot count in, because he was a child. But the childhood of William James cannot be left out because that was the maturity of his father and the years from 1882 to 1910 cannot be left out because, of course, this was the mature life of the son.

The whole problem today, however, is not to tell you anything about the philosophy of William James or the theology of Henry James, but only to show you that these two generations differ in their dealing with time from men like Woodrow Wilson and Roosevelt - that is, from people who had to live through an epoch without ever mentioning each other, without even being allowed to say they loved each other. There is a mystery in this relation of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt which came out very beautifully in one act in Roosevelt's life: On December 7th, 1941 something occurred ... and on the 8th of December there was, therefore, a united session of Congress. In all this terrible turmoil, in this surprise of a war suddenly on our hands against Japan, Italy and Germany, the President of the United States took time out to tell his wife, Mrs. Roosevelt, that she would have to invite Mrs. Wilson and take her to the Senate chamber for the session. That is a very touching, although it seems to you private, move. It was the only confession of Roosevelt that he was a second-generation man, that Wilson had seen this session of December 8, 1941 in 1923, and had died for this vision.

Now about, now, the James? They have lived this out ~~how~~ in the open. You can see here how two generations pose a question to each other - so that the life of one generation is not understandable without hearing it as a dust, sung in an Opera - where you also cannot only listen to the prima-donna, you have also to listen to the tenor. They both love each other and it isn't enough that he says, "I love you" - you want to hear "he loves me."

Generation has never been embodied, I think, here in America in such a spiritual manner as between these two men. Because they cover the whole nomenclature, the whole vocabulary, all thoughts, all contents of thinking in the whole realm of mental life in this country from 1842 to 1910. A physical father and a physical son leaves most of the intellectual battles to the schools today and to the books, and to the ball-sessions of his boy and to his fraternity and to his political party-life, and to his church, perhaps.

Not so with the James! You and I should, of course, in principle - teach our son the whole story. We shouldn't need any teachers, we shouldn't need any professors,

we shouldn't need any ministers. If a man really feels that he IS his generation, he should have it in his brain - not only to beget a man, but to implement him with spiritual power. It should make him potent in the spirit. We delight in this. Not so with the James. Henry James, Senior (whose life has been, I don't think very strikingly or very convincingly - but very completely - described in this new book by Frederick Howard Young: The Philosophy of Henry James, Senior; it came out last year and as I said, it isn't a very convincing book, but it gives you all the facts) - Henry James, Senior was, in the words of his own son, "a religious genius and prophet, if ever there was one." That's quite something from the boy. And William James has been called, "the prophet of the nation that is to be". And I, myself, have christened the Camp which I had to establish for the leadership training of the Civil Conservation Corps: Camp William James... that is why I feel a certain authorization, today, to speak after twenty years of William James with a feeling of some kinship.

William James stood for philosophy. He stood for a secular nation. He stood for psychology. He stands for pragmatism. He stands for his famous talks to teachers about the "second wind" ... getting up your second wind ... and he is also, I think, well known for his famous moral equivalent of war.

Henry James, Senior, stands for the last phase of the Protestant evolution, you may say, which redeemed in the middle ages the monastery, in the Reformation the household of the craftsman - the producing unit, in the Puritanical reformation the fellowship of like-minded, professional people in the 18th century reached the point where the married couple had to be made the carrier of the revelation. He was very much excited over the fact that the world was a marriage of God and man. He was a Swedenborgian (and in this sense I invite you to overlook all the absurdities of Swedenborg) in this one point of marriage, as the revealer of what sacrament of the church, he is incontestable. Swedenborg and Henry James as well as Luther was in preaching the Gospel around the father and the mother and the children in the home. Just as Luther has built up the family around the Father and his wife, so Swedenborg confined, perhaps - but also revealed all the secrets of divine relativity in the relation between man and his spouse. That's Biblical... just as Biblical as any doctrine of the Reformers; more Biblical, perhaps, than the monastic orders could boast. I only want to say that Henry James, Senior, is not an arbitrary man, is not a painter, is not a philosopher, is not a private thinker - but he represents a living translation of our whole faith into terms of married life. And he lived it in his home. He had his leg cut off when he was a boy of thirteen and he was a wealthy man and therefore he lived at home. He traveled much, however, all over Europe and in this country and even tho he was handicapped in this external sense, he had no profession to fulfill, he had no work to do, and he devoted himself therefore, to an upsurge of eloquence around the family table. You know the anecdote of the breakfast table. That was Oliver Wendell Holmes. He was, perhaps, not the subject of the breakfast table (Henry James) - but you may well quote him as a prophet of the breakfast table, and of the lunch table and of the dinner table ... and after dinner.

The children were deeply impressed. A famous story told how the boys, Henry James the novelist and William James were once mocked and teased by Bernard Shaw that after all this man, the philosopher; this man, the famous novelist weren't a very interesting. Far less interesting than you are no good. Your father is the only interesting man in the family" and of course this day (I won't scold him now - he is dead now, this man, Bernard Shaw) - this man was quite overwhelmed when both sons, unanimously, said, "That's wonderful! We are glad! You are the first man to recognize what a great man our father has been."

The father was told by the sons to be a greater man than they. Now, I am not wanting this grandeur but it is important with our problem of the generations that he impressed these boys as being so good. Now he only talked religion, he only talked prophecy, he only talked Christianity - and yet you see that neither of the two boys mentions this as part of their own beliefs at all. We can say of William James that the son felt emancipated since 1867 when he was twenty-five years of age, to go ahead and try, to become a natural scientist first, a psychologist second, a philosopher third - to try to write a system of philosophy in which God certainly wasn't going to be mentioned ... in which, then, the whole eloquence of the father was excluded. But was it? This I am asking you. These people lived each other; the father told the son, very depressedly, very negatively, in 1867, "Now you are going to Germany. I assure you that I can give you more than anybody in Germany in the learned circles." But the son didn't heed. The father again wrote, very emphatically, that the son was just childish by his letter in nature. This is a rather interesting project: "Your superstition is nature - that is to say you, as a man of science, admit that everything you have observed by any sense is just relative to everything else." But he is not disconcerted by this fact which would confuse any sound thinker, because he holds instinctively to an absolute substance in which all these things in here - this substance being called nature."

Then he goes on and says, "You believe in some universal quality called nature, not merely the mother, or the specific objects of sense to be their matrix, but also the father of them." Now, that is very important - because here he gives away already in an early period of American history the psychoanalytical problem that a son tries to escape from his father's authority by calling it all nature. To call things "nature" means to get rid of the personal stamp of creation put on them. Nature is a way of not saying "creation". "Nature" is a way of dealing with the universe not as God's creation, but as being there and having its own cohesion outside the creative world which determines the hour in which this thing has to be created. You see, nature again is the world of creation without time. It is indifferent to time, and the father James knew this. And here this great preacher, you can say this last generation of preachers embodied in one man here, coming to a head, stands for all the fathers of all the secularized college professors of this country. For all the run-away ministers who now teach philosophy in our colleges. He is the father who still goes on and that has been repeated for a hundred and fifty years in American history and therefore Henry James, Senior is such a very important figure. Because in him this is all coming to a tremendous, visible impersonation. He stands for all the fathers who have trembled that their sons by going natural, by going scientific, will lose their faith.

And this out-baby (you go to Germany and really I know better than anybody there) is a very painful statement, as you can see. From 1867 to 1882 William James did not listen. William James became, in those fifteen years, an agnostic, a pluralist pragmatist, whatever you like. What is this, then? A genius, not under the authority of his father. And here we are discovering the two terms to which I would like to lead you today: to discover that you cannot know what a father is if you do not understand what authority is ... you cannot understand what a son is, if you do not understand what genius is.

Every man passes through two generations, genius and authority. Because if a man has any good (all our children are geniuses until we put them to school) - he has something in his loins and in his body and in his heart, and if the mind is not too smart and not too wicked, then it will come out of this body - it will incarnate in some creative work. Of course you can't see it now because we have IQs, and IQ geniuses. Genius has nothing to do with an IQ - I can tell you this.

Lecture III - page 7.

In a terrible, terrible country. When you hear the 105th instead of 100th you hear him give an instruction, you say he is arrogant. Our potency, our creativity, as a human being, our manhood, our virility. Henry James is never tiring of mentioning this word: manhood and virility. Genius and power is the world not from the brain. The brain puts on the brakes. The brain is clever to avoid pitfalls and tells you, "you mustn't say that" - but genius and your whole body wants to say it and the mind sometimes finds a way out. How to say it ... if I would think with my brain, I would certainly be the public danger. All thieves are tremendous brain workers.

The point is that, really, God has created man as His son and insofar as we are His sons we are creative, and insofar as we are creative we deserve the term genius. But genius alone is not enough. Genius is not yet a son. And authority is not enough. Authority is not yet a father. We are told that in 1857 Henry James, Senior went into mourning. He gave up and he went on to visit London to his son in Europe and to love him... but he knew that authority had failed. His fatherhood had found its limit where it shouldn't find its end - because if a father cannot convey and arouse and evoke in his son a living faith, the heart of his fatherhood is frustrated.

That's the only reason why you have the right to bring up your children in your own faith, in the Church ... because it is part of our mandate as fathers. We are not fathers by begetting them physically at all, we are only fathers by making them heirs of our fatherhood and that happens only when our authority is recognised in this field by them. Of course the nets have obliterated all these truths, but even the Quakers have borne Quakers. They aren't born, they are made by their parents. And they should be made ... But here you have the tragedy that in the 19th century this conveyance breaks down and the parents of the last hundred years have all followed the honorable behaviour of Henry James, Senior - not to break off, not to give up loving their children although they changed their religion. because we say, politely, they love their faith, but they have a faith. They have idols: they love sports, they believe in science, that is idolatry. Secularism is not non-religion - it is just a poor religion, a faith in false gods, a lower form of religion.

This tragedy is enacted in every modern home and therefore I think Henry James and William James are very important people. Because what has been the answer of William James? He wrote, when his father died, to his wife who never enters the scene otherwise - and who has acted like a saint in this whole thing, as also the wife of Henry James, Senior ... The two of them, Henry James and his wife and William James and his wife, then represent men in every one generation. When we speak of epoch, we could forget the women. I told you that a generation is only a wider or more profound aspect of epoch. When we speak of generations, never underestimate the power of a woman! - That's very important because in the problem of generations, the Church which talks to be so abstract about church membership reaches ground bottom and knows that the pendent man consists of a woman and a man, and that without the rib that is lacking in our constitution, we are not able to live the good life. The bride and the bride-groom, the man and the woman, then, are represented in this letter which I am going to read to you, in two generations:

William James whispers, so to speak, to his wife, "You have now one new function here after, rather not so much a new function as a new intellectualization of an old one. You must not leave me till I understand a little more of the value and the meaning of religion in father's home in the mental life and destiny of man."

Lesson 122 - page 9.

It seems to me that this is the deepest secret of the generation. You will always find that the genius of the son must be in the discovery of new things - and that the authority of the father will always consist in the upholding of the revealed truth. You will always find that both are right; that there is an opening gate between the two in what these two people have achieved by correspondence and in their correspondence.

We speak very much of failing - we speak of the "war" and "peace". I am very often doubtful of these expressions and not too ineffective, really. If you would begin to see that the word, "correspondence" is a Christian term, and invite it to play a part in your thinking about the Holy Spirit, you would see that the inspiration of the individual genius, at the communion of church authority, can be happily blended, in any situation - family or wherever - by this insight that an exchange of the two statements already involves a surrender of authority and transformation of genius into son-hood.

What is a genius who becomes a son - and what is a father who allows himself to remain a genius? I think these formulations are not without some wide bearing on all the problems of our time. Every man in his youth is genius, creative - if he even only is once proposed to. Every man, as an older man, wants to have some authority ... you, in your pulpit. The reconciliation, obviously, between Son and Father for which Jesus came into the world to fulfill the prophecy of Malachi at the end of the whole Old Testament was that children learn to see behind authority - that the authority of their parents stems from the fact that they have been confused in their youth ... and that fathers only see that the genius of their children one day will be in authority.

That is, authority and genius are two aspects of the same life process. If a father has just authority, quoting Scripture or quoting the law, he is not a Father. A father is a man behind whose authority the son can sense the creative genius of love, of the first generation of his father's life. That is why we have marriage and honeymoon, so that even the son is allowed to know something of the passionate life the father has led before he is a father. It is more difficult, perhaps, for the father to see that his son must one day be in authority. But he can then see what of the bubble of the unorientating state of late youth in the son, is needed, so that the son one day may be in authority; and what is just impudence, mindlessness ... and you will find that it is both very much connected with shame.

The whole problem really in modern psychology and in other fields of human conduct is to find the fructful place for shame, for embarrassment. People always want to save people embarrassment, but certainly it cannot lead to insight. The genius who is just impatient will never acquire authority. The authority that is just brash and loud has lost its connection with its own point - with its own growing point - with the travails of its once having been himself genius.... That is struggle, that is son.

And so, because the words son and father have been talked about so much, I want to introduce these two words: genius and authority, to show the limitations - the limiting concept of father behind authority, of son behind genius.

Every one of us, as an older man, needs some power. Every one of us, as a young man, needs some growth. The generations cooperate and generations correspond when the young man is able to see the authority of his father still trembling, and still in its creative stage in which it was made, and when the old man can

