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. Then 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! I say I compare with this a story which I could have picked up daily twice, out of my newspaper - a letter to the editor of the newspaper - a kind of "Daily Post" letter:

"Dear Mr. Horse: I was married when I was sixteen. My husband was four years older than I. We soon out-grew each other and each found someone better suited. Moreover, 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. Over, because of the children's 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 my 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 resoned 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." He didn't like it at all. Isn't that strange, that when it comes to time-binding, as it has been called by Osipsky, 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 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 unwillling or unprepared to listen to this. But what I will try first to do today
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is to shew you the incredible abyss into which we all, including all the theologians, have allowed time to disappear. "That is called time today is the corpse of time. It isn't time as God created it, and as all generations of men from 100 thought time was something living, something working, something organic, something it could stand up under the eye of eternity, and be one of its elements - an element of the cosmos. 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 'Einstein,' shall try to build up the real time as God created it for us. So that in us and we can understand that the liturgy of our church has always tried to remind people and to make them experience real time. We will make 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 fulness. 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-erected, 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 to have, therefore, this rather sober, rational reason and scientific task before us to connect the elements - the time elements which are called epoch and generation and era. 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, myself, I 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 Trinitatis 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
I really feel that the Liturgy in our Evangelical and Reformed Churches is today, so to speak, "allowed." 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 17th Century with the enlightenment - when the life of Jesus was taken out of context and the Master's relation to His 'disciples' was suddenly scrutinized and people began to say that they had misunderstood Him. You can see 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 ad you can imagine my amazement. The great-granddaughter of Trevelyan - the nephew of Macaulay, 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 Vanishing West. She wrote a book about it. "She, too, is very interesting." Young - Trevelyan, she was received in the house of the Governor-General of Canada and the man said 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, by and large, permissible and has been permissible for a hundred and fifty years since the Tubingen 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) - "an has not only moorings in his past, but also in his future,) - and by cutting the moorings of Jesus from the future which His generation, we made it impossible for modem 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 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 to mention the name of Jesus... and to preach the same Gospel, just the same... a hard thing to do.

This is 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 incoherence, the incapacity of seeing that that 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 out up when you go and are buried, or when I come and am born. That isn't time."
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So I decided to force something upon you which you don't want to do, I know very well, to see the unity of God's time, the time that flows from year to year and century to century — as the time in politics from election to war, in political and scientific progress, 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 archaeology ... 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 hasn't ruined it. It is all very simple, you 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 arc (how should I express it?) yardsticks of time to ourselves ... that your and my life runs, from birth to death and that it begins when I am born, what it ends than I die and as the man of the famous dictionary, Ambrose Pearson, 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 you out of God's time. That is dead time. "Yes, this is exactly what has been done."

First in religion in 1750, or in theology — then in 1800 in philosophy, and finally today in sociology. The three natures of man which have deprived man of his Godliness and his Bod-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 Zinsendorff — the Moravian brother. They were vital people, Jonathan Edwards or Gilbert Tennent — 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 Zinsendorff has expressed it, with "naturalness." That is, they wanted to have natural lips and I think it is that in the revival they ventured to loud 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 neither you take Pietism or whether you take Zinsendorff, 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
consequences would be — but they wanted to institute, institute a natural relation to their God and they succeeded. In the last of the last years we still have, those we still have, those days. They have revived them, 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 that 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 Billy Budd. 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. Cordill myerson was the man of the day (in 1850) — and obviously with his nature meant something quite different. This 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 then the sun sets. This 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.

Yet in this year 1850 — 51 — 52, something very terrible happened. He had one great soul in this country who did not fall for the Hermsonian 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 forsook and had to be thrown out of the window — that the language could not possibly be the “Hermsonian poetry.” Not the Hermsonian 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 quotions 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 Billy Budd it's all the wrestling about God's time; when to do, when to act, how to save yourself in this limited period on earth. It is still a great story of revealed time. Billy Budd 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 “Moby” and it is the first psycho-analytical book of the pure brand of psycho-analysis. A man who is in love with his sister 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.
(implying, by the author of *Why Not*):—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 new 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. You, you can always say, "Well, that 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. He date: we say when and we say now—we say 1750, we say 1850, we say 1950 in order to save our souls. You underrate this; there have not 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 fell 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 has 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 being 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 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—no 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 time, 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 telling here to the Jesuit fathers and even they felt that they couldn't toll 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 ... what 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 went to re-conquer the Christian era in our own life and consciousness by seeing that obviously the points on this line: 1750, 1850 and 1950, existed and shall exist
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After all those heresies and aberrations, those extravaganacies 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 upon our own to 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 improvisation that 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 very first say, says the conservative, scholastic, reactionary) — it says, "Gratia naturae non tollit sed plenescit." I would like to translate, "Grace does not destroy nature — but lifts it up." Instead I would like to propose as the fruit of those considerations here, some understanding of this, that we might better say in the future, "Tempus gratia non tollitus 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. "Then 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 "time in every man's heart." So may I say once more, "Tempus gratia non tollitus sed plenescit." "With the help of Grace, time comes into its fulness." Grace, then, enters time. Nature destroys time.

So, you will see how I have avoided the term nature — and the term super-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 man, whenever you are seriously speaking of men, because when we speak of men at all, it is 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 "Brotherhood" (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, supplementary 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 quarrel with 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".
A creature is something that the Lord is in process of creating. Nature is something that is 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 Rakah, 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 eighty 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
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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 Mohamad 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 Bethlehem - 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 Edahma.

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 man. 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-illumianted.

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? ......
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."

So, 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 bound up, obviously, with the question of timing. The great two sins, the only sins, I think, that one can recognise 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 WHAT they do those 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 1850, 1860 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... lair—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.
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So, perhaps I come nearer to my problem of the aroma 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 men?

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, "all, 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 era 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 exhalation 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.
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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 nation 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 that an epoch is an event that 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 forty-seven years after the Lord had died; they wouldn't believe him. He said it not too early; he said it right. 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 worse 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 predicted 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 lead 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 1959 — this I assure you.
I had lived it all after all, and paid the price of this insult and I was haunted by this fact since 1919. It was too diffcult 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 benighted 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 1921 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.

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! ... 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, unfortunately, prescribed 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 what those 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 impotence 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? When 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 Brasil and Argentina and the United States. It will never make three Republics.

So, let's go back a little further. Before Woodrow Wilson realized ... nothing that the world had not found peace, one other great event had reached America more; 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 armed against their will and to unite the churches against the denominations - and everything you have heard Mr. Harrison proclaim ... those reactions of churches, of young
people, or families, or nations to the world context in one simple content — in the simple elements of that new event, the industrial revolution and world economic consequences and implications. A strike in a Bonne mine in France slows up the record of Uranium-Pine in the United States... and so on...

is a product of the workers of the world had known all this before — for then the revolution, the epoch, the change existed in the fact — (I had talked in Site in twenties-five years ago in my farm work camp which I 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 can't have any work." — To know 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 then 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. This was, to speak, the antipodes — the opposite world from the world in which the political struggles of the Europeans had been fought for, all these centuries before. Russian and Japanese met, as you knew, at the same harbor of Chinsilp which is today called Inchon. In the February days, 1905, that is exactly nor forty-seven years ago, by a small attack the Japanese there surprised the Russian fleet — that fleet was then repeated at Port Harbor in 1917...

The importance of the Russo-Japanese 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, Theodore 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. Harriman, wrote me that he had never heard of this utterance; it is an authoritative 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, he should let the Russians and the Japanese bleed white." "Because if there is a lot — profit between us and then, they will be weak. That is not an argument, however, on which the President of the United States and save his actions. He always had to act as more than the President of the United States." Because the United States are a human agency — his move lies within the order of responsibility that far transcends the responsibility for the welfare of the United States — you may be deeply shocked by such an unpatriotic nearly communist opinion — and you may report it to... Senator McCarthy, that the President of the United States was a Communist in 1905.

What is commun... What is all this race? What is a World War? And what is a World Revolution? — if it doesn't mean just this: that everybody living in his own home town, is doing something within an order of the world. For the first time the States 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 man enough to come up — to do it — to articulate it — to see the objections against it — and do say, "It can't be helped!"
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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 non-yet-existing world organization. Can you see what I mean? I would like to emphasize 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 Sakhalin 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, Dr. Solte. I think we all are true sprinters - at least I am. We are mad much against our will, into long-distance runners ... and that is exactly what an epoch is. A 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 unrememberable, only after sixty-six, after the Roman persecution in Rome, after Rome had done the same that Jerusalem had done, after "the two witnesses" had died in Jerusalem in a writing parallel to Peter and Paul in Rome. Hegel had 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 - what 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 native, blind, one-generation men, it came about that the same steps had to be taken, more or less. Here is Woodrow Wilson and there is 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 De Gaulle ... 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 faith, 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 out. 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, c'est nos pères: 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 goes, I take to the back riots, because I am not responsible for this stuff. My old man did it."
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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 very strange to us as in all ages, consists in the surprise experienced by the younger generation that it is caught by the actions of a previous generation. The Old Testament, as you know, ends with the strange prophecy of Nahashi 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. For, an epoch is based on the fact that the hearts of the children are not turned towards 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 Nahashi quoted this one-half of the prophecy of Nahashi, 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 Nahashi 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.

The epoch is this very inconvenient event by which it is clear 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, 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 1939? 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, peacefully, but quite peaceably, yet they won’t be able to live there peaceably nor 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 Hattennich. If the news of V-Ely had traveled slowly, perhaps we would now have peace in Germany and Italy. It may have traveled so fast, so fast that people said, “unconditional surrender is victory”. The news, indeed, can travel too fast!
You will know from my sermon, ... you care to look into it, that this isn't so. An
optimist or optimist has absolutely nothing to do with victory ... because my
theory implies a statement by the victor of who he himself is going to be in
the future. Victory is not for one side only - the victor himself must declare
... all about him as means by being victor, so can't do this destruction of
(Korea), so as I think, will seem to be preached about for the next hundred years.
I'm not sure there is a real innocent country; it isn't Fascist Italy, it isn't back-
out Germany, it isn't Communist Russia, it isn't Imperialistic Japan - no cult
of an ignorant 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 anti-heroes, you see), this little country,
the land of Fred Hoyle.

I would say that, instead of putting the United Nations into this palace on Lake
Fulmer, we should go to Korea with the United Nations ... so that the United
Nations, the office and Mr. Lee (Mr. Trigve 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 experiences of
this 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
suddenly turned from naturalness about God to naturalness about man, to
naturalness about man, the beast. And it had led from religious certainty to
practical lyricism and finally to anaemic man. We have lost speech, certainly,
not at this moment. he can't talk to each other. But the time doesn't exist where it isn't.
called our God's all-animating voice, voiced its creative power first by saying,
"Ich", and then saying, "Laos" ....

If you have the news only, that which he has created before falls to the ground...
and the news gets all the spotlight. If you get the letterman's attitude, of
course, nothing new happens - the world consists only out of yesterday. But
yesterday and yesterday are GOD in His creation, and all our mass media completely
failed ever to want the next and the new to the old. The future of Christianity, of
the Advent of the King, is always the reconciliation of the old and the new. The
God news is good because it the old and now too, at the same time. The difference
of our faith, obviously, consists in that fact that everything the nature of man
wants to do with an event is to isolate it and to say, "this is it" - "this is
only". 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
able 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 ways 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 heart united hearts of two generations have to admit that God has called into
being, our, called us 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 1910 and in 1945 the external event - the stepping of the blood-shot, of the
shooting, made such an imposition all over the world that the churches were incline
The uselessness of the state of affairs as a status 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 can not be made without a new name.

It is not only that "In the beginning was the Word." You must also see there of a Word can only make a new beginning with us if there is a new Word spoken.

As the 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 unjustice coming. The United States didn't say anything -- they had an "observer" there;

Making the whole thing as a burlesque show where the other people were allowed to undress and the "observer" looks on.

The uselessness, or the paralysis, of the human mind in the last thirty years consists in such phrases as "space," and "time," and "observers" -- 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 conqueror? So you got, for fifteen years, the historian's feeling of guilt complex -- trying to vindicate the German cause. They want too far, in the opposite direction. The reason of why this whole guilt complex -- they were the German guilty for the war -- you must know have in St. Louis about this whole era of fifteen years duration, this trying to convince the people of the United States that the German 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 clergymen, should be trained -- 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 Peace -- 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 that man related, after all, to our Biblical thinking -- our greatest tradition -- they glibly spoke of Peace because no gun was fired. Everybody talks glibly about peace and time -- and then I ask people, "How do you experience peace? 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 -- those sixty minutes -- is your presence in faith to me. These sixty minutes do not exist in reality -- they are sixty single minutes when you make them into one set of faith... by giving me that time. These sixty minutes, then, cease to be just sixty moments -- or three thousand, six hundred moments, you see.
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Since it 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 this which is completely lacking in the upbringing of our theologians.

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

He who today always outgrows the existing world of space. He creates the next space.

It has come up that every man do more than he is by title. Here are your students at Den Seminary ... but you are more! Every minute you can be more. The President of the United States discovered in 1905 what 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 the other people think he is!

And he who realizes this, is not liable 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 new 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.
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Father and Son in the Family of William James.

"... as told by Mr. Morrison's account, that today we had to look for 'general' con-
sciousness of the church and of the spiritual type has very little to do with
morality," he said — it is something different. If you have followed the first few
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-carnal sphere of great
powers, dominions, and principalities of which I have tried to speak and
perhaps I say this to invoke in you some consideration because I think I have
simplified these tremendous mysteries to such an extent that you even think it
must be 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 time and the 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.

Epoch are mysteries and therefore they have been annually by the theologians. As
little as you find in any theological book anything about epoch — although it is
implied that the Church rests on our power to experience epoch. So it is with
morality 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 age, 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 use the 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-considered, and this whole today of the
epochs is also a re-awakening of the problem: It is so simple to know
that our future in Heaven... but what are the ages? 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 last lecture, a period of forty years or more than one
generation and it certainly means the coalescence, the getting-together in one
direction of two opposing generations who have to do the same thing and who
cannot say, "No war — that's our parents"... So, in the epoch you have two
generations, and perhaps you have also in two generations the epoch... Perhaps
the generations, an epoch, are two aspects of the same great mystery of time.
Webs, time, emptied, or even shifted — 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 note 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-echo this with regard to the epoch, first,
and then to the generation second, by very simple analogy.
The Book that Contains the Key to All the Epochs of History... therefore, to be read always... what to the Bible? I recommend to you as a very practical application for your Sunday-School teaching and for your dealing with literature (which will make you very enjoyable) this simple and level of evaluation: Any normal book must be read at least twice - and we call those books “classics”. The standard book is the book that doesn’t come up to standards and therefore is read intermittently, experimentally, once and then thrown away... thirty-five cents and never again!

The real book is the book that can be read in any work of history - classics. Books are all specialized books, they belong to an epoch and the Bible belongs to all time. The fiction story belongs to no epoch... and you are “on the run” while you are reading it, in the outlay, on the run. It is a hobby, an evocation; it is a pleasure, it is a novelty; it is an unnecessary 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 young people are only fed the books they should not read... and the church is looking in vain. When I look at the Sunday-school literature I think it is just monstrous! (length as for bullying one... I have no influence in the matter - but I shouldn’t live when I do.)

I look at it... you see, as a man who would prefer to be literate to this kind of literature when we are speaking today in this country. When a high-school boy learns in that every book must be read once - if it is assigned. And this is, therefore, the next intelligent country I know. Because it is illiterate to ask 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, when people set to the game of education... this means, basic truth comes first, basic truth alone comes first, contains, describes, describes the future and truth and life, consisted exactly as distinct from selfish men in this fact that the past and the future are enlightened by his willingness to suffer and to sacrifice. And since it didn’t expect that for anything the church, he was able to see the future and to make an eye an eye for an eye in history. The man who reads classics or reads any great classical book, by understanding...
But you see by lumping together the classics, the inspired poets with the best talent, we have done what sh. Alexander8 accused us of -- we have made the denominating of the hierarchy the owners of the spirit of God, of the real Church. No, Shakespeare belongs with the real Church; 'Genesis belongs there, Milton belongs there, and Dante belongs there -- but how can we afford to do such together these poets, these speakers, you say, with the cheap people whose books we throw every other having read them in school? 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 thevisible denomination of yours or not, and therefore the Church has to preach now how to treat Hamlet and Shakespeare and cannot be left to the Departments of English. The Lord of the Spirit is our concern. The Spirit of a true book is analogous to the Spirit of history of creation.

Colonizes you can't say the Bible only. There is genius, spirit and inspiration, and maximum 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 eyes ... because then we march with our eyes open into the known, into the revealed. The meaning of Revelation is no longer; and it is one for all inspired words.

But do 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. This 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 fabricate. If 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-statement of that I have tried to say all this time, that there are times of resistance to time.

The believer believes in the unity of God's time and asks only "then." 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
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This is one generation that has merged into the past as fully as any other. In the face of it, or as an object of the whole lesson... (You repeat our last

We shall listen. And the third lesson on which to meet you... Good day.

The third lesson. But not the subject of the generation my mind is called for you to discuss this is a very beautiful line, a very simple line - because the

life-generation is not to discuss the third generation thirty years. In my

province, I have seen that the third is coming so. Even the people who study a

situation which at this moment will have to be reversed, in this country and the

current change, the two who - Henry James, London and William James, the generation -

over a period. I would say, from the birth of William James (the son) to his death

1843 to 1906.

One generation is responsible to another. Generation in succession is unanswerable.
The generations are the products of one conclusion. And as he said, for,

The first thirty years of the father to discern comes in, because he was a child.

The second thirty of the time cannot be left out because that was the maturity

of the father and the years from 1843 to 1860 cannot be left out because, of course,

this was the picture life of the son.

The third generation, however, we have to tell you anything about the philosophy

of the son, or the brother of Henry James, but only to show you these

two generations differ in their dealing with them from men like Howard Vincent and

Maxwell. And this is, from people who had to live through an epoch without ever

accomplishing anything, without ever being allowed to say they loved something.

There is a mystery in the relation of Howard Vincent and Franklin D. Roosevelt which

was not very beautiful. In his own movie life! In December 7th, 1938

witnessing burned... and on the 6th of January there was, therefore, a united

sensation of Congress in the vast columns turning, in this figure of oratory,

a witness in our hands against Japan, they will in Germany, the President to the United

States that does, we owe to our envoys, to our embassies, to our ambassador.

But the United States, and this is the second chapter of the session. This is a

very touching, although it seems to you part of now. It was the only opposition of

Roosevelt under which he has a three-generation man. With Wilson had been some time

the session of December 8, 1939. This was the idea for this verse.

How short, now, the years? They have lived on the law. You can

see here how the generations pose a question to another - so that the idea of

one generation is not understood, without knowing it as a past, long in an

epoch. Whereas you also cannot only listen to the years-change, you have also to

listen to the change. They have grown and it isn't enough that he says,

"I love you" - you want to hear "he loves me."

Generation has never been divided. I think, here in America in such a spiritual

manner as between the two, because they cover the whole vocabulary, the

whole vocabulary, all thought, all question of viewing in the whole scope of

mental life. In this country from 1843 to 1938. A spiritual father and a spiritual

son leaves not the intellectual heritage to the student today and to the book,

can be the test-conditions of his boy and to his fraternity and to his political,

party-life, and to his church, perhaps.

Not as you, to Daniel. You and I should, of course, in principle - reach our own

the whole story. We shouldn't need any teacher, we shouldn't need any professor,
We cannot tell any platitudes. It is too cold a fact that he is his government's servant now as it was before - but they've been at it for a long time, and so it is not surprising that he is a "political" man or that he is a "political" man. The political facts are not the point. The point is that there was a very considerable body, but it gave you all the facts. - Harry James, Senior. You see, in the words of the Civil Service, "a religious genius..." and now, if ever there was one, this is quite something from the boy.

Within a century has been called, "The project of the nation that is to be". And, I agree, have considered the game which I had to establish for the leadership training of the Civil Conservation Corps. Henry James... that is why I feel a certain embarrassment, today, to speak after twenty years of William James with a feeling of some humility.

Harry James, Senior, takes the fine piece of the Protestant revelation, you may say, which preceded the Middle Ages, and so the Protestant he roused the ranks of the organization. He is the Protestant one, in the Protestant restoration the followers of life-improving, professional people in the 18th century realized the point where the principle of labor had to be made the center of the revelations. He was very much excited over the fact that the world was a marriage of God and man. He was a Slavophile, and in this sense I imagine you to overlook all the absurdities of Slavophiles. In this one point of marriage, as the revelator of the sacraments of the church, he is much attacking, Slavophile and Harry James as both of family was in preaching the gospel around the father and the mother and the children in the house. Just as culture has built up the family around the house and the family, so Slavophile continued, perhaps - but also revealed all the horrors of divine separation in the relation between man and his spouse. That's Slavophile. Just as Polish as any cowman of the ascetists; more Biblical, perhaps, than the ascetist orders could boast. I only want to say that Henry James, Senior, as an ordinary man, is not a writer, is not a philosopher, is not a private citizen, but he represents a living understanding of the inner side and terms of man's life and of God's life. As Henry James, Senior, places himself on the inner side of the family, and this is the history of the family, you know the structure of the breakfast table, that is Silver Minutes. He was, perhaps, not the periphery of the breakfast table (Henry James) - but you may well quote him as a member of the breakfast table, and of the dinner table and of the inner table and of the inner family... and after family.

The children were always impressed. A famous story tells how the boys, Henry James, the novelist, and William James were once invited to breakfast by Bernard Shaw - after all, he was the philosopher. This man, the famous novelist, wasn't a very imaginative. Mr. Shaw gave no idea that there was a very interesting man in the family. And of course this day (I won't recall now) - he is dead now; that man, Bernard Shaw - this man was quite overshadowed then both being, simultaneously, both that's wonderful. He was great. You are the first man to recognize what a good man our fellow has been.
The famous botanist, the man to be a great man, then they said, I am not writing this plantation, but I am important that our problem of the generation is to be understood from the boys as being as it is. Not as only a naturalization, but a plantation. A plantation study, a philosophical study - to try to create a system of philosophy as many of certainly will going to be interested. In which, that the whole grammar of the plant was extended. But the better this I am saying you these things are nothing. The test told the story very depressed, very interesting, in 1867, "when are you going to Germany. I assure you that I am very much interested. I am going with anything in Germany, in the learned circles." But the rest of the book has its beauty, its beauty if you always, you always have the feel of the man that is interested by the poet in another. This is a rather interesting point: "Your appreciation of nature - that is to say, as a man of science, make that everything you have observed by any sense is just relative to everything else." But on this cannot be supported by this fact, which would confuse any sound thinker, because it leads inextricably to an absolute substance in which all these things in life - time, substance being called nature."

That he gave and says, "You belong to an entire quality, called nature, too many by the nature of the External objects of some to be their natural, but the rest of them or men. But that is very important - because here is your nature. In the early period, during the years, the psychological problem was a set time to escape from his father's authority by calling to tell. This thing 'nature' needs to get rid of the natural stamp of creation you or it. Nature is a way of not saying 'creation'. "Nature" is a way of dealing with the external not as God's creation, but as being there and having its own connection outside the creative world which determines the how in which the thing has to be created. You now, thinking again in the world of creation without those laws to understand to grow, and the natural laws make this. And have made great progress, you can say that the construction of nature are organized or we can have, coming to a head, outside of the factors of all the constitutional setting. Presidents of the country. For all the run-away ministers who now reach philosophically for a light."

But in the rest of the book, it is the father who still goes on and that has been repeated, for a hundred and fifty years. In American history and therefore Harry Dance, Senator is good a very important figure. Because in him this is all coming to a tremendous. You can understand, the others are the leaders that have themselves that they are not. They are going better, by good conductors. Well, that better better... and this country (you go to Germany and really it was better to anybody else), it is a very pleasant country, so you can see how to 1867 to 1862 William Evans, and the里面 came scenes, in these fifteen years, in ages, a situation. In Europe, whatever you like. Where is this, then? A garden, not what the... authority of the family. And here we are discovering the two terms to which I would like to know that you don't know what to do. If you do not understand what authority is... you cannot understand what a man is, if you do not understand what meaning is.

Every man passes through the generations, some and some not. Because it is a man no any god (all our children are parents, until we put them in school). - he had growing in his bone and in his body and in his heart, and if the mind is not fast and not too weakly, then it will come out of this body - it will influence in some other work. Of course you can't stop it now because we have the... and 10 generations. Counts him nothing to do with it. - I can tell you that.


The point is this very clearly God has created and as He saw and made them so He created and endowed the world with the power to struggle on the earth because He has endowed man with the power to struggle on the earth. It is not enough merely to say you are a Christian and you believe in the faith of the Church and then stop. You must continue to struggle on the earth. You must continue to struggle on the earth because the Church has always been called the Church of the Struggle and the Church must continue to struggle on the earth because the Church is a living faith, the heart of the Church is the struggle.
The sunillet is at the top, and the bottom is at the bottom. This is a 3D rendering, and it is not clear what is being described. The text is not legible, and it is difficult to make out any meaningful information. It appears to be a page from a book, but the content is not discernible.