

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

... and that's not a means. That's an end. Now, you will agree with me perhaps later on when you look around yourself. You may not know it at this time, but nobody wants to talk about this to you, that this country is sick with means. You cannot have 40 million cars and trucks without, you see, being drowned -- drunk by means. These are means, the cars, the trucks, the transportation, the -- the radio, the -- the movie, the television. Two billion dollars spent in this country for television last year. Two billion dollars -- that's more than the state budget of France.

We use up year -- annually, this country, 42 percent of the gross product of the world, and we constitute 7 percent of the population. Can you see what this means? That we have six times as much as would be normal, and we have, of course, because we eat up the 42 percent, we have actually not six times as much, but 12 times too much, compared to all the other people in the -- on the globe. And you see the whole Marxian prediction today is somewhat ironically turned against { }. Marx says the rich will be richer and the poor will be poorer, and therefore there will be war between poor and rich. Now he thought that would happen in one country. But with us, it has -- it's happening under our noses so -- in such a way that the Americans constitute the rich, and the rest of the world the poor. And that's a very bitter constellation. And the only comfort we have is that the Russians try to make up for this. And they are the only people who try to break the class war between the United States and the rest of the world. The French do not produce, you see, and their standard of living is -- are going down, and they seem to be our allies. But Mr. Malenkov is the only hero we have in this country and patriot, you see, because he tries to make the Russians finally equally rich with us. And that will make for peace. Funny. You see, if you have -- otherwise you fall under Marx' prediction. The funny thing is that the Russians are the only ones who at this moment have some prospects of becoming richer, in -- in prozen- -- percentages, you see, than they are at this moment. You will not say that the -- that the English have any prospects, and you will not say the Germans have. Perhaps the Germans have a little bit, but they are such a poor country. I mean, such a small country; it's just Rhode Island and plantations, you see. It's just nothing there. Germany is so small, and Switzerland is, too.

But I'm quite serious, because we have idolized means. In this country, when you say "standard of living," it is just as opening a cathedral and kneeling

down. After the -- in 1945, we had a meeting here convened by a very religious person, Dr. Ambrose Vernon. He is well remembered on this -- in -- on this -- campus by the few who still care to -- care for continuity at all. He founded the department of biography. And this man was very interested to do something about the future after the catastrophe in '45. And he asked me what I thought, being European by birth, and I said, "Well, the whole question is the distribution of population. If the United States remain the most thinly pop- -- populated area on the globe, all the others must band together against us and -- and take our riches, because it is impossible that 140 million people" -- it was at that time only, you see -- "could hold 50 percent of the world's wealth." But if we make room for 100 more millions in this country, then the -- it wouldn't be only the 100 million people, but the prospect of anybody that at one time, he or his cousin might come to this country would alleviate the pressure, because you don't -- you have to take the pressure completely off from a steam kettle. If there is only some steam, you see, getting -- going out, that's enough if you only allow the rest of the world still to believe that this country will absorb some million people a year, you have peace for another 50 years, because there is hope. And hope doesn't require immediate fulfillment. It isn't necessary that I may -- am able to say at home at Austria that I can leave. It is enough that I feel that somebody can leave to make me pa- -- more patient, because even those who stay at home, you see, are relieved of their pressures to a certain extent when their next of kin can get a visa and come to this country.

So if you allow 240,000 people in all -- or Europe to leave, that takes the pressure off from 10 million people, of course, and not just from the 240,000. And the 10 million then -- gain some understanding of the worth of peace between the United States and Europe.

But what did I get as an answer, in 1945, to my great dismay? These -- the economist of this college, allegedly a Christian, pious man, everything you want -- they're all pious nowadays -- he said, "Nothing doing. Standard of living. You can only do this if you stan- -- lower the standard of living in the United States," which I do not believe for a minute, but it was just -- you see, he thought -- what I'm trying to say is this: he thought that by mentioning the standard of living, he could shut my mouth forever.

That I mean by the temple, you see, and by the dogma, by the idol. If you can use an argument without further discussion, not in its relative value, but at the absolute answer, then you know that you have met an i- -- with an idol. And the standard of living in this country is an idol, because you cannot even mention it as relative, you see, as not meaning much. It is so absolute that all votes, all

elections, everything is based on the assumption that the only point of agreement between Americans is the standard of living. And it is, because we all differ in this country as to the aims and ends of life, the goal of life. And so the only way in which politics are kept going is that we can agree on the means of life. And that's the standard of living. The means.

As you know, we are overeating at the rate of eating three times as much as the ordinary man in other parts of the world: 3,400 -- calories. Now the doctors say 1800 is enough, and most people get by for -- with 900 and 1200. But you eat 3,400 as an average.

Only to show you that the standard of living has become an end in itself.

To come back to my story of Copenhagen. I haven't finished yet. It's a Danish story, and it's quite important. This man has been appointed. And since I brought him to this happiness -- first sending him to Denmark and then mee- -- making the -- this foolish move that he should be appointed American representative of the NATO council, I got of course a payoff by a letter of thanks on his part. He was very enthusiastic, and he was appointed the secretary for preparing a cultural center for NATO. A cultural center -- there you have again this plague on both your houses: culture. And cultural center. And I read the prospectus and he hand- -- sent it to me for criticism. There's not one word of the purpose, not word -- one word of the difficulties, but there's only: "This is the place in which we shall all unite," this cultural center, "and in which all the good endeavors of the world will come to prosperity." There nev- -- will never be nothing ever, because he has just this frame of reference -- cultural center -- and he has not even begun to dream of -- of some violet or some forget-me-not which he could plant there.

Now, all things in life, you see, do not begin with cultural centers. Sond- -- they begin with one musician writing one tune, or one poet writing one poem -- but a complete poem, a poem on somebody distinct from others. You can't write poetry in general on the universe. It's no poetry. And so the -- he's liv- -- just living in this soap bubble, and of course it will remain a soap bubble -- all the NATO people in New York, and he in Copenhagen will shake hands and say what wonderful fellows they are, both. They are, if you abstract from the ugliness of their brain. This cultural center idea is just ugly, because it is not an embrace of anything real. It's an abstract idea. It's perfectly futile. I'm ashamed of myself. I had to laugh, because the man in New York, whom I had influenced enough upon to prevail that he could send the other man is not -- equal -- equally definitely a fool. And so I brought two fools together and they feel very good about it.

If you think of my poor friend in Paris, or near Paris -- in the country there -- and this well-placed individual in Copenhagen, if you think of the potential of being in the center of things, so to speak, in the know of the NATO organization and being able to pull off this stunt with a paper, a tremendous plan on paper of a cultural center -- when the man cannot even -- has never even known what culture is, just a big word -- and when I see how this other man has really gotten immersed into the spirit of some great souls of 19th- and 20th-century France, and is feeling that they are the spread, the condiment, the spice, which this country in its anemia needs, then I -- you -- I see what it means really to {face} the future, gentlemen, you see, and to have the proper sequence of ends and means, or have the wrong one. Cultural center is just a means, obviously, you see, if you know what it -- what you can put into it.

Now, this -- I know both people so well that I can say this not with conviction only, but knowledge. The poor boy, {Phillip}, in -- in Copenhagen doesn't know anything of what he could put into the center. He could put in leather bindings, you see, with gold imprint. Would look good, you see. But he wouldn't know what he should put in to -- between the two covers of this book, let alone what he should put in between 8 and 9, when he has a cultural lecture, you see, in the cultural center going, about the culture of the world in the West, and in the East, and in the North, and in the South, and with the {Wales}. It is just ridiculous. And most of the things you read about in the paper are just as ridiculous as the Ford Foundation. Money, money, money, money, you see.

I told you the story of genius in Germany, did I? When they came to me and said what -- some rich Americans with many millions behind them came to me in -- in -- 25 years ago, and said, "We have heard that you have such a fine group of boys working with you, would you tell us what we can do to cultivate genius? In our country, in America, we seem to -- to kill off all genius. We are all so standardized." Means always are standardized, you see. Mass production. "So we feel the obligation to save genius in the world at large. And we want to help you. Please tell us how to save genius in Germany, because it seems to be the only original country left."

And they were very nice people, but they had this same starry-eyed look, you see, gazing into the future in general, just in general. It was -- would be just the same as if you would try to procreate the human race in general. You can only procreate it in particular.

Well, you know, what -- it was very simple for me to tell them what they

should do. I said, "Gentlemen, if you want to help genius in Germany, you would oblige me greatly if you would take a ticket and depart. It's the only way in which we can save genius, by saving it from the contamination with your money."

Later on, when this genius has established its -- its ends -- his ends, you can help these people, you see. But you can never begin by digging out the roots of this genius, by shaking his -- his peace of mind and his quiet growth by giving him money, you see. He -- after he has been -- become sure of his end and already, you see, suffered from the ignominy of the resistance of the world, then some understanding, sympathetic, rich foundation can very well come to the rescue of such a person and try to break down the resistance. But before he isn't attacked, before he isn't growing, before he isn't trying to explode out of the darkness of his brain and grow through the wall of stone which indifference heaps up -- over every soul that wants to see the light, you can't do it. If you go down into the coffin and take this -- this soul that is trying to burst up -- open, you see, the soil, you just uproot it. You just uproot it. There's nothing you can do.

Well, what -- why did I say this? I wanted to show you that {Lawrence} book is one of the most important books with regard to our problem, because it is an historical book, because in history we will -- to learn -- have to learn that prophecy and vision always precede realization. Nothing can become historical that remains accident. In accidental events, the means come before the ends. In historical events, the ends constitute the means. You believe that opportunity given, you can do anything. No ripeness is all, or readiness is all, Hamlet says, doesn't he? Does Hamlet say, "Readiness all"? or -- there is -- two sayings -- in Shakespeare, equally important. One is "Readiness is all," and another is "Ripeness is all." You cannot, because we are creatures of God, you see, overturn the sequence of creating your ends, and then carrying out these ends by all means. All means, you see, come after the ends.

Therefore, gentlemen, the people who are in a hurry, the careerists, the men, the so-called success-story boys, are men who carry out ends that are already constituted by others. If to be rich is in itself an end, then you inherit this idea from others, 150 years ago, and you carry out, then your success story is only, you see, that you find the means of carrying out a goal that everybody seems to believe in, as important, as good. If you however find that you should have a new end to be created into people, as the monks did, or the saints did, or the seers did, or the poets did, or the nuclear physicists -- that there should be physicists, which in the 16th century were burned as witches, you see, which you

couldn't be without endangering your life, after you have constituted the new aim of being a physicist, you see, then others can come and become physicists and building laboratories. But the first hundred years, man had first to be quite sure that it was a good end of becoming a physicist.

This is not so far afield as you think. You think all the ends are found, and you only have now to find the means. That's not true. A famous -- who is -- has studied a little chemistry? Who has taken courses in chemistry? Only that many? All the others buy perfume? No, chemistry may be -- smell badly, but it's a very interesting study. The most famous chemist of the -- of the 19th century has been Kekule von Stradonitz, because he made the distinction between organic and anorganic chemistry on which your own course of studies is based. He found out that or- - in organic chemistry, there is this hexagon, you see, between carbon and what is the other? What?

(Oxygen.)

Oxygen, yes. C6, you see, and O6. Wie?

(Oxygen, hydrogen, { }.)

Well, {with alcohol}, it's always CH.

{ }.

CH. Hydrogen and carbon. Well. He was not allowed to become a chemist in his youth, gentlemen. His father said there is no such thing as chemist- -- this was at that moment thought of like a -- a -- you think of a barber. No profession for a decent boy. His father was a learned man. And he said, "You can become an architect. Of this I'll -- that's a vocation. You cannot become a chemist. That's just ridiculous. That's like becoming a cook. I don't want you to do this."

So the -- he was first an architect, and then he finally went to Belgium out of Germany, and in Belgium he managed to become a chemist just the same, against his father's will. And his great discovery was made because, in his vision of the future of chemistry, he saw -- had suddenly an architectural vision. The two years of his architectural studies served him right, because he suddenly saw flapping doors, opening and shutting, as it is with CO6, if you think of the {ring}.

Did it come out right? One, two, three, four. I need -- oh, pardon me. This

-- this -- this is wrong. So. I am not a chemist. This is meant to be a hexagon. Now if you -- he saw that this would be like flapping doors, he thought that every one of these sides could open and receive another element in chemistry, you see, instead of having the C attach next to the H, you see, and O, of a -- an S could take their place; and you get all the variety in organic chemistry, you see, by what he had as a vision, it is not necessary now to use it, you and me. Flapping doors opening up between these -- this -- in this hexagon and allowing something else to enter and to substitute one of the corners of this strange, architectural temple.

What I'm driving at is, that he found from the old means, he had still learned the architectural means, you see, his way to his destination, becoming a chemist. There you can see how an old scaffold of old forms, you see, has to be made subservient to a new end, and then can bear fruit, you see. But it was a very painful process, because he had to break from his father. He had to leave his own country, you see, and -- and so on and so forth. But still, by having this deeper vision, you see, of a new future, he took with him, so to speak, the equipment as to means, you see, and translated these means into a new realm of vision, and everybody in organic chemistry to this day learns about the hexagon in the way Kekule von Stradonitz has taught it.

I -- you want me to make a break now?

(No. { }.)

And so back then to {Lawrence}, and you see immediately that this has quite a bit to do with our main topic. Mr. {Lawrence} also is not a means to an end. He's an example. Mr. {Lawrence} you must read, not just because -- for what he says about America. But because of this historical event, you may say that he is the first European who came to this country and remained a European. He is not traveling for six weeks and then writing a book on America. And he is not immigrating, as I have tried to do, trying to become an American. But {Lawrence} is -- has tried to stitch together America and Europe and to find a place for both of them, you see, by embracing America very seriously, most seriously { }. So he is himself in history and though we make the acquaintance through {Lawrence} with that which means history, gentlemen, history means always the change of boundaries. America and Europe are not the same after {British} has written this book on classical American literature, you see. There is a new tie between the two parts of the globe. Well, we'll see this later.

Now, back to our distribution. Who is interested in -- in the first two centuries?

[tape interruption]

... philosophy and religion. The Church has always tried to organize its thinking around the death of people. It begins with the Crucifixion, after all. And therefore the death of people is meaningful to them. They speak of last judgment, and they speak of the other world, and of the Heaven and such things -- only another expression of saying that death, the way you die, or the way you have completed your life is more important, you see, than what you have thought during. Then the philosophers, however, are sold on the opinions of people, what they think.

A friend of mine gave a course in biography, and he wanted to know what the men thought about {woman}, and what he thought about {God}. But you never find a great man this way, because we think very many foolish things during our lives. If you think that this makes a man what { } taught. Well, he was so hypped on philosophy that he thought a man's principles, a man's theory, a man's system of thought was indication, you see, of the man's value. That's the other way of looking at things.

So we have so far divided history into the -- history of opinions of people -- philosophers, poets, you see, thinkers on one-hand side, or about their saintliness, their -- their counting in -- in Heaven, like -- like St. Francis, or the Apostles, or the evangelists, or Mother -- what's the new -- American saint?

(Mother {Blour}.)

Mother --?

{Blour}. Cabrini.)

That's not her name.

(Cabrini?)

(The American saint.)

Wie?

(Cabrini?)

Cabrini. Yes, you said Cabrini? {Bain}, you said Cabrini?

(No, I was -- I was joking, I guess. Mother {Blour}; she was -- was something entirely different.)

Well, you could have said "Alice in Wonderland."

And what I tried to show you is that we need a new method which integrates these two ways, the secular and the religious. At this moment, I said I was interested to look into the dovetail, where a man changes his mind, or where a nation changes its mind, and therefore it has to keep this freedom to go from one ment- -- state of mind to another state of mind. And that is, to a certain extent, dying and -- rising again. You die to your one mentality and come into another. And we -- I wanted to shell you -- show you, that in a case of the Jameses, that there has been lived something that really is new, unutilized, unknown, unobserved. The poor people, William and Henry James, have been still treated as though they were thinkers: one a theologian, and the other a philosopher; one a religious man, and the other a scientific man. And they have been treated as though they were two entities by themselves.

And you -- what I -- shall try to do is to show you that they represent a unity, because they didn't think {alike}. Now that is a new method, to say that people belong to each other, because they have nothing to do with each other, so to speak, on the surface of things.

I want to give you an example of the problem. When Bernard Shaw met the two Jameses, William and Henry the novelist, the son of the old -- the senior -- in England, he always tried to give -- put people ill at ease and {put them out}, and he said to them, "Oh, you people think that you are important people -- one in philosophy, and one in literature. I tell you. I know better. The only redeeming fellow in the family is your father. He is an important man."

And the two sons unanimously said, "But you are absolutely right. Our father is much more a genius than we are."

And he was completely put out, because he thought he had, so to speak, you see, he could make them blush and embarrass them. They were the great worshipers of their father. And they said, "He is much more important than we. Yes, of course, he is the genius in the family."

You must take down these sentences as they come now to me in this narrative, because before systematizing them, I think it is worthwhile to see these glimpses of life that other people have had of the true relation within the Adams -- the James family. The second such thing I may say is that William James said, "My father has been a religious genius if ever there was one." That's a very strong statement: "My father has been a religious genius if ever there was one." And the same James son -- James, Jr., William James -- has given a definition of religion which proves that he has no idea what religion even is. He knew what relig- -- by what religion is only from a respect for his father. And I assure you, we'll go into this perhaps at the end of the course. I don't wish to go into the material side of his teachings at all at this moment. Not to confuse you. He had no idea what religion was. And it's all childish what you read in William James about religion. And his father knew it. And in his letter, which I recommended to your attention, he says that much, you see: "You just don't know what it is". Now, even though you have not understood the letter verbatim, we'll come to that later again, you see, { } that the father says, "My dear son," you see, "you have never stood in this situation, and therefore you -- you just don't understand what I'm talking about."

You -- remember the letter? Who has read the letter in the meantime?

That's still too few. Gentlemen, I demand from every one of you that he has read this letter on -- in Volume 2, Page 707 of the Ralph Barton Perry.

(The library { }.)

Well, that's your fault. I gave it to you, didn't I?

(What?)

Why did you give it back? You -- you should have kept it on and to have it circulated. That's why I took it out. The naive egotism of your reading the letter and then giving the book back. You did it -- gave it to one else, who -- to who --?

(No, I've { } the volume, Sir.)

(I didn't do it.)

Well then, how can you manage to have them so long?

(They have --)

Volume 2.

(I've read it once, and I still can't understand it.)

But you have no right to keep the volume. You must make it accessible to your fellow -- fellow students.

(I guess I { } turned it in, but { }.)

Well, that's just ridiculous. That's not why I gave this man this book, so that you can sit on it.

(Oh, I { } book, I { }. { } two of them.)

But still we are 16 people here, and they all have to read it.

(Well, he said that he passed it around there and then turned it back in.

That's what he said last week, I thought. { })

But he hasn't passed it on to you?

(No. No, Sir. I have another one { }.)

From the library card.

(Yes, Sir.)

But from the reserve desk.

(No, Sir. See, I went into the stack.)

Well, I would ask --

({ }. They don't have it on reserve.)

No. At this moment, I will -- we will not go into it. I thought about this.

We will not at this juncture go into the literary interpretation of the letter word by word. But I only want to state that the father felt that William James didn't

know anything about religion, and I'm -- you may also take it from me that William James thought that his father knew nothing of philosophy or of science. (William James or Henry James?)

It's always Henry James, Sr., the father, you see, the -- it's very important for you to understand the pedigree of his family. We are dealing with the spiritual side of families.

Gentlemen, at this moment, in the world of ours, there is nothing as a carrier and bearer of spiritual truth left but the family. The family, however, has been reduced to something material and physical. Who thinks that the Holy Ghost is {vested} only now in house parties? According to your fraternity life, it isn't. The -- that is to say, Church, and state, and factories, and offices, and diplomacies, and armies have grown too big that there can be no spirit in them, you see. They are too gigantic. So we are -- why do I offer you the problem of Henry James, Sr., and his family? Because he -- we will see in a minute -- has made of the family the organism, the form which in former days, cities, communities, factories -- houses of economic production, households, could have -- or churches could have, or monasteries -- we have nothing left in this country as a white hope except the spiritual relations between members of one family. Now you understand right. You can be a man's sister, brother, and parent or son without blood relations, if you see what this relation would have to be in a spiritual sense. You can adopt a child, for example, can you not? And then you have a spiritual family without the blood ties.

Now in this country, and all over the world at this moment in the West, there is a complete decline of vital spiritual forms of fellowship, living together. If I go to my church, there is no fellowship. There is a semblance of a fellowship. The only thing they would not say is the truth in the church, because you can say the truth in the abstract sense, that we should help the Chinese, or we -- the Chinese should help the Russians. Should all be charitable. But if it comes to neighbors, the only thing you can do in a church is to be silent, because otherwise you give offense. We cannot speak the truth about our inner, real life and our problems in marriage and in the family in any church of the United States today. It's too dangerous, too explosive. But you still can between friends.

And I shall call at this moment the situation of father and son in the James family an example of spiritual life, because where -- you -- can have life only between people of the spirit. "Spirit" means the common breath of people. Spirit-

ual life therefore -- for -- can never exist in one man. Oh, no. It cannot. That is the -- therefore completely in eclipse in your textbooks. They don't know what spirit is. They deny it even, and then they describe in sociology the family as a bundle of people who don't fit together, which is perfectly true, because without a spiritual life, and without common religion, and common worship, and common aims, such a family is bound to be ridiculous, and to get on each other's nerves. "My family always cramps my style," a young girl said to me, you see. "My family always cramps my style. I'm much better off alone, because then I -- I'm not a Cinderella, but I -- I -- coming out in full force. And I can represent the world family when they are absent." That's one condition. They must be away. And families on the surface of things, if they are only { }, are absolutely funny. And they are impenetrable to others, too, I mean, just as a nation is. I mean, you come into America, or come to France, it is as a great man has said, "All nations in themselves are abominations," because for the foreigner they do not offer a spiritual experience, you see. They -- just as they are. And that's not good enough for people, you see. Flowers and stones can be as they are. You and I have always to be willing to be different from what we have been. We have to be changeable, you see, because a man is a man as long as he can change his mind. Befo- -- otherwise he is just an animal. Now unfortunately the nations of this earth are all just -- can be described in very simple terms. Because they are just what they are, they only want to be what they are. So they are so boring, and so the only way of bringing them together is the hydrogen bomb. We will do from fear what we don't do from inspiration. Spirit, gentlemen, is breathing together of different people. That is what spirit is. And if a man is inspired, that -- the meaning of "inspiration" is that it -- he's -- he's able to impart to others a new spirit. But it must go out, or he's choked. There have been people whose inspiration has been throttled, and they died in the process, you see. You can -- spirit means the founding of groups. Now, the question of -- is today is there any inspiring group left in this country, or in the world -- or the Western world, despite industry, despite the stock exchange, despite the press, despite the radio, or it is all just commentators? Is it all just -- just fiction? Is it all just veneer? You cannot believe any man who appears on television. He smiles because he's paid for it. He'll smile at any circumstance, whether you are a rat or not. Now, I want to make -- see myself treated with distinction. That is, I want

to know whether this man smiles at me, or whether he smiles because he was paid for it. I'm not interested in paid smiles. Well, we have male whores in this country by the millions, people who are really able to smile, because they are paid for it. All the radio people are this way. All the actors are, you see. You know the story of the clown who comes to the psychiatrist and says, "I'm -- in such a depressed mood, and I'm just -- I want to weep inside of me all the time, and I feel that I have a breakdown. What can I do? Can you cure me, doctor?"

"Oh," he said, "Yes. Tonight, you just go to the -- to the this show. It's so funny, you see. You laugh your head off."

He said, "I'm the man who makes the other people laugh."

That's, by and large, the state of affairs in this country, that you cannot distinguish when a spirit is genuine, and when it's just put on. Most of it, you can -- you pay a man a thousand dollars, he'll stand on his head. Instead of paying a man a thousand dollars because he stands from mere exuberance on his head, you see. So he has no exuberance anymore. He has just a thousand dollars. And what do I care for a man standing on his head without exuberance? But if a man is so enthusiastic he stands on his had, I do anything to see him, you see. I might even be willing to pay him a thousand dollars in gratitude. But he first must produce spontaneously, and not because he's paid. Can you see again the confusion between ends and means? Can you see this, that the whole country is sick, because everything can be paid for, and then you have it? But you don't have it. You don't have it. Nothing you can pay for you can ever have. You can only consume it. That's a con- -- on the consumption side, you see. But the good things of life, you see, are inconsumptible, because they cannot be bought. They are always there. They are there forever. We call this "eternity," or "everlasting." Now this is the problem of the family, gentlemen. If the family is spiritual, then it is everlasting. Then it doesn't depend on -- on physical -- procreation. Then it must -- then it is the cell in which life of the -- is restored between the members of the human race. And the Jameses, gentlemen, did not understand very much of what the other fellow was talking about, and yet they inspired each other. It's a very strange story.

So I gave you some anecdotes. I said Shaw was put out because the sons said, "The father is important. We are not." The father says, "My son doesn't even know what religion is." The son says, "My father is a religious genius if ever there

was one," but as you also know, he wrote a book, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, and he put his father down as an oddity. He's just one religious genius.

And there are many other types. And that again, means that William James canceled out, so to speak, the real achievement of his father.

We go on from there and we say that William James, son, writes a letter to his wife when his father is dead and said, "The rest of my life I must devote to save the remnants of my father's spirit. I feel that it has come to me as I cannot rest the case with his death. I must go on." And he published then in fact the literary remains of Henry James in 1884, two years after the father's death, and far from being satisfied with this achievement, it has been on his mind for the rest of his life. There's more to it, gentlemen.

William James had two brothers who went to the Civil War. And both were ruined morally, and physically, and financially in this experience, as veterans. They didn't -- were not killed, but as you know, it might be much worse not to be killed in a war, but to come back with a frozen heart or a frozen foot, and to be a cripple. And it has always weighed very heavily on William James' mind, and I -- you will take this down. The two brother Jameses were always present in William James' thinking, and he always tried to represent their problems as war veterans in his own thinking. And he did this by finally writing "The Moral Equivalent of War." And this amounts to a declaration, so to speak, of equality with his brothers. He says, "Since my brothers ..." he doesn't say it in so many words, but I feel this out of his behavior, "... since my brothers were ruined by the Civil War, I must be willing to suffer in peacetime as much as they did in wartime, or I'm not their brother. The brotherhood of man consists in my being willing to suffer voluntarily what others have been compelled to suffer without being asked," so to speak.

Gentlemen, that's -- is the decisive problem of your philosophy. If you begin from what you want, what you desire, what kind of world you would like to love -- live in, you start on your own as a foot of yourself. If you look around and see what people have done for you, you stand on the other foot and try to find your own place in life by measuring up to their sacrifices, you see. It's an absolutely different problem which you put, you see, because you do not begin with what you want, you see, but with what other people have done so that you are. And from there you get a completely different yardstick. And I assure you, you never end up with the standard of living, which you must have, because all the people whom we owe our existence, just had no standard of living, you see. They were all starved, and destitute, moving from Egypt to the desert and into the promised land, without honey and milk for a long time to come. And yet, we

owe them our liberty and our existence. And if you begin this way to looking at things, you know that your only problems are ends, and not means. It's utterly ridiculous and indifferent to talk about means, except when you are a careerist and want to be elected governor of New Hampshire, or of the United States by the way.

What time is it?

(10 of. 10 of 3:00.)

Well, I have not finished my task -- by a long shot about the Jameses { }.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Philosophy 53, October 8, 1953. Testing one, two, three. One, two, three.)

... solution, so that we feel that we have some firm ground under our feet and are not just drifting. This has a special reason, gentlemen. It is my experience that most courses introducing you to civilization or history, you see, wrongly begin somewhere in the past and then lead nowhere. So from somewhere to nowhere, I don't wish to lead you. I wish to begin with a goal, and then show the way towards it, and the reasons why this goal is really the goal, because there is no other way out.

You -- this method of the course has something to do, gentlemen, with the good life. The good life is not a life that doesn't know its direction. It is groping for the means, but it is quite sure of its destiny, of its end. You live -- try to live a life that's just the other way around. You begin somewhere, and don't want to know where it should lead you to. If you read any literary critic in this country on great art, you will find that most people today are under the impression that art must always hold a surprise, that the happy ending, you see, must come in the last minute and send you home with the feeling as a detective story: why didn't we know this all the time, that this would be the solution? That is, gentlemen, the secular mind, the ordinary mind of yours, the animal mind goes along and is finally surprised by the solution. Any such literary production that -- like a detective story -- cannot be read twice, because you know the solution, and the secret is out; and therefore the reviewers of -- you know, of detective stories have agreed that they must not give the secret, because otherwise the poor publisher wouldn't sell one copy, because even if the review only would divulge the solution of the mystery story, it would no longer sell.

That is, the good fortune of the book depends on your not knowing the end. This is an imitation of the animal life in your own life, that you do not know the end of your own life, and you -- try to keep it hidden. Perhaps you may not have to die. Although Johnny and -- and -- and Billy have died, perhaps you can escape it. That's, so to speak, the fervent hope of the animal in us. We don't want to know. We don't want to know. You take the hero -- you take Christ's life -- who knew not only that He had to die one day, but He even was -- had resolved that He should invest His death as a capital of mankind in a new bank for the unity of the human race. Here is a man who faces the future, who knows perfectly well that we all have to die. And his question is only: how to invest His living powers best. But the direction, the consumption, their death -- His death is

always with Him, all the time. You try to forget it.

Now the animal in us, gentlemen, is therefore always reflected in the so-called fiction. You call literature "fiction." And it is fiction. And the early Christians have taught me a lesson. I come more and more, the older I grow, to a -- have a direct disgust with fiction. I do not see why I should waste my time with books. There's a new novel written now by a 23-year-old Harvard man, classmate of this gentlemen here. Well, I'm not going to read such a book. All the reviews tell me that it's just fabricated. I don't care. Why should I listen to the fabrications of a 23-year-old guy? I'm -- I'm not interested. I don't want to have fiction. I want to have truth.

Now gentlemen, all great art gives you to know the end of the story before you start. Homer -- you open The Iliad, and you know it all in the first verses. You read The Odyssey, you know it all when you open the book. There's no plot to take you by surprise. What you read is the "how," not the "that." What you read is how it comes about, because that's where we are distinguishable. How we live. We all have to die. And a great poet takes this for granted.

The small -- the -- the fictionist, the imitator of literature, what you call the "American literature" is just all -- salesworthy, you see. It's commercialized. They want to keep your attention by the plot, by the surprise, by the detective {thing}. You don't know what's ahead of you. But take Wolfe. There's no -- nothing to surprise you about the end. He's a real { }. Or you take Melville. There's nothing in the story that is really at the end different from -- the beginning. First page and the last page, you are exactly in the same climate. Any great -- or the same with Hawthorne, even, although he is certainly not a -- an overpowering poet, you see.

But a genuine poet, gentlemen, doesn't have his contact with you through his keeping you just in suspense, but making you feel that you are living in one climate all the time, and -- he can very well give away his secret, his so-called secret, I mean, the solution beforehand, because he keeps you in suspense by retardation, by showing how difficult it was to bring it about. As Virgil said, "So much work it was to found the Roman race." But he begins immediately, "{Siden}," you see, "Arma virumque cano." Of arms and man I sing -- of -- of Aeneas and Anchises, how they found Rome finally, you see. But then there is this great sentence, you see, {tanta} moles erat Romanam condere gentem. Such a trouble it was to come down to brass tacks and found the city of Rome. The moles, the -- the difficulty, the same is true of Tolstoy, War and Peace, one of the greatest books ever written, you see. There's no surprise in this story, but there is

a melody, and just as much as any -- great musician gives you the theme in the first beats, and then enlarges on it, and doesn't hide it, you see, under the bushel, but once you take the Fifth Symphony, you see --

[opening notes of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, then a shift to another theme]

Well, it will never be better, that's all -- all there is to it. These two themes, these two -- have you heard it? Well, that's the story. And that's great music. No surprise. No detective story. But you are so mistaught that you always think that is not -- that the -- the whole gist is as in a short story, you see. When does -- the moment come when she proposes to her man, you see. You know the degradation of American literature now goes so far that they even have -- make always the girl propose to the man. And the trick is only, you see, to do it in some way you have never read before. This is -- has nothing to do with literature. Just -- it's is saleable.

I had once a jung -- young friend. I saved her from committing suicide, so she was always very grateful to me. She went to Radcliffe -- alias Harvard, and she wrote her autobiography. And of course, since she had an exciting past, as I -- you can understand from the -- this experience with I -- which I had with her, that she had something to write about. So she got back this paper, with the -- with the remark by her English professor, "Saleable."

Not an "A," you see, not "Excellent," but "Saleable." That's the ultimate degradation, you see, of the human pen. That was the criterion this -- this asinine man had, you see, by which he -- that's then called "education." In Radcliffe. It was not Tuck School. It was not a commercial school. It was not a school -- and then -- and I mean -- I just felt that -- well, the -- the bottom fell out of -- so to speak, on -- from my faith in -- in education in this country, if an English teacher can tell a student who gives away her most personal life experience, you see, in an eloquent manner, "Saleable." Is this the goal?

If this is the goal, then you understand why it's -- has to be tricks. If it is saleable, you see, it is just imitation of other literature. Anything which you write for sale already has a standard set by others, because you want to judge -- if people will sell it, you can only judge it by other books. Any great book is not for sale, because it creates a new market. It -- is a new product, if it is an original writing. You don't know if there's anything { } so to speak. You will know that even the -- all the American publishers in New York -- as they are concentrated there and going bankrupt every day -- they never know of a success ahead

of time, you see. They are always surprised. When Mrs. -- one of the great successes was *The Good Earth*. Well, the publisher had no idea that it would be a great success, you see. You remember *The Good Earth* by -- by Pearl Buck. Well, that's -- that comes to mind. It's an old story, an old experience, that a real bestseller cannot be known beforehand by the publisher. He has no idea. They always try -- I mean, they have a kind of -- of -- of course, the sorcerers of Egypt -- pharaoh-of-Egypt service. I mean, they have prognostications, and astrologers, and just as the people at the stock exchange. They always want to know ahead of time when they are going to lose their money. But they always lose it and they don't know ahead of time.

But you are the -- living in a -- in a -- absolutely debased and falsified climate. And so I have to cry you awake, gentlemen. Homer is not a great poem because you are kept waiting for the outcome. It is a great poem because although you know the outcome from the very beginning, you cannot help reading it. Just think of the Bible. The whole outcome of the Bible is known, you see, that Christianity would be a complete failure. And you read it just the same, if you -- if you have at all the -- the nerve. It's not saleable. The Bible is -- I mean, no publisher in New York would take a book of the contents of the Bible today and publish it. It is -- can be no success. The whole story is known beforehand. The fall of man in the first chapter. It's all there. Man is just so depraved as he is today. And he is so this way from the beginning.

So you -- you have, you see, lost even the organs of this dis- -- decrimination. And therefore, gentlemen, I have to try to -- to impose on you the method by which I say the American story is vital to you, because the outcome can already be known, and not although the outcome can already be known. Do -- can you see the difference? And all the people try to -- to lull you into this insecurity as though the outcome couldn't be known. It is very well known today what could be the contribution of America to -- to the world at large, and what cannot be. We can already say that the denominational tradition of the churches in Europe cannot be the American contribution, because we have 287 denominations, you see. So that's out, you see. But we can also say, gentlemen, that the independence of America from the rest of the world cannot be America's contribution to the world, because the world is sick with independent parts, you see, and must have a planetary organ- -- order. Therefore we already know that's out, you see. The question is, then, what is not out? And I do think that the James family stands out there as something to be considered very seriously. But it ha- -- they have already lived.

I come back to my first statement in the first meeting, that your problem is to understand that something can have existed in the flesh and yet not reached you in its spirit. If you do not believe this, you cannot believe that Buddha, or Lao-Tse, or Christ, or the Bible have anything to tell you, because that's long ago. I never understand these people in this country who on the one-hand side pay lip service to the Church, or to religion, or go even with their family to a service and on the other hand say that history is bunk. Well but -- I told -- we talked about it, you see. Jesus, after all, died 1900 years ago. So in between there has always -- only been bunk? I don't believe that He can claim for Himself that He has more historical rights to talk to us than any -- all the things that have gone on -- in between. This is to me too artificial. If there hasn't been -- a stream of spiritual life reaching out from Him to us, to this day, then I shall not have the power to say why American denominationalism is -- is not the blessing we have to impart to the world, and why American nationalism, or independence, or isolationism cannot be the gift we have to impart to Iraq, and Iran, and Germany, and Poland, and Norway at this moment. But you know this, as well as I. We only have -- I have to cry you awake to the fact that you know much more about America's contribution to the future of humanity than at this time you have the -- the likelihood to -- to admit.

What have the James family done? Well, gentlemen, Mr. Henry James, Sr., was a heretic. That is, he did not believe in organized Christianity. His church was his family conversation. That is, he had tenets that coincided I think with orthodox Christianity, and he found it sufficient all through his life, to his death in 1882, to expound this vigorously within a tremendous conversation in his family. And his eloquence resounds in the diary of his daughter Alice, in the novels of his son Henry, in the heroism of his son Robertson, and in the philosophy of William James.

That is, he found a tremendously rich, colorful, and you may say "prismatic" response or echo in what his children did with the words they had heard from his mouth. He expounded the Gospel at his family table as a father. And back comes to him one tongue, philosophy; one tongue, that's Alice's, the invalid, most eloquent woman that ever lived in this country -- in her diaries, they were -- have been privately printed by the family, but you can -- I think we have it here -- anybody interested? Then the epistolary of the -- of William James as published by Ralph Barton Perry, and the novels of his -- Henry.

Now, spiritually and -- so to speak, as a problem of the mind, we -- you see then that here is a strange situation. A man who day and night only preaches

the law of the Lord, as in the first Psalm says, he is like a tree planted at the rivers of water who bears his fruit day and night by speaking of the law of the Lord, you see, day and night, and his -- the answer is in various -- idioms and dialects from his children, and they are -- these idioms are secular.

So gentlemen, you may say one equals infinity in the religious tongue; there is only one way of speech; that in the secular, you can respond from the periphery in many tongues. So if you -- think this man stands in the middle, you can also say this is the center, and this is the periphery, and gentlemen, the echo of a good teacher, or of a poet, in the hearts of his audience, or of his spectators is many-fold, and can never be in the same idiom. Not the man who repeats the words of the master is his disciple, you see. But St. Paul is the master, the best disciple, and you know that St. Paul never quotes the Lord. He always speaks in the {live} moment, as Mr. Richards, I'm told, has asked you to speak. Did you go to his lecture? Who did? Well, you see.

The -- the Paul, the Apostle, never quotes Jesus. If you read his letters, it's all fresh. It's all expressed, you see, without any quotation from the Gospels. No Sermon on the Mount quoted, as the pious people do today. If you want to be -- lead a good life, gentlemen, don't quote the Sermon of the Mount, because Christianity has nothing to do with quotations. The apostolic life is to speak with the same power, and without glibness, and not saying, "so on and so forth," or "at some way," or "anyway," or "I think you understand," and "if you know what I mean," you see, and all these terrible words. They are all agnostic words. If a man says to me, "You know what I mean?" I can only always answer, "No, I don't know what you mean. Please tell me."

Well, gentlemen, we are in the midst of a tremendous problem and you don't see it, and that's why I -- invite you to wake up to the fact that the relation of such an eloquent father who, outside the Church -- without a pulpit, without being a bishop, without being a saint, without being an apostle -- is able to -- to fertilize, to incite in four members of his family such a tremendous intellectual life, you see, is a very serious power behind the throne, so to speak. And we have to look into this very definitely. You -- we may say, gentlemen, that in America, the Gospel has been unchurched in the person of Henry James. It has become unchurched.

You still find the Mormons having to write a second book, a second gospel, The Book of the Mormons, you see. They -- that's in the middle of the -- you see, Young and Brigham, you see, in the -- in the middle of the 19th century. Here however is a man who definitely forgoes all reliance on either scripture,

sacred text, or -- or church, but who feels in his family still provoked, challenged, {and} compelled to speak day and night of the Gospel, and to translate it in such a way that these children suddenly feel a Niagara of eloquence avail -- awakening them. And any one of -- I told you the story of Bernard Shaw and the two sons, when they said, "Of course, our father was {a genius}. We agree, you don't -- can't tease with saying that we who have the literary fame in the world are bigger men than he."

Now you have this strange situation, gentlemen, that Henry James draws the sum of the religious past of American history in a strange manner, you see. It is through him the religion still reaches this secular generation, you see, of scientific and literary attitudes, beginning perhaps in 1870 or after the Civil -- 1865, you see.

So you have him as the last religious generation in this country, and that's why I made the break in 1865, you remember what we did. And you have the purely secular in these people -- people. Philosophy, diary, novels -- I should have perhaps said "the epistolary," is something specific. This -- these three forms you know, but we'll have to build on this as something not yet fully evaluated and treasured.

Now Mr. William James, to oppose him right away to his father, tried to be a scientist. He went to Brazil with an expedition in geology and in zoology. And the special sciences, however, were too much for him. That is, his attempt to forget his father's imposition of unity and comprehensiveness, which always -- gives, you see, in religion unity, universality -- one god means "unity of all -- for all," you see. If you take this point of the thought of his father at the breakfast table, God, and you take the sciences -- zoology, medicine -- this was the great temptation of William James, to be sure, for a while in the '60s. And he tried very hard to forget that he had any relation to his father. And he tried to build up his own personality under the -- in the studying at Harvard, and then going, as I said -- told you, on expeditions. And it didn't work. He fell sick. He had a melancholia, and he could not stay in this so-called -- well, how should we call them? -- in this plura- -- pluralism, in this plural. Here we have oneness in the father, but heresy with regard to the Church. Oneness with regard to faith, heresy with regard to Church.

Now here you have an attempt of plura- -- pluralism in the very beginning. Oh, I study zoology. I study anatomy. I study {this}. I study psychology. I study this and that. This -- this -- this- or that-ness, which you all suffer from. Many things. The "many-ness" is perhaps better than "pluralism." How would we

call this in -- in Latin?

Well, we should have a word instead of "hoi-polloi." Not "hoi-polloi."

That's a mass, you see. But we should have {ta pola}, the many things, you see, the many-fold, the Encyclopaedia Britannica facts, so to speak. I don't know what -- how to call this many-ness. How would -- you have any word for this?

The multitude. We always think of people when we speak of multitude. But of -- what I want to insinuate is, you see, the multitude, the ocean of -- of knowledgeable fields of -- you see, of scientific endeavor. How would you call such a many-ness?

(Multiplicity?)

Ja. I think that's -- that's not perfect, but I think it's quite good.

Now, gentlemen, will you take this down -- on faith for the time being?

All secular things are multiple. People today even believe in multiple inspiration. You go to Hollywood, and you have five people sitting in -- in adjacent studios and they have common inspiration. They call it -- I mean it's multiple inspiration. The -- they -- the most incredible story, you see, because unfortunately God created men and -- and fe- -- fe- -- male and female, but He didn't create multiple inspiration. But in Hollywood, they believe it. These glued and -- and -- and -- and tailored and -- and pasted comedies, you see. One writes the beginning, the other writes the end, and the third writes the middle. And that they call then "art." And you believe them, too. I mean, you can sell in this country anything, because you believe that art has something to do with selling. As long as you believe this, you must believe in multiplicity.

Now, the important thing is that in 1865, gentlemen, William James and Henry James are farrest apart. If you look at your own life, I think that's true about you, too, that at this moment you are farrest away from your father. At least you must be. You should be. At this moment, you must let as many elements that are foreign to your father's tradition and life enter your own bloodstream, in order to become somebody in your own right. You must try out how far you can go away from him. That is your duty at this moment. The interesting thing is, gentlemen, that in -- at a certain moment in life, you are farrest away from your father, and that is also from the spirit of your father's tradition, and his -- his -- his position in life. And that, believe it or not, as time goes on, you can then build bridges between that which has entered your life as novelty and a new thought, you see, and his position. And I think that at 60, normally any man can have -- can affirm both positions -- his father's and his own, you see, without

much trouble. But now you have all the trouble in the world, I suppose -- or I hope -- to asser- -- -firm your -- assert your position first, because it isn't yet in existence. Can you understand my point?

So gentlemen, in William James, you can study the fact that in 1865, he is more distanced from his father than ever after. Now I think that's -- already is miraculous, because it -- also shows you that time is not what you think it is -- going this way, from A to B, gentlemen, because we learn here, here is the life of the father lived. And the life of William James begins at the farrest point and then returns. In order to find its relation to this previous life, it has to come near enough so that you can build an ellipse, with two foci, so that there is some electric spark going over, you see. Now, you have an elec- -- a machine for electricity, you know if you remove them -- the two poles too far apart, no spark, you see. If you bring them together completely, no current, either, you see. But you have to find the polarity under which there will be light, there will be electricity.

Now, I propose to you to look at this James family problem as a discovery in -- in your own historical situation, because your idea is that in 18- -- 1980, you will be more away from your father, or your father's generation -- that is, me, you see, and what I stand for -- than you will today. I assure you, this is not true. The -- the main point is that a man of 45 at this moment -- I'm already older. I'm already -- so to speak, could be your grandfather. But a man of 45 and a boy of 20 are more antagonistic, you see, than these same people are at the age when one is 80 and the other is 50 or 55. And that's very interesting, and I think quite exciting. But you have to apply to the universal history of the human race. History does not go in a marching procession, as all the scientific analogies or diagrams try to show you. History is not going from A to B. Christ is farrer away from the Old Testament church of course, than the people in 300, when they already prayed the Psalms again in the Church. Jesus had first to tell people that they could worship God without the Psalms, too. But there was no harm done in 300 to bringing in the -- Psalms again, and have the whole liturgy, you see, and the whole caboodle {prayed again}, as they do today, you see, where -- where you have all the hundred-fifty Psalms preached in every Protestant and every Catholic church every Sunday. But if the Apostles and the -- Jesus had only done this, there would have been no Christianity. Can you see this?

So gentlemen, history is a mysterious process of bringing up B anoth- -- a new position, and then relating B to A. That is the real process of life between people who know of each other and are not in nature, but in history. People who love each other, gentlemen, cannot spare each other suffering, because B has to come into being. A mother must give life to her child under great pain and suf-

fering, under travail. If she doesn't separate the body of this child into an independent entity, both die, you see. The child has to get away from the mother, but it has to come back, to her -- by her smile, and her tenderness, and her -- you see, her nursing, and so on. But first it has to go out.

Now gentlemen, between father and son, this is true in the spirit. What is true about the body of a mother and her baby is true, and you can study it fortunately on -- in a story lived in this country better than in any European country, any Roman, or Greek, or Palestine country. The great story about William James and Henry James is that here birth was given to a new type of man, the secular American, the scientific American, the American who wouldn't take anything for granted, the man who said, "I don't know what the soul is, and I don't know what God is. I live without them for the time being," you see. And it was given birth by a church-d -- unchurched Christian who was so full of the Gospel that although the son evaded all denominational, all church affiliations, you see, did not forget the sound of these words in his ears. And although he struggled hard to get out of it, and ran to ends of the earth, to Brazil, for -- on his zoological expedition, is still under the spell or -- and has to echo it, and has to re-translate it into, gentlemen, what? A secular unity. A secular unity. A secular comprehensiveness, which doesn't remain mere multiplicity.

What time is it? Oh, dear. Let's have a break.

[tape interruption]

...me retard my statement by telling you my own experience. The problem of single-aged and multi-aged, or pluri-aged thinking in politics has moved me all my life. And if you think of the idea of a renaissance, a coming-back of classic civilization -- as they believed in the 16th century, or in the 18th century, the restoration of anything that has gone by us -- the English people believed in the restoration of the old freedoms -- you have always the same problem that the fullness of life can only be experienced if more than one generation is after it and endeavors to fulfill it, because all these restorations try to do better, to do the same thing, but now -- on a -- on a higher level so that it would be more tenable than before. If you restore Athenian -- Athenian painting in Raphael and Michelangelo, you feel that you are doing more than just having the Athenian arts, you see. You are now fulfilling the real destiny of man to repeat, to reproduce its highest forms, in a conscious effort. And therefore you already have the problem of bringing more than one generation to a common fruition, to a common exploit. Long ago, somebody does something -- Plato, or Aristotle, or Jesus -- and we today try to do it consciously and therefore connect ourselves with such a

bygone generation.

The renaissance topic therefore, for example, already in -- suggested to me -- it is my oldest topic in my own thinking -- the problem of: what have generations to do with each other? If you found 48 states in this country, then of course, the 48th still has to bear some semblance to the -- Massachusetts, or to Virginia, or to Vermont. And therefore, you still carry within yourself, you see, the loyalty to the people in the other states, although you are out in Arizona, and get statehood in 1908. And that is a renaissance problem. And it means that although you seem to be acting independently, your independence is really limited by your affection, and reverence, and interest in another generation's doings. And what is this? How are you free and dependent at the same time? The relationship of this, you see, has intrigued me.

But I want to be more down to earth by telling you that in 1900 -- in the '20s of the 19th -- 20th century, there was in Europe, as you may know, a pronounced youth movement, a rebellion of the younger in the machine age against the drabness and the -- the philistines among their parents. And there was a kind of strike of the young, out of which finally then the Hitler movement -- was {formed} by a multiplicity really of elements. But in the -- since 1905, in Europe there has been this so-called youth movement, a radical re-interpretation of the life of parents and children. Very much like progressive education. The child owes nothing to the parents; the teachers are facilities; it is the child that must decide for himself what to choose -- the elective system in every way of human endeavor. And if you can get the nursery school child already to make decisions on its food, all the better. Concentrate, condense all decisions of life into the individual's lifespan; then you have emancipated this child.

Well, the youth movement is the German aspect of this complete severance of relations between parents and children as a spiritual problem, as a problem of common understanding, and you may say that it is the -- the radical outcome of the liberal century. Liberalism meant that the parents were demanded to make every sacrifice for the education of their children, but they had to make no -- make no demands on the work -- the labor of their children -- think of child labor, which has been abolished at the end of this period, and no demands on their creed, their faith, their loyalty, or what-not. It's a very strange paradox, that liberalism at the one-hand side demanded the utmost in sacrifice on the part of the parents, and on the other hand, demanded no sacrifice on the part of the children.

And you can even say, the more sacrifices the parents make to send their

boys to college, the less the children are demanded to make any sacrifices for their parents. That is the awkward situation, so to speak, down to the two world wars, that the word "sacrifice" is ridiculed just as much "adolescent" is ridiculed, or "virgin." There are no virgins in this country. There are no adolescents in this country. And you must never mention the word "sacrifice."

I once tried to publish an article on this -- a series of articles on this on campus here, in The Dartmouth in 1940, and -- as a vocabulary of education. And I finally got it in and I had to say, "I know that the word will not go over, but the thing remains, there is no historical life possible without sacrifice. And you won't hear it, and therefore there will become -- come a terrible catastrophe" -- it was just before we entered the war -- "because when you don't believe in sacrifice, then you will be demanded to make it by violence, by force," which has always happened. I mean, that's the way in which God corrects man's ways, when you don't believe a part of the truth, the truth comes upon you, from your back. It just says universal military service.

Which is sacrifice. But you don't want to know it in front of you, in your own philosophy. So it comes through the back door. And that's why still we have this trouble of having just universal military training established, you see. You want to do it half-heartedly, and so you get all the injustices that boys are sent to Korea, after they have participated Second World War, just because you are -- cannot be made to understand that you have to sacrifice.

Well, this unpopular word "sacrifice," as I said, has been written large into the hearts of all the parents of the 19th century. If you think of Dartmouth College, what the alumni do for you, it's just unbelievable. Why they do it, nobody knows, you see. God only knows how long they are going to do it for us, you see, but they do it. But you, I mean, you may have to fight your own way through college by serving at tables, and so, but that's still enlightened self-interest, I mean. That's within your own, you see, within your own sphere.

And -- so gentlemen, liberalism consists of stressing the sacrifices of the parents, and of stressing the non-sacrificial situation of the young. You may say that down to 1800 the reverse was true. We stressed the sacrifices by piety and loyalty to be made by the children, you see, and the authority of the parents was stressed more than their sacrifices. But today the child is the authority, and that's youth movement.

So these youth groups in Germany were led by very energetic, so-called leaders. The whole leader principle originated, gentlemen, in these cells, in these

youth groups, where 15, 20, or 10 or 8 even would cluster around a leader and go out into the woods, or go out into Italy, or Yugoslavia, or some other part of Europe, just with tents and hiking, and -- on very little means, and -- and quite daring, and would follow the -- the leader. And I was thrown into very serious contact with these people. I tried to persuade the youth groups after the -- between the wars to serve and to go to the workers and farmers, and run what is now known as work camps, and -- a thing which we invented in the '20s for the first time. And I have succeeded in part to make these youth groups, which consisted of young, middle-class boys, I mean, students, and high school boys, and scout -- what we would find in the scout movement, you see -- with people who -- were young Communists or young Marxians, and people who were young -- well, how would you call it? -- young Texans, I mean, rodeo people, and such -- I mean, people who had no time for scouts, because they were out in the wilds, anyway. And -- farmers' sons.

And so we wanted to bring together three quite different ways of life: the old countryside way of life, with its old customs and folklore; the Marxian way of life of the citified workman, enlightened and individualistic in one way, and politically mad in the other, and -- mass man, you may say; and the student, as a -- individualistic type, with his own self-determination very much stressed. In this battle, this wasn't easy to gain access to these youth groups. They were very suspicious. And they said the leader has the say. And the -- the allegiance was between the -- such a boy of 20 or 21, and his 14-, 15-, 16-, 17-, 18-year-old gang, or however you may call it, I mean. Soldiers, privates. And so I was faced with this very problem in a -- in a -- experimental way of the place for a man who thinks in terms of more than one generation, facing a group that is loyal, and is alive, and is very powerful, and very vigorous, because of its immense loyalty to the guiding spirit, to the leader. And I had a public discussion of -- with some of the more dogmatic leaders who didn't want me to intrude into their work, and didn't want -- open their youth movement to these mixed camps, in which of course, farmers and workers having no such ideas of group allegiance to leaders, you see, would have fallen in such different germs of disintegration, perhaps. This public discussion already was go- -- going on at a time when I knew very little about the James family, certainly. I knew a little bit of William James. I knew nothing of his father. I lived in Germany, and yet I wrote an article which is called -- which I found the other day, "The Polychronic -- Polychrony of a Nation," of a people. "Polychrony" means many times, you see, the -- the plurality of times, of ages to -- repre- -- present all the time in a people. And I said, all real problems of history are polychronic. There is -- or pleiochronic, you see. They're pleiochron- -- there is more than one time. Pleio means "more than one," you see.

You have heard of Pleistocene, perhaps in -- in geology, you see, which also means when there was the most of it, the most of -- of -- of -- of something. Well, whether you call it "polychronic" or "pleiochronic," it is the same problem of the pluri-aged, which has faced this country, as I told you, since 1685, and I think it is -- gives me a kind of -- of clear title to my special interest. I haven't learned this when I came to America, but I have learned it only here in a specific American application. It is the universal problem of mankind, and it is the specific problem of our own time, gentlemen. Everything in our own time appears to be of this time itself, only. The only group of people that has to take a beating in this country, by poor treatment, by terrible salaries, are the teachers. The teachers are clearly located between the generations, because they have to hand over to one generation what the other generations have achieved. And they have to enable them to get into their own -- into their own shape, with the help of the achievements of others. That is, of course, belittled here, because Mr. Dewey has tried to tell you, and all his teachers' colleges in the country that the child -- it is the child who makes himself, and the teachers are just standing by and -- and taking out the handkerchief and dry-cleaning your noses, blowing your noses.

But idea of a female schoolteacher I think doesn't hold water here in -- in any college situation. You will admit that what I tell you is not of your own doing. It just comes to you. You may reject it. You may not listen to it, you may laugh at it. But it comes to you from another age, you see. And its there-ness can only serve you if you admit that there is something outside your own age which is necessary to your own existence. Otherwise my whole offering here makes no sense, because I cannot share the experiences of your own generation. And you cannot share directly the experience of my generation, you see. But we have to agree on something, you see, that goes on through the generations. I have to divest myself of the two special types of my time, you see, but you will have to do the same about your own specialty, or we can't get together.

And I mention these articles. They appeared in a -- in a magazine of which I am still very proud. I wasn't the founder of it, but I was one of the -- the machinists, so to speak. I brought the people together who did edit it. It was edited by one Roman Catholic, by one Protestant, and by one Jew. And the three together called the magazine, "The Creature," Kreatur, creatura. And they said that the creature of man was that he was a temporal being. And so my article, you see, was one of the programmatic articles, because I said man only begins to be man if he is aware of his -- you see, his problem that the temporalities of your and my must -- must be dovetailed in some form. How, that -- we may look into

this. That may be open to question. But man begins only if he is not only of his own age, because he has to be spoken to, and he has to be spoken into a life, you see, of the race.

And therefore, life begins not at 40, gentlemen, but life begins when you meet your grandchildren and your grandparents, spiritually. And never -- it doesn't believe -- before. Life doesn't believe -- begin at 40. It doesn't begin at 18. It doesn't begin at your birth. You're quite mistaken. That what we call human life, and not animal life, begins when one tone -- your name, "John," "Bill" -- enters you as coming from far away, and when you begin to believe and hope that there will be somebody who listens to you, and your grievances and your complaints to carry them on and to redeem you in the future, whatever you have to complain of.

Once you enter, you see, this relation between the ages that have gone before, and begin after -- with you, you see, then you be -- come to life, to what is deserved to be called life. Everything else before is just existence, vegetation, animal nature. It is certainly subconscious, unconscious. It is this side of good and evil. It isn't life. It is just the lower life.

So my suggestion is, gentlemen, that in the James family, already in 1865, that which is facing every family today in the whole Western world has been lived out with great clearness and precision, as a problem of the age: how does a child spiritually come into its independent existence, and yet not sacrifice, or lose, you see, or gainsay that which his fathers have spiritually, you see, created. That is a paradox, and you can't get out of it, by forgetting it. And it is before us at this moment. And that's the whole crisis in America. That's Mr. McCarthy. That's everything we are talking about today, you see. What is the relation of your freedom, you see, and of tradition? But as you -- say "freedom and tradition," it's a very murky -- I mean, a moldy thing. I'm not -- the words have been talked -- overtalked too much. But if you understand that it is the question of how one age is embedded between the other ages which we have to affirm as being ages, too, in their own right and with full glory, you see, then you see that it is not a question of some abstract noun, "freedom and tradition," for which I cannot wax warm, you see. But it is the question of the full stature of man in his own generation as soon as he accepts "generation" by definition as something that has to be followed by generations to come, and that has been preceded by generations that have gone on before, so that generation is always only inside a sequence.

Now I think we have already for today made one big, successful assump-

tion that in any generation, the experience of other-ness, of particularity, of being specific, of differing from the past comes first. Every one generation should wake up with the feeling: we are different. And it's the second discovery that they discover that in the very feeling that we are different, we are identical with all other generations, because all generations recognize themselves only by this feeling of distinction. And that isn't the whole problem. The problem is: how this distinction, you see, can be reconciled to our identity. But we have already reversed, gentlemen, the naturalistic, evolutionistic conception of a straight line in history. History is not a straight line. It is a jump, and then a bridge -- bridging-back of the gulf.

I always compare it to this, because you see, if a man goes into the mountains, for example, and is confronted with a torrent -- I had to solve this problem once -- how does he build a bridge? Not by standing this side of the torrent and then beginning to build the bridge. One man has to get to the other side, and then you can begin to build the bridge, you see, by ropes, and by beams that you throw over. You cannot build a bridge from one side, only. You have to get across by a jump, or by fording, or by -- on horse- -- or horse swimming through. What -- however you do it, or you have to go upstream where it is more lenient, you see, and not so wild, and then come back down again to the point where you feel the bridgehead should be made. But whatever it is, a bridge has to be built from both sides, or you can't build it.

So the idea of ours has been so mechanical that you think time is just a patching-on one year after another. This is not the case, because years are abstractions. They are mechanical. They are a clockwork. Life never is -- happens in this way. There must be a new entity that lives a little bit longer than the father and the grandfather. This entity has to be first assured of its independence, of its own character, of its quality of belonging to its own age, and then after it has received the security and reassurance that it is somebody in his -- its own right, you see, then it will also harken to the burden that it has to carry on, the sound that had to be -- has to be spoken through the ages.

I think that this is such an important discovery that I should stress this; although on the other hand, if you really look on it, is very trivial, because you know this from your own family experience. But unfortunately, gentlemen, science has made such inroad on the soundness on your brain, that you don't know it, that you really believe in the mechanism of time and mechanical time that A and B are connected automatically. They are not. You, as a brute animal, would kill your father. You would forget him after a year, as all -- animals do. If you go to ani- -- into the animal world, the son does mate with his mother,

because after a year, the -- the filly or the -- the calf has forgotten who the mother was, although the mother nurses them, you see. No memory. There is therefore, gentlemen -- old age is only horror to the young in the animal world. It holds no promise.

And this is a summary of this, gentlemen, for today: the fact that we remember the past means that memory is a promise for our own future. There comes in again this regeneration term, this renaissance term. You see, we kept only an interest in remembering the past, because it must still mean something in our own future. As mere memory, we should forget our parents, or grandparents. There's no reason why you should remember sentimentally something that is just bygone, you see. Let the dead bury the dead, the New Testament says. The only question is, "What is dead?" you see. But the dead must bury the dead, and you go on to new things. But are your parents dead? Well, physically, they may -- have to die before you, you see. But spiritually, that's the question, you see. What is dead?

This we have to decide in every generation, by a decision, and not by an autom- -- automatic evolution. Evolution is utter nonsense for human beings. It is perfectly useless, because either it's too much to carry if it is just going on, you see, or there's nothing to carry. The whole question is: how much of tradition do we have to carry, and how much do we have to reject? The amount of freedom, gentlemen, and the amount of tradition, the amount of sonhood, and the amount of independence have to be re-determined. And you can only do it by saying independence is first, and interdependence is second.

And as you know, that's the great lesson now preached to the Americans in general in history, you see. Independence in 1776 and interdependence by the famous law, Number 1776. You know which law this was, which bill in Congress, which had the number, the fateful number 1776? And I think you should remember it. It is -- I'm sorry it is forgotten now. That was the famous lend-lease proposition by which we entered the war on the side of the Allies, that had the number 1776. And it meant that in 1941, when this bill was passed, it was -- I never forget it -- it was March -- it was very fateful in my own life, this date -- I was in Washington at that day and something was decided in my own life, too -- that was the -- when this -- the -- this bill was passed in Congress. It meant that we have gone back on our Declaration of Interde- -- Independence, you see, and had entered a period of interdependence. America had come of age. The young American had to assert, you see, their being an age by themselves. And since 1940 it is, so to speak, common knowledge, that this isn't the whole story. Can you see this?

So let's stop here.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Testing 1, 2, 3, 4; 1, 2, 3, 4. Testing. Philosophy 57, October 13th, 1953.)

... don't know how much more important the half is, compared to the whole. So I had half of you assembled downstairs, and we had a wonderful time.

At least, I had. And so that's why the other people have to wait.

As to the report of today, I have only -- Mr. {Bain}, would you be good enough to read it?

[tape interruption]

... which has already occurred in America in the James family. I think it isn't easy for you to see what I'm driving at. I'm trying to put your eye on a s- -- turn your eye toward the spot which usually is not seen, a spot at which, from the tree of life, a new generation springs. We look -- if we look into the newspaper -- into the spirit of the times; and therefore the title of the newspaper is the "Times," the New York Times. And then we go onto another time and say, "It is another time." The issue today for the whole of the human race is: is there a community of the times into which every one time has to be planted and rooted? As you remember, the upshot of the la- -- whole -- all I have tried to say in the last lecture has been that we discovered the strange rhythm of history, that independence comes before interdependence. And it is contrary to the evolutionary scheme, which thinks that we first keep what we have, and then add. Now, in real human history, we forget what we have, and we turn to it after we have become assured of our own individuality, and our own full life. Every generation is a secret society, gentlemen. Every generation is a secret society, with its own idiom, its own slang, its own habits, and it's quite impenetrable to any other generation. You wouldn't be understood by Em- -- Ralph Waldo Emerson if he entered this room today. Your mores, the way you make love, et cetera -- that's your private, temporary secret, as it -- the habits of his time would look funny to you. And you have to affirm this. Every generation must first live its own life. The thing becomes tragic, gentlemen, if this, your own life, is not only the starting point for the full life. The life of your own time is not the full life to be led. Most of you believe this, however. That would be the purely secular mind, because the secular mind says that the life in your generation is all you have to live. But the mys- -- mystery, of course, of a good conscience, and of a directed life, and of a successful life is to be succeeded into. You can only be loved by a posterity if you have something to be loved for. And what is it, what people are

loved for? The sacrifice of their own will. People are loved who have been able to -- to go beyond their own temporary will. The -- Beau Brummell -- you know who that was, Beau Brummell? Who knows who Beau Brummell was? Would you tell them, please?

(Well, {just very briefly}, he was a -- an actual, historical figure who was known for his good looks and his charming ways {and the} way he dressed, and so on. He became to symbolize -- or came to symbolize, that is, that {elderly} man which always pretends to be what Beau Brummell actually was. { } historical figure.)

How do we call this in America, this type?

({I'm not really certain}.)

Well, we have a play -- we have a play that represents the modern type of Beau Brummell very well. *The Man Who Came to Dinner*, don't you think? *Man about town*. That's what it amounts to, only more refined, as in England, it would be more refined. I mean, the dress is more perfect, and everything is more, even -- transparent. When you see the man, it's all in -- within 24 hours, so to speak, his excellency, and his distinction. Now such a man can be remembered as a caricature or as an oddity, but he cannot be succeeded into, or cannot be loved. He can be imitated.

Gentlemen, the question then before the house is: in our days how an independent generation, without loss of character and individuality can enter the interdependence of generations, the interaction of generations, and therefore succeed and be succeeded.

Let me today formulate this in two other ways. I ran into the report or reminiscences of an -- sculptor's wife, a Mrs. French, who has written a very charming book on her reminiscences, and she mentions Robertson James, the brother of William James, and Henry James the novelist, and the son of old Henry James, and she says that in her estimation, Robertson James, who never wrote a book, was by far the most brilliant of all the children of William -- of Henry James, Sr., which I think is very much im- -- of some importance to us, you see, in this connection, you see, of looking at this point where the tree of the James family splits into father and sons. Now we had already said that the unique character of the James family rests on the fact that Mr. James brings into his home the universal church, day and night, that he preaches the Gospel, that he is his own church and minister at home. And therefore, gentlemen, what I'm

saying to you is not a solution of a carnal nature in your own family, or in my family, because ordinary men do not bring the whole church universal to their luncheon table, or their dinner or breakfast table. What I'm telling you is: the spirit of one time as connected with the spirit of another time. It is not the flesh of one family generation, as the flesh in a -- and the flesh in another family generation. The unique character of the James family is in this: that Mr. James, Sr., when he spoke, was absolutely nothing but the mouthpiece, you see, of the pulpit, of the Church, of the sacraments, of the Gospel in his living room. You will admit, that we all, who have work to do outside the house, you see, cannot afford this luxury.

So please do not confuse the question of a purely physical descent in -- from one generation into the next -- from the eternal question: how the spirit in one generation can be transmitted into the, you see, the hearts and ears of another generation. You must, to- -- therefore, so to speak, in the James family see a unique constellation. Solutions in history gentlemen, which then can be followed and -- and redeemed, and respected, and quoted, as I tried to do this solution -- bring into your life as a real solution, have of course a kind of perfection and -- which makes them apt to be examples, but which also in this sense cannot be repeated. Your relation to teachers, to your parents, to ministers, to religion, to history books, to biographies, to people you come to know in life, you see, altogether may be able to match this -- what in this one case was allowed to happen between one father only and all his children, because here was one man who, in the middle of the 19th century, was still in the absolute intimacy of the tradition of the Church, as nobody today really has it, outside the Bible Belt, and on the other hand, he had already the heresy of saying that the Church had to come down to earth in every life, and wasn't dependent on a Sunday service, you see, or on a liturgy, or on any denominational tie-up.

So you see, what I'm trying now to warn you against is not to see why the James family has this special quality. A hundred years ago, every family in the world had still strict religious authority in one way or the other. There was prayer, you went to the services, and neither Jew nor Christian were emancipated. But the -- the -- the -- you had to belong to an organized religion. If you say today "organized religion," it is always second-best. It isn't -- filling everything. Even if you have Catholic tennis grounds, the tennis ground is -- wins out against the label as being a "Catholic" tennis ground or "Catholic" swimming pool. Nobody seriously believes that the water is more Catholic than the secular water in which you can swim. And this whole problem day of the Church is to run after all our secular activities and then to -- to make them into de- -- something denominational just doesn't work. I mean, because everybody feels that we

live in a universal society, and a -- a greater universe. And no denomination can cover it totally. It's just impossible.

The -- the Anglicans, for example, have struggled very hard to keep their -- their tradition here as -- Episcopalians in this country. But when you read the constitution of the Episcopal Church -- who is an Episcopalian, anybody? Well, if you read your constitution, the mainstay is this purely democratic constitution, which is an imitation of the American Constitution, the way they vote, you see, the -- how the bishops and the house of the -- of the lower clergy and the laity, because it's irresistible here that you do everything in the parliamentary way. Whereas in the -- in -- in England, you see, they never have, as you know, gotten rid of the authority of Parliament to rule them. You can't have a Book of Common Prayer changed in England to this day without Parliament, you see, allowing it. And so the Anglican Church to this day in England is very different indeed. Here it has just become a part of the democratic way of life in this country. So the faith in democracy is stronger than the -- in the ways, you see, the historical ways of the Church. Well, you find this in -- everywhere, I mean. You find it in Catholicism, and Protestantism. Don't believe for a minute that the -- the ways of this country haven't had the power to submerge, so to speak, everything that is purely divisive, and purely denominational.

Without going into this, I still say once more: the James family, at a moment which was the last moment in American history, in 1865, when -- and before the country went absolutely secular, as the basis of its education, the basis of its press, the basis of its politics, the basis of its scientific search, there is still this one man, Henry James, Sr. And he sent into the world this group of youngsters. And as I told you, this man Robertson, who never wrote a line, yet is highly representative of his children, they all had a silver tongue. They all were feared and beloved for their incredible eloquence.

What makes a man eloquent is therefore one of the questions we'll have to answer in the -- this story. Nobody can be eloquent by himself. Eloquence is a response. You can only be eloquent if you have -- we are allowed to respond to the stream of speech, of eloquence, of garrulity that is around you. Eloquence is response. Nobody is eloquent who is not in some reciprocity.

Now the family table of the Jameses therefore to this day -- you can, so to speak, realize it in their books, in their letters, in their collected letters -- outshines the eloquence of the pulpit and the sermons of the clergymen in Mr. Henry James, Sr.'s generation. So you have the strange thing, which is an historical -- great historical law, gentlemen, that the most heretical form of an institu-

tion can, at the decisive moment, outlast the more orthodox, because it already has, so to speak, made contact with the future -- by {laicalizing}, by translating all the liturgy, the sermons, the chorales, the hymns, the thoughts, the prayer, of the Psalms, of the Church into dinner talk, into breakfast talk, into the witty and cordial exchange, and the affectionate speech between parents and children. Mr. James represents heresy. He is a heretic with regard to official religion. No doubt about it. He wants to be one. He's a heretic. That is, he proclaims a way which in some way does away with the organized church. He denies the Church. That -- we can't go into this in greater detail, but perhaps at the end of the course, we may be able to read some of his texts. He says this in the paper, you remember the -- have you read my paper on this, at this time? Well, I'm quoting his -- his words on Jesus, when he speaks, you see, that it was an unspeakable sully of Jesus, that the Church got hold of Him, you see, and deified Him, you remember? So he's a heretic -- no -- no -- we shouldn't mince any words and not try to save his soul in any orthodox way. But a heretic may, at a moment when the whole institution dies, bear fruit outside.

When the Roman Senate -- to give you another example -- when the Roman patricians had kept the law under cover for a long time, the {plebesians} rebelled, as they would have riot- -- they did riot, and they seceded to the sacred mountain. And Rome wouldn't have been Rome without making peace between the old patrician tradition and the new {plebesian} tradition. You have heard of the patricians in Rome, and the plebs. These two words, perhaps, may have struck you and that's very important, the way, again -- can an older group can be reconciled to the younger group, and the tradition go on fruitfully, you see, or must the next generation just break away -- the plebs, you see. And they w- -- have nothing to do with the patricians. Now it so happened that Cneius Flavius, a -- a man of rank, had taken pity and sympathy with the plebs before the riots started, and had taken the law out of the sanctuary of the patricians and had written it on publi- -- had published, so to speak, these laws, the texts of which had been kept as the sacred reserve of the peers, so to speak, of the realm. It would be as tho- -- though the House of Lords only knew the common law in England, you see, and the House of Commons had not been allowed to read the text, the old decisions, you see. And he broke this taboo, Cneius Flavius did, and so Roman law was allowed to go on in traditional ways, because his publication of the law, his acting as a heretic in the old order, you see, had come just about in time to make the {plebesians}, after they had read it, to say, "Well it isn't as bad as we feared it would be, but as long as it was kept a secret," you see. "Now we see, that we can very well continue this -- in this line, you see, because these laws make sense."

You will find everywhere, gentlemen, that timely reform, although considered heresy at its own time, can save the peace between one generation and the next. For example, there is one, beautiful monastery in Germany, the {Komburg}, near -- in {Württemberg}, one of the most beautiful Romanesque churches you can find there, where 30 years before the Reformation, the canons declared they would break the law of -- of celibacy and allowed each other to mar- -- get married. Now, that happened in 1483, when in 1517 the Reformation started, the people on the {Komburg} were -- remained unmolested by the new Protestants, because they said, "Well, they have gone halfway already voluntarily, and we won't interfere with their possessions. We won't destroy the pictures and the statues in this monastery, because these canons have already admitted that marriage is a normal state." And so this monastery was allowed to continue 300 more years peacefully. And it's still standing undestroyed, and one of the very few places in Europe where neither the Reformation nor the French revolution have, so to speak, cut off the noses of the statues, which they have, as you know, in France, in the most devastating manner, during French revolution, because in France they had not reformed for even 300 more years. They haven't even to this day. So the mob went out and finding no heretical courage inside the Catholic Church did it wholesale and they broke away. And you have today this curse in France that they only have left and right, and they have not sons and fathers. They have not the two-generation problem, but they have just one world and the other world in constant opposition. That's why the Ameri- -- the French mind is just very logical and very witty, but so absolutely sterile. Because the heretic -- if you see now what I mean -- in the case of -- Henry James, you see, can now represent to you a form of Church and Christianity, and Scripture and Biblical authority, you see, which you may not grant to the pope, or to the Presbyterians -- Church, or to the Episcopalian Church, you see, or to any organized religion, because you say, "My higher life cannot be dictated to by organized religion." But as an example of the good life, Mr. James has divested himself of any such authority, and he just asks you, "Don't you want that? Can you live without me?" so to speak, you see.

So the heretic at this moment represents the Church as a lovable institution, without authority. And that is the great aspect of this one side of the James family. The older generation, by having become heretical, cannot claim any authority. It can only be accepted by you because you love it, because you have to love it, because it makes itself lovable. Now to be lovable, you see, is not a question of authority, of right, of law, you see, and order, but is a question of your surrendering your heart to it, and not your brain. You see the difference?

So my appeal is then made to you in the same manner as Henry James did to his sons, because why am I entitled to say all these things? Because religion, Christianity, the faith, the Scriptures, prayer, the presence of God did not come to the children of Henry James in the form of any authority. They only came as the outpouring of the free spirit of his father -- their father. And that is -- something magnificent. The father dared -- the father risked his own -- whole existence on the basis of free love. And here the word "free love" is in order. Free love for married people is ridiculous, when it is opposed to -- to marriage, because any real love wants to lead to -- to marriage, or to -- eternal union. And however, to be loved for your relation to your maker -- that can only be done if you forfeit all claims to authority. The father did not claim that his sons had to believe because he believed. He did not claim that he -- he should join any church, because he had no -- found no fault with Christianity, you see. But he let them completely free, but there was this testimonial, you see, his witnessing.

And so now you see that the -- the family really represents something very special. You read any text that comes out of this family, and you will find that these people were flooded, the children, with this constant flow of the eloquence from their father's mouth in the family. It's a family pulpit. It's a family's gospel, so to speak. The -- the Gospel preached in the family. That's unique. You may get Mrs. Beecher Stowe, or you may get a great minister doing this at home, but he still has his other pulpit. He still does his best for his congregation, you see, or with -- inside the church. Not here. This man had no other outlet. The occasions in which he could give a lecture or a speech outside the family were very few. And then he was a mainstay, where his own friends, you see, members -- assistant members, so to speak, of his family.

And now, also let me underline this. Such a family as the James family, of course, does not consist of the people born into this by right of blood ties. But it contains the friends just as much, and the correspondents. A family, as the James family has happened to be, is of course a spiritual organ, an organ of spiritual life. It is a spiritual institution. It is not an apartment story. It is not a story of two parents and two children squeezed into 45 square feet of room, with a kitchen and a refrigerator, what you call a "family apartment." That's all a total misunderstanding of modern architect. Any family today is -- is needed, because we need house parties. And we need house parties, because the Holy Spirit today cannot be hoped to exist at Cap- -- on Capitol Hill, or in John's -- St. John's Cathedral.

They are too big, gentlemen. If you have no longer commu- -- rural churches, and you have centralized schools -- no district schools -- and every-

thing, if we have 3,000 schools in Dartmouth instead of 400 in normal times down to 1918, for the 170 years, what do you expect? Do you think you can have the Holy Spirit in any of the groupings of such size? It's impossible. You have mob rule.

So the family today is nothing but the normal bearer of the good tidings of the spiritual life. And you have to make it into this. You can't make your wife happy if you have no guests. And you can't have guests if you only regard them with television. There has to be something to be talked about. You have to make peace in your family. You have to give your guests something that strengthens them when they go out again. And you must give them cause to come to you to receive this fortification, in their distress, and in their doubts. And you are -- this television business is just one more attempt of the manufacturers of the spirit of the times to settle once for all that there shall be no Holy Spirit in which the academics -- crowd, of course, heartily joins, because the academic spirit today in this country is a secular spirit, is the spirit that wants to destroy the communion with our forefathers and says, "They were superstitious. They were just dated. They were antiquated." And so they write books about the last Puritan.

In the -- in the -- I have to stress this, gentlemen, because I -- I didn't when I began talking about these things, because to me it is normal that you and I, when we meet, speak to each other, comfort each other, and therefore are meeting in one spirit, either of despondency or of courage, or what it is, but certainly what brings us together is not just our physical needs. But when I hear you talk, you really think of the family just as satisfying material needs: sex, and hunger, and prestige, and security.

Well, gentlemen, the James family knew nothing, because in this man's decision not to become a minister -- Henry James, Sr., you see -- there was involved this strange vow, probably never articulated, that he certainly wouldn't go back, behind the ministry in an organized church, but he would prove that the real spirit could be inherited better outside the organized church. So I give you Henry James as an example of a superminister of the spirit, who consecrated his home, not because he couldn't become a minister for believing less, but he couldn't become a minister for believing more than you have to believe in an organized ministry, when you only sermonize or say Mass mor- -- in the morning from 8 to 9. And he said, "But I have to witness to this totally, with my whole life." There is no distinction between weekday and Holy Day, and that you may sum up as his main heresy, that Mr. Henry James, Sr., said there is no such division between a sacred place called "the church," and a desecrated place called "the private home." Religion is neither private nor public. It is openly confessed.

And gentlemen, in this point, I want you to see -- we come now to a description in -- of the solution problem in the James situation, in the James creation. You are killed and murdered by your simply dividing private and public life. The best of you, you think, is private. And the -- that which you will stand for is called "public." But gentlemen, God hasn't created a private world and a public world. And he hasn't created private law and public law. That's all nonsense. He has created us openly, in His image. And whether you live in the family, or whether you live in the -- under government orders, or you live in the -- on the planet -- in the desert Sahara, you are -- lie open to Him, absolutely open. And He knows nothing of this division of private and public. And religion, of course, is killed in this country, because it is said to be man's private affair. Then there is no religion. As soon as religion is -- if you know ahead of time that religion is private, it has been abolished. Because if religion is one thing, it is the permeating force, you see, that -- under which public and private life has to be brought. And by saying that religion is private, you have denied that you have any. Then it is just -- well, it's uninteresting. It is not only belittled, but is in fact abolished. Now Mr. James is so important. He is a heretic. He challenges the whole organized church from pope to moderator of a Baptist meeting, because he says, "Twenty-four hours a day I breathe, I try to breathe in the -- in the atmosphere of the Holy Spirit." It is this pervading force that makes him a unique fellow in your eyes, because you can think of a man who leaves the Church and still believes, but then you always imagine that he treats his { } as private utterances, to be kept private.

Now gentlemen, may I say then that Henry James has not, in 1865, taken the decisive step into the secular era, because he has not allowed his home to be degraded into a private affair. It wasn't his private home. And he has made his children into public agents of the spirit, by transmitting him this task of translating his gospel into the spirit of his -- their own time and this language and the eloquence of secular speech. To write a novel, to write a letter, to write a book, to make -- crack a wit for the children of Henry -- of -- the Henry James father, has always meant to be -- to speak openly, and not privately. That is, to speak with the whole man. And may the chips fall as they may, as we say today, when we are willing to take the consequences, you see, of what we say. When you speak openly, you forget whether this is a private room or a public room, and only such words of you will bear fruit. The power of the spiritual life depends just as the power of creation in -- of children on your willingness to take the consequences. That we mean by "open." It doesn't mean shameless, you see. It doesn't mean exhibitionist, it doesn't mean naked, but it means open so that you do not regulate the truth, and the consequences. You are willing to let it affect others as far

as the spirit may move others. That is open, you see. Whereas "private" means I know that nobody will take it out of the walls of this room. And then you have scuttled it, and you are imprisoned -- have imprisoned the spirit into the walls of a -- padded walls of a telephone booth, where you don't want the sound to get beyond the padded walls.

This is the curse of your idea of privacy, gentlemen. It's the same as -- as birth control. The children are born only when the parents are willing to take the consequences. That doesn't mean that anybody is shameless enough to invite other people to look at their making love. They are just as discreet and private as the others. But when the walls are broken and the child is born, they are willing to take the consequences. That's the difference between private marriage and open marriage, you see. If you are openly married, the fruits of your intercourse are legitimate, you see. In your private love affair, there can -- may be -- must be no fruits, because it is only privately -- private as long as nobody knows that you have lived together as {husband and wife}. Can you see this?

Gentlemen, this is something quite far-reaching. I want you to understand that the institution of the home of the James family in some ways is more important for you to understand that the relation -- than the relations of Church and state today, because you don't know what Church is and what state is, today, because you make the division of open and private. You are so sure that a man can take his own life privately, and are so sure that he can -- that he can control and check his offspring by birth control, that you do not see that the problem we are asked in the full life is: to know ourselves as the link in all life. When it is a link in all life, then anything we do, from shitting, to having sexual inter- -- a lov- -- a loving intercourse with a woman, to thinking, to speaking out, is a part of a process in which we do not sit at the switch, and we -- cannot control the effects. And that's why the Bible says two things: by their fruits, ye shall know them; and judge not, lest ye be judged. Because any one of us knows that many times he -- his utterances and his deeds should not have -- take affect. He's afraid, of course, you see, that he be judged, because once you know that you are living in the open, and there are no secrets, because there is only one life, one territory completely containing us and working through us, then we are all deficient in grade. Many of our acts, you see, we condemn -- would condemn ourselves, so we shall not judge anybody else, because we know that for one successful act, there are 99 unsuccessful and deficient acts in our own life.

Now you have to balance these two utterances. Judge not, lest ye be judged; and the other: that only by their fruits we shall know them. In order to see the problem of a man like Henry James, who is satisfied of handing over the

best he is possessed by, to his children and to leave it with them to bear fruit, without saying, "You have to be members of my church," without saying, "You have to share my convictions," you see, without trying to convert them, you see, but only trying to divert them, so to speak. Trying to entertain them. Trying to enter into a conversation with them, and make the -- his side of the conversation so overpowerful that the echo, the response, the answer in some way must come up to this {strength}. It is the vigor of the father's appeal that is the only investment and the only certainty that he has that the echo must be equally important, and appealing, and fruitful. Can you see the difference between a transmission of content and a sowing openly into the ground and saying { } must die, the { } can be reborn. That's the ultimate in faith. Can you see this? It isn't the same word that he wanted to hear from his children repeated, but he wanted to have the vigor of his word, you see, repeated, re- -- reborn.

So, the faith, gentlemen, in the Henry James generation, is of such an ultimate, extreme character, that he doesn't want to have his word of faith come back to him, but a new word of the same degree of faith, isn't it? Now gentlemen, here you have something of a perpetual character, which the Christian Church has never lived before, neither have the Jews, neither have Mohammed and Islam, nor have the Chinese. It's an incredible appeal to the interaction of generations, that the older man has said, "My inspiration is true, and I will believe in the truth and my inspiration, and I will feel rewarded if my sons -- sons say something quite different, but say it with the same enthusiasm and the same vigor." Will you kindly note this, gentlemen? That is something you have never read about and never heard, and it is still -- far in the future. The problem of Henry James, the heretic, was not to find affirmation of his tenets in the -- by the younger generation, but his -- his task was much more faithful, and much more inspired, and much more daring. He wanted to have the same vigor, the same devotion, the same lack of lackadaisical degeneracy which he represented, and he -- this was his reward and the echo: that he did give birth to Henry and -- and William James, who are the most eloquent English writers of their generation. That isn't the whole story, but I'm only trying to develop it at this moment from his heretical situation, from his -- not his -- so much his point of view but his -- his point of action, because it wasn't his point of view. He became aware of what he had done only late in life. He made a decision not to become a minister. His negative decision was consciously done, you see, in his youth. Then as a man of independent means, he had the fabulous courage to concentrate on creating this family conversation. And it is, you see, with your damned idea of privacy, very difficult for me to give you the respect for this man's creation as though it was more important than the crea- -- creating {Socony} Vacuum, or the Empire

State Building. In my mind, the lifelong action of Mr. Henry James, Sr., is much more important than the founding of any corporation in the United States, be it bathtubs, or soap, or what-not. You can give me Procter and -- Gangster, and who -- not, I mean. It doesn't make -- it doesn't make any difference. All these corporations also had to be founded, and people had to give faith and trust to them and -- for generations. This -- this -- they are producing our soap. All right. But Henry James invested in something quite new, incorporating faith, pure and simple. It's also incorporation, in the spirit of a family, and daring his children to forget every word that he has said -- had said, but not forgetting his spirit. Forgetting every word that he had said. That he had to do, because he was a heretic. You ca- -- no heretic, you see, can ask from anybody else to be orthodox, because if -- since he defied the Church and the Church fathers, here was this father of fleshly children who had defied the fathers of the Church. And therefore, he had to pay the penalty. Now the penalty is, however, much more complicated than you think it is, you see. The penalty was that he couldn't ask for allegiance and adherence to his faith, to his formulated, articulated faith. If I reject St. Augustine, and the pope, and Luther, you see, and everybody else, then of course I would be ridiculous if I said, "From now on, you all have to believe in me, Henry James," you see, because anybody -- can only ask for what he does himself, and therefore, after Christianity -- no heretic can found a church. A heretic cannot found the Church because he has himself desecrated the Church and cried it down and said, "It is -- there is no church for me, well, then there can be no church for others."

But this isn't a simple solution, gentlemen. The reward of the loving heretic, of the faithful heretic, of the inspired heretic is that he may sow the seed in another man's heart to love as much as he, to be inspired as much as he, and to hope as much as he, and in this sense, you see the strange purification of faith in such a life, you see. Not what I say is what I have the right and the privilege to hand over to the next generation, you see, but the fact that I believe, and that I speak with full conviction, and that I put it in the open, and cast the bread on the water and let it reach, you see, a -- work and be effective as far as I can make it effective, you see, something very different from selling a commodity, you see, in a described -- -- fashion, you see, of a dogmatic statement. Can you see the distinction? It i- -- no? Then please ask the question. It is not right for you to sit there and --

(I can't formulate it, but -- I've been trying { }, I think. I can't formulate the question { }.)

But you do see that it is a problem?

(No. I don't see that there is a problem.)

Well, do you come -- if I may ask this question -- from any background where Church has played a part, or a denomination?

(No.)

It hasn't. Well, still you would understand that a chemist wants to teach you chemistry, you see. And he thinks certain things in chemistry are in accordance with the state of the science at this moment. And he wants you not to believe anything that is dated and antiquated. So wouldn't he be very anxious to make you reach the standards of chemistry, 1953, and would he not be down on you if you -- if you believed something that was thought to be true in 1889? Don't you think that would be true? That he would be very anxious to make you see that we had progressed and that in 1953, in chemistry, you had to think such-and-such things to be true? And you must not relapse into some prejudices which people still had in -- in the 19th century in chemistry? Would you agree to that?

(Yes, but {since have been proven false there}).

Well, I haven't. That's what I have assumed. Sure. But there have -- there have many things been proven false. So -- so you have no trouble understanding this. You understand this ...

(Yes --)

...that a chemist wants you to teach chemistry as of 1953. That's all. So you believe in the duty of a man to teach content, a certain content of tenets that must now be thought to be true, so that this chemist can go on and perhaps progress again and so that 30 years from now you may be the leading chemist. But in order to become the leading chemist in 30 years, he would have -- first have to learn from this man what he should know at this moment. Is that right? Any trouble in -- in seeing this?

(No.)

Now Henry James' situation is the opposite, the very opposite. He's not a chemist, but he wants to assure his children of the presence of a revelation, of a -- of a spirit that guides their steps in every one moment, and tells them to give up

chemistry, for example, or to study chemistry. The decision of becoming a chemist, you see, must also underlie some sanction. That cannot be the chemist's sanction, because you may have to choose becoming -- between becoming a politician and a chemist, or perhaps emigrate and go -- become a Japanese. As long as these higher decisions, you see, are at stake, the chemist can't help you, because he only knows what can be known. When we make decisions in life, if you want to find out whom you have to marry, you see, there is no -- there is no science about this, because you cr- -- re-create the world at this moment. And here we enter this -- this sanctuary of which the letter of Willi- -- Henry James' father tries to speak to his son. He says if you believed in creation, you would know that you must be at that moment in the sequence of how to create. The first chemist could not be told by chemists what chemistry was. But he had to cry out, and say, "There shall be chemistry. And I'll prove it to you." And nobody believed him and they burned him at stake as a -- as a wizard, as a sorcerer. And he said, "Just the same, there will be another chemist. We'll -- we'll look this -- see this through." The first chemists actually were burned, I mean, as witches, because they -- you see, alchemy and -- and witchcraft were -- were contaminating each other, of course, and were thrown together in the 16th century.

Now gentlemen, there is then, where something is not known to exist, a -- quite a different jurisdiction, and that we call the "realm of creation." The realm of nature contains all the things you know already to exist. The realm of creation contains the things which you feel must be proven to exist -- like love, or sacrifice, or patriotism, or -- or beauty -- but which you cannot prove to anybody, except by your own deed. It's absolutely -- you can't look it up in an encyclopedia. You can't look it up in a textbook of chemistry. You don't believe this, of course, because it is beyond your experience. You -- in any distressing decision of your life, you will however be exposed to justice. You always have to ask yourself, "Shall I take vengeance on an injustice done in the world, or shall I go beyond and create another -- a new standard of { }, which includes even the -- the doer of the evil?" you see. "So that I take him with me into the new order of things." "Love your enemy" is always a creative act, you see. It can never be proven, you see, by chemical rules, that it will work. He may bite your hand and he -- he may stab you in the foot.

We have a -- I have a dear friend on this campus whose brother was killed in the war in the Pacific, because the brother was a very -- a Christian gentleman, really, and -- and pardoned a Japanese, and had him come out of his -- of his hedgerow there, his -- how do you call it, this cave and -- no, what's the word? Trench wel- -- wie?

(Foxhole? A trench?)

Ja. Foxhole, and made him prisoner, and then the man murdered him, this Japanese, for this act of forgiveness. Now when you try to love your enemy, you're always exposed to this danger. Nobody can guarantee that thine enemy knows already that you are going to love him, you see, and before you know it, you may be murdered, as Jesus was betrayed by the people He -- He tried to redeem. That's the secret of the Redemption, that He had to go to the Cross, because He loved His enemies, the people who -- and His enemies were the very people who crucified Him. So He could only show his love by accepting the verdict and going through the ordeal, and -- so that their eyes may be opened after the event. And you are a Christian when you can say to yourself, "I would have crucified Him, too, but I mustn't," because then you are the -- His enemy who would become His friend.

This is very simple, but so simple that you have forgotten it, gentlemen, that to love thine enemy, any act of love is risk -- can always be betrayed. The viper can always wound you mortally in the process. It isn't true that "love thy enemy" is without risk. It isn't true that thy enemy wants to be loved by you. This is all sentimental sugar-bread which you receive in this country. To live thine enemy is the most dangerous sacrifice of your own life. It is not done by good will, but by great courage. And you can't do it always. It's only when the appointed hour has come that the world wouldn't, so to speak, be able to survive if at this moment not one man would love his enemy, you see. It's always a creative act which is added to the nature of things. You cannot ask all Americans to love the Russians. You cannot ask all the Russians to love the Americans. But I'm quite sure that it is very decisive that one American at this moment goes and loves one Russian. It's very important, but you can't promise him any emoluments. You can't promise him a position in the state department after that. It's -- the -- the easiest prediction is that he'll be slandered and defamed in his own country, and that the Russians will throw him into jail and prison and that he'll die from famine or -- or -- or -- or an infectious disease. But that doesn't mean that he hasn't to create the future. Ten thousand have to -- try to create it, and one will be -- may succeed. That's how risky real life is, gentlemen. You hate to hear this, although you see in -- in -- when you deal with chemicals, and you deal with bacteria, and you deal with anything -- plant life, or animal life -- that there is always the seed of a thousand, and one of them grows. So it is as risky to live.

(Sir, can we have a break here?)

Of course. I want one very much. Open the window, too.

[Tape interruption]

...but people only have peace if it has allowed age to come and be reconciled with this spirit and there is a strange utterance of William James in which this secular mind says he will not have rest before he hasn't made the voice of his father heard. He writes to his wife. Has -- somebody found this letter, by accident in his -- in this volume there? It's a very wonderful letter by which William James asserts this very faith, that it is not enough to be William James, but that he's only, you see, in peace with the ages that have gone before, if he has made his father's voice heard, too. So that in addition to age, you see, to be -- being his own -- himself, he has also to give -- make room for this age, towering over his age.

You all know an -- an utterance which still can be repeated with some acceptance in this country. When Lincoln died in the -- in the morning, as you know, after the assassination, the secretary of war said -- Stanton, what did he say?

(Now you belong to the ages.)

To the ages. We belong to the ages when we have become understandable to the next and the previous generation, as well as our own. And as long as we only believe -- belong to our own age, we just haven't done that. We belong to the ages, and otherwise you only belong to your own age. It's all the difference. That is what is implied in Mr. Stanton's word, and he was truer than he could know at that time. Lincoln belongs to the ages, you see, and we are very different -- indifferent to the poor digestion, and the -- his marital troubles which he had in his own age.

So we shall call this level, gentlemen, where the ages are connected, a level of universal history. You belong to the ages when you have entered something, you see, that can penetrate the fog of your -- any one's own time. Can you see this? It's stratospheric, so to speak. The fog and the -- the clouds, and the atmosphere of your terrestrial existence is not blinding you to this fact that in the stratosphere, the spirit of Lincoln is still there. Now that was Henry James' father's problem. And I have been asked a very pertinent question in this connection which you now kindly will repeat. Ja.

(Not I.)

(It was me.)

Oh, it was you. Pardon me. I'm sorry. I'm -- get up and speak. Get up and speak. They can't hear you otherwise.

(My point, Sir, is that a -- that a heretic can't exist as a -- a heretic can't exist first of all in a family. There is no such thing as a heretic when it's the part of a father, that a heretic can only break away from a previous authority. The definition of a heretic is one who -- who places, or substitutes an authority of his own, so that -- of a pre-existing authority, whether it be personal or ideological, and that -- in the case -- although I don't know about William James, but in the case of all other heretics that I have ever studied, it's a man who places his new authority in his own beliefs, and his own private beliefs and breaks away from pre-existing authority. And take, for instance, music. You can take any of the -- any of the -- the -- the heretics of music like Mozart, or Beethoven, who superimposed their own ideas on a new generation. Now these things are not accepted, as you said, Sir, emotionally or through the spirit -- or through the heart. They're accepted intellectually, and that a heretic cannot transmit his content or his attitudes intel- -- anything except intellectually. Otherwise he's not a heretic. He's a sentimentalist. And he cannot be a { } theologian.)

Well, it's so wonderful, you have learned all these things. Now, I like you to consider your own situation in real life. And you will find it's much more complicated. Jesus was a heretic, and He was very orthodox. The -- the ideal is, of course, to be authority and heretic, and free, both. There life only begins. You're only moving on this lower level there, you see. Either-or. That's not your real life. And I prove it to you.

I have published an essay, which perhaps I should recommend to your attention: "Youth and Authority." "Youth and Authority" was published by the Harvard University Press in 1940. And I put the simple question -- we have 287 denominations in America. And all these denominations have created at a certain time by heretics. Or most of them. Just started in this country. And yet they have all asked their children to belong to the same denomination. That's why you have a Society of Friends, and -- you have Quakers to this day, although the children, you see, were left without authority officially. And the Quakers do not claim any authority. But they are -- you have hereditary Quakers, and you have hereditary Baptists, and you have a whole group of people where you know they have been Baptists for 200 years, which is a contradiction in terms. But there life begins only, Sir, you see. It's too simple, your logic. Your logic is in- -- in- --

unassailable, you see. Either-or. Your own authority or not. It isn't true. The heretics have all had a meri- -- a relative -- a relation to authority. They only attack the authority as established, but they try to purify it, and purified it from their own authority, too.

(But that's exactly what I said. I said { }, that's what I mean by "super-imposing their own authority.")

Not superimposing, but only using their authority for pulling down wrong authority, but not standing in the way of righteous authority. You only see the destructive thing. "Superimposing their own authority," the -- or they have real heresy. Luther did not say that God hadn't spoken through Moses and the Prophets. He didn't say that Christ wasn't in authority. He only said you had to recognize once more Christ's authority. That isn't superimposing my authority in a positive way, but it is making room for the positive authority which speaks in your heart, my dear man. And that even the pope has to admit that Jean -- Jeanne d'Arc was right against the priests of her time, and that she was an authority, and the priests who burned her was -- were not. And that's good Catholic doctrine. You just -- you don't know the -- even the ABC of Christianity and of faith. It's all here in this country -- it's talked down. What do you think, read, or any orthodox statement about faith, your conscience is still higher, according to Roman Catholic doctrine, than anything the pope says. If your conscience forbids you, you can't do it. It's always super- -- if you call this "superimposed authority" then you don't believe in God. If God cannot speak in every human heart, then the whole story of Christianity and Judaism is just a fake and a hoax -- if it's only a question of one man's authority against another man's authority. It's a question of divine authority and the sources of divine authority in you and me and every other mortal being.

And that is a real question, my dear man, and it cannot be decided by your nice and neat logic. Any mother and any father has to show proof in the education of their children that they are not punishing them wantonly and arbitrarily by superimposed own authority, but because it is necessary that -- that arbitrarily the child must be spanked. It is necessary. Any one would have to act in this place, and then you are right parents. If you make it clear to the -- to your child, and I hope you will, that he isn't spanked because the father is just a fool, or moody, but because any man who wants to raise children has a responsibility from God to raise children. And he cannot raise children in any spiritual sense if he doesn't punish them. They want to be punished. They wait for it. This ridiculous situation in this country at this moment, where the parents -- don't even know this, because they speak of "superimposed authority." Is it superimposed

when a grown-up person has to bring up a little one, with all the means and the might in his power? He has to.

(That's exactly what I'm saying. Henry James was therefore not a heretic to his family.)

Oh, you want to limit the use of the word "heretic." Yes, but this is very important to see that he accept, you see -- we are all heretics.

(No father can be a heretic to his son. A son may be a heretic to his father.

But once -- he can -- he can change the authority. He can try and alter an authority. He can try and substitute himself.)

You are not seeing what I'm trying to say. Let me -- perhaps I have to be too much down-to-earth with the James family.

Gentlemen, so long we have tried to find the divine will in a universal history, or in a universal revelation. Down to 1865, there was a church and you could appeal to it and its -- there was the ...

[Tape interruption]

...seems very modest to you, and not interesting and you -- most people in this country prefer Mr. Strike with Union Now, or they prefer some tremendous scheme of a World Court or of a United Nations. But God is very much a concrete creator of direct and special situations. And I assure you, if you look into the problem of the authority of Henry James and William James, you will see that he solved and answered your remark in a very different way, because he didn't treat his children spiritually, as permanent children. He told them that they would be equals in the realm of the spirit in their own generation. He could not superimpose his authority in his family. And he didn't. He said, "I am a heretic and I want you to be heretics, but you must have still the religious conviction that you stand for creation, for the whole, and not for department of science, and not for department of a school, or of -- teaching, or -- education department, or the department of chemistry. You haven't understood that he already anticipated your remark and said, "I'm more radical." What's your name?

({Rafelson}.)

Well, then Mr. {Rafelson}. I'm not satisfied with this eternal drawback that parents, after they have been free thinkers for themselves, then have sud-

denly to impose -- superimpose their authority on their children. That's too much of a -- of a -- of a contradiction, you see. Here is a man, a Dartmouth student. He has cut all the classes and then he goes to his child and says he has to be on -- on time at the dinner table. So the child says, "I cut the dinner table. You cut classes." And I think the child's utterly right, you see.

So Henry James comes about -- Henry James, Sr. -- and says, "My son, I'm perfectly happy as long as he cuts the dinner table out of your schedule for the same good reason for which I have cut out of the Church. But it must be an equally good reason. It mustn't be indifference, it mustn't be misunderstanding, it mustn't be laziness of heart, but if you have such a overpowering reason as I have to remain a free man, God bless you."

Jesus saw a man working on the Sabbath. That's -- is outside the official Biblical reading. But in the best manuscript in the Gospel, Luke, 5th chapter. You probably don't know the story, because it's not in our official text, although nobody doubts that it is authentic. And he saw -- looked at the man and he said to him, "Man, if you do not know what you are doing, you are cursed. But if you know what you are doing, you are blessed." Now here you have the three levels of behavior. A man who breaks the Sabbath from indifference, laziness, not knowing what he's doing, is cursed, because gentlemen, compared to your childishness, your indifference, your laziness, the law is better. The Sabbath is better than the man who's not on terms with the Sabbath. For example, that's what this story is about. But if you have an outstanding, overpowering reason that you say, "The Sabbath is good, but what I'm doing is better," to -- to come to the rescue of a -- of a poor man, at this moment, you see, and thereby leaving the church, the services alone, then you are blessed.

So gentlemen, the question of the -- of the heresy or authority is only soluble if you admit three levels of performance: the individualistic performance, which is haphazardous, from your own mood; the lawful, traditional performance, which is of long-standing authority; and the creation of a next performance, which does not deny that it is good to keep the law, to come at -- to dinner at -- in due time, you see, to attend classes, but which is allowed to enter the scene because you have fully realized the goodness of coming to my class, the necessity of being on time for the luncheon or the dinner at home, but the experience that something bigger is at stake at this moment in the life of the world for which it is good to sacrifice the schedule of the dinner table, or the schedule of this class. Can you -- can't you see this? This is the human problem, gentlemen. The human problem is never an either-or. It is the problem of the -- the tremendous law, the law of history, that the good is the enemy of the better. The good is

the enemy of the better. It is never a question of good and evil. Who -- who wants to do evil? I haven't found people who want to do evil; they all just dress it up as good. But I have found innumerable so-called "good" people who prevent the creative life of -- of ever breaking in because they are satisfied with the good. The good is the enemy of the better.

Now, the -- the preaching of Henry James, Sr., is -- may be summed up in one sentence: the good is the enemy of the better. The good is the enemy of the better. He says, "I {have}, of course, to act as your father. I have to support you. I have to -- you have to sit at my table. But woe to you if you think what I have to say at this table is the best. It isn't. It is all I now can give, but the hour will strike out in which you will have to decide what is the best." That isn't superimposed authority. That isn't making the heretic into a patriarch in the family. But it is solidly the issue of the ages, gentlemen, how the better can come to pass without denying that good is good. Can you see the difference? It's -- you all will have to grow up certain -- grow out -- outgrow certain things which you think are the ultimate in life. Don't deny them. But say there is something more important and better to be done, you see. Then you will be free. As long as it is a struggle of "this is evil," and you will do good, you will never be able to the very best you can do. The world as created is good, gentlemen, but it isn't good enough.

Therefore, the whole, real battle of history is between good and better.

And it is not between evil and good. I mean -- I understand that a man doesn't murder and doesn't kidnap. You have in this -- country, of course, only the constant relapse into full barbarism, I mean, kidnapping this -- this child there, and things. Well, I think that isn't worthy of a debate. Let this man be executed. Let this woman be executed. I won't shed any tear. I have no pity with the Rosenbergs. I do- -- never understood it was a Russian -- a Communist issue, of course, to -- to make the president of this country to make him weaken his position and ask him to show mercy to these people. What is below good, I mean, is of no concern to me. But life, gentlemen, is suffocated if the better is not allowed to come to -- into being, compared to the good. That is the real battle. That's worth your -- your interest.

As long as you think it is -- I mean, it is very easy to agree that murderers must be -- must be put away. And to -- we have forever -- however liberalism, you see, having this wrong idea of only fighting good -- evil, you see, and -- and -- and believing that the good is already there, have -- have shed all the tears about the criminals. So they are pardoned too early, and then they commit their next crime. This country, after all, sees the worst crimes committed by the people who have been pardoned, you see, from a false sense of pity. Why? Because

good people's interest has always been directed into this direction, that it is a most important thing to care for the -- for the criminals.

I mean, we have a funny situation today. The -- for the criminal, it is cared for, but I have a grandchild that has -- is a genius, really, in talent and gift, and she has to sit in a class of 50 at the age of 8 and she's bored stiff. Now that's criminal, you see. They think they have a good school there, but they -- should have a better. And my real interest is only how I can rescue this child from this relatively good school to teach her {as an angel}? But what can she do with -- with 50 children in one class? And that is a scandal. But whether this man there who has kidnapped this -- this little boy is immediately electrocuted or hanged is not -- no interest to me. Behead him, poison him, I don't care. Put him in a bag and drown him, I mean. But all the interest in the United States has gone into the fight between good and evil, because the march of history has been excluded here. The march of history says that good things are good and we know already that evil has to be penalized, but we have still to go one better. And we cannot just put a child under the law of public education, you see, and sanitize it. We have to rescue this child from the good of -- of compulsory education. You -- you understand? That's today the issue.

I know a child in this town that has been ruined by the superstition of his parents that he should -- has -- must go to public school because that's the best they can do for him. And I told them, this child has to live better than these ridiculous schools in which people are made happy. This one probably wants to go. It's a long story, and I -- I'm afraid Mr. Keep has heard this story already twice, have you not? And so this boy, what did he become? I mean, since they didn't allow him expectations and promises, and a great school, he grew backward. He netted -- wetted his bed again, and he began to stammer, and he became two years old, because a living being that is not allowed to go forward will always go backward, and they thought they could just, you see, do no harm by sending him to this allegedly good Hanover High School. But they -- I have never seen a case where the good was the enemy of that which these parents owed their child, the very best. The creative thing, they had to invent the -- a way out. I offered them to send him to England. Anything would have been better but this so-called "good" school. And that's what is important, because here is a good boy. And he was not a -- what do I care for the -- for the non-good boy? But I do care that the good boy gets the very best, and that has to be created for him against the good.

So there are always three levels, gentlemen, three levels. You can have a playboy, who isn't even himself. Here, the {joiner}. {That's on the} lowest

possible level. That's the mass man. I mean, that's the fraternity brother, the man who is always everything to everybody and nothing to himself. And he never reaches even the -- the adulthood of -- of -- of self. He always nods -- what everybody else said, he says, too. Well, I'm not talking of this infantile level. I'm talking of the level of personality, of character, of individualism. And I say this is good, but it isn't good enough. Lincoln wouldn't be interesting if he had just been as ambitious as his secretary of state, Mr. Seward, who then later became judge- -- Chief Justice and was paid off, so to speak, like Earl Warren, for his ambitions of becoming president. That's not important. So neither Mr. Warren nor Mr. Seward belong to the ages. You can be sure that Mr. Warren doesn't. That's a political deal. And that's all right. No harm done, but he doesn't belong to the ages. He cannot. He has only tried to establish himself, and that isn't enough in history. The people are not interesting who are success stories. They are -- it isn't even important. I mean, it's neither here nor there. It's good. But isn't the best. The best is only a man, gentlemen, who can rise about -- above the {talk} of his own time and make people in his own time become aware of the fullness of time, of the fulfillment of destiny of ma- -- the human race through and in his own generation. And I assure you that a father, like Henry James, and I hope myself -- and you, too when you are a father -- has this tremendous tri- { }. He first has -- must pray that he has a normal child, and not an imbecile. Then he must pray that this child goes independent, you see. And then he must pry- -- pray that this child comes back to him, and not to him as a person himself, you see, but to that which he has tried to represent while he was his father. And that -- are three things to be done, not two.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Well, I don't care what you do with him. Of course, you have to get him out of the way, because he might do something again. I -- what I'm arguing against is all the sentimentality to -- to judge these things around this insane man. Society is not interested in this -- in these freaks, and these feeble-minded, and in these idiots, and so on, you see. That's one story that has been overdone in this country. It is interested in the heredity of its order that can go down through the ages. That's the first thing.

The second comes from a surplus, if we are very well established, if the society is defended, and armed, and vigorous, and well-educated, and so on and so forth, then you can bend over and say that the weak elements have to be treated nicely and decently. But as you know, for the last 50 years, before the two world wars, the ladies of -- in this -- of this America who run after all the show, the churches, and the -- the whole education, and the arts, and all the -- and the women teachers, they thought that the interest in the criminal was the most important thing. The interest in the freak, you see. This is the wrong emphasis, because there is no historical group whose heredity, whose fecundity does not take first seat before its existence at this moment.

You see it. I mean, your generation has given the wonderful answer to all the statisticians who have said that America would be over-aged and se- -- senile in 1960. Here are 6 million young children born in this country. That is the real answer of your generation to all this stuff of -- that a sterile, over-aged society is of equal reality as a society whose renaissance, whose constant rebirth, whose constant regeneration is first ascertained. We live fortunately in such -- at such a turning point where it is -- obviously is the greater concern of people to have children, you see, than to have the idiots built up to a higher IQ. Now I have nothing -- against idiots being educated, you see. But obviously, the first concern of a society is that there are no idiots. Isn't that very simple?

The interest in the murder is something sickish in this country, the interest in the -- in the criminal. I mean, the Hauptmann case will always stand out, not as a terrible case with regard to the kidnaping of the child only, but with the courtroom procedures, and the newspapers. The -- the -- the criminal cases don't belong on the -- on the title page of your papers. As long as you allow this, you are -- have to be ashamed of yourselves. And you are -- don't know -- even know that this is criminal, the -- what these newspapers' editors -- do. They haunt you every day with another crime. What have you to do with this? Go your way, and

have all the great problems of injecting into your children some vigor. That's more important than all these crimes which you {-- fed}. What do we have to know about all these crimes? No concern of a decent man.

You know nothing but this. You only hear in politics and everything, the crime. {Addiction}. And Mr. Hearst has invented this. You read the London Times. They -- why are the English people such a sturdy race? Why ca- -- don't they -- depend on this standard of -- high standard of living? Why have they this tremendous character? And they'll outlast the -- all the Americans, I can tell you this. You think the Americans are -- are on top, and dominate the world now -- and the English are finished. I can sh- -- only say you one thing -- to -- to say one thing to you: the hydrogen bomb will not be thrown over England, but it will be thrown over this country. There is no country in the world that is in greater danger than the United States. Europe is absolutely safe, because Russia wants to have Europe. It doesn't want to destroy it. But it does want to destroy this country, because we are rich. The poor today are safe. The rich are in danger. It's all nonsense what you say, "Europe is done." We are done, if we go on like that. Europe is absolutely safe. Nobody's going to destroy it.

And why? Because nobody in England cares for anything but heredity.

And in this country, everybody cares for crime. You just compare the title page of the New York Times and the London Times, and you see what I mean. There is no title page in the New York -- in the London Times, because people live quietly.

And your generation has to revolt against all this. You have to live without newspapers for three or four years, a band of you, a group of you. And that group is then entitled to govern the United States. And you have to live three or four years without radio, and without gramophones, and all this television business. Then you can come back and use these mass media for the -- governing other people. But only the group that is absolutely superior to these mass media will be allowed to govern, because government means to be ascetic about the means of life. And just as the Methodists have ruled this country for the last 150 years because they didn't smoke and they didn't drink, so the next Methodist group in this country will be the people who do not read the title page of the American newspapers, who just won't read them.

And you will not look at boxing and wrestling matches, or -- football matches, or baseball matches, or -- on television. And you have to look at them; you think you must. Therefore you are absolutely unimportant in life. People who have to depend on some such things are no longer important in history,

because you can't make a new start. You depend on something utterly meaningless. And what the Methodists did to this country was to make people, in a cold, unheated civilization with no central heating, no electric light, they made them independent of the unpleasantness of their environment. And the non-smoking, and not-drinking of these Methodist people showed them to be rising above their environment. Now today this isn't your problem. Smoking and drinking today are not important vices, gentlemen; and girls are not important questions. The mass media are the important perversions of -- of thinking, and of the human mind. So you have to protest against these mass media.

But I don't see any American boy or girl who knows what his next religion should be. You don't want to have a religion. You don't want to band together for any rebellion, or for any doing anything creative. You have given up every hope that you are important. And yet the whole world is yearning for a group of Americans who laugh off Hollywood, who laugh off television, who say, "What? This country is spending \$2 billion annually for television. It's a shame! It's a scandal!" And it is a scandal at a time when we complain that we cannot pay \$2 billion for foreign aid, for hungry people. Then we buy television sets for \$2 billion a year here. If this isn't shameful, I don't know what is shameful. It's all done for prosperity.

Well, you haven't even heard, you -- that something is expected from you. And you haven't heard -- for the last 15 years on this campus, I have tried to shout myself hoarse, that every generation has to found a new religion. Not a sect, not a church, but a religion in the sense that you are obliged to inject something unheard, t- -- untold, never lived before in to the life of the race. And this abstemiousness of the mass media, that's what you are expected to perform. And you can be sure, the group that does this is the next government of the United States or of the world at large.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...elect what parts of you shall remain. I have ceased to be a German. I am an American. I have dropped a part of my nature. As far as it goes, I have tried to excise it. I've rejected it. You all can -- and must reject a part of your heri- -- heritage in order to insist on other parts that to you seem valid and valuable. Nobody can -- I said before -- can go without some selection. In this very moment, the word enters your nature. Your heresy, you see, the chemists' heresy, Mr. Einstein's heresy is that they think the universe exists without the word. It doesn't. You do not understand me. You think I'm just insane. I know.

But so have all Jews, and all Christians, and all Greeks, and all people who have ever believed in any god, or deity, or spirit been insane in your eyes, because you just think that man is an animal. But you speak about being an animal, and no animal can say, "I'm an animal." Any man who says, "I am an animal," knows who God is, because God is the power to speak. That is the word. That's the -- all -- of course, these fundamental texts, the ABC of human life to you have become some -- chosen books which can arbitrarily be discarded. Do you think the New Testament or the Old Testament can be arbitrarily discarded as denominational bias? They cannot. They are much more fundamental than any ABC or the -- or any mathematics. They're true. They're so simply true that you live by this.

Your whole freedom, the whole independence, all your rights of being a student at Dartmouth College, all your rights to be -- live in a democratic society depend on our conviction that you can appropriate the spirit of the institution in which you live by the power of the word. By saying, "I am an American," we begin to trust you. That's democracy. Democracy means that any man is not just by the nature of things born into society, but he can, by rising to the spirit of society one day say, "On my word, this is my society." And in saying so, the society begins to live, to a certain amount, by -- from the spirit. And on the basis of the spirit, you exhale, because you are now giving back to this institution some of the spirit which has been imparted to you before. And you cease to be just a child of nature, and suddenly the word, which you have freely chosen, begins to carry the institution.

And you are -- instead of becoming a product of your environment, you become the creator of your environment -- the re-creator of your environment, by this strange volunteering for the affirmation. People today have, of course, you see, obliterated -- they speak of "conscious life." All right, you can also do

this. Conscious life is a different kind of life from unconscious life. And you -- human beings have to lead conscious lives. This is just another form of saying they have to speak. Conscious life is not simply life. But that's the life into which you are destined.

Therefore you are not an animal, because -- Sir, my body carries me into the power of speaking to you, of connecting the times and the places. I can build railroads. I can send telegrams. I can make speeches. I can print books. That is, I use my body, certainly -- my animal body -- so that I may build up connections through time and space which no -- an animal is not interested in. A {dog} is born; it dies to itself. You are not this way, and I am not this way.

We are, therefore, not animals, because anybody who says he is an animal is, in the process of saying this, divine. And so man is this strange mixture of divinity and animality. And you can't get out of this. Anybody who speaks is in this quandary, because he speaks the truth. And the truth is valid for anybody who can -- hear to -- listen to you. Or you can cheat. Or you are a liar. So there are either gods or the devils. There is no way out for you, gentlemen. You cannot live innocently in a refrigerator. You cannot live in {anarchy} all his life at 35 degrees of Fahrenheit. That's all -- every American boy tries to do that. He tries to stay out of trouble, by never saying anything, never sticking his neck out, always saying, "Yes, yes, yes, yes."

Somebody says -- then speaks for you. That's what I tried to put on the -- on the blackboard. I have said you are { }. You see, you may make attempts to say, "I'm just an animal." And there are pigs, and hogs, and -- and asinine people. { }. But there is some devil who -- who takes advantage of their votes who -- I mean, who -- whose henchman there -- he is. You are the henchmen of all the people who -- whom you allow to speak for you. Because you want to have peace of mind, you allow them to make war. Here, once more -- as you are lived today, at this moment, sitting here innocently, you say, "Well, if we are born animals, then we can -- don't have to go into history," you see.

By saying this, you are abusing your power of speech, which all American boys at this moment do, you see. No -- 50 years ago, your grandfather would have blushed if he -- anybody had doubted that he had a soul, and that he had to live up to his soul's requirements. But you don't feel ashamed at all. You think that's very funny. And you think it's wonderful -- it's intelligent even to call yourself an animal. Intelligent.

Unfortunately, you see, you have lost your innocence because you have

the power to say, "I am an animal," and you can only say this if you know what God and man is. Because otherwise your sentence, that you are an animal, makes no sense. You fight off something by saying "I'm just an animal." "Just" gives you away. The word "just" gives you away as soon as you know of other categories of life.

How do you know something? Because you are not natural. The only reason why you know this, because you know for sure that the animal does not know what man and God is. Just look at the poor animal. It is bewitched. If you do not -- don't domesticate it, it is full of fear. It can't even sleep at night. Must stay awake. But you can have such peace that you sleep deeply at night, and are awake in the -- in the morning. The poor animals can only -- so to speak, rest in daytime, when the sun is out. And all day -- night long, they must -- they must fear their -- their enemy. But they cannot make peace. They cannot speak. Everybody -- you live, of course, on all these beliefs, but it is so -- you are so uninterested, you see, because you prefer to have this wonderful silky curtain drawn before your real existence, and to daydream some philosophy, which is so cheap, called -- whatever is realism, or material- -- I don't care, I mean, or psychology or something -- and just look at some ridiculous, arbitrary selection of reality in yourself.

But when it comes to choices, and when your children will be ungrateful to you, you'll be very much surprised what you have done to them, because you haven't brought them up in any faith. Very much surprised. And when your friends betray you, and when you go to a man and you ask him for a loan, or you ask him to help out, you just take it for granted that he will. Why he should, you cannot explain if you are an animal. Why he should.

John Quincy Adams, when the slaves, you see, petitioned for freedom, he could have answered, "They're just animals." But he said, "The right of petition," which then the Southern states, you see, wanted to gag in the Congress, "cannot be denied. It is a natural right born with man's nature -- man's nature, if he is to implore." It's a very great saying: to implore. No animal can go down on his knees and implore. It's a wonderful saying.

The old ge- -- man who certainly was a very -- was a realistic, and sober, and very, very caustic man. Not a very amiable -- you must not think that John Quincy Adams had any sweetness or light in him. Not at all. He was very drastic, and very crude, you may say. But he knew one thing, that the gift of man, of imploring his fellow man as his alter ego, as being just as much entitled to live,

that this lifts man above the animal. And there is no law and no order {in this government}, except among people who recognize this, that they are not animals together, but they are, under God, forming the lawful order, in which therefore anybody who can listen also can speak, and because anybo- -- if this -- relation exists, then I -- you, while speaking, already invite the agreement and consent of all the people who listen. And therefore you identify yourself with the whole tree of the human race.

And that's why you know that the story of humanity started 6,000 years ago, and you have to be in agreement with the great direction of the stream of human life. And that no human -- no animal is asked to know. But you have to know who your ancestors are. You have to know whether you come -- stem from Caliban or from Prospero. It's your choice, Sir. If you choose Caliban, we'll kill you. I will -- be the first to vote for your immediate execution.

I -- if a man wants to be an animal, let him be it. Out he goes. You don't see that you forfeit your life by saying that man is an animal. I have no reason to let you live if you say you are an animal or if you say I am an animal. In both cases, the enmity is eternal.

Animals have no friendship and solidarity. They cannot. Eat -- they have to eat. And what I eat, you cannot eat. And what you eat, I cannot eat. It's mutually exclusive. Ask the Arabs, and the Israelis how they feel about each other, because they think that just a sw- -- one is a swine, the other is a son of a bitch. It's very serious, Sir. The peace of the world depends on your -- on what you think of yourself. You are not allowed to think arbitrarily about your own nature. Man has no nature. Man's destiny is to be built into the temple of humanity as one brick -- living brick. And that's all. That's your -- your destination. So you have no nature, because your whole body and soul has to be used up, has to be re-molded. You have to give up your nature. That's meant with the sentence, "He who doesn't lose his soul," you see, "cannot gain it."

Why -- why is it -- forbidden for man to look in the mirror? Why is it forbidden for us to be vain? Why is it forbidden for us to be -- live purposively? Why do we have to be humble and -- and free and open-minded? Because our destiny is always larger than the physical equipment which we have received at this moment. Why is any person greater who overcomes the obstacle and the handicap in his equipment? Why is a great singer -- a greater singer or greater -- Demosthenes a greater speaker because he had -- he was a stammerer? Because man has no nature. Your natural equipment does not determine what you are

going to be.

But the calling which you hear, the vocation, what's needed in the world -- do you think the -- Helen Keller has by nature any right to exist? Yet she has done more for humanity, because she has overcome all her -- obstacles, because her nature was just not there. She has no nature, to speak of.

And when I received a letter from her the other day about the blind, I said to Mrs. Huessy, "Well, it can't be helped. It is Helen Keller who has signed this letter, and although I have not in- -- no interest in the cause, I have to give something." Because she has set an example how to overcome her nature. Man begins where you declare that your nature isn't good enough. And the animal begins when you say, "That's all I have." Anybody who acquiesces his animal nature has given up the right to be defended in court. Why should animals be defended in court? They can be slaughtered. Pardon me?

(I said they could -- { } just as good as man.)

No, they cannot, because they cannot render, you see, this same altruistic loyalty. They want to eat first. You have never seen an animal -- an animal willingly share his food with somebody else.

(Yes, I have.)

Don't do it. Wie?

(I have.)

Well, the kittens -- as long as they are very young under the same mother. But not older. Impossible. Ja?

(Sir, I deny that you can base your entire thesis on the assumption that Christianity is an unassailable truth.)

Well um- -- I mean by -- my dear little Sir, certainly you want to -- live with the apes in 5000 B.C. I still believe that for the last 8,000 years, we have found certain things to be true, as the Constitution -- fathers of the Declaration of Independence also believed. If you really think that we have to wait for you, till you tell us what we have done -- had to do for the last 7,000 years, I'll say, "Please, you are absolutely entitled to do this, but I'll take an axe and I'll kill you,"

and you can't complain. You have no right to exist.

You have no right to have excluded yourself from the society in which you are entitled to tolerance, and to listening, and hearing, and to a -- an opportunity. Opportunity is only within history. There is no opportunity in nature.

This is so cheap, I mean, if a 10-year-old boy begins to say this. But that a 20-year-old man of your stature should -- should really try to play backward and say, "I know nothing. I'm just ignorant." It is very -- people at 14 formerly could -- had already to make declarations of faith, and they knew what they were saying 200 years ago. But you just want not to know anything, so I grant you, you don't know anything. But I -- why should I respect this? Ignorance is not a title to -- to respect, because you don't want to know.

(I don't want to -- I don't want to accept anything that's the truth which I do not know.)

But -- while you are trying to accept the truth, your own truth, I'll give you -- you must know that you are living in the good faith and the tolerance of others. We give you these 20 years to make up your own mind. Sir, you owe -- grant human loyalty to the people who gave you these 20 years for your silliness and inanities. If you admit that at this moment you don't know, I'm perfectly happy then to admit that it is the -- the -- the graciousness of -- of -- of the historical humanity which says, "Every apple should ripen himself, and so we give you, as the future apple, a chance. And in this time, you may say as -- what you please." {Certainly}, you are unassailable in your stupidity, to use your expression. And you -- are unassailable, you see. Only, you live at the mercy of us. And this one sentence, "Thank you, gentlemen, that you allow me to be so stupid," you have to say it first. That is your real creed. You believe at this moment in humanity at large, which allows one of its members to be at this moment so silly. That is unassailable, Sir.

And this is enough to build a whole -- a whole theology, and a whole philosophy on this. If it is true that you have to be allowed to make up your own mind for 25 long years -- in which nothing what you say must be held against you, in which you can be as silly, and inept, and contradictory as you please -- then this is a very wonderful society, that puts tremendous faith in you as a human being, which thinks that man's spirit is so divine that after he has been allowed to wallow in the mire, like the prodigal son, he'll become a saint, and a hero, and a leader of the community. As long as you keep all these doors open, if you understand the meaning of the freedom you enjoy at this moment, you are

{utterly entitled}.

But you -- you cannot say that you have { } and therefore the other fact of the matter, that the -- we are under law to give you this freedom, doesn't exist. If you admit that we are under law, duty-bound to allow you to be stupid, then we can begin talking, because then you presuppose our -- that we have to be religious, while you can be frivolous. That's all right. As long as you see that we allow you to be frivolous and ridiculous, but that we have to be terribly serious to make sure that you have something to eat, and that you have friends, and that you have schooling, and that you have service, and peace, and aren't shot dead while you are making up your mind -- if you see this, then you admit that we must have a religion, you see. It is only -- it isn't your religion. You want to have a better religion.

And then you -- the second point is that not only must we have a religion which secures your livelihood, your life, your existence, freedom, liberty, pursuit of happiness, that is, our -- must be our religion at this moment, but also, Sir -- now comes the -- the terrible thing -- { } whatever you find in your own 25 years to be true must not be less than this, which now at this moment we grant you. That is, your religion may be better than my religion, but it is not allowed to be worse. You cannot backslide before -- into the society in which all the children which a father did not like could be just murdered -- you see, thrown into { } as the Spartans did.

You are already bound by my religion to -- to the fact, or to the task, or to the responsibility, that whatever you find to be true in the future must be better than what I have found. Under this condition, you are free. Absolutely free. Certainly can find anything better. But as soon as you say, "I'm not bound at all; I can find that man is just an animal," I say, "Sorry, out you go." Out you go, because you have broken the covenant. You have broken the covenant under which you have been granted this freedom. You have abused it.

This is the situation in which you are. {Granted}, I want you to be free, Sir. But the conditions of this freedom are very clear. You cannot do less than we are doing for you. The -- the society which you have to establish by your own deeds has already certain minimum requirements. And they are unassailable, Sir. Now, if you are so uneducated not to know that they are the Christian pre-requisites of life, I don't quibble about the word. You call it "American democracy." Well, American democracy is a secular translation of "Christianity." So I mean I -- if you are so ignorant, you see, that's a minor matter. You just don't

know {it}. But the freedom which you have not to know is based on very precise conditions and premises. If you deny these premises from which it springs that you enjoy at this moment this -- this freedom of saying, "I know, I don't know," you see, then you are -- have excommunicated yourself. It's the Calibans in America. They run around by {the thousands}, the people who take to the back hills, the people who say, "Society is not for me."

There is a Swedish sculptor who has written a book, Caliban. It's in the library. I recommend it to your care, you see. That is the real description. You aren't anything like this man, but he has taken the consequences, which you, so to speak, { } talk, mention that nothing has been proved. { } He wants to -- to find out {only} by himself. So he abuses every woman and every man he meets in life. And he had even the guts to write this up. It -- it's a tremen- -- he calls it even Caliban. So he even knows what a -- that he lives, because others are not Caliban, because of course, a man can only commit all his heresies and all his crimes against humanity, you see, because the others still assume that he must act as a human being, and he never does. The second already wouldn't get away with murder. And the third, even less. It's like the kidnaper. The first kidnaper gets away, and then you pass a kidnaping law.

Sir. This is the -- this is -- for a student, is not much of a performance to say that this is unassailable, as you did. There are very clear conditions under which you can say that you do not believe in the truth of Christianity. If you analyze under which conditions it is permissible for you to say this, then you will see that you are already far advanced in history, in the historical { }. They only say this in the year of the Lord 1953. And that -- 2000 B.C., you would have been burned, and tor- -- and quar- -- and -- and -- how do you say? -- quartered. Put in a bag and -- and thrown into the river.

What time is it? Oh. Gentlemen, this is not what I was going to say at all. Perhaps in this six -- seven minutes I have left, I may connect this problem of beginning to think from the point where two generations meet into some great story in the -- of the Bible. Despite your remark, I hope you won't take issue with me on this.

Anything important is only important when a listener and a speaker meet, because only when at least two people become one will there be any effect in history -- in reality left. Anything that is enshrined into your thought and never leaves the of your brain obviously cannot make much effect on the { }. In some form, it has to ooze out. And so I take as a minimum supply of energy in the universe of human history this meeting, where one listener agrees to what a

speaker says. And I took the father and a son as being the -- the most -- simplest form of such a process, you see, of some point where the electric current of -- that goes through you -- the human race, is closed, is -- the negative and the positive pole are so brought together that the current can run through.

And I advise you, gentlemen, this is really so simple. If you begin instead of thi- -- speaking of cooperation in space, or between people here and there, you see, you begin always to ask yourself how a truth that has been older than you is established and which bears a fruit -- is made to bear fruit by the simple fact that you hear it. And then you begin to think how you want to influence your youngsters in a camp, or in a -- in a Sunday school class, or in -- in -- in -- your own family, a younger child -- how important it is that this child should understand and believe what you're telling him. You will find that it is very fruitful to treat the listener and the hearer of a wor- -- word spoken and -- and heard, and -- as potential father and son, or potential ancestor and founder, and heir and successor. They are the purer forms of hearing and listening than what we do here.

You see, you are a little younger than I, and yet obviously in a teacher-student situation, this is a father-son situation. And I use the father-son situation, because I think it seems to be the most recurrent, and the -- in which all other situation of listening and hearing are contained. A father of his country, you see, a Washington, you see, is in this sense the speaker, the father, in one, unified. You see this. Th- -- I'm -- I'm not meaning this in any sentimental sense -- father and son -- but I mean it in this very logical, philosophical, abstract sense, that the speaker is representing something that has already been known before, and the son is inheriting this truth -- a younger man.

I would say that if you should be teachers of a 50-year-old girl, or woman, or man in -- in some capacity of yours, you would be the older, and he would be the younger. You would be the father, and he is the son. Whenever a man opens his mouth to convey knowledge, or convey instructions, you see, or advice, to another peop- -- person, the listener is in the position of being younger, and the speaker is in the position of being older, because both in the process of continuation, you see, of the spiritual life obviously represent first and second degree -- predecessor and successor.

What I'm driving at is that all these terms, "son and father," "heir and ancestor," "student and teacher," they are all only amplifications and ramifications of the one great problem: how does the truth get on? How do the directions of life continue to be followed? How does an historical humanity, that began to

speaking at 5000 years B.C., or 7000 years B.C., you see, still speak the same language -- Indo-European, or Semitic? It's all one great language, after all, which we still carry on. You still say 1, 2, 3, 4. Why do you count? Why did people find -- find -- find it useful to speak as our { }? Because we need these numbers. They have done something useful for you and me. You can't get out of speaking. You have to -- just continue to speak.

Therefore, the people who make you learn your language are your parents. And we call anybody who makes us take up the direction of history our parents. And we owe them, as I said -- religious gratitude, because we believe in their religious dutifulness, of telling us that -- their best truth. You believe this, too, that I'm now at this moment -- although you may not -- dislike what I say, but you still believe that I'm trying to do my darnedest, you see. Don't shoot the pianist. He's doing his darnedest, as you know.

Now, gentlemen, in the Old Testament, in the end, in the 24th of the 24 books of the Old Testament, the prophet Malachi has a strange prediction. He says the earth must be cursed, and will perish, unless the parents turn their hearts to their children, and the children turn their hearts to their parents. And you know, the New Testament is considered the fulfillment of the Old. And if you open it, however, you find a very strange distortion of this old text, because in Luke, which is written 1900 years ago, only the one-half of the prophecy is fulfilled -- is declared to be fulfilled. When Jesus comes, He says that the hearts of the parents now are turned towards their children. But the other half, gentlemen, that the hearts of the children must be turned toward their parents, is left to the Americans and to your generation to fulfill -- even to understand its implication. What I'm trying to tell you about Henry James, and William James, goes back to the tremendous problem of the ancient people, who felt that the greatest achievement of humanity would only come when the children would grow up in complete freedom, but not in the freedom of arbitrariness. Not in the freedom of anarchy, but in the freedom that would lead them -- what I have tried to show you already in the figure of Henry and -- and -- and William James, to a certain extent, where the children would -- after having been made sure of their independence, would turn back their hearts to their parents and begin to understand what these parents were trying to solve and to do, and would identify themselves, because when your heart turns to your -- to somebody, you understand him, you support him. "Understand" means to stand under his task, and -- and booth and don't -- not knock. What he's trying to do then becomes a part of your own task.

Now, it's very strange, gentlemen, that you have in this -- on -- in -- on this soil in America, in this strange family history an anticipation of the last, unfulfilled promise of the ancient peoples, because the Old Testament there only stands for that which all the -- the natural people, the nations of the world, before they were welded in one faith, always felt. The authority of the parents was so firmly established, because it was taken for granted that the children would run away like the animals, young animals, and forget their ancestors. Now, in the long process of thousands of years, we feel so settled, and you feel so settled, that you think that you can forget your ancestors, because they are so good to you. And so you say, "Christianity is not unassailable." You don't know what you're saying by this. You're just denying your whole background. All right. We do this, but with this criterion, Sir, that you must listen to this grave promise: after you have been -- become independent, and have denied everything, you will still have to look for the genius of the parents behind their authority. Deny my authority, my dear man, but don't deny the genius of all the nations, and people, the generations that have been before you. If you can -- as William James, you see, came -- to believe in the genius of his father, away with the father's authority, that's all right, you see. You can say the authority is not unassailable, but the genius of the people who have created the world in which you live, that is unassailable. But we are waiting for { }.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...to their children, and respect the genius of the child. What I have called "genius," you now understand, the continuous the spiritual life of the child. That is in itself meaningless, because it can become an idol; it can kill the life of this mother, as it did in this one case. And hurt the child, too, because the child isn't helped by getting a neurotic mother in the long run.

So that you have now -- and that is now left, I think, in our time to a -- fewer and fewer people. The people who want to free themselves from the dogma of their own age must wake up to the totality of the dogma between the ages. This woman, if she wants to live right, is now suddenly called out of the ordinary. She has to know more about her responses and reactions as -- in the natural stream of consciousness would be demanded from her. As long as you live the life of your time, you have not to ask these fundamental questions. And to a certain degree, her behavior and her handling of her children is very beautiful. And everybody agrees that she is doing a good job. But there comes this point where she has to limit it. And in this very moment, gentlemen, where you have to go against the spirit of the age, for the salvation of her daughter as much as for her own salvation, the strange thing is that knowledge, consciousness are not -- no longer philosophies, thoughts, or ideas, you see, but they are necessities. They are lifesaving. That is what the ancient people -- called sal- -- the "question of salvation." And in order to know what you need for your salvation, you have to emerge, to rise above the spirit of your time.

William James, Jr., did it by the love of his father. He never forgot the spiritual experience; he never -- forgot his gratitude; he never forgot that his father was a religious genius, if ever there was one. So he identified himself with his father in part. This good woman, however, and you and your parents, and your -- your contemporaries, will have to rediscover the meaning of the full freedom of man, that although he is steeped in the spirit of his age, and you may trust that this spirit has in itself some positive, creative meaning, you see, he must be able to go so deep back into the bowel of -- of his heart, as the Bible calls it, to see where this grew out or -- out of our {heart power} so much so that now she is -- or he is -- entitled to grow another offshoot, the next one, and to limit this branch of the universal dogma of the spiritual life between people. Can you understand what I mean, that it is necessary not to say to this woman, "Go beyond there -- your love to your daughter. Go beyond the spirit of the 19th century as the century of the children," you see? But we have to say to her, "Go back to the roots out of which, in 1850, this very special feature grew, and renew

this power."

Do you understand why I think it is wiser to speak of going back to the deep center of which this one trend developed, you see, and not to say -- exaggerate this trend, do more, more. You cannot. I mean, after all, you see, to limit it in our {heart} powers. You have to show her that the main point is to keep the heart itself intact, the heart of the world, mankind's heart. This center, this common heart of all men -- out of which the 19th century conceived this idea of being the century for the children -- only by going below the offshoot, the branch, back to the heart, the growing point of this plant, of love, of mutual fellowship, of in- -- interdependence, can this woman, so to speak, be converted to a wholesome life and see that she does not commit a crime, so to speak, when she would tell her daughter, "No. This is more important for you, my dear child, that I now have the benefit of a refresher course in life, of staying, you see, away. And you will put up for half an hour without me." And of course, the best thing would have been if she hadn't telephoned at all, and hadn't asked her daughter any question, you see. And just done it. And known that -- that -- this is the typical case where Luther would have said, {pecca} fortitor. Sin with fortitude, and with all your might and main, because it is sin only in the light of your spirit, but what is moving you is something bigger than your temporary spirit, you see. It is able to recreate the order of the universe.

Now, I think you will be faced with this. The whole question of religious education is a question where of the parents today are {asked} in this country, you see: is it enough to wait until the child is wanting something? And the whole elective question. I mean, is it right to ask a 6-year-old child what courses it shall take, or a 12-year-old boy which language he wants to learn? Is it right to ask a 2-year-old child what it wants to eat? It is not right. It isn't right. But you do this. It's demanded from our society.

So I only wanted to say that the overcoming of a dogma is the reason for the existence of the dogma of the Church. The reason why dogma is there is not because you and I, before we have lived, need dogma. But we need dogma in order to free ourselves from our own dogmas. This universal dogma is based on the experience that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit -- the three-generation problem, you see -- is something that in any age demands from any member of this age an act of -- of transgression, of going beyond that which he thinks is fundamentally the easiest thing to do. In this case, to go to the telephone and make yourself dependent on your daughter's decision if you are allowed to see -- to join a party or not. It is so simple as that.

Dogma is in the world against dogma. And you will not understand the dogma of any creed, or any faith if you do not see that you are dogmatic. The men who talk against dogma are always the people who are the most dogmatic. And they don't know it. The ma- -- the point is, gentlemen, the immersion in the spirit of your own age is unconscious, is this side of consciousness. The going-beyond the spirit of your age can only be achieved by breaking out, so to speak, into consciousness. You have to burst forth into full consciousness. That's why the Church, for example, has always demanded a confession. But the confession makes no sense for per- -- people who haven't lived and haven't been -- found themselves to be prisoners of their own age. It is only when you have to break the prison of the dogma of your age that you discover the larger freedom.

The United States, gentlemen -- and the world at large, the Western world -- have gone in the last 90 years through a strange experience. And I want to make two points about this. The one is: you must learn to treat a hundred years like one day. You must learn to treat a hundred years like one day. The time from Henry James, Sr., to this -- today is just one minute. It isn't simply possible for any reasonable person, gentlemen, and it isn't necessary, to treat the century of the child as one minute in the history of our race. And from 1865, gentlemen, to this day, we try -- must try to treat the time as at a standstill, as being on one level, on one level of behavior, because this good woman did exactly what Emerson recommended people to do. She's just a contemporary of Ralph Waldo Emerson in this attempt to -- to let the child grow spontaneously, and bring no pressure, or Henry James, Sr., or what- -- whoever you take there. This -- all this gospel was preached then. And it was a gospel; it was the translation of the Gospel in the times of the -- one age, you see.

The second thing is, gentlemen, that as a consequence of these people's dogma, they could not convey to their children the spirit of their own age. They could not convey to the children the spirit of their own age. They abdicated. Now this has taken the form of the two world wars. The two world wars were enacted, as you know, by -- in this country by Woodrow Wilson and by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. They were enacted in Russia by the czars and by Stalin. They were enacted in Germany by a man called Ludendorff, first, and by Mr. Hitler in the Second World War. They were enacted in France by Clemenceau in the First World War and by de Gaulle in the Second. And only in England -- by the grace of God -- is there one man, Winston Churchill, at least who has lived to s- -- to tell the whole tale, so to speak, to live through both wars, which again is a strange fact.

The First World War, gentlemen, and the Second World War, have been

led with complete blindness as to the fact of their identity. The only man who has known all the time that it was the same war fought by two generations is Winston Churchill. He has said of the Second World War "the unnecessary war." In all other countries, gentlemen, it was strictly forbidden to say that the Second World War was nothing but the repetition for the benefit of the younger generation, which had been left without the benefit of their parents' experience. So we have here, I -- I told you, the result of the giving-up of this problem of the interaction of the generations. This is the test case, the two world wars. Mr. -- Franklin D. Roosevelt, on December 8th, 1941, said to his wife, "Will you kindly invite Mrs. Woodrow Wilson to sit with you in the gallery of the Congress, which now is going to declare war?" This he was not allowed, however, to do in public. I always think of Franklin D. Roosevelt waking up every morning of his life and saying, "What is the mistake Woodrow Wilson -- has made in this situation which I now have to avoid?" You know, inter-party system asking the opponent -- has been the principle of Franklin D. Roosevelt, because Woodrow Wilson miscarried when he didn't ask Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge to go with him to the peace conference in Paris. And so on and so forth. This is -- the same is true of Hitler and Ludendorff. The repetition, according to the degree of paganism in the various countries, the repetitive character of the war was not allowed to be mentioned. And you can grade the various countries according to this taboo of never saying that this war is after all nothing but the repetition of the first -- of the -- the other war.

The cycle, as you know, of these two wars begins in 1904 with the attack of the Japanese on -- on Korea, on Inchon, on -- they called it at that time "Chemulpo." But even the change of name is typical of our time, where there shall be no cohesion, there shall be no overlapping of times. Every age to itself. So when you read the history of the first Russo-Japanese war, and you read that they -- they torpedoed the Russian battleships in Chemulpo, in Korea, you do not -- are not even reminded of the fact that that is the place where MacArthur landed in September 14th, 1950, you see. But it is the same place. And the roles enacted there by Russia and Japan have been enacted in 1950, et cetera, by the Chinese or the North Koreans, as you know, and the United States of America. But that doesn't mean that it isn't the same event, that it is there where the world comes to an end, so to speak. The globe becomes the globe and the planet becomes the planet, because they meet at the -- at the other end, so to speak, of this round earth.

Here, I should put in 7, because as you know, that's the year in which the United States entered the war. Now, again, the United States at the same -- in

this war, too, are drawn into it, after -- after two and-a-half years. The issue, the problem -- organization of the world in some peaceful manner -- has been the same both ways -- times, as you know, that you couldn't go home from this -- such a world war without doing something for the open discussion of your grievances, so that a war should not come as it had come in 1914. How had it come, gentlemen? It had come as inevitable, and it had come as absolutely unforeseen. It had come -- these are the qualities. Will you kindly write down? Inevitable, unforeseen -- a contradiction in terms, as you will admit -- unforeseen, aimless. Aimless.

We came from a century, gentlemen, of youth, of a century of children and parents to themselves. No aims, therefore, beyond a generation. Now all wars, gentlemen, can only be fought when and as long three generations are not in accord with their aims and their purposes, because the fathers, the {Senate} sent {their} children -- the soldier into war. And the soldiers are killed, and their children inherit the earth. If you have not three generations acting together, you can't have war. If you say every generation has its own aims, the children cannot be sacrificed for the aims of the child- -- of parents, obviously the children are not obliged to go to war, which is just logical.

There was a famous saying in France, between the two world wars, which ran: *La guerre, ce sont nos pères*. That is in -- in English, "War -- this last war, our parents', our fathers' business," you see. "Leave us alone." That was the slogan in Europe. *La guerre, ce sont nos pères*. You understand? Very important, because it bears out this fruit of such an education, that the children felt, "Well, the stupidity of our parents cannot be visited upon us." They were through with this -- with the ancient, Old Testament law, of course, that the sins of their parents are visited on the children in the third and fourth generation. You know that this is simple true, but they denied it. *La guerre, ce sont nos pères*.

In Germany we had the same -- we have the youth movement. And I had a terrible fight with these youngsters, who also didn't want to liquidate the First World War. They said, "We have nothing to do with it. We dream our own life. We go into the you- -- paradise of youth. And we live the good life and that's all you can demand from us." And we -- I had -- this has been in print, a discussion between the leadership of one generation and -- and the business of a teacher who tries to dovetail the generations. I called it at that time, "Leader and Teacher." And it's in a periodical called *The Creature*, which is just our bad luck, you see. *Creature* -- as creatures, we are marooned in one age only, of many ages, that I tried to -- to reconcile the thriving youth movement of Germany with some service -- in the service of the re-ordering of Europe. I didn't succeed. But at least

the -- the -- the problem was very clearly put, and that's why I founded these work services there at that time, to force upon the youth some service -- in its generation at a time when, as here in the Gay Twenties, you see, the generation -- the younger generation simply thought it had the power, if nothing else, the power to forget everything that had gone before.

This strange fact, gentlemen, of -- of two wars fought on exactly the same lines by two generations who, in some countries, as in America, were even anxious to obliterate their identity -- which is very strange, you see -- has very much to do with our problem of the Jameses. It has come to a miracle of mo- -- much -- many older people that the majority of young American boys did go -- to fight in Korea. And there has been, as you know, many times voiced, amazement that these youngsters, without understanding what it was all about, were willing to fight in the First World War and in the Second again -- with some reluctance, perhaps, but at least they did.

Now gentlemen, this gives you a lesson, that in a decent human society, it isn't you and I who have to know what we are doing. If there is faith between people, we -- one person does because the other person says so. If you -- have belief in your elders, you do it before you have understood it. This is the same question as of this child and his mother, who goes to a party, you see. If the mother says, "You must understand and tell me if I have to come back," you see, that's the -- the official ideology of our day -- time, you see. But if the mother is loved by this child, and the child has the minimum respect and faith in the mother's decision, it is wrong to demand from the child to know, and to know what it's all about. Now this seems to be a very small decision, but it's very much the same as in a war. The boys of 20 cannot understand what it's all about, but if they have every reason to believe that their elders are responsible and will not jettison the life of their loved children for nothing, then they go, if the father or the grandfather, and the generals, and the judges later, and the president say, "Children, you must defend the home, our home," you see. If there had been a fire, you do not ask questions from the chief of the fire department why you are sent out to carry this pail of water to this { }. You just you do it. He { } understand. You don't.

But you come from a time where you actually and seriously believe that a -- the individual soldier has to know what he's fighting for. This has never been in any war, believe me. In the warpath of the red Indians, it wasn't possible to explain to anyone, and it hasn't been true in -- about the Civil War, and it hasn't been true about any war, that the people actually understood fully the issues. Here, I mean, in Vermont, a soldier might have -- go to war against slavery,

when it wasn't slavery; it was secession -- well, what Lincoln really forced, you see, to raise an army and to declare war on the South. And so on and so forth. I doubt that it is very important whether a soldier knows what he's fighting for, if he's completely tuned -- in tune with his country. In the process then, if the war drags on, he will get information and -- at the end, he may fully understand. But I don't think he should -- you should ask that he should begin -- he should understand fully in the -- in the first place before he decides. That's asking too much.

You have to write off a part of your gospel of the environ- -- of the Enlightenment, that everybody has to know everything. This is idiotic. Then there would be no division of labor with regard to knowledge. But knowledge is, of course, sparse, gentlemen. You think it can just be scattered. But you cannot know serious business if it isn't our business. And we cannot know how serious it is before it is our business. So before you are soldiers, you read even the political issues with a vague understanding as your -- our friend told you -- told us. Well, you participate, you are informed. But you say, "Well, I am not informed enough to pass judgment on this." But when the Congress declares war, then the judgment has been made and then you -- now you have then to learn by the facts of life, by joining the army, what it's all about; but you can only know by participation. You cannot know beforehand. Can you see the point?

And yet you come from a dogmatic century, gentlemen, which sold you the idea that a young man cannot make any sacrifice before he has fully understood what it's all about. I'm sorry, gentlemen. You will never see such a world. And the sooner you write off this as a bad philosophy, the sooner you will come to know what philosophy can do and what it cannot do. This is an idiotic gospel, and I think nothing hamstringing more American education than the idea that it is not so. The general idea is that any man -- any voter and so on, does not vote for General Taft or General Eisenhower, but for the issues. My -- my experience in this country so far has been -- I have celebrated yesterday my 20th anniversary -- is that the people only vote for Eisenhower or Taft and Truman, and for nothing else. They -- have people they trust and they have people they don't trust. That's the first thing. And later in -- in the process of participation, of course, they come to form their judgments, too.

The double war, gentlemen, is the payoff for the double standard of the generations in the last century, for saying that genera- -- every generation can have its own standards, and the parent as parent doesn't exist as a moral entity. The parents of the First World War have not been able to convey to their children their convictions. They haven't. And you may even say they had no convic-

tions, gentlemen, because that only is more than opinion which we are forced to convey to our children. It is impossible, gentlemen, to form more than an opinion something which I do not wish to propagate.

And here you come to this result of the last century in another respect.

The result of the last century in its disintegration of the relation of parents and children, and teachers and students, has been that -- propagation of the Gospel has been replaced by propaganda. Propaganda does not include the propagator of the propaganda. Propagation does. A father can teach his children only that which he believes himself. A propagandist can teach anybody anything over the radio for which he is paid, or which he has some such interest, without believing in it himself at all. You know that.

Now, you are so much victims of modern propaganda, that you even believe that all propaganda is of the same brand, and that only those who do not propagate their faith are decent, and everybody who wants to make disciples is indecent. Gentlemen, I want to make disciples. Certainly. But it is claimed as bad -- bad taste in this college: "You mustn't make disciples." Gentlemen, then I couldn't teach. And therefore you have no teaching in this college, because nobody wants to do anything but sug- -- make suggestions, and perhaps it's a good idea. Perhaps you look at it in your own way. I think that's silly; it's a complete waste of time. If I am not convinced, that is, if I do not think that my -- my thought must bear fruit, I certainly am not adequate for teaching. Teaching means the propagation, you see, of the truth, and can only propagate it if you get hold of this truth, because I say so.

Now all this is against the trend of this last century in this country. A friend of mind asked the superintendent of schools why her three children hadn't learned anything in the schools of their town in California. And the superintendent wrote back and said, "Lady, forgive us. For the last 30 years, we have not believed in teaching." That is America. We have believed in making the children happy and giving them luncheons. And taking school -- I mean, school buses to the -- and making them read funnies. Or taking them to all kinds of inspection trips, or what-not. We have made them fun, but you haven't been allowed to learn anything, gentlemen. That's why your mind has gone so absolutely color-blind.

You haven't believed in teaching, and that how -- as you see, it's all one thing. The century of the child. You -- we have waited until you will be good enough to learn something -- or not to learn something, but to say something, to think something, or what-not. Now we have, of course, always reaped the good

and the bad of these fruits. I -- don't think that I'm blind to the greatness of this century. This is a very great attempt, but you can also see that it is only one attempt. This is what you have to keep in mind. I'm not disparaging this. My own parents have allowed me all the liberty and freedom. But I think I am a little bit the first Henry James in -- in reverse. I mean, I woke up in the -- by the -- the Russian-Japanese war, and this is my whole life story -- to the fact that there had to be authority, and that there couldn't be -- shouldn't be a revolution. My -- my -- my horror of the Russian revolution was when -- there when I was -- well, how old was I then? 16 years old -- I don't know why, but that's how it happened. And for all my life I have devoted to the question -- of this question where -- of which I am trying now to give you the vivid picture, so that you see it is our task. What are we to do then if the generation of children which finally matures says, "We need authority"? This is what has happened. After a hundred years, you see, of devoting all the energy, all the savings of a country to the freedom of education of the child, to forgetting teaching and to say that only the students matter, and only the -- the children matter, the -- you find a generation of children of whom I feel to be the first-born, but of whom your children will all be members. I am the head of a group which now, as children, says, "Lo and behold! We need authority." My genius is in -- in looking for the amount of authority that is needed, you see. I don't know how. I don't know why. I'm perfectly free to find any solution that is feasible. But I know one thing: that this mustn't happen again, you see. That such a waste, such a -- of an unnecessary war, such a catastrophe of complete forgetfulness, of la guerre, ce sont nos pères, of progressive education, of all this nonsense which is at this time visiting America, you see -- one generation Communist, and the next McCarthy, and nobody knowing, you see, how it all -- is all about. Just this -- this twist of the human mind. It's too much.

Now we have therefore today this central -- this central question that the children are conservative and the parents are liberal. The -- what the liberals thought was impossible. Or the children are reactionary, so to speak. Mr. McCarthy has a fan mail, as you know, of hundred -- thousands of people, and very many young people. And rightly so, I mean. It's crude. It's coarse, but I can fully understand it, because these children all of a sudden realized that if they have to be soldiers that it is better some order over three generations, because you cannot be a soldier, gentlemen, without the three-generation principle. And the three-generation principle is on one side, and the principles by which Henry James educated his son are on the other side, and they are in themselves not to be reconciled -- reconciled so easily. It's not so very simple.

So we have today the fact, gentlemen, that the fathers are all Williams Jameses, and the sons are, so to speak, all Henry Jameses, Sr., at least. That is, they speak again out of the fullness of an eternal gospel of something lasting, something embracing the human race, and something that tries to avoid -- that every generation just does anything it pleases.

If you begin to see this, then you will understand why I am very interested in this dogma, gentlemen, which is part of the Christian dogma, that before God, there is no time. That what we say, the Creed -- Father, Son, and Holy Ghost -- and what we say with Henry James, Sr., and William James, Jr., and what we live in the two world wars, and what I teach you in this classroom for two hours a day, that this is the same, regardless whether it stretches out over millions of years, or whether it stretches out over five minutes. What I tried to show you is that this body of time, gentlemen, in its relationship between a past, present, and future, is equally complex, is equally marvelous, is equally mysterious, whether you think it up now, at this moment, as students in Dartmouth, with regard to your parents and teachers and your own children, or even if you only think it in terms of your four years in college with what you believed before you came here and what you are going to do when you go out from here. Wherever you have man, he is in this same strange quandary: that he must continue what others have done before him, and he must begin something what others must continue after him.

Therefore, to convey conviction and to inherit conviction is the essence of your fruitful living. Therefore this is the essence of all questions today of the philosopher, nothing about the world, nothing about pessimism, socialism, materialism. I mean, who cares? The main question is: how am I able to continue something which my fathers began? And how am I able to start something which my grandchildren will continue? If this cannot be, gentlemen, then there is no meaning in life, absolutely no meaning, because nothing, gentlemen, a man can do himself the -- the final result of the -- all these analyses ought to be for you -- we come too late to our own lives. We come too late to our own lives unless we are allowed to continue what is worthwhile, and unless we are going to rely on other people to do with our lives something in continuation.

When I now know all these things, gentlemen, unless you do something with this, I have known all this in vain, because obviously I have not been able to prevent the two world wars, although I knew all this since 1904. All I have learned is how to teach it, how to preach it, how to convey it to you, how to show that these events are setting the pace of your own life. You, perhaps, by my early teaching, can at 20 already do something in time.

Gentlemen, we all come too late to ourselves. Will you take this down?

We all come too late to ourselves, with our self-knowledge. Anything -- you are all so clever, you are so psychologically minded, you want to psychologize, and to know yourself. All right, know yourself, gentlemen. But know one thing: what you learn by experience has to be inherited by somebody else before he -- anybody is really helped, because you have spilled the milk, you see. You have gotten into trouble with a girl, or with debts, or with gambling, or with -- with intellectual mistakes, or -- choosing a wrong college, or what-not, you see. But you can prevent another man to do the same thing. Yourself, you are {done with}. I mean, you have all the scars of your mistakes. We all come, with regard to our experienced knowledge, too late to ourselves.

Well, I mean, in minor matters in -- in -- you don't come too late. You know -- well, I mean, you can make an invention, spending -- like the Wright Brothers -- 10 years on it and still be lucky and find it yourself. But if you analyze it carefully, every mistake we make, every experience of which we say "No, don't repeat it," you see, after all has been made. So the "don't" which we then write on the table -- on the door of this experiment, or this experience, you see, can only benefit ourselves as different people. We have changed, and we don't have to do it a second time. That's perfectly true. But the person who went through the wrong door is no longer there. Only gentlemen, if your children -- or the next generation -- aren't your physical children, of course -- can represent your best aims and your best knowledge, can we want to make any experiences. Experience has to be conveyed in order to be experience. My own experience cannot benefit my s- -- my old self. As I said, it can benefit myself, but then I have to analyze carefully and say, "I am not really the same person now. I have been changed by this experience, and now my other man -- my next man, so to speak, doesn't repeat it. But then I am a chameleon. I have just gone from one transformation to the other."

This whole question, gentlemen, of today, continuation of effort, in order to have mea- -- give meaning to any effort, is the new question of our time. It has never been asked by all -- any philosophers. We call it today with a very poor expression, "the philosophy of time." Many people speak about the secret and mysteries of time today. But I want to draw your attention to the fact, gentlemen, that we have here in this course, on the escape from history -- "America's escape from history," as you could call it -- as showing you that we are speaking of experienced time. We are not speaking of time as we look at it, with a stopwatch, or with a -- by the clock. What you and I experience is that once we have experienced something, it's so much water over the dam unless the -- its fruit, its

content, its meaning can be conveyed to somebody else, who is still before the jump, before the event, before falling into the -- into the Connecticut River. Now, as you know, there are two choices for the continuation of experience. One is: no trespassing. We just prevent the next person of jumping into the river or exploding the firecrackers on July 4th. We just forbid. That's just the German principle, you know, verboten. You just don't allow anybody to make the same experience again. You see, you exclude all negative experience. Obviously, gentlemen, the new order of society, you will have to avoid this mouse-trap. It's too simple. The experience of a -- one generation has -- can never consist in simply saying, "No other man must make the experience which is -- we found to be fruitless or negative." It also cannot run, "Make all the same experiences as we have done and found fruitful." Many parents try to -- give their children the same opportunities they have found useful in their own life. Send them to Europe, you see. I tried to make my horse -- my son ride horseback because I love horseback riding. Of course, he never learned how to ride, because his father told him so. See -- you -- you -- this is very complicated. We cannot return, in other words, gentlemen, to 1850. The times of simply restoring the authority of the parents over the children is over. The result of what we have lived through, the last hundred years, cannot have the -- the character of an interlude, so that we just go back to normalcy. There is no normalcy, obviously, in human relations.

So gentlemen, we have two things. The simple way of re-establishing the authority by having the child repeat the "yes" and "no" of their father -- that's what it is, "yes" and "no" of their father -- is not the solution. We must never forget that the children today -- and I myself, too -- have been allowed by my father to discover authority under my own steam. So the new authority, gentlemen, is voluntarily discovered. That is a very strange story. It is voluntarily discovered by the young against the authoritarian elders who had ceased to be authoritarian. That's a very queer world.

So gentlemen, I have to admit that my good father and my teachers allowed me to discover the anti-doctrine, the doctrine which turned against them. Therefore, I'm -- owe them, you see -- owe to their liberalism my authoritarianism. Queer -- a queer situation, you see. Can you see this?

And there we -- our life begins, {to me} problematically. But gentlemen, in this one sense, as far as you can discover in your si- -- inside yourself the same problem: how the young must now ask for a certain amount of authority to McCarthy, to Eisenhower, to planning to -- to the -- alliances, to -- to anything, I

mean, of an order, organized character, insofar you and I are contemporaries. And I want to stress this point more than any other, between you and me, gentlemen, because you are unable to conceive of this fact: that before God's eyes, a hundred years are like nothing. Insofar as I have made my point, that I woke up in 1904 to the very problem you are loaded with, since 1950 in your own mind, you see -- decision, draft, service, authority, fight against conspiracy, you see, giving up of a certain amount of civil liberties and what-not -- as soon as you see this, you -- we have reached the point, gentlemen, where you also can rise above the spirit of your own generation. There is -- are issues, gentlemen, in which people are organized by experience and not by the accidental age in which they live, physically. That's the reason why the saints of the Church and the great men of the past still have -- are your contemporaries and partly waiting for you -- are ahead of you, because their experience still waits to be taken up by you. They were not shared at that time, by the -- mass of the people, what they experience, you see. But they are waiting, still.

And gentlemen, you have to break through the idea of being contemporaries only of your contemporaries. Every one of you must find in the course of life, gentlemen, that he's the contemporary of people of a different age. That is -- means the belief in God. There would be no God if this wasn't possible. If God is only the God of your time, and the -- then you have no communication with the other times He has also created, then there would be no aim, no continuity, and you would only be the contemporary of your so-called contemporaries. Now I feel, gentlemen, that I'm not the contemporary of my contemporaries, but that my time has still to come. And I think every decent person, ever since -- since God was revealed, has believed this way. Abraham, and Moses, and Jesus, and the Apostles, and Luther, and Cromwell and -- no one has ever believed that the people who were -- happened to live in his own time were his contemporaries, you see. They felt very definitely that these people { } out of { }, you see, or he was out of { }, the man himself.

And you have given up in your -- that is naturalism, gentlemen, then. Naturalism overlooks that the -- your own time must be overcome. This is what William James, you see, had to overcome when he had to love his father. If you are totally nature, then only your own time counts. If you are not totally nature, you can get out of your -- the accident of birth, the accident of your own time. But then immediately you must look for allies in other times. That's why you read books, you see. And that's why -- what is the meaning of the Bible is to reach this timeless level, in which all times are contemporary, simultaneous, at the same time.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...theological seminar. And it was war in the army. And our situation that, without encompassing the war into our thinking, the thinking of the civilian in this country was sterile and perfectly nonsensical -- especially the pacifists of this country -- but all -- the economic thinking, too, explaining the peacetime life without the relation to the fact that we are -- peace is always between two wars, makes no sense. You remember that the last meeting, we -- helped us to understand this a little better by the serving-up, the rising of the navy -- the American navy as a world function, as a world instrument, and you remember how we -- I laid great -- who's this? You are the Admiral of the Fleet, it seems. And I want you -- now I want to forget that beginning with John Paul -- what is it? Paul Jones, this robber admiral -- pirate admiral -- who is -- what's his name? John Paul Jones, isn't it?

(That's probably right, yes.)

To -- up to Admiral King, there is a constant, wider scope of the American navy, and I told you it is not an accident that the greatest living historian of America, Samuel Eliot Morison, has written the story of Christoph Columbus, and now has written the story of the American navy in the Second World War, and in between has written the story of the 19th century in terms of scientific and economic achievement, and the history of the 17th century in terms of the religious achievement. So I want you once more to understand that American history -- all history here is, hang -- hung up -- we may make these vier -- four periods for the life of -- this is the man's name: S. E. Morison -- no, it's two "r"s, Morrison. Discovery, religion, economics, navy. Now, the -- the life work of this his- -- historian, of this re-thinker of American history, the foremost American historian of our time, and he's president -- of course, has been president last year of the American Historical Association -- and a -- in itself reflects exactly what I tried to show you all this time, that the history of the American mind has passed through these phases and that you, gentlemen, are so obsolete, so totally obsolete in this Dartmouth College, because except for the reserve officer training, and for your attempt of dodging the draft, or entering the army as officers already, you are not able to think war. You are unable to think war, and the people of this country will not listen to you, because you are only covering one-half of the real world in which these poor people at the filling station, and in the fields and the factory have to live in. Therefore they elect President Eisenhower better as president than any civilian, and they will not, in the future, listen to the simple businessman -- that's why McCarthy has this following -- or to a the professor in a

college who is reading lyrical -- lyrics, and poetry, and -- and otherwise is for a higher standard of living, but he cannot explain for the world -- life of him why a man has to die in Korea.

What does -- what are -- is you -- are you helped, and one-half of your life is -- go liv- -- lived on the installment plan for television, and the other half of your life consists of being maimed and losing two legs in Korea. You want to know why you have to lose the two legs, and you don't wish to know why you can buy television on the installment plan. But that's at this moment the mentality of the educated people in this -- in this country: that you go to college in order to have a picture of the world which is only one-half of reality. And the other half you don't wish to see. It's disagreeable. "Oh, if the Russians weren't so bad, we wouldn't have to do this." You won't see night. You won't see evil. We have chased out the -- the night out of our thinking, because we have floodlights, and electric lights, that there are stars in the sky -- that's to you something astronomical. But gentlemen, that's nothing astronomical. That's something existential. It means that half of our lives at sleep -- and at night, you see, we have to move by other instruments of life than seeing. We have to live in the dark. This is a very important that you are -- must be clear that half of your life we are in the dark, and that no -- any attempt to see God is blasphemous. But you buy Look and you buy Life, and you buy Illustrated magazine, you have television, you go to the movies, and you actually believe that life can be seen. Death can be seen, and daytime, we only see dead things. But at night, the love begets the procre- -- the new creation. That's -- part of the night.

It's -- you don't believe this. You don't believe in the -- in the acceptance of the double ring of life, which consists of an alternation between faith and knowledge, between darkness and daylight, between war and peace. You think that if you think peace -- as all the American philosophies of the last 150 years, beginning with Ralph Waldo Emerson, and Cooper have done, or Franklin -- then war is left as evil and wicked at the outside, and man is so kind and so sweet, that there is -- war is an -- an addition to the program of living, which comes as an exception. You don't see the war in your limbs, which any -- the sex already commands. Isn't there war in your body, which at the one time wants you to remain an innocent child, your parents' child; and on the other goes out and makes war against the other sex and tries to conquer? That's war. But this -- mustn't be mentioned in good society. When I mentioned it at Union, they -- they -- they -- there were some girls from Barnard who began to -- to laugh. Then I became very serious, and said, why did they laugh? I was talking about their own greatest secret, and if they weren't able to redeem a man from his war -- the war in his limbs, they wouldn't -- didn't deserve to be -- to be girls, or to be

women. Then they became quite serious. They saw that I -- that I -- was the only man who could help them to explain monogamy, why a man who had found peace in such a woman's love didn't have to run after other wo- -- chase other women any more. But if it isn't making peace after war, then marriage is nonsense, if it is just the pleasure, to have fun, as the people in this country say, "We must get married to have fun." Well, that doesn't last long, gentlemen. But this is the situation in this country: we have no decent tradition for war, except in the history of the armed forces. Read General Sherman's memoirs. That's one of the greatest books an American has written, his two volumes -- reminiscences as a soldier, with his march through Georgia, and his experiences with the American civilian mind, which is very pathetic. And -- and read Mahan, and read {Symmes}, and read Homer Lea. Who is reporting on Homer Lea? Are you ready?

(Right now? No, Sir.)

Why not?

(Well, this { }.)

You have -- should have been ready a week ago.

(I didn't realize that, Sir.)

Wie?

(I wasn't, and I'm not yet. But I will be next class period.)

This will be a century of wars, gentlemen. Not that we have to fight them. Quite the contrary. This is the first -- as we have solved the problem of production, and productivity, of machinery. That hasn't to be invented, and you can improve on your machinery. It's not very exciting now. Though the last -- next centuries will be engaged in the redemption of war. And for this you have first to annex it into your thinking. Only good soldiers will be able to do anything in this matter. Anybody who says, "Even -- the war is bad," is not fit for the kingdom of Heaven, gentlemen. The Lord had to sit with the -- with the sinners before He could redeem them. He didn't sit in judgment over them. And that's the attitude in America, and that's why America is now the most bellicose country in the world, as you know. Even the peaceful messages from Russia are not published in the New York Times, in this great hypocrite -- this greatest organs

of American cheapness and -- and stupidity with regard to real life. Not a mouse is born in the Ameri- -- New York literary magazine. It's all sterile. And we gave an honorary degree to the man who heads it. Ja?

(Sir, we've heard you lecture now about war in various classes so far, but you always refer to it negatively. You've said that what we have not done in our understanding of war, but you haven't -- we haven't really been very demonstra- tive about the topic of war, yet. And I was wondering if you could throw a little more light on it positively rather than by contrast of peace. What is the impor- tance of war? I don't understand what place it has for you, although I can imag- ine -- I can't -- I {won't come} { }.)

A bit { }. Then bring it up { } very soon.

Keep these four in mind here, will you? Because of course these four generations in one man's mind will have -- have something to do with this. {Well}, don't you remember that we spoke of faith in one generation begetting the answer of science in the second generation, but in such a way that the scien- tists still had inherited this eloquence from the religious adoration and praise of his -- the parent generation? We -- I have tried to show you that the Henry James-William James situation is an eternal one, that we all have to receive speech, and we all have to translate it. You can all ge- -- run away with your own generation my- -- myth -- -s and science. But the way in which you express this own experience is the heritage of living speech, as you have heard it at the breakfast table in your own family. There is no way out of this great secret, that your -- fact that we speak English, and even you -- if you express your disap- proval of all people who spoke English before you, you still have to say it in English. That is, life is not dialectics, but life is dialogue. The listener must have listened before he can answer. You -- I haven't to go over this again. Isn't that -- you remember?

Now, as soon as this relation is forgotten, the sons are not {remembering} -- are just antitheses. This is the son -- the fruitful sons-father relations. In war, it is just -- take the civil war, which is more of a war than the external war. It is fathers -- and sons rebelling against them -- going on the barricades and shoot- ing King George and his generals and his -- his governors up in the Revolution- ary War. What { } here, I have the antithesis.

Now, the unfortunate thing is that you don't have to listen to an antithe- sis, and the thesis has nothing to fear if the antithesis is just talking. The so-called "antithesis," or the so-called "rebels," or the -- the -- the -- the people who really

force the issue must be willing to die. If you haven't a cause for which at least one man is willing to die, nothing moves, you see. He's just taken -- arrest by the police and there the thing ends. You can always know that a thing is serious if there is one man at least, usually more, who is willing to die for his cause. Now war is nothing but the expansion of this antithesis into two generations: one generation dying for it, and the grandchildren inheriting the victory. Gentlemen, the -- war means the -- recognition that the flesh cannot inherit, because this fleshly body of the soldier is not inheriting the earth, but is allowing others to inherit the earth, the children. That is, in other words, in a war, the two-generation problem is changed into a three-generation problem because of the lack of peace between parents and children. Whenever the older order -- that is the old generation, the old order, the status quo, you see -- is upset, then you can -- either have the loving recognition by the sons of the righteousness of the old order, as in the case of William James and his variety of religious experience, for example, and his attempt to write "The Moral Equivalent of War" to do justice to the people doubted -- killed in the Civil War -- his father; or you have the inevitable, as we have it now in the two world wars, that a whole 30 years of man do -- a futile life, are the lost generation, lest the grandchildren have nothing to inherit. And you -- have the pleasure of being the grandchildren, and you have now to ask yourself: how much do you have to sacrifice for your children, how much have also you to be ready to die in Korea or some other disagreeable battlefield, and how much have you not? Most soldiers in this country just die nonsensically. They have no philosophy or religion about this. They just do it. The chaplains are pacifists and leave these people on the battlefield without even the comfort of being good Christian soldiers, and so we live in a terrible moral situation. I mean, the underdog at this moment in the count- -- this country is not the worker, but is the spiritual man and is the soldier, because nobody in this country at home has any recognition of his -- of his -- shrouded mystery, why any country that is so out of hand as this needs war to integrate itself. We -- people do not understand that by the nature of things, every class of man, every generation is at war with all others, and that as your body has to marry, before it is at peace again with its disintegrating limbs, and parts and appetites --. Think of your stomach. There you just want to be lush -- have a luscious life. That wouldn't lead to marriage, because -- if you eat -- want to eat, so to speak, and have a -- have a -- have a complacent life, a convenient life, it is -- you would be left by yourself. You would go out of your parents' home, yes; but then you would have a -- a fine apartment, and a shower room, and all the juices, and all the vitamins the doctor of modern superstition prescribes, and -- and there you would live to yourself. That's one way of solving the problem of your limbs -- making the stomach king. Or making, with all the apparatus -- apparatus in your room, making your curiosity king, your eye. You can have television, you can have

radio, you can have phonographs, you have -- can have a collection of musical disks, you can have sculptural -- sculptures and pictures and books on your shelves, and you can become a collector and you can say, "my eyes satisfy me." All the rest is just subordinated. I know such people who actually believe that they make peace in their own life when they suddenly concentrate on this one part of their equipment, the eye. And they -- they call themselves "intellectuals." They -- they don't think that they are sensuous. But they are. A man like Irwin Edman is just nothing but a great sensualist. Typical of our civilization. Ja? (How can you reconcile your attitude towards war with -- well, I don't know -- your regard Christ's teaching? That's one --)

Well, I have no attitude towards war, but I have -- the firm belief that God has created the world, and that you and I are not the people to say that part of reality is evil. And I say that you live in this room at this moment on the basis of 6,000 years of war of humanity. And the -- it's ridiculous on you to say that one part of that which has borne and created you and this college is bad and the other is evil. And Christ has never said one word of this. He has said, "I am coming to bring the sword." There will be war. Just read Luke and Mark. You have never read the Bible. You read only the selections for the little red school-house, and your woman schoolteacher, and the little minister, and all these people who see only one little corner the world, because they only want to add some ointment, so to speak, to the -- to the -- some ingredient. They want to be nice, make life nicer. They won't live the true life.

If you condemn all the people who have died in battle, my dear man, you have simply made yourself -- castrated yourself for the kingdom of Heaven. This is today in this country, a castrated, a eunuch Christianity. Mentally, this country wants to live as a capon. This is so terrible. Everybody outside America knows this. That this country is run by the women voters, mentally, who cannot accept war. The Mothers of America. But you are the son of America and Jesus said to his mother, "Stay away. You don't understand that I have to go to the Cross." This is this futility. That's what I'm talking about, Sir. Just your question. How can I -- yes, how can you distort Christ's teaching in such a way?

When you become the Apostle Paul, you may, but not when you marry.

Why does the -- can -- can't the Christian priest marry? Why can't the apostle marry? Because then he has no claim -- heredity. Then his life is his own, and he lies it down in his generation and these -- these people, you see, of -- whom you have in mind, they were killed for the faith, because they -- they opened their { }, said, "Death has to be, but then it's better that I die than I make die." That's

very true, but you get married and you want to make money, and all this entails war. This is the misunderstanding of Christian teaching, as though you little layman, who wants to have a job, has the right not to see -- to be blind to the fact that your holding a job makes for war, because the fact that you here defend the standard of living in America of course forced the Italians, and the Japanese, and the Germans to go to war, the no -- the have-no nations -- the have-not nations. If you don't understand that anybody who wants to have a claim, and the land, and the treasures of this earth is making for war, you haven't even learned the ABC of Christianity, {and} of the Bible. You can forego all this, like Jeremiah, and who -- or sacrifice your life like the Apostle Paul, or our Lord, but then you have to know what you're doing. The first thing is that you can't get married. You can't have children, because it's your duty to defend the old- -- the property of your children in the land. You have -- they can't be kidnapped, and they can't be dep- -- deprived of their -- of their opportunity, and they can't be deprived of their inheritance. And so, it's the whole Biblical story. Judaism is the defense of -- of -- of Palestine. The -- the -- you can't give up this land and say, "I don't care." You have to hold it.

Well, whether this is in the big United States, or Puerto Rico, or Alaska, my dear man, or whether it's the seven seas, on which we now have air stations -- after all, we are an imperialistic -- power of the first order, aren't we, much more than England has ever been, but nobody is allowed to mention this in this country. We are no imperialists. No. It's all lies, one great lie. This is the greatest world power in the world, but at home, the people say, "We are pacifists." At least they don't say the word "pacifists," they are in their minds. And that's the impotency of politics, you see. This is why there is this great mendacity in America, that you -- we say one thing and do the opposite. And everybody loves it. At home, you have to speak one way, and with the world, you speak another way. You prefer it, because you feel impotent. You feel not up to the tremendous mystery of reality. It mustn't be mystery. It must be rational. Now rationalists are only one-half of life. Rational is everything sexless, gentlemen. Rational is everything without death.

Rational is everything without heredity. Rational is -- where no children have to be born and no people die, you can be rational. But as soon as you get into this mystery, that if you do not sacrifice, there is no continuity of history, you get into the story of Adam into the last judgment day.

Your story's all Greek. Your story's all -- all very simple, I mean. Plato and Aristotle, they left the city of Athens and lived happily ever after in a college and

taught what they pleased. But the result was that the first disciple of these men was Alexander the Great, and he united the Eur- -- world of which these people always had {taught men theory}. And how did he do it? By war. And you -- nobody can -- can take from Plato and Aristotle the responsibility that they created Alexander the Great. And I'm on the side of Alexander the Great, and I think he did a good job. And how did he do it? Because his Macedonians were still people who hadn't gone to school, and hadn't gone to college. And they were not these cheap Athenians and Corinthians, who talked and talked and talked, and -- and debated, and discussed, and had doubts about reasonable reason, or unreasonable -- what, I don't know -- what you read in the Platonic dialogues. But these Macedonian boys said, "When my -- Alexander the Great wants to unite the universe, let's do it. It seems to me a good idea." And they died for it. And he sacrificed his best friends in the process, as you know. One -- he got drunk and his best general was murdered. Life is very tragic. And when Hamlet had to set the world at -- aright again, he had to give his -- up his own life, and his mother died in the process, and Laertes died in the process and Ophelia went insane. And do you think you can have it cheaper? You cannot. But as -- that's the -- all forbidden in this country. You read Hamlet. Do you ever learn anything from Hamlet? No. Never. It's just a nice story. But you would behave quite differently. I -- this is -- this is so terrible. You do not equate your real existence with this -- what Mahan says, you see, "There is no self-made man in the kingdom of Heaven." You remember? Who said -- who -- you remember. But that means that I find myself in a hereditary situ- -- I have to defend my patrimony, you see, and I have to acquire, you see, a new heredity, and there I go to pieces in between, you see. I'm shot dead.

Now, it is very difficult, gentlemen, to understand this -- sacri- -- the tragedy of life. I may say you can -- we cannot understand it, but we can stand under it. And it would be much nicer if you would stop to try to understand everything, and would just be -- coy enough and chaste enough to stand under it. That is, that is the cross of life which is -- has -- the Lord has imposed on us. He has -- have demanded from mothers to lose their beauty and their youthfulness by giving life to children. Every woman has to do that, the travail. And man is made into a mother-like creature, in -- when he gives life to -- the order of things or defend the old order of things as a soldier. I'm quite sure, gentlemen, that's the relation of the body and the spirit. The -- the mothers realize the spiritual -- spirit of God in having the courage to lose themselves in the birth of their children, which means that they are no longer girls to dance with, but they are mothers. And the more they are mothers, the more inevitably they take a second seat. They have sacrificed their first generation to the glory of their children.

(Sir, in "The Moral Equivalent of War," James says that -- he takes a different -- there will be a moral equivalent of war. He doesn't -- he doesn't ever refer to exactly what this is, and what {substance it will take}. Do you think this {-- he's excluding} himself? I mean -- I mean, if it -- if it -- according to what you said, you would think that war was not only necessary from a -- causation way; it was also necessary normative-wise, that it's an integral part of the individual ...) Well, you see, I believe there is no moral equivalent of -- but an equivalent of war. The word "moral" is the eggshell of poor William James, you see, by which he tried to defend his -- his rational generation. I think it's real life -- I mean, to give birth to a child is not a moral act. It's equally not an immoral act. It just isn't applicable to speak of a life process as moral or immoral. That's why I feel I can't answer you so directly. We must first agree on a little more. I'm fully aware of -- of -- of your -- your question's perfectly legitimate, but not at this moment. Because otherwise you bring up William James' own generation with all their limitations, you see, because they felt that if it hadn't been -- wasn't moral, they couldn't accept it, you see.

I want after all to lead you into something where you can see that life -- the life -- the history of the human race has, for the peaceful islands of existence, codes of behavior, you see. You know that you do not steal here this overcoat in this room, you see. That's, so to speak, codified. But that to speak of life and death in terms of ethic is just absolutely funny. And that's what all the children of this country do, and that's why they are so funny. I mean, you aren't good at politics, and you aren't bad at politics, but you are alive in politics, or you're dead. I mean, you -- we are, as you know in this country, when you come to politics, everything is defended in the status quo. We are not able to foresee a future of South America in which these 21 states are united -- unified, or even two of them. Or even Paraguay and Bolivia. Therefore we are the enemies of life in South America. That's what they resent, because it's unnatural that there should be 21 states. But we, you see, because we are legal- -- legalistic, we think there are 21 states. And how long are they? They are just a hundred years there. What does this in history, you see?

So quite wrongly do you embark on the assumption that it is better to have 21 states in South America than when Mr. Peron says to have one. We should have a better imagination and outrun Mr. Peron. But we certainly should admit that in the long run, 21 states in Europe and 21 states in South America are obsolescent, I mean, are nonen- -- you see, are nonsense. Just -- and -- and our future with Canada. Charles Lindbergh said in 1934 that we shouldn't -- or 1937,

I think it was, when he came back from Europe -- that he said the -- the British Empire was dead as a dodo and we should now take over Australia, and New Zealand, and Canada, which -- we are doing it now, you see, but at that time, he was stoned because he said it. But we have just having -- had -- had now -- just a defense treaty with Australia and New Zealand, and nobody says that this is the annexation of the British Empire. What else is it? It mustn't be said, that we are now the imperialists. We have -- are called -- we are now the British Empire, for all practical purposes. Mr. Eisenhower went to Canada, do you think for a joke? He went to make sure that north of the 54th degree of latitude the hydrogen bomb couldn't be flown in. That is, he -- he made sure that this is one now -- from now on, for all practical political purposes, one country. You may go on and read the American Constitution and repeat on it by heart, but that is no longer the Constitution under which you and I enjoy life and -- and liberty. Obviously it's a constitution by which it is quite sure that -- that the -- from -- neither from Australia and New Zealand, and Hawaii, nor from Canada an enemy can reach our own frontiers. Now, in older times, one calls this an "empire." But we are too coy, and we say that we -- our frontier is at the 54th degree of latitude. Not a word of truth in this.

But you want it so. The group in this country, gentlemen, that will understand this tragedy of mankind is understanding that man as a mortal being eats up the -- out the bowels of peace, and that war always comes when the sacrifices made for -- are -- in the former war are forgotten. That will be the rulers. And I'm afraid it looks as though we enter a time when only naval men, and air men, and army men will have something to say, because although they do not understand it, they instinctively are trained at least to encompass it into their thinking. And that's the great danger of this country and of its democracy, because you have made yourself stupid. You have made yourself insipid, by talking to your girl not about heroes, and -- and battlefields, and -- and victories. But you talk about the next refrigerator. And as long as you talk about the standard of living to your girl, you are just a slave, a slave who is sold down the river in the next war, or in armaments race, or in what-not, because you are not responsible for the full picture. And the mi- -- human mind is only -- obviously, you can understand this -- potent, when he accepts the universe.

There was a lady in the farmou- -- famous transcendentalist movement in Concord. Her name was Margaret Fuller. You may have heard her name -- who has heard her name? Only one. Margaret Fuller? She married then later an Italian, and so she was then more or less in a little disgrace. But she was a great friend of Thoreau, and Ralph Waldo Emerson, and who are the other -- transcendentalists. Alcott. You have heard these names?

(I think so.)

Well, she's an important person. And she said one day with great rapture, "I accept the universe."

And then Emerson said, "She had better," you see.

And I can only recommend the wisdom of both these people to you. You have not accepted the universe, because you do not admit that you owe your existence to war and peace. You say you owe it to peace. It's not true. You owe it to the people who died in battle. This is -- don't under- -- don't misunderstand me. I do not say that I understand this better than you, you see. Just as little as I understand why God created billions and billions of stars. No astronomer can tell us this. They only can describe how these stars move. But do you think that any astronomer can introduce you into the great secret that there is night, that there are stars? Not the slightest { } and what a waste. Gentlemen, what a waste. Two billion people on earth, and -- and 20 billion stars. It seems such a waste. Why has God the Almighty poured out this quantity which we can never, so to speak, really understand and organize it in our mind? Our mind's just not up to this and it's bigger than we can understand. But obviously with this big-ness, He wants to suggest something.

And anybody who begins to understand that night and Heaven are talking -- talking, demanding obedience, is on the way also to understanding that this little something of us, since it is mortal, sometimes can -- may conce- -- take his life in such a way that it concentrates in a short life of 20 years or 30 years more meaning than in a long life of 70 and 80 years, and 90 years. And therefore that the soldier in a battlefield, who gives 40 and 50 years of his youth -- of his vitality to his country is doing a better job of -- of fertilizing the soul of his nation, just as a mother who dies in a -- in childbed and gives birth to a child is more blessed than a proud spinster who says that is a sin to have sexual intercourse, and therefore never has a child -- baby from cowardice. And she's -- a spinster may become a hundred years old. She has still missed her vocation, but the mother has not. And what do you say of a young mother who dies in 20 -- at 20 in childbed? Should she've said, "It's too dangerous. I won't have children"? That's what you say when you say it is bad to be a soldier.

You -- we don't know. This is a mysterious thing, gentlemen. Here I am alive, I am talking to you about all this. And I have been spared. All my friends are dead long ago. I think the -- the only thing a decent can then do is to treat his

life as already forfeited, and to lead it as though it didn't matter now whether he lived or not. And I think you will find, gentlemen, that this is your duty, that at a certain time in life, you have just to have the guts to say, "I have now to act. May the chips fall where they may." What does this mean? That you are indifferent to the question of life and death. You cannot be after 30, gentlemen, a good citizen if there is no occasion where you say, "It doesn't matter. They may take my life. They may arrest me. They may starve me. They may take my reputation. They may exile me." Do you think any statesman can -- could be a -- rule a nation if he is not willing to be impeached? That's the -- the -- the phra- -- the risk of the -- of the business. The only risk you understand is bankruptcy, financially, gentlemen. There are many other bankruptcies. I have been bankrupt in my life in the eyes of my friends -- or my foes even more so -- 20 times, because I have been completely indifferent. And I would be ashamed of myself -- I have been a soldier six years now. I -- I reported to the infantry in 1917, when this was certain death, after 13 -- 30 -- the three years of butchery. And so I really know what I'm talking about. Now, I am not dead. But I would be ashamed of myself if I would now say, "This is wonderful not to be dead." I'm very doubtful about this, gentlemen. To have to teach you in this college is just as much a punishment as to lie in the grave.

Life is not in its -- my life is only meaningful if it is reproductive of life.

This you can take down, gentlemen. That's a very simple formula. A -- a mother -- a woman who is unwilling to enter the chain of generations by giving life to new children is on the way -- in great danger of becoming a harlot, or she must become a nun and serve a higher course of -- a still greater sacrifice where your faith says, "I don't have to see in the flesh children born from mothers," but I can create out of the spirit new souls," which really the Church does, if it does its duty. Priests do this, and nuns, and monks have -- do it over the centuries. You and I wouldn't be alive today in our hearts. You wouldn't look as blank as you are if there hadn't been a Francis of Assisi, or there hadn't been St. Jerome, or there hadn't been -- the Benedictines -- monks, you see, with all their singing, century after century, keep our souls alive. If you sing any hymn in any Protestant Church today, it comes right from the monasteries, who through 500 years -- you remember St. Patrick and all these people -- sang -- sang the Psalms, and gave praise to the Lord. Do you think you would even know what it means to give praise to the Lord, if these monks hadn't be- -- lived in spiritual fruitfulness and sacrificed their family, their children, their offspring, their progeny and had lived as though they were already dead? Because their only idea was to give life to you? And -- but you say all this sacrifice was for nothing. You really believe that a man who gets money from the Ford Foundation and from Dartmouth College by itself is able to tell you the truth. Gentlemen, without sacrifices,

nobody is able to know the truth. But if this man has fought in the war, and you know that he is able to stand it or has withstood the dan- -- the powers that be in any other world, you begin to trust him, because a man has proven that the truth is more important to him than the powers that be.

I mean, for -- for thousands of years, Israel was in danger of life when a man said, "I am a Jew." They would take him and burn him at stake. And thereby the faith in the living God has been kept alive. As soon as you take every danger from this -- from this group, the -- and the Israelites are no longer in danger of life another group must take over and you get Jehovah's Witnesses. You get all the Mormons. You get always -- the Quakers. That is, there has to be always a group that is in danger of life when it certifies that it believes in the living God, because otherwise there is no value attached to it. And the latest value to attach to the -- the belief in the -- in the Revelation is obviously that you are willing to lie down your life for it. Otherwise, the -- the truth begins to dwindle. You think that once the truth has been -- has been known -- become known that we all want the truth. This is your great error, gentlemen.

No generation by itself, in its own interest of living, wants to know the truth. They always say, "Oh, it will still carry us." Just as the famous people in the French revolution -- the nobility said, you see, "Après nous, le deluge -- le deluge." After us, the deluge. That's what you think. If you only have a job, if you only have a family, if you only can pay off your mortgage -- after all, that's all you want -- the living God won't work. It's too complicated. What do we know of this? The tradition of the human race, that's all so complicated. Let me have my peaceful life. So you say, "That's Christian teaching," Sir, you say, "That's Christ's teachings." It is not. Christ came into the world to unify all the generations of man, and so He went out of His own existence, out of His own generation -- He was unknown in the world of His days -- and said, "I want to use the whole vitality of 70 years of my life; the first 30 years just to bring into the world, to give birth to the 12 Apostles. And then I will even confiscate my own life and let them have the impression of my full strength, in my prime, and so these 12 Apostles will be able to multiply -- my faith." But there have to be apostles and there has to be the Lord in every generation. It doesn't help that He died 1953 years ago. That's long ago. It doesn't help at all.

So you always take the teaching of Christ, instead of His sacrifice. And then He says obviously, to the hous- -- to the captain of Capernaum, "It is better to be a soldier than to be a civilian." The best is to be the -- a Christian. But only if you do not compare being the apostle with being a civilian, you see.

There are these three stages. Here you have your job -- hunter, with a refrigerator. And you have the soldier. And you have the martyr. Well, Sir, when I hear in this country the interpretation of Christ's teaching, it is always that the martyr has been replaced by the job-hunter. So he mustn't wear a uniform and mustn't shoot. But it is understood, gentlemen, that the sequence is: this is the primitive man, that's -- we all are. That's -- everybody begins this way. That's the second -- that the existing community asks -- demands the laying-down of your life and death. And that's the third -- the new community, the coming community dies -- demands the laying-down of your life. But let's not talk about not laying down anything, and then be called a "Christian." You cannot have the cake and eat it, too. If you want to be an American, a respectable citizen, become a Senator or a Representative, and be a married man and be a Rotarian, that has nothing to do with Christianity.

And if you think that Christianity is castration, you're quite mistaken. It's creation, the restoration of the creative process. And Jesus said, "Even mothers no longer will -- want to bear child- -- children, so we have to set this great example, that the men can be born -- reborn not by the will of men or by the flesh, but in the spirit." So He -- the Apostles felt that they were born in a virgin birth by -- Christ, and that is the story of the virgin birth dogma: that first the Apostles experienced new birth, and then they { }, Jesus must be born the same way. So all these debates, which these civilians in this country for the last hundred years have fought out about the virgin birth, is only a cheap way of not seeing that we were dealing on the level of Christianity with life, where it's only the question of re-creating life, of giving birth at all. But you only think of this as an individual affair, of sex, and such nonsense. That has nothing to do with the problem of Christianity. The problem of Christianity was { } in the Jewish nation, the spirit of the living God no longer could be contained, and could be represented and dwindled, and so they had to be taken out. And so Jesus found this tremendously higher form, that even people already born in a special nation could be spiritually so redeemed that they formed a new na- -- a wider nation of the human race. And therefore the whole -- the whole springing up of this -- but under the condition that nobody could think they were cowards. Nobody could think that they were not for marriage and for fruitfulness. The Apostles did marry, did they not? No, they were married. Peter was married, as you know. This was no -- that was not a -- he -- found himself married, so it wasn't a reason for -- divorce his wife. Paul didn't marry because he was called and it was more important to do this -- this higher order. But the condition is always that every one of these people was absolutely immune against cowardice, and that -- he did- -- didn't -- didn't condemn fighting, or being fought, but he said, "It is my

significant role not to fight, but to be fought."

Every time -- each time it boils down just to something, gentlemen, that as soon as our structure is established -- you are 30, that's manhood -- your carcass, this skeleton, these bones, these dried -- this flesh of ours, is, after all, obviously mortal. You know already at 30 that at 70, it will all be over. Therefore you cannot fight for your own life in the sense in which you can fight for an hereditary order. It is obvious to the man at 30 that he asks himself this following question: here I am structurized. That is, I have my talents, my interests, my prejudices, I have my family. Well, I'm not going to fight except for my children and my wife. They are -- I'm responsible for them. But I'm really not -- not good enough, so to speak. I'm -- I won't last, anyway. You must see this. There comes in this really pacifist element in all decent men that they will not fight just for their own bare existence. And {generously, they will say} -- let him { }. { } to go to Klondike -- I couldn't go to Klondike. It's just missing in me this element. I must have the gold -- I would just say, let him have it, I mean; I don't care. It's not enough -- for me, I cannot make great fuss. A certain amount, I mean, I may have -- try to have some elbow room. But I will be very much aware as an individual at 30 that for these 40 years on this earth, I cannot ruin 20 other people, so to speak. This is -- don't you think? I mean, this -- nobody -- not -- none of us want -- wants to do this, because we aren't that important, in our mere physical existence. We are -- because death therefore constrains us.

That is, in our lifetime, we can have ethics and a code in such a way that everyone -- can have something and nobody has everything, because nobody deserves this. He can't take it with him, in -- into his grave. And he can only eat once. And all these things were -- would be all so simple if I and you, we were all sobered people of 30 who are aware of their own mortality. But the thing becomes quite different when we are responsible for the progeny, for these people who have to grow and to find a place for themselves in the future. As soon as this man of 30 thinks of the great deeds of his forefathers, and thinks of the great future for his grandchildren, he is willing to say that the living generation is just good enough to keep the continuity. And as soon as you and I will -- feel sure that it isn't my or your personal interest, we will be very {heroic}. That is, we will understand that our -- we have to be sacrificed in this greater process {from love} for our children -- from love to our ancestors. It's perfectly normal, I think. We -- and then I said the third, the martyrdom for -- for new heredity, a new way of combining the work only comes in if the mere children of the flesh, you see, and the mere ancestry of -- in my pedigree, or in my nation, prove incoherent as now. Then you get revolutionary problems, because obviously as

long as we have kings in England and presidents in France, and -- and -- and so on, that isn't enough integration. So somebody probably will have to, you see, preach a -- a gospel, or live a gospel, I should say, that goes beyond the service inside the nation for children and -- and ancestors.

But the main point is, gentlemen, that this warring generation -- a warrior, gentlemen, is not -- or "soldier" is even better, is not a man who fights for himself. Result is, for example, that no decent soldier hates his enemy. Only civilians do this. It is so -- awkward in this country, where the journal, the -- the newspaper clamor is so great that you allow commentators to speak of "the Japs" or of "the Krauts" and so, despicably. A decent soldier has never done this. I have still to see a man, and I have been six years in a -- in -- in the German army, and that's quite a long time, gentlemen. I've been four and-a-half years at the front, and I have still to see a man who hated a Frenchman or a Russian. That doesn't exist, because, you understand, we just are able to be soldiers, because we are sobered to serve { }.

Now I said 30 in order to shock you out of your somnolence, that this is really a question of ma- -- human maturity. A soldier is antithesi- -- mature in anticipation. He is made mature by his wearing the uniform beyond his self-interest. As a student, you are egotistical. You want to get a girl. And you want to get a profession. And you want to get an equipment. And you want to write a book. And you want to become famous. You want to make money. I said "30." Now I have to add: a soldier is treated as though he already was aware of this sacrificial attitude at 18. And you -- the uniform -- gives him this, which your physical age wouldn't give you.

And therefore the soldier has no hate. Therefore he is not touched by your Christian warning, these -- that you should love your enemy. Every soldier loves his enemy. He loves him much more than the civilians for which he has to fight -- the reporters, and the nurses, and all the terrible people at home who desert his cause. I can assure you that we all at the front felt tremendous solidarity with the other armies fighting us, but we had no patience with the people at home. This is the real situation of a normal soldier. Therefore he doesn't come under your jurisdiction, Sir, because he doesn't hate his enemy. He doesn't want to shed blood. He is not a murderer. He's not killing. This is all in a spiritual realm of which you seem to have no idea. He is in the most sacrificial and purest mood. He's a much more purified soul than any man downtown in business, who has to compete and has to use his elbows. The soldier doesn't use his elbows. (Sir. Do you mean all soldiers here think this way?)

Pardon me?

(Are you thinking that all soldiers think this way, or are you thinking...)

Well, in this country, you see, the barbarism of the -- this -- the Second World War has been so terrible because the Church has deserted the armies. It hasn't preached the honesty of soldiering. That is, the chaplains had no word to these soldiers, and therefore they had no influence. Therefore there has been hatred of the Japanese. I have met two chaplains, gentlemen, and I still think it's the all -- low point of my life's -- spiritual -- experience. Anything that I have met with doesn't amount to such brutality as this story of the two American chaplains in uniform. They were on Saipan. And they took a walk, and they found three naked Japanese corpses. And when they came home, they told me this.

And I said, "Did you bury them?"

And they said, "No."

They had forgotten that to bury a man is the first part -- is an element of the faith of man in the solidarity of humanity. And that -- they were not Christians, these chaplains. But the soldiers who had killed the Japanese were Christians, because that's an honest war. They have -- we do not act for ourselves, but in the service of a cause. But these chaplains, who got this -- these fat salaries, and these good uniforms, and no danger, and who take a walk and look -- stare -- they told me themselves -- at these three naked corpses, they had lost all humanity, let alone Christianity. And this you do not understand. You look at me and say, "Well, what -- { } get excited? That's not important."

Well, I sh- -- tell you, gentlemen. Man -- man's history begins with -- with burial. And if we do not bury people, we have no longer recognized that we are united, despite our fleshly mortality, if you treat these corpses as -- as carcasses of animals. And this was their sacred duty to -- go, either to bury them themselves, or to get -- look for help and do something about it. But here, I meet with a shrugging of shoulders and people are utterly indifferent to this and say, "This doesn't mean anything after they were dead." { } gentlemen. And the souls of man in this country are absolutely dead to the real issues. These chaplains have in my estimation -- I told them so. One is dearly a friend. He still can't get over it. But we are all weak, I mean. Every man has in his memory something he is ashamed of. Now it's enough for my friend there -- whenever we speak about it, he says, "I am ashamed." And he needs some remission of sins. But as long as you

do not feel that man has to be ashamed when he does this, you see, you don't -- not see the whole issue.

(Now, { } you wouldn't say the same thing for a civil war, would you, that you're saying about a war between nations?)

Well, the normal thing, you see, all wars in the Western world are civil wars. It is absolutely no reason to believe that a war between France and Germany has any less of the character of the Civil War than the war between South Carolina and Vermont. That should be...

(I'm not talking about -- excuse me. I should be more specific. I don't mean a war in the West. I'm talking about, for instance, the -- the -- the Chinese, Communist war versus the -- Boers { } personal gain in mind.)

Well, the difficulty with the -- with these new wars, of course is -- I know very well -- is that we have not a common name -- because wherever you can invoke some spiritual power under whom -- whose energy we bow -- it is very bad. Therefore the Christian -- the -- the Japanese and Chinese, as adversaries, are very difficult. Although I think people who believe in the Communist revolution still are believing in a spiritual force, very similar to ours. It's a partial -- partial -- a part of the belief of the messianic faith in the West, but that's a long story. But the cruelty is -- is -- is -- I'm very well aware of this, that the cruelty is greater. But all the more, the -- I wouldn't have said that a private soldier should have had to bury the Japanese. Chaplains had to. You see, this is a different thing, because they were -- they were allegedly, of course they're members of -- of the Christian faith. Of course, they weren't. They were just American army chaplains. I mean, the -- they were just -- a job. They had a business. I mean, most -- most ministers I come to know just have a business, when -- his percentage is from the undertaker.

But -- but by -- by constitution, after all, the -- the -- the -- we are, you see, if our industry has come to the West -- to the East, our -- our armies, our ships, our goods, our ideas, and therefore we owe them that which has redeemed all these partial goods, the faith in the human -- of the solidarity of the human race. And therefore cruelty or not cruelty on the other side, you see, or on our side, and hatred not -- in the individual soldier, when a chaplain misses this point, that the whole West has been the dynamic element and has mobilized the -- the East, and doesn't add this in the -- within which all this other alone can make sense, you see, {this unity} -- then they have ceased to be functioning. Then they are just Americans, and as Americans, they have no right to wear the cross, and

as Americans they have no right to be outside the fighting. And the -- all the privileges granted to them by our government, you see, are still given under the condition that the Church is a universal institution and not an institution of -- of, you see -- of self-interest. So I -- if I understand you rightly, you wanted to say these rules do not apply in the East, because it's such a -- more cruel warfare. (Because it's a sel- -- war of -- it's a warfare of self-interest. { }. That's all it is. And this is -- this is the way most people have always characterized civil wars in the { } you were fighting for something -- with something for the {amenable gain} as -- as something which you win as soon as the -- as soon as the war is over.)

Well, if there is a war of plunder, of spoils, that's what you really mind- -- mean to say, of gain -- then there would be always the other side; there is always then one side that def- -- justly defends and the other -- other is a -- that -- is then a different, you see, unrighteous war -- a righteous war.

(Yeah.)

But I don't think that things are so simple. There obviously are wars in which both sides are right, you see. And then there are wars in which one side is -- is right, you see. But I don't think there is -- can be a war in which both sides are unrighteous, I doubt it. This is -- usually the point isn't made, you see, that there are wars in which both sides are right. And I have the idea that -- that the conflagration between East and West is still to a large extent this, that both sides are right. I have -- our tradition has always been that there's absolutely no reason in a war to find that one side is wrong. This whole idea of the -- that comes just from your courses on ethics. Now, in Germany there is no course on ethics, because we are -- don't judge other people. We always want to know that other people are wicked. Or that you are wicked -- because the Bible says, "Judge not lest ye be judged." This is all nonsense. Why do you have to -- but it seems to be an urge in this country to -- always to know that somebody is wicked and always -- the politicians. If you only would forbid yourselves to say, "That's politics." You are, of course, making necessary the politicians, as you very well know. They are just -- your handmaids. You -- you are too good, and so you have to have the politicians. If you were a little more wicked, you wouldn't have to have a specialist in wickedness. But you are too good. Therefore you have to -- have your politicians. Anybody whom I meet in this country who says, "Oh, that's just politics," I have hearty contempt for this man. I am -- my heart goes out to the politicians, because they are -- the people who accept the universe. And you are people who don't accept the universe.

I -- I mean, this is very simple. I mean, here you live because other people make politics, then you despise the politicians and you brush your hands and say, "I -- I'm chemical -- sterile, and no bacteria." Just less life, but it isn't better life.

So, I mean, you can apply this to civil war, Sir. You can apply this to politics, which, after all, are a kind of anticipated civil war, of -- you see, of a less-bloody character, all the time, or just character assassination, and such nice things, you see. But that's war, too, obviously. A little war has to be in any peacetime society in order to make the big war unnecessary.

The whole problem, gentlemen, boils down to this question, you will admit: that the combustion motor -- the combustion engine in any one car is better than one big explosion of all the oil you have in one big catastrophe. Now if you can admit in your heart of hearts that you are at war, and that the community is at war, fragmentarily speaking, by bloody feuds or unbloody feuds, you will have less great explosions. That is, the more peacetime somnolence you get -- 70 years of peace -- make it necessary that the next thing is the most cruel and terrible world war. But if you have enough war, day by day, in a small way, then you can forgo the agglomeration, accumulation of war -- incendi- -- war materials, so to speak, for the big busts, where then nothing is left and everything is destroyed at once.

But to say that war is impossible would say that -- that all people die graciously. Now the fear of life makes every one of us hold on too long -- longer than is good to his interests. Every group, every -- take the doctors now with socialized medicine. It's very naive, but very natural. Take yourself with your property, not liking to pay everything in taxes to the government. Everyone is afraid to be destitute, to lose out on his vested interest. You, too. I mean, there is nobody. If -- if Dartmouth College degree no longer helps you in life, you would be very angry with this. And on it goes. That is, gentlemen, the fear drives men always to a point where they defend in some respect something that has deserved to die. And war is inevitable to make up for the difference between the mortality of man and their willingness to accept their mortality. That is, the mortality not of their fleshly life, but I, of course, represent all the laws, the orders, the frontiers, and boundaries, and traditions, the languages, and religions, and denominations -- everything which works through me. And therefore the fear of man overextends the lifespan, the lifespan of many institutions, of many things. And because it does this, war is the remedy. War is the remedy against our fear to die. And therefore it's an all-human affair. And we are all

guilty of it. And you certainly are, at this very moment, because you do not reform this college, but you just...

[Tape interruption]

...aging, and their responsibility. It's a wonderful temptation, I grant you.

It's not -- never to get out of school in some form or other, but what does it mean, gentlemen? War is inevitable, has -- because you try to overextend the mortality of any one phase of life. St. Augustine has said, "As many ages and phases, as many deaths must be died." Quod -- very briefly in Latin, very beautiful -- Quod etates tat mortes. As man- -- you understand this? as many -- etates -- as many deaths must be died.

Now you remember that I told you about Cotton Mather's report on Westminster, that America was on the way of becoming the matter of one age, because in every age, the myth of America is, "This is wonderful." They live it out to the bitter end, and no connection with the other ages, no sacrifice for the continuity of the race. Every one age, the Gay Nineties and the Gay Twenties, and the Gay Sixties and the -- I don't know. It's always "gay" in this country, you see, which means "blind." But you always mean that they live it out like Wallis Simpson. She's a good American, but a very bad person, you see. Instead of -- you see, when you marry, you marry. She has married three times. She's a bitch -- because she wants to stay young and repeat the act. That is how to live in one age, you see. Repeat -- repeat and stay young. Any man who has a -- in his senses, you see, does the final act and then he is through with his childhood, then he is through with his boyhood, then he is through with his adolescence. And he doesn't want to repeat it. A whore does. She does it -- {does the} act every day. This lady, this Du- -- Duchess of Windsor is -- is on the way, as you know, to a harlot, and then she wants to be queen at the same time. But to be queen means to have forgone this cheapness of adolescence. And you can say anything of Elizabeth of England, but you cannot say that she is a matter of one age. She has died to her childhood, and she has died to her girlhood, and she has died to her playfulness, and she's all duty, in such a way that we even are terrified. I at least am, you see. But there you can see the difference between a queen and a -- a lady from Baltimore. I think she is from Baltimore, isn't that true? She's not a lady. She's just one of these flappers who never want to grow old. She's just the thing that has made war inevitable in every generation, gentlemen. If you do not understand it -- because she acts, and acts, and acts, I mean, like -- like Barbara Hutton, and all these jet ladies, you see, who have to have six husbands -- seven husbands to assure themselves there is still somebody who likes them and can be tempted by their millions, and -- because they repeat the acts.

All, endless repetition is -- is anti-historical, because the conscience of man says, "Isn't it -- one enough? Must I -- can I repeat? Isn't this asking too much for -- for my -- for my elbow room in society?" Can you understand this? How can a man or a woman use up six or seven husbands, or a man use up six wives, you see? This is a {grave} question.

So gentlemen, wars are inevitable because we fear to die, but corollary: this fear of death is not meaning the fear of physical death. Nobody in this country is really afraid physically to die, but he's terribly afraid of having to give up golf. But he's terribly afraid of having not -- being not reputed an honorable member of the Rotarians or the Free Masons. That is, we want not to die to our honor, to our reputation, to our conveniences, to our physical exercises, to our leisure, to -- all these things that we think are coming to us. We have made always a part of the cosmos, gentle- -- take this word, because it's a good word -- of creation as being an integral part of our way of life. So please, will you understand? The corollary is: life, in humanity and human history does never mean just the physical existence. Life means the way of life. And we are afraid to give up the way of life, to which we think we can lay claim. And as soon as we -- from sheer fear of having to give up a certain way of life, you see -- grow blind, and stupid, and stubborn, the compensation is war, because the war destroys the mortality, and doesn't -- doesn't take -- take cognizance of our fear. And therefore, you see, in a war it is tested. If we are afraid, we will run away. Then there will be no war. We'll surrender. By our very courage, we prove that it hasn't been fear of mortality, but the decent respect for the order created, the deep gratitude to our ancestors, and deep faith in -- in the future of our group. So that the courage of the soldier is the refutation of the cowardice, so to speak, of the civilian. And that's why it takes courage to win a war. And the victor is the man who is thereby tested and found out not to be the coward, who wants to have this land, or these machines, or these gold mines, for the -- the fear of his mortal flesh, you see. But he wants it because he has a good conscience that this is the way mankind should travel, that he is the functionary of a great office on this earth of progress, of history, and that is -- I -- therefore I believe in God's judgment in history, gentlemen. That -- the amount of hero- -- heroism, and of sacrifice, and of courage is nothing accidental.

When the French ran, in 1940 at the Marne River, as you know, so shamefully, that was a judgment over France. They had all the -- everything: the ammunition, and the generals. The only thing they didn't have was the spirit. And when you -- you have forgotten this, but let me say this -- poor Cotton

Mather, he must rest in his grave, till next time -- when the French in 1940 choose between fight and Paris, they said, "Paris must not be destroyed. That's too terrible. The Americans must still be able to be -- come here and be tourists." And so they choose the armistice most dishonorably, and Paris wasn't destroyed. And everyone who -- seriously minded at that moment knew that the French had given up the ghost. That is, they had chosen stones, and streets, and places, and boulevards, and gardens, and paintings, and sculptures, and monuments, and the Arc de Triomphe, for the real triumph of the human soul over the fear of death. And so they don't exist anymore as a political entity. You can write them off. They just don't exist, because at a certain -- the decisive hour of their life, they chose -- that's all decided now. They -- that doesn't depend on the individual French anymore, you see. That's all over. They died in June 1940 -- I -- I mean this, if you understand it, you know what war is, because they could not go to war.

Now, I don't blame them, but as a structure of political decision, they have ceased to function. It's out, because political decision of a nation, of a government means that at a certain moment, the courage to defend the order wins out over the frailty of the human flesh, of a -- the fear to lose the human order. And if the souls of man do not feel that the order lives here and can therefore be built more beautifully with Paris in ashes, then there is nothing you can do. The -- the thing cracks. And that's why the Germans, whose cities were bombed, are alive. And the French, whose city of Paris was spared, are dead. Not the individual French, you understand. Not the French families, not the French individual groups, the community. All this can exist, but the -- the -- what we call "France," that no longer is an entity. That's why they don't pay taxes, why everybody is rich in France and the government is poor. They have a quarter of the gold we have in Fort Knox, in France. But it is not in the -- in the -- anywhere near the government. It is in the stock -- stockings of the peasant, and of the bourgeoisie. They have the gold. They -- are -- they estimated that there are 8 billion gold francs in France. That's a lot of money, you see. Gold francs, it's more -- you don't have any, and I don't have any, you see. We believe in the government. We believe in paper, you see. We here have credit. We trust our government. The French have all the billions we have in Fort Knox exactly in the same proportion in their own private homes, because they are only afraid, you see, of -- of not holding onto that which is coming to them. So from now on, they will be the -- the object of history and not the subject anymore of history.

So you see the connection, perhaps now? Is this clear? Have I drawn -- if you can only see that wars defend a way of life at the risk of your own life -- a way of life is defended at the risk of your fleshly life -- as soon as your -- the

interest in -- your own existence of survival wins out, no war possible. You cannot fight a war if the very existing order -- as there symbolized by Paris, the stones of Paris, which are after all of just one static nature, just there-ness, and have nothing to do with procreation, and nothing to do with new life coming and old life dying, which is just you see, timeless, sta- -- static, being there -- that at this moment, the war becomes impossible, inept for the French, because the sweet life with the omelette soufflé is -- is -- and the red wine is -- is -- is so much better. They really believe in the -- in the five senses. They are a sensuous people. They are not cowards. Don't misunderstand me. In a physical sense, they are very -- it's not true.

If you get a Frenchman outside Paris, in the colonies, for example -- I met a Frenchman in the -- in the Egyptian desert. Were you with us at that time? Wasn't this a great fellow? But he was alone in the desert. There was no Paris, you see, which tempted him. And no good food -- certainly no good food in the -- you remember? And so don't mistake me. You -- you free this Frenchman from his -- from his temptations at home, the beauty of Paris, and he certainly shows a very heroic soul. I remember the -- shall remember always this man as one of the finest specimens of the human race. And I felt very privileged that I ever was able to meet him. Here, Russ Keep was with me. There he was, all by himself, with the -- some natives, far away from any marketplace, and -- and -- and just working as head of an -- on an exploration of a desert temple. But -- when these Frenchmen get together as a group, then they become, you see, dangerous to themselves, because their leisurely way of life, as it is, seems to them not to deserve any -- they cannot think that -- that perhaps part of it is -- is too good. Thank you. The next time then, we get the -- Homer Lea first, and then the Cotton Mather. And then I will have to say nothing, but I thought I have to make the connection at this moment, you see, but you understand why your belligerent Cotton Mather and modern -- and modern Admiral {Symmes} may have more to do with each other than -- as a modern minister and a Cotton Mather in his days, you see. You understand?

(Yes.)

(Have you got a few minutes to spend now...)

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

In organizing some of my files, I have found an old pencil-remark which I may read to you, to introduce this problem of today. And the problem is, of course, the place of Jonathan Edwards between the 17th century and the 19th century. I don't know in which connection I jotted down this note, but it speaks for itself.

"Injecting themselves in a dangerous moment of moral collapse, between the Pilgrim Fathers and the American-born, between pioneers and New England -- now already old -- between civilians, engineers of the 19th century, and the soldiers of the two world wars, Edwards, Emerson, James -- that is, Jonathan Edwards, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and William James -- have rebuilt the American way of life three times. A faint-hearted generation was encouraged to remain all-inclusive; stay open to life's real width, length and height."

Now, I offer you this as a motto to what I shall try to do today for Jonathan Edwards. I said to you that he introduces the scientific bent, which we know so well as dominating William James' scientific psychology and rational philosophy of his first age's pragmatism, that he represents this for the first time, but in a strange fashion, in a negative philosophy of will, of the will. Jonathan Edwards is -- became famous in the 18th century in Europe. And he's the first American to be respected in Europe as a thinker. That's why he is so important. You can imagine that by 1750, before Ja- -- Benjamin Franklin, there just was nobody in the New World whose thoughts seemed considerable and weightful within the old structure of Europe, within the universities, for example. But Jonathan Edwards was famous in Edinburgh, where people, as you know, have very good brains. His book was printed there, also his historical book, *The Economy of Salvation*, and this gives you an idea of his esteem, within the Old World. He spoke a language they might not approve of, but they had to accept as being equal in forcefulness, and in training, and in discipline to their own way of thought and discipline.

If you ask now, "How come -- what -- what was in content so important and so contemporary that they said this man has to be mentioned, and has to be reasoned with, and has to be counted with in Europe?" -- when you ask this question, you can see that he puts the question of the scientific mind, of the scientific reason squarely into the center of his work, at his desk. In writing books, he did not just have his church in mind, and his congregation -- as the

Pilgrim Fathers, who wanted to nourish the flame inside the congregation -- but he started in two directions from his little church. If you take here the little village church in Northampton, and later in the wilderness of Stockbridge -- among the Stockbridge Indians, where he had a very desolate existence -- he did two things which together enabled the trustees of Princeton to call him in as their president. This -- not one of the two biographers here unfortunately stressed sufficiently that it was, after all, strange that a revivalist, and a missionary to the Stockbridge Indians could be called to become president of Princeton in 1758. He died within six weeks after he had been called there, from the flu, but -- pneumonia -- and he was very surprised, because he had expected that this call would be the coronation of his life's work. His greatest book, this universal history from the aspect of divine providence was published after his death. So you shouldn't have omitted this from your papers. Only the fact that Princeton called him equals in America the respect he was held -- by -- in -- in Edinburgh, obviously. That, so to speak, matches the European respect given him. And in the Princeton call, I think two things become rallied, and reconciled, and united -- unified, you may say, of his life's work: the revival inside the Church, and the polemics against the secular brain -- of science, going wild on its own. Both together make him the outstanding person. If you do not see this very careful balance -- you have here this nave of the Church. And here the people gather and form the cross, the body of Christ. That's the idea, as you know, of the Church, forgotten to you, that when people come there on Sundays, they form the living Cross -- crucial situation of Christ's own and living body. Not the building, and there is not an altar, and there are no pews, and there are no benches meaningful, but in the 18th century, the Congregationalists of Massachusetts still knew that the congregation is the Church; and that you have to have a building around it is very accidental, and rather superfluous. And certainly it shouldn't be -- today they should all be torn down, the churches, so that we can see if there is any church or not. If there is no church without the buildings, you see, then the buildings aren't worth supporting.

You cannot understand the situation of Jonathan Edwards if you do not see that there had dwindled down this power of forming every Sunday out of the political community, of a meeting house, and a congr- -- a community living around this meeting house, if you have -- forgot that there had to be the power on Sunday to transform this secular group of divided people -- divided in their work interest, family life, and age, and sex -- into one union, the transcending power of the so-called meeting house in the 18th century was that it saw the metamorphosis, the famous transubstantiation not only of bread and wine in the Communion, but that these same people who were just flesh and blood -- that is,

bread and wine -- on weekdays now became the body of Christ, the divine and the inspired unity on Sundays. That's why the Protestant churches are not open on weekdays, why they are closed except for the Sunday hour, because if you want to pray, you pray privately, secretly, in your own bedchamber. That's understood since the -- since the Gospel was written, that your own prayer, which you can perform as a -- as an individual, doesn't belong into the Church. The public service, however, injects into your own attitude something you cannot get by your own willpower, and by your own subjective lyricism, and emotionalism, and pietism, and however these -- these sugar-coated elements of sentimentality might be labeled in a religious manner. But you have to expose yourself to the scurrility of the world, that you are willing there to take the attitude of needing the -- congregation for knowing what you have to do. That is, a common spirit of the congregation gives you a cer- -- certain understanding of your situation that nobody can ever get by his own willpower.

Now this, Jonathan Edwards tried to revive. This power, gentlemen, I'll put it once more -- to transform the secular pioneer and settler into a member of a living body of people who do not their own will, who, from their love of Christ, are willing to do God's bidding. This is the problem of the will in the Church: that my will and your will have to be dismissed. If you cannot get out of the church and come -- go home with the sudden enlightenment, the sudden clarity that all the wishes you carried into church -- so you want to ta- -- go to Europe, or you want to marry this girl, or you want to become rich -- that they are nothing compared to the true intention of the world's government by its creator, then don't go to church. Then it's a misunderstanding. You don't go there for good feelings.

Now, many people followed my advice, already in 1750 and said, "We don't know anything anymore about church life, and remain secular." There has been of course in this country always -- 90 percent of the people have been blasphemers, and swearers, and drunkards, and whores, and what-not, as in most countries in the world. I think the proportion here was a little larger, even. It has never mattered, as long as America still boasted of the Pilgrim Fathers. This thing is only serious now where everybody pokes fun at the -- Puritans, because you see, it doesn't matter in any country or in any time what the majority of the people thinks -- as long as the majority conforms to the minority. It's the opposite from what you think it should be. You must understand that in any class, in any college, there are only 10 outstanding students. As long as the 10 outstanding students are acclaimed by the other 675 as outstanding, everything is wonderful, because then the top is the top, and the tail is the tail. But here, in this college, you have reached already the point where a man has to hide and conceal his

intellectual achievements or his intellectual interest. It's dangerous. There and then you get majority rule and that's mob rule, always. Gentlemen, there is never in any time of society the majority strong enough to stand on its own feet. That's -- doesn't exist. You have to be satisfied when in any one time there are two or three { } {prophet}. That's very many. The -- your idea that every one is one is just ridiculous. Absolutely ridiculous. The sooner you wake up to the old Gospel that this isn't so, the better it is. You have to be satisfied if there are 12 apostles in the whole Roman Empire at one time.

But if you think -- do you think these people in Rome were any worse than we are today? They were just as normal people. The salt has to be a little part of the meat, but you have to have some salt, as you -- the Gospel says, to salt. But the salt is minority. It is not a minority that rules, but a minority which is recognized as being the -- the salt of the earth. As we say today, still, of a man. If you have 10 good men in one town, well, you can reform the whole town, can you not? As long as the others say these are good men. If the others say of these 10 good men, they are not good men, then it's terrible.

You know this man, who wrote this new book. Oh, he's quite famous from his Hiroshima book.

(Hersey.)

Hersey. Have you read -- seen his new book? Has anybody heard of it? He makes this attempt of showing the rejection of a community of the -- its best citizen. You remember?

(Yes. In Massachusetts.)

Ja. And that's the state of affairs, gentlemen, which is really always calling forth the -- the catastrophe. It is never the absence of the good man in -- as a majority, because never is a majority of us awake, or strong, or hearty enough. They always have to be called to order. But when the call to order is answered by an outcry, that the caller is below parity and not above parity, then the society can no longer be cured.

Jonathan Edwards therefore -- if you think of the -- of the same church in the 17th century, you -- and the little country that they covered -- you may put it in this simple way, that outside the church certainly there were people who never were reached by the preaching, but the people who filled the nave of the church -- able to admit their shortcomings -- outnumbered the secular people

here, the people who believed in witchcraft and tried to bewitch their neighbors' cow, the people condemned in the Salem trials, of which people always forget that they were convinced of their own witchcraft, to a large extent, and meant to do harm, very much so. Now however in 7- -- this is 1650, or -- let's put 1660. If you take now the situation, in 1740, during the great revival. It is obvious, if you look just at the map, that the settlements had multiplied. These people had all 12 children -- well, seven of them had died, but five lived. And the immigration had been apace -- gone apace, and so you see there were innumerable people who didn't care -- sects, also; and you have in the Congregational Church then, all of a sudden, the minority. That's by and large the situation.

Now, I do not put this on to show you what we have in 1840 or 1940, where we have one against a hundred, and here we have one against a thousand, inside and outside the Church. Now for Edwards, the {resolve} -- very different from -- as we shall see -- from Emerson, and from James -- was one: you have to speak to the people outside. You have to speak it to the people outside. And you have to divide the sheep and the goats. You have to speak to those who may still be moved into the interior of the Church by terms of a revival. And you have to talk to those people who will not budge in any case to enter the Church in terms of logic, of science, of philosophy. So you may say that he is -- here he is the preacher, you see. Here he is the philosopher. And here is the revivalist, that is, the converter. But let us just at this moment use the crude term "revivalists," because there was no such man -- no revivalist in the 17th century needed. Seasickness and for three months on a boat is enough to revive anyone's faith in almighty providence.

So gentlemen, we have this man, Jonathan Edwards, in three capacities. One: to the people whom he can still hope to get into the Church. And the other group to which he talks outside. I can't get you inside, but I can give you the negative side of your existence. I can here tell the congregation of saints what the Gospel tells. I can make these sinners into saints. And I can talk to the sinners. That's the terminology of Jonathan Edwards. We would say today, "I can speak to the fundamentalists in church. I can convert the agnostic. And I have to reason with the deliberate sinner." The del- -- we don't call these people "sinners." We call them today "smart," probably, or "intellectuals." These are the two typical words. I think "intelligentsia," you have to say today for their depriva- -- depravity. In the 18th century, they were called "sinners." That is, people who believe that without -- they -- by their own willpower, they can save themselves, which is today the normal approach to life.

When -- most of you would be sur- -- quite surprised if I tell you that by

willpower you can't do anything. That is the -- however, the Gospel, that it is impossible for any man to save himself. You take any rationalist -- the more a rationalist he is, the more he depends on one good woman who will fulfill his desires. Certainly -- usually they need many women, these rationalists, who are good enough to sacrifice their lives and their devotion to their existence. It's -- has always -- puzzled me how all these anthropologists like Mr. Malinowski, or Mr. {Perito}, or -- or Karl Marx, or Lenin, how they completely depended on the devotion of women, and how this nowhere appears in their philosophy, in their program, in their politics, as dogma, that one-half of mankind must always be willing to sacrifice for the other half, which is so clever and so smart, that they declare that they do everything by their own will. Your sex you cannot -- the appetites of your sex you can never satisfy yourself. And therefore this means that the more you are a rationalist, the more the woman who gives you love has to be sacrificed on the altar of your rationalism, because rationalism omits this very fact. It isn't even grateful for this love, because it says, "Well, it's so stupid. Beyond words." I don't understand how anybody can sacrifice his existence for love, but these women seem to do it. They seem to want it.

So the women in this way are always excluded from good Marxian or good liberal society, because it seems so nonsensical for the rationalist. The rationalist only follows his enlightened self-interest. Now certainly it is in no woman's enlightened self-interest to be affected by the man's whims, venereal diseases, debts, bankruptcy, and -- and dangers. He may be shot dead on the battlefield, then she's a widow after being a fortnight of being married. She does it, just the same, and she loves it, because she loves him.

So in womanhood, gentlemen, life begins with love for a person. In rationalism, life begins with love of an idea. A woman cannot love ideas, or she goes crazy. They do now in Smith, I -- I know, and -- but they are very poor women. When a woman loves an idea, then she becomes very dangerous. She usually becomes a Communist and throws bombs. When you cond- -- a woman at 45 may love ideas. A woman of 20 may not. If she does, something is blown out of her system: her heart. And her -- below the belt, she serves really then the Devil. The -- you find that Emerson, you find that William James, and you find that Henry James never mentioned their wives. They're taken for granted. Only these people were enlightened enough to include the life and the soul of their wives into their philosophy. But they were unable to give a place in life for the structure of womanhood, which is anti-idealistic. But out of William James' fight against mere idealism, speaks very much this consciousness, as with his brothers, as with his father, so especially with his mother and his wife, he was initia- -- initiated into the real powers that run this world. And they certainly are the

opposite from mere reason.

So once more, gentlemen, the superiority of the religious thinker in all centuries has always been that he was able to do justice to the indispensability of the children's legendary existence, and of the wives' sacrificial existence, and that they always knew that these people were just as real human beings as the so-called scientist, and the so-called philosopher; and that they were the poorer, in your science and your philosophy, the more you made your own s- -- idiotic behavior of mere rationalism the norm of humanity.

But the great event -- breakdown of the self-confidence of the {freature}, which we find in Jonathan Edwards' tragic life--and it was a tragic life--he, after all -- no one, not one of you two biographers said this again, that he was exiled into the wilderness, without a library, without white men, among the Indians. Have you no feelings, no sympathy with such a great tragedy, with such a majestic endurance by which he was put to the test? I can't understand you. The two main facts of his life are just this: at first he was sent -- thrown away, cast out into the -- into the woods and then he came back and was made Prince- -- president of Princeton. That's a dramatic life. It doesn't end in 1750. The drama of his life is between 1750 and 1758, or -6. When did he die? When did he die?

('58, I think.)

Well, "I think," Sir. You have to know, not to think.

('58).

It is '58. So he establishes the right of the secular, and he revives the power of the ecclesiastical realm. And therefore, he already represents the dualism between the first and the second generation of which we have spoken at such length, you see, in the 19th century. Can you see now the importance of Edwards? Because the fullness of the secular life was left behind in the 17th century, was left to the Old World, to Europe. In Jonathan Edwards it attained a mission in this country, but the form in which it was admitted is very typical. And I think you should admire the organic processes in which mental, spiritual, intellectual life is replanted, or is developed in such a new world as ours, here. The first aspect of the scientific, which gains a foothold in this country, is to view it from the church steeple, to look at it as the new danger, and to give it therefore a negative philosophy, so to speak, a negative status.

You may have heard that in the first thousand years of our Church life,

there was a -- quite a group of people who treated of God in a way of a negative philosophy. They said, "We can know of God nothing except what He is not. We -- we know he is not fin- -- finite, so we call Him `infinite.' We know He is not limited, so we call Him `unlimited.'" And on and on, you see. "We know something, He knows everything. We are potent, He's omnipotent." These are, in fact, the people would say -- these are in fact negative qualifications. "Everything we may be able to think and excogitate about the world in which we live is categorized. We must free God from our categories, so He is more than any one of our categories." And finally the people went so far to say, "He's good and bad. He's limited and infinite. He's free and necessary," because they wanted to express the paradox that God must be more than any one aspect of a dualism, because if He was only on one side, couldn't be God. Then He would be a limited force of reality. Like night and day, God obviously must be night and day, which by the way is an old attempt of antiquity already to establish the gods of antiquity were just -- people felt this very deeply -- more powerful than any one of their seasons. And if you look at a Mexican statue in the Peabody Museum in Cambridge, which I recommend highly to you, or the Natural History Museum in New York, you will find that the statues of the God always alternate between a grimace and a very severe face and a very angelic -- {part}. There are these {styli}, which you may have seen, with three or four divine faces, which are in alternation horrid and meek, appealing and deterrent. Why is that so? Because God has to be beyond the division of appeal and repeal, of horror and attraction. And these people were very good theologians in antiquity. Don't think that these pious pagans had not very profound insights into what the divine was. Therefore Vitzliputzli and all the gods of the Mexicans had just these very same qualifications, that they were one god in the tempest and in the sunshine, in the winter and in the summer. And if you -- read these {styli} with this understanding -- which is too much for a modern intellectual, because he's -- has watered down his thinking to logical, little arithmetic, that one thing cannot be the other -- then you would find that the first thought of antiquity on God was that God is one thing and the other. The divine logic begins where you say, "A equals B." And the modern logic begins with this very plat- -- great platitude -- platitude that this overcoat cannot be a chair, you see. But that's not interesting. We know this, you see. That's for children.

But God is in you and in me, and in all our ancestors, and all our future generations, although we contradict each other. Now, if you can rhyme this, then you begin to know why we have to speak of God, because otherwise, there could be not peace between you and me. I have to admit that the same spirit may move you and me, although we appear to each other as devils incarnate.

This is the story then of Jonathan Edwards' experience, that the secular mind of any one period has to be spoken to, even before he has recognized the paradox of being at peace with his opposite number, male especially with female. The so-called "natural mind," gentlemen, of 18th-century philosophy, of which you read and hear, and which you ha- -- should study in the department of philosophy here is ...

[Tape interruption]

...a condescension which the Christians, since the -- 1100 more and more had to make to cope with the unmarried, the unparadoxical mind of the plumber, of the technician who's only interested in things, and therefore doesn't know that life only begins when a couple can get married and say, "I am myself, and you are yourself, and yet we are one." That's where life -- real life of humanity begins. "You are different from myself, but yet we are whole -- one." The plumber says, "We remain different. That's all I know. The rest is mysticism," they say. But the same plumber is married, and the same plumber expects the fire department to risk their lives when he is burning out in his workshop. So all these idiots which today dominate the scene, the plumbers, the physicists they -- we call them today, these glorified plumbers will only rationalize what -- on what they see, and they do not see all the strings that are attached to their very existence, by all the good people who protect them, who pay them their salaries, and who allow them to do all their glor- -- self-glorification about their science. You live under this idolatry today, as you know, of a -- well, "secular" of course has today reached such limits, that I -- I had a hearty laugh at lunch today, because I read the announcement of a new acquisition of this library here, our beloved Baker Library. They bought an edition of Fortune with the title, "What People Will Buy."

[Tape interruption]

So this is an {official} religion of cheating. Officially it is declared desirable, and great, and heroic to make people buy that which they do not really need, because, as you say -- as I say, if you know -- buy what you need, for this you don't -- not have to have any agency. You must see the secular in all its bloom today to understand why, from the point of view of a leader of a community, it is so very second-rate. It is there. I don't begrudge any man the attempt of getting rich or of selling his wares. But his first demand obviously is: do the people need what I sell? You see. Let me do something which they actually need. If now these farmers of Vermont try to talk us into eating cream all the time, you

see, and getting overweight, you have to laugh, you see. They'd better give up their dairies. You know that's the great crusade at this moment in -- in the dairy states, that we -- all of us, you see, have heard so much about dieting that we no longer drink enough whipped cream -- eat whipped cream. So what will people buy?

Now that is behind the -- or that is the outcome of secular -- of the secular mind, that your purpose has to be followed out to the maximum, because you want to sell. Therefore you write a gospel for America: how do I make the other people buy my product? This is secular, because it doesn't begin with the paradox that I and the man who does not want to buy, and never will buy what I produce, still form one society. This is the mystery. That is, people who do not serve my ends, my purposes, are just as much people -- brothers, sisters of mine -- as the people whom I can make subservient to my ends. This is mysterious. It is not proven by any secular rationalization. I mean -- no self interest can ever explain why the man who is interested in his own aims, and in his own self, has to feel that the people who do not serve his self-interest, like, for example, a good priest, or a good missionary, or a good preacher, or his wife, or his mother, why they are more intimately connected with him, and have more solidarity with him than all the people whom he can jump -- make jump at his command and at his whim. I mean, you -- will admit that the salesman who makes 10,000 customers buy his stuff has no such relationship with the people he really depends upon for his attachments, for his emotional life. He will tell the people he really loves, "For Heaven's sake, don't buy this." That's a test of his real love, and of his real belonging, you see. When any man in his own field says, "You don't need this, really. You can get with- -- go without. Oh, I -- I'll give it to you, but don't buy it," then you know that this man has real connection with you, real contact, that he is really with you in one and the same human family. Can you see the difference?

This is the pre-secular existence out of which the secular in every generation comes again. The following of my purpose, of my specialty, of my job -- of my profession, is always based on the assumption that despite all our spreading into many directions, we are still living in and out of one root. Once you have to give up this hope, that regardless of my -- your buying or selling to me, you see, we are together, there is no America, there are no United States.

Will you kindly try to understand that what I am showing you here is: the birth of this, or the re-birth of America of a necessary conflict, of one-generation purpose, and all-generation faith, or solidarity. The solidarity of the human race defies to be dependent -- made dependent on any share of economic, financial,

or { } {interest}. It's -- too shoddy and it's too changing. That's not good enough. You cannot love people who come to your market and buy in your tent. You leave them again. Next year you have another product and you go to another market. Why not? But that's second-rate. So the problem is to have and to live happily in two worlds. One of first-rate importance, and the other of second-rate importance. The secular mind says, "I cannot do this. I have to rate the second-rate world as first-rate."

Therefore the logical dichotomy of secular and ecclesiastical is very poor and very misleading. It isn't a dichotomy of one here, and the other there. It is one of perpetuity, and the other of transiency. The secular world depends on the commodities, for example, we produce. Obviously I have to make people sell coal, and later I have to make them sell electricity, and that will be different in every generation. And therefore I'll call myself with a different name for my agency. I'll use different mass media for getting onto the market. But what of it? That's all second-rate. And it's all perfectly okay. Nobody will object to the fact that we now have blacktop. But when a professor of history at Harvard begins his lecture on the history of the 19th century by saying that the blacktop on this first street in New York in 1874 makes an epoch in history, you have to laugh this man out of court. That's making second-rate changes, you see, into first-rate historical epochs. And that's all over the place today. And you all believe it. To tell you the truth, you are all against me, and you are all on the side of the Harvard professor, Mr. Schlesinger, Jr., who embodies this stultification of the human mind in this country.

The whole Eisenhower administration is in -- up in arms against this, of course. All the elements of a greater continuity of America are up in arms against this -- this gang of intellectuals gathered around the New York Times, because they have no ways of placing their intellect into two different concepts. One of my own self-interest and its purposes, which is perfectly -- you always have to say, "All right." Mr. Schlesinger wanted to become professor at Harvard. He has achieved it. That's all right. But that there is Harvard, that there are the United States -- that depends on soldiers, on missionaries, on nuns, on nurses, on all kind of people who do unrecognized service. There is no community of a first rate, gentlemen, that does not live by unrecognized service. The soldier who, on watch, although he could go to sleep, doesn't go to sleep, doesn't get a premium. Nobody sees what he's doing. He could get away with a half-an-hour nap. It is only he who represents the United States at -- in this moment. There is no policeman, no cop who can see and inspect him, because if you put a watch over a watch, and a watch over the watch who wetch- -- watches the watch, where do you get? There is an ultimate where there is no control, where you just have to

do your duty, although nobody else will ever know that you have done it. Then you wake up to the fact that there is nobody else except you to cement the order of the universe. There's absolutely nobody else. There is no law. There is no regulation. There is no cop. And so there is no mother and no father, my dear child, to sweeten your -- your worries, because you still have their eyes set on you. No. You are your own god, completely your own. And then you feel, of course, you aren't your own, because it may cost your life, because it may cost your life to stand on watch in the -- such a dark night, with the enemy attacking. So you know very well that nobody can do his duty as an unrecognized servant if he doesn't believe in his representing some bigger order than himself. And no soldier therefore is without religion. It's only the civilian mind that can laugh this off and say, "I can do without it." He doesn't know how much he depends on others who have that which he has not, and for the lack of which he can only be despised or -- or put in second place. But we have reached the point today where the snickerer and the sneerer is put in the first place. He's clever; he's smart. And the people admire him.

With Jonathan Edwards -- where's the book? Did anybody -- one -- did you bring it, or I had promised to bring it, did I? On the Freedom of The Will, we also enter an interesting controversy. Before you -- giving you the controversy, however, I shall give you a -- the lift of five minutes of --.

[Tape interruption]

...of his book on the will, Jonathan Edwards puts the question whether human will is free. His last biographer has mistaken his question and has isolated it. And {Barry Miller} thinks he is a real predecessor of the people who discuss the freedom of the will in the 19th century in philosophical terms. But you will now understand that for Jonathan Edwards, the freedom of the will is always only the corollary to the love of God. Will and love are both there in his vocabulary any minute. And when he discusses the will of man, he can do so because he knows, and he thinks he can assume that his readers still know what the love of God is. In the 19th century, that was completely given up. One-half carried the whole day. And if you today discuss will in your departments of philosophy, it goes so far that love is made a subdivision of will, instead of being the opposite.

I always say that if you identify love and will, it is exactly the same as when you identify -- atomic bomb with a newborn baby. Love is like the newborn baby, and will is like the atomic bomb. And they have very little in com-

mon. Especially the -- they are divided by the fact that one is alive, and the other is mechanic. And your will is the mechanical part of you. It's the self in you that -- the mortal self that has force, energy, that can all be quantitatively, so to speak, stated in forms of width -- width, length, and height. The baby, however, cannot, because it can only be stated in terms of future, growth, affection, and being expected, and being promised. So in very different terms, indeed.

This is then the point in the American history, the year 1750, which today has to be reconquered. As long as you identify will and love, you must end with Mr. McCarthy, because fascism and Communism are the only forces in which logically such a system is complete. Where will and love are identified -- or as it is even worse today, where love is simply one whim of will, where you will to love, where you want a girl and therefore say "I love you," but not meaning it, because you only will her -- in such a society, the only will that can tame all these wills is, of course, external, a dictator, a -- a secret police, the army, a commander-in-chief. It is only where you admit that inside yourself that you are torn between will and love, that we can admit and we can believe that man is in this sense subject to influences which tame his self -- self and bring his self under control. I put it in a German essay on "What is Man?" the other day in a very simple way. The man who says, "Man consists of will, feeling and intelligence" is called today in this country "a thinker." He's -- denies two -- three things: that man is a member, that man is unique, and that man is personal. In this definition of will, knowledge, and emotion, as you see -- the membership, the powers by which we are members of larger units, just doesn't occur, because if you will to be a member, you aren't a member. You must be a member, and then inside the membership have a will to fulfill your membership. But membership is something that cannot be given to you. You are the son of a family, Sir, you can't will to be a son of a family. Just there. And then you will accordingly, that's membership. That you are a person makes that people listen to you. Now all the intellectuals want to sell their books. That is, in other words, they want to find a way of persuading people to listen to them. They want authority. Authority -- that is personality, you see -- is not within the realm of describing a person as having knowledge, emotions, and will, because not any one of these -- qualities qualifies you to be listened to, or to have any authority over anybody else.

So this so-called "theme" of secular philosophy in the last 300 years, gentlemen, you must understand was always meant as a rival to religion. It was an attempt to describe that individual which is not a member of a church, which is not married by love to a larger unity, which is not taught and inspired. It is a rump. It is the mutilated self. When you say, "I stay outside these three given

great roots, great belongings, or -- that existed in 1620 when the people landed here," that is, that they were members of God's commonwealth, that they were inspired, because they had been taught, and that they were unique, so that they had the authority of a experience which nobody else had, and they became persons -- these three things were always presumed. And in Will- -- in Jonathan Edwards, you have still this heroic situation, that he still holds onto the belief shared by his contemporaries, that this was so, and tries to put at rest the weak part in us, when we lose our membership, forget our inspiration, and are cowards and have no mission to fulfill in life. In all these weak moments of ours, we are philosophers, that the philosopher always takes the gap in our armor and tries to console us in these dark, black nights of failure, of absence of spirit, of absence of love, and of absence of membership. And for these individual situations in which most of you find yourself at this moment in college, philosophy is quite a good thing, because it fills a gap of our normal attachments, of our normal inspiration, of our normal loyalties. When there are no such loyalties, we try to explain our existence just the same.

This is the meaning then, of the discussion of the freedom of the will in Jonathan Edwards' book, that he deals with that part of us which remains unredeemed, uncheerful, pessimistic, doubtful, and says, "To you I can only say that at the moment in which you think is these terms, you are just pure force, brute force." He wouldn't have said at that time I think "brute animal." Perhaps he wouldn't also have said "brute force." But he s- -- said, "You will be unfree. You will not be free."

Don't overrate therefore your pessimism. Don't overrate your causation theories. Don't -- your epistemology, your ethics. Everything philosophy can do, you see. You must see that these are just like the bubbles of your bad digestion, as -- a modern psychoanalyst would also say. And in -- if you analyze Jonathan Edwards' theory of the -- of the servitude of the will, it is very much like Freud, because all interpretation of the sinful ego amounts to the same thing, to show that it is projection of desires, of urges, of instincts, that man's big ideas about himself are all rationalizations of his desires, and -- and you could take Edwards and translate him into Freud, and not doing violence to either one of the two, because it is the sinner of Edwards, which in all its -- his bleakness, and his despair, and his blackness, and his being fettered to his repressions, and his pains, and his desires, which is given in Freud's analysis.

Therefore, gentlemen, I always wonder about you. When I say, "Man is not free," your scientific ego says, "Wonderful. Of course he isn't. We are just part of nature." And when I say, "Man is free," you also, as a liberal -- liberal, rejoice

and say, "Of course, against these damn Puritans and these religionists, man is free." You all -- any one undergraduate of this college is split in his tenets. You yourself, Sir, you -- believe in the morning that man's will is free and in the afternoon that he is not free. And you rejoice over both statements. And that is so very funny to me. I have never found in any Dartmouth student who has ever made -- up his mind to see that he cannot be a liberal without believing in the freedom of the will, and that he cannot be a naturalist without believing in the necessity of the will. What you really mean, I do not know. But you are all carrying on both shoulders. You are all split. Every one man in this college, on this campus, has available to himself two opposite beliefs. One comes, of course, from the membership in some religious body of your ancestors. And you won't give this up, that man can be good, for example. He can be -- be evil, he can be a genius, he can be creative, he can be a person. You all believe this. You are all reformers at your heart. But at the same time, you also think it is wonderful that every man underlies strict psychological laws, that by analysis it is proved that it's all in the glands, your whole life, and -- and that two and two is four, and that you can make people buy anything, because you can cheat them; and they are like apes, and like sheep, and they can be led by you. You believe it all, at once.

Now, in this anarchy, of course, a man like Jonathan Edwards is too logical. And William James, by the way, too. These people knew that it had to be either way. You were either one or the other. Now Jonathan Edwards' solution was that you are at times one and at time, the other. But he was very careful to state when you are one, and when the other. Unfortunately you are not. You are absolutely careless about this. You think you are -- can both be at random. You will in the same -- at the same cocktail party, or at the same bull session, uphold the both -- both -- opposite tenets. I have seen it. And you must admit that this is so. What?

(Would you give us the opposing view?)

Which opposing view?

(The one that says we are completely { }. Well, I -- I don't see what -- I -- I think that this is a perfectly natural conclusion to come to. I think that -- that man being {imminent} and transcendent comes to the conclusion that he is part {free} and not -- not free.)

Well, the important thing then is to know the conditions under which we are free and are not free. When we fear, we obviously are not free. When we are

without fear, we are free, for example. However, in Emerson, you find of course the glorification of the freedom, you see, -- per se, because Emerson was so unafraid that he never thought man was such a coward and so fearful, just as much. He always thinks we can be free, because we don't fear. So there you have the --

(I thought you yourself were castigating this particular position, I mean.)

Pardon?

(I thought you were castigating the position there.)

No! But doesn't everybody -- one of you know that when we do not provide for membership, and for tradition, and for personal sacrifice, that we fall -- become slaves then of our fear, and our ambition, and our own will. Our will is just enslaving us. Any vice shows you this. The addict is a man whose will has become master of his freedom. Freedom is therefore -- something constantly lost and re-acquired. It's like virginity for a girl. It has to be re-acquired. Any woman, any ma- --- moment she loves is a virgin again and has to be reconquered. There is not such a difference between a virgin and a wife. Do you think our -- our -- your mother is not a virgin every morning again? She is, because she recuperates. She is put again into the right atmosphere of a family. You don't believe in any of these things, I know. But I don't see how -- how you then can call your mother "Mother." Then Freud is right, that she is always subject to your own lusts, and your own appetites. She isn't. You know this very well, that to you, she is your mother. That is, she is completely sexless. And you are also old enough to say -- know openly that this isn't so with regard to the man who loves her.

Any mother is virgin and bride at the same time. That's why the Catholic Church worships the virgin and the bride in one person. That's her secret. It isn't therefore the -- a -- a new problem, gentlemen. Since there has been religion in the world, the paradox has been for the gods to be there in rain and shine, and for you and me to be free and slaves. That's a religious problem. It's an eternal problem. When you are first-rate, and when are you second-rate? You are first-rate when you are free, and you are second-rate when you are a -- the servant of your will. That's why the only prayer that is unanimous in Christianity to this day is the prayer to be emancipated from your own will. But nobody seems to -- to heed this prayer. I have seen people pray "Our Father in Heaven," and yet believe that will -- their will is free. The will isn't free. But from the love of God, you can forgo your own will. That is, the condition, Sir, of your being free is to share the only will that is free in the world, the creative will of the power that

created the whole universe, and re-establishes, therefore, your own place in this universe, every day again against your own will; because what you have to become Sir, that's not up to you, what you're meant to be. You will be told this one day and every day.

If anybody would get what he wants, he would be the most -- unhappiest creature. Look at all the rich people who have all they want at 45, and then they blow out their brain, because their whole life has only consisted in getting their will's desire, which is the most miserable, calamitous situation any man can have.

You remember the description in Wolfe's last book, of the writer whom he meets in Europe, who has everything he wants -- women, and success, and money, and -- but he has nothing. Just fluttering. He's not guided anymore, because he's not a member. And he's not taught anymore, because he's not inspired, you see. And he's not a person anymore because he hasn't to represent the order of the universe in his own time.

So the answer is, Sir, that everything, what I have said so far is of course very primitive, but will it { } -- children know this. Only learned people in this college don't know it, you see. The stupidity of the academic clan is just out of proportion to what everybody knows, what every woman knows. Every other person knows all these things, but we have arranged here these -- blinders around you. So you really believe these are deep problems. The depth of the problem is of course only reached when we begin to ask: when are we free and when are we slaves, you see. The "when" is all-important. The two things are given. That's the famous story of the Fall of Man, but you know, the 19th century has a wonderful way of poking fun at original sin and saying, "That's just funny," because you -- of course you are always free, you say. The next moment you listen to a scientist and say, "He has proven that nothing is free. That we are just nature." Didn't we have this paper on "just nature"? You remember, William James, you see, saying, "It's just nature." But if we are just nature then obviously there is no -- no -- no -- no corner of our being where there is any inkling of our freedom. Nature has no freedom.

In Holland, the problems of Jonathan Edwards filled the whole first half of the 18th century. It's perhaps quite as well to know a little about the great Arminian quarrel in Holland, by which the Church itself, under the influence of the rich merchants and the secular well-being of the country -- the high standard of living in Holland was famous at that time; it was the richest country in Europe -- were, of course, inclined to give to business first seat. And that is to say that the

will of man was good and free, personal will, the -- self -- the will for self-aggrandizement, for getting rich quick, et cetera, et cetera. So the Arminians, and their opposites fought in the Church of Holland. And there was the famous Dordrecht Synod in 1619 -- 1714, which had to decide inside the Church on this Pelagian heresy, whether by human will we could become members of God's kingdom, as I try to phrase it, to make you familiar with this great, very important problem of membership in a community, which cannot depend on your or my will, because we have to be recognized members of the community. There is a give-and-take in this which you cannot force. You can lead a horse to the water, but you can't make it drink. And you can ask people to be balloted into a fraternity, but you can't force them to do that. For this you have to be loved and liked. There's just no other way.

Jonathan Edwards then is in this tradition of a theological controversy.

And that's why the Europeans were very much interested, because inside Calvinism, there was taken this first step toward so-called "deism," in which God was deposed from the actual lover of today and creator of tomorrow into a pensioned-off official who had once been the prime mover -- that's the theory of deism, you see -- but had -- could now be dismissed in favor of these rich individuals who planted their tulip bulbs in Holland. These -- they were called in Europe "pepper bags," which people -- selling and buying spices in Arabia, the pepper and the cinnamon, et cetera. Now, the rich will always be in favor of the freedom of the will. Their capital looks to them as an inducement to build on this, you see, by their own purpose -- their own purposes, and their own intent. Poor people are much less tempted to be heretics.

Deism then is the enemy of Edwards, because deism has to take the whole will of God out of the divine cosmos and put it into your and my brain, and say, "You and me are able, by clever computation, to set our own goals, and to fulfill them, and to find the means not only, but to determine our own ends in life." In this sense, then, the attitude of Jonathan about freedom of the will is in anticipation to Voltaire and to all the deists outside the Church.

[Tape interruption]

...so it is the ministry itself, which contains this second branch, you see, the future scientists, the future rationalists, the future physicists, the future philosophers, { }. And Jonathan Edwards in this sense is not an American figure at all. It is right that he was respected in Edinburgh or in Holland, because his position was that of the man who sees the ministry to become at one side the ministry inside a church, and on the other side the cradle of all the future profes-

sors of colleges. They are all runaway sons of ministers, as you know. They are all secularized ministers today. If you count the heads in this college, you will be surprised.

Now Jonathan Edwards feels this. In 1738 there was preached in New -- in Pennsylvania -- or no, in New Jersey it was -- in New Jersey the famous sermon on the dangers of an unconverted ministry. That is contemporary to Jonathan Edwards; it was preached by a very great man, Gilbert Tennent. Gilbert Tennent. And it may show you the problem of fathers and sons, once more when I end up today with giving you the parallel to Jonathan Edwards' position inside this split of the ministry, or -- of the split of the ministry which there was prepared, that after 1750, the Benjamin Franklins and the secular college professors would just be half of the offspring of the ministers of the first 150 years in this country, that they would go one in the ministry and the other, into science or into the professions of some such secular type, and become all deists, and Voltairians, and Free Masons, as they are today in this country. Gilbert Tennent had a father -- very much like Henry James he must have been -- William Tennent, who came to this country from North Ireland in 1716. We know very little about this strange man. We only know one great act of faith on his part. He established a log cabin in Pennsylvania somewhere and educated his own six boys and eight -- six sons and eight other friends of his sons, and this group, brought up in the famous "log cabin college" of William Tennent, Sr., was the cradle of the great revival in New Jersey and New York. And here was a father who gave his sons once more the strength, obviously, because he had crossed the ocean and was still one of the, you see, of the old type, the old generation, to preach this great sermon, to break away from the synod of New Jersey and go over to New York, and then be received back into the synod of New Jersey some time later. He was a great schismer of the times, the breaking away from one -- the faithful from the unfaithful. And this sermon, of 1738, I -- recommend to you as an illustration of Jonathan Edwards' two-fold confrontation of his contemporaries. It was preached on the dangers of an uncon- -- -converted ministry. These people saw the danger not in the faithless people of the laity, you see, but in the fact that inside the ministry, you had these philosophizing humanists, these people -- who talked to me about it? You -- you see, these popists, that is the people in line with Mr. Pope of -- of their days; the Arminians, the people who believed that man could be free and love God at the same time. That is, in other words, they changed the -- prayer of "Our Father" and said at the same time, "Let my will be done, and occasionally yours."

Thank you.

[Tape interruption. The following is a transcription of a discussion after class.]

...there's a three-fold translation: a Protestant, a Greek Orthodox, and a Roman Catholic translation. And the Protestant says, "Peace on earth," and how does it go on?

(It's -- the last words, it says, are...)

Ja. Ja.

(Peace on earth, to -- good will to men -- no. Peace to -- on earth to men of good will.)

Well, that's the Roman, and that's in the King James Version. It Luther has translated very strangely enough, "and a pleasure to man," or "a comfort to man." The Greek Orthodox have the true, Jonathan Edwards translation, and "Peace to all men of His pleasure, of His grace," because that is something that will cannot -- you see, do by itself. To have a good will, you see, is not of your own doing, is the point, because it means to try not to have your own will. To keep your will so fluid, so liquid, you see, that it can always bow to necessity and say, "Well, it doesn't matter. I planned this so, but I'm not disappointed."

So, I wish you then peace on earth in all three denominational forms.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...the delegation of power into this men- -- purely mental field of reasoning and getting the facts. You believe, of course, in this concept; that's the whole world. Instead of -- you know very well that your mother at home is toiling and mending your socks or whatever she does -- and sends you your laundry. And she's not at all Greek. She's your mother, and therefore she has a Christian position in the house -- in your family. And you have the mental position of the Greek at this moment. That is, you do not care how -- who pays, and you do not care who does the work, but you care to get ideas, to think. Whatever the consequences, you have ideas.

Now these ideas, gentlemen, mean, in terms of the whole race, always a relapse, always the hope that somebody will -- the community will say, "We need Greeks," which is a Christian gesture. The love for the Greeks, that is, the love for anything created, is Christian. The Greeks themselves do not love anything non-Greek. They are just curious about it. They have intellectual curiosity, because this tenet of the academic mind is, "I want to know that," but not "I must love it." But "I collect. I am encyclopedic. I write The Encyclopaedia Britannica."

So gentlemen, every admission of Greek activity is a relapse, or -- permittedly -- "relapse" is the wrong word -- is a leeway, a licen- -- a license, a franchise given to a modern man to step back with part of his being, that is with his mind, into pre-Christian living. That is what the academic, the liberal arts college world does, that it invites you to step back, forget about all the -- the problems of modern, crucial living, with your sisters and your brothers of man, and to indulge in ideas.

So in any one time, gentlemen, the son who rebels and becomes secular against his father destroys history, because he's in a way older than his father, who already accepts the whole burden that mankind must be one, that peace must be established between the clever and the stupid, there must be no slavery, that the mind must not be used to enslave other peoples -- which is, you see, not at all the Greek idea, because Aristotles -- and all the Greeks -- believed in slavery, that -- that the educated people should enslave the uneducated people.

The same is true now of Cooper. If he introduces a non-Christian principle of aristocracy, or of caste, he is allowed in his imagination to produce such an artificial world because we allow fiction. We have this nov- -- these novels. We have all these things in which we can play again with the mind. Very Greek. He

is indulging in the -- what we call "romantic" literature.

All romantic literature, gentlemen, is not that life which the judge, and your aunt, and the school principal really -- want you to live; but it's as with Hovey -- you know, Richard Hovey here: get drunk. It's like the frescoes in the dining room there. You can't run around with your sister in this costume there, which is no costume, you see. But it's nice to have it painted on the wall. It's fiction. It's obscene. So the alumni wanted to have something that was definitely not artistic, and so they got it. In revenge from Mr. M- -- Orozco.

So we -- we are privileged to have this fictitious picture there on the dining hall, which is given to a modern Christian civi- -- society, the privileges of a pre-Christian world of obscenity, indulging in your -- in your -- in our minds with it. That's Greek.

Cooper -- the whole romantic movement, gentlemen, must be understood in this light. Wordsworth the same. Blake protested it. Blake saw that this -- you see, he's not a romanticist. It's all wrong to place -- Blake. Blake knew exactly what was demanded of a man, you see, who wanted to be of his own time. All the romantic school against Blake -- you -- you know Blake, I -- you see, very much against Blake who had the full responsibility of a man living now, you see. All the others tried to get us into a second {mood}, into a world above the real world, or outside the real world, or below the real world -- it doesn't matter what -- how you put it. Byron thought it was below; it was hell which he tried to produce, you see. And Wordsworth thought it was the -- a lark. It was higher. But it doesn't matter. Romanticism creates a second world which is not our world, but a world in supplementing ours, and which is identified with some golden past. It is -- you will always find that the romanticist, whether it's a castle in Walter Scott's novels, or whether it is some natural- -- nature garden, whether it's Eden, Paradise, the Golden Age, the Greeks -- take Swinburne, where it was { }, you see -- it is always the second world which is not fully responsible for its {suspicions}, which doesn't interfere with daily politics, for example, which doesn't say what laws we should pass. You see, that isn't discussed. It's just a world of feelings.

Now every romanticist does exactly what the scientist does. He adds to the present-day meditation -- a -- world of fancy which is outside our Christian era, which enriches it by fiction, by images, by conjuring up Dionysus, and Apollo, and Venus, you see. But they aren't quite serious. They are bygone, you see. They are ghosts, which we use for decoration. They are adornments; they are additions. You can say that they are, within the room of our own era, the

murals on the wall. You will s- -- admit that if I put the Orozco frescoes on the wall, with the Mexicans marching there, you see, I'm still in 1930, when it was painted, you see; but I have surrounded myself with these people of bygone times as murals.

Now that is what the romantic school has done, and all Renaissance thinking does. It -- it -- it tap- -- it's a tapestry inside of our own historical time. Bringing past times into this room of our time, not changing the date of our own existence really, you see, but only trying to make us forget when we live. If you look at the Orozco frescoes, these people marching there, you may for one time -- moment be taken back there and dream that you also lived 500 B.C., you see. But woe to you if you ever should {think so}. You understand?

Gentlemen, you must get hold of what fiction is. You cannot afford to allow yourself the acceptance of fiction. You -- history and fiction must be completely clear to you as two different things. Fiction is a creation of a second world. And that's a dangerous thing if you don't know wha- -- that this is a toy, a plaything. And Cooper is, in American tradition therefore, an important person. James brings in the Greeks -- the Greek science, which could lead to Darwinianism. And when it is taken seriously, it leads to a war of everybody against everybody else. It leads to exploitation, to slavery, to all these things.

Now William James -- had enough of his father in himself to wake up, and to see the consequences. Cooper didn't. In Cooper, fiction has been declared not omnipotent, but sovereign, independent. And ever since, the American- -- allow their fiction writers to run riot. And I think you have very unhealthy minds in Greenwich Village. That is, that American literature still to- -- today has to -- bears the signs of -- of Mr. Cooper. And you see it from Hemingway. This adoration of the civil war in Spain is -- it was -- just his way of saying, "Now we all go Communist." And you see what the country has come to. With McCarthy, I am a contemporary, my dear gen- -- people. I want to shoot your mind back into reality. He shoots your bodies back into fear, intimidation. But gentlemen, I have to tell you that from Cooper to Hemingway, this country has allowed its fiction writers to take you everywhere except into your own political responsibility, into the hour in which you really live. And certainly anybody who could say that you had to fight in Spain with the -- which was the brigade? Wie?

(International brigade.)

No, there's another name. Roose- -- not Roosevelt. It was -- wie?

(Lincoln.)

Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln, you see -- hasn't rendered you a service. He is the last Natty Bumppo. That's what he is, you see.

Does anybody read the Sunday Literary Times? Here in this country -- I mean, the New York Times literary magazine? There was such a terrible article about Mr. Camus, Albert Camus, the leading article of the -- this Sunday. The poor man. -- The only thing he knows is: you have to be a rebel in literature. Why one has to be a rebel, I do not know. So Hemingway thought. So Cooper thought, who had also to rebel against civilization, against the, you see -- had to have a romantic world in which people were better, and freer, and so on -- so on. The second-world idea. It is obsessive. The French are perishing under this. Mr. Camus never asked the question: Couldn't he be a good son who has received good things? No. Every word in this -- have you read the article? He begins life; life begins with him. Everything before is just muck. Then he is, of course, at a loss to find any good company and any comradeship. And -- tragic.

You know, he's the -- one of the leading existentialists in France. If you want to study what fiction has done to the disintegration of the educated classes in the western world, you can read him, or you can read Hemingway. It is tragic, not that he couldn't come out for Communism, but he would have to know that this is a choice, that obviously other people could come from something else, you see, or -- stand for something else. But as it was in the '30s in this country, you only had to move forward to -- to -- to a nonexisting world. "Go left, my dear man, go left." Which is very parallel with the whole movement, you see, of the romanticism: "Get outside the framework of your real society."

Have I made my point, that the secular mind, gentlemen -- in reality lives before Jesus Christ? Just as this lady who writes of the nature of tragedy. I -- the -- once you see this, you -- you -- surrounded by this artificial world in which people who actually live -- must live in 1953, where we have no human sacrifices, we have no slavery, we have woman's equality, we have the belief that all men are created equal -- that is, white and black makes no difference, then you see these sports, these -- these aberrations of the mind plunging into zoology, into Darwinianism, into Mendelism; that is, attempting to dream up a pre-Christian world of the mind in which all these things we already have to enact in our lives are not valid, but are tempted, so to speak, and held up to ridicule even. Because that's the gospel now, you see, among the scientists, you s- -- that you -- that you should use euthanasia, and that you should use eugenics, you see, and should forbid -- you should regulate -- prop- -- propagation, and so; you see these

Mendelians, the geneticists. They tell us all this. And we know it's wrong. We know that the -- only the human heart can decide marriage, and no -- oh, no laws of these -- of these damned -- damned botanists.

But this is a cleavage. In -- always at every moment, gentlemen, this must be the last word today -- every moment the relapse into pre-Christian tenets through the temptation of the mind is a real danger. It is every moment perfectly possible that a part of the human society does erect gas chambers as in Nineveh, because -- in antiquity all the captives were just slaves. You see, nobody would say anything against it.

And so, gentlemen, the relapse of the second generation, when it -- leaves history, is -- has happened under your noses. And you don't believe it. You think, because you are later, you must be progressive. Gentlemen, because you think that you are later, you must go wrong. You can only uphold the achievements of the human race, if -- it makes no difference whether it's your father or yourself. You are all shot through with the same tenets. As soon as you say, "Since I live in 1953, I must be advanced, compared to a man in 1900," you already have lost the problem of history, you see. You have then erected the dream world of your own generation, because you are no longer asking, "What do I have to continue? How do I bear fruit?" But you only ask, "What do I want?" you see. And then you will get it. You will get what you want, sure. But that will be all. An -- a man who does get what he wants is punished by God for that, you see. Any man, St. Francis has -- has said, you see, who does get what he wants, is cursed. A man is blessed if he never gets what he wants, but if he gets what is coming to him.

Yes, Sir. You don't know what you want, you see. That's the first thing a man in history knows. We don't know what we want.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Philosophy 57, December 7th, 1954.)

...between the generations. And if you look at Franklin and Cooper, you have a fascinating economy of what they bring in, and on what they tacitly rely in their society as inheritance. You can say, you see, that beginning with Cooper -- and I'll just follow what you said here on -- on Franklin, where is the speaker? Here. Thank you. The -- may I have your paper, too? Fine. The -- let's -- we don't wish to -- to go into the details of Franklin or of Cooper. I -- I accept your pictures. And you know -- every one of you knows a little more, I think, about Ben Franklin, some detail. But we are interested, after all, to economize, that is, to see on what these people naively rely in the way of energies, of spiritual life, of order, which they couldn't create. To me, this is always my important question, you see, to myself, too. If I claim something, if you want to be independent, you still believe in some order inside which you can be independent. Now that always will be visited on us when we do not give, you see, permission to these other elements be- -- who are -- have allowed us to change.

The -- you may formulate it today. It's very important, you see. We have today quite a fascist movement in the United States, obviously -- people who run into -- to the FBI, become members of the FBI, applaud Mr. McCarthy. So they all seem to be very much for discipline, and order, and silence, and intimidation, et cetera. If you however study their story, it is, after all, a fact that they choose to do this. Therefore, the freedom of choice is still one of their constitutional tenets, because obviously if I today may choose to follow Senator McCarthy, then I must admit that I claim a right, which somebody else may also use in another direction. I cannot claim, you see, a free association, without giving an- -- other people the right of free association. I cannot be, for one moment, you see, not being brought up in discipline, but choosing discipline without saying other people may choose liberty.

The first generation of any new order or discipline always represents the still-prevailing liberty. And the first generation in an order, organized -- take a Spartan who, after 200 years of over-rigid discipline, becomes a philosopher, or an artist, I mean, breaks away from Sparta, you see -- well, this man wants probably to build up some new order, so he must allow for one element of discipline in all his freedom. And on the other hand, as I said, a man who establishes a rigid order, like Mr. Stalin and Lenin, today is hard-put to allow the -- for the fact that he was a revolutionary. Therefore, today Russia is by nothing so much

endangered and imperiled, but by the fact that Mr. Malenkov is not a revolutionary anymore, but just a routine bureaucrat, who was already part and parcel of an established order in 1921, you see. Therefore, the -- the whole heroism, the old spirit of the Russian revolution today is in abeyance, because there is no longer anybody in a prominent position who isn't either a general or a bureaucrat. So no Russian revolution, because the Russian revolution must admit that there were 100 years, four generations of Russians who were revolutionaries. Now this is the problem of the spiritual economy of any one man who opens his mouth. He has always -- whatever he stresses -- emphasized the power of walking the road which he himself had to travel in order to change. Can you see this? Your problem of being independent, you see, of -- of now being -- no, no. Let's take the -- again the -- McCarthy. This enthusiasm of your generation for being regimented -- perhaps not so much in Dartmouth College, but in the country, and for having jobs and for reading the statistics, that the prosperity is secure, and the president will give you a job, and all this childish magic, you see, of the pharaohs of Egypt -- this Egyptian situation in which you are now landing yourself today, that everybody is just taken care of -- you have heard -- has anybody listened to this -- to the platitudes of last Tuesday?

(Of who? Of what?)

To the platitudes of last Tuesday.

(The Eisenhower speech?)

Yes. Well, that's -- it -- that should be forbidden. I mean, if the man had a good advisor, he shouldn't make such a speech where -- in which he says just, "I -- I am responsible for prosperity," you see. Well, that's -- that's Communism, Sir, you see. Nothing else. It's bla- -- blatant Communism, you see, and taking the place of God Almighty upon yourself: "I am responsible for prosperity." Now think what this means. How about a -- a drought? And how about the famine? And how about all the real acts of God? We human beings, including the president of the United States, are very powerless really to -- to rule the world. It's ridiculous. Utterly ridiculous. But it seems that we have landed ourselves already in such a -- I mean, if somebody had made such a speech as president of the United States, John Quincy Adams in 1825, he certainly couldn't have become president. The people would have sent him to the lunatic asylum, would have said, "This man undertakes to put himself in the place of God." Don't you see this?

It's impossible, {with} such an undertaking. But you expect it, because you have no longer the means of production at your disposal. You are just cogs on the wheel, so you all tremble that if there aren't jobs to go around -- well, what can you do? You can't do anything. You can just be obedient. So you have chosen obedience. All right. Be obedient, but you have chosen obedience. That is, there -- you can't forget the ancestors who have given you this right for making a change in your generation. It's very much like the half-way covenant, the problem of 1700 in this country, you see, always this going soft, this let-down in the second generation.

Now in the two cases of Franklin, it seems to me, and in the case of -- of our other man, Cooper -- I think we should go a little further and analyze which premise they keep when they give it up. This is a paradox, you see. I think in Franklin's case, I would draw your attention to one fact, that he says, "Worship may be useful." Religion may be useful -- have some utility. Now, as you know, we are still sick with this. We had here a professor of religion who always recommended religion as a good thing; and a real, religious man, Dr. {Ambrose Vernon} here on this campus, who founded the biography department, loathed it, and said, "That's a scandal. He ruins all religion, because if religion is useful, then it is no longer religion." Yes, yes, Sir. But you are all so Franklinized that you do not even hear the blasphemy that the fact that religion is useful would -- must -- shall -- will make an end of religion. If religion is useful, you see, then it is second-rate, because useful things are second-rate. A baby? What's the use of a newborn baby? There's absolutely no use. And when this baby dances around a molehill and sings the praises of God, it's of no use whatsoever. It's just beautiful; it's just right. That is, this child liveth by praising the Lord. The word "divine worship," gentlemen -- whatever you take it to be, I mean, I don't care -- is the way -- final way of existence. It's an end, not a way, never a means. As soon as you say, "Religion is a means to an end," abolish it. Then it's bad. Then it is abused, and then it is degenerate, as it always does.

So if the people recommend religion to you because it keeps you in good spirits, and keeps peace of mind, loathe them. Spit at them. You have thereby debased religion, because religion is nothing but the way of life to which we aspire, whatever that is. I mean, it can be any -- you can go into the woods and say, "That's my religion," but it means that's an end in itself. That is, you're waiting all the week until on Saturday afternoon you can take a walk in the woods. But there's absolutely -- as soon as you say it's hygienic to go on Saturday evening in the woods and have a -- have a -- so that you can work better on Monday, this is no longer nature-worship, you see, but just hygiene. And that's -- so the same act can be made useful, but then it has ceased to be your faith. Then

it is just a means to an end.

Now many people go into the woods with -- under the pretext in this country, since everybody -- -thing has to be useful, these poor nature-lovers have to say to themselves, and their -- their family doctor, and their wife, and their child, "It's good for me. It's good for you." So these poor children are told to do something which is good, which of course is terrible. Which normal child wants to do what's good? It wants to live. What { } wants to do good? I hope you -- agree with me that it is lo- -- loathsome to ask a child to do goody-goody -- be goody-goody. Child doesn't want to be goody. It wants to be per- -- as it has been created. It has -- certainly to be created to be joyful, exuberating, and praise his creator in many ways -- by dancing, shouting, yelling, and sometimes by the -- the hymn, or praying a Psalm. But the divine worship should be and can only be if it is any meaningful the crown of your life. And that's why meeting in church and forming the body of Christ in the church, which no Protestant any longer knows, is the meaning of the service on Sunday. You really think you go to the service to hear a -- a sermon on the daily politics of the nation. Well, that has nothing to do with divine service. That's just a lecture committee, which you can then appoint. You don't have to have a church for that.

But that is all Franklin's doing. Franklin has managed to get all the articles of faith and of life itself -- all the ends -- into the category of means. So it is no longer with Franklin and the Franklinites, and you are all nine-tenths Franklinites when you discuss things with others -- not in your heart, I think, so much, but in the public -- in the marketplace. Everybody has to behave like a Franklinitite, and the Franklinitite system is very -- cagey, gentlemen. Please take this down: it isn't that Franklin prefers the means to the ends. That is -- why not? We need pe- -- technicians. But that he says that the ends are the means, too. That is unique in this perfection. Worship is useful, he says.

(Well, can't the ends be means, also?)

What?

(Can't the ends be means --)

No. They cannot. As soon as you say a child is a means, you are already on the way to -- to killing the idiots, to euthanasia.

(What about consciously a means, as with religion. Can't religion be a -- a -- a subconscious means to -- to some --)

When it is, throw it out. Throw it out. {Oh sure}, it can be. But then if -- you have to persecute it. If it's opium for the populace, out go -- it goes. Sure, if it -- that's all what the psychologist says, "A good thing, go to church." All these rascals, these scoundrels who haven't the cor- -- the courage to say, "Be an atheist. Defy the religion," which they should. And I would respect them for this.

They say, "Use it." Well, at that very moment, it's out.

(But if you don't go to church thinking, "I'm going to church because it's a good thing," you go to church as an end, but yet it serves the purpose of a means, besides?)

Which besides? Where -- how can -- my dear man. Look at all these charity ladies. They have also degraded in this country and everywhere in the world, by the way -- the bourgeois lady -- the ends into means. So, I give you a present. Now this lady has not as her first reaction that she enjoys it -- my present, but the first thought of all these scoundrels is, in -- in the world today: how much will it cost me to give the -- the corresponding present back to this person? Therefore, the whole thing has become part of a bargain. Useless, you see. The condition of a real present on the part of the receiver is that at that moment, he does not give one thought to the compensation. As soon as he even fathoms how precious, instead of saying "how beautiful," instead of joy, when he puts -- and you all do this -- the consideration of "how much?" on this present, although he will only give next Christmas a corresponding present back, you see, he has taken it from the realm of free gift to the realm of bargaining. It is now a bargain. And everybody in this country thinks, "{Do ut des}", I have to give because he has given me, and because I give him, so -- lest he give me." And on it goes.

And therefore you have no joy in life, it's the most bor- -- so boring, all our social contacts, because nobody dares to exuberate. Here, let me give you this flower -- I don't care for it. Give it -- have it, you see. Well, if the receiver who -- whom you give your wa- -- your wristwatch, you see, immediately says, "My, now, I have to give him my knife," well, where's the joy, you see? You have left the platform of ends in itself. This joyful moment is something to be cherished absolutely for its own sake. Has no past, no future. It's just a complete present of the God -- the divine spirit here at this moment. The divine spirit knows of no past and future, you see. It's just omnipresent. God is present, gentlemen. If you can enjoy a lecture, really, imbi- -- drink it in, then it's here. If you ask, "What do I have to remember for the examination?" you have changed the lecture from an end into a means. You can always do it, Sir, most of us -- you do. But it is bad.

They -- all our -- put it this way, gentlemen: all our ends are so frail, that in any one moment, they can be debased into means. It's very important, gentlemen, that you should -- you see, when I hear these discussions about means and ends in this country, they never realize the Devil. The Devil is the man who says, "All the ends are means." It's not the man who's -- recommends you, "I want to be -- have a castle." Well, I'd better get rich. What's wrong about becoming rich, if I know the end for which I want to be rich, you see? But as soon as I say that the castle itself is then a means of social prestige, or that it will bring customers, and so on, you see, then I have no -- no end anymore. The castle itself has fallen down into the second floor, into the basement. And that's what you all do. You -- means and ends live on different platforms. They are utterly different, you see.

I always make it clear to you, I have done it in other ways, I think, in other classes, when I tell you that, you see, here is Mr. {Silverberg}, and here is Mr. {Niren}, and here am I, and we are introduced to each other, and you take a course with me, and that's my privilege, that I have two decent fellows studying with me. This is important. Then we talk to each other, gentlemen, in class, occasionally now. You talk to me and { } your papers. This is second-rate, compared to the great fact that we know each other, and to a certain extent trust each other. And then comes the third, that we may quibble and argue about some improvement in your paper, and I may say, "You should have called this such-and-such, because I conceive of this, this way." So you get three levels of behavior, gentlemen. I'm talking about the means in your paper for expression. That would be the lowest. This would be the -- how you expressed what you wanted to say about Fenimore Cooper. Then we -- you are going to speak, and read this paper, which you have just done. And that paper deals with a living being, { } the topic -- topic Cooper. And be- -- above this, gentlemen, there is the fun, that we have a class in Dartmouth on January 7th, 1954, in which we can deal with Cooper, in which we can deal with Admiral (Symmes), in which we are masters of the universe, in which we can -- and I hope you have, I always have -- a good time. Now, gentlemen, if you say that this class is a means so that you graduate from college, you can't have fun in this class anymore, because this is an end in itself, if it's a good lesson, a good lecture. Any perfect classroom situation should not point beyond itself, but it is a good life. If it isn't -- many of you decline to accept it as a good life. You say it's just boring. Or the -- you say, "I don't find anything to take away with; it's not useful enough. I can't buy a car for what I learn in this course." You probably can't. But when you buy a car, you are not quite sure that you have one hour even in your life in which you forget everything else and say, "This is life." See the difference?

Now. No -- no -- no -- not yet. {Don't yet}. Not yet. Now, gentlemen, here we meet by name. Here we meet by -- through words. And when we talk of means, we always deal with concepts. For example, you get 10 carpenters or 10 students together, and the students say, "I will need a dictionary in order to write out the -- the paper which is due for this class in so many words. I need concepts." Now we -- you live -- Mr. Franklin created a society in which concepts were declared to be more valuable than words, words more valuable than names. And this is called the "rational," or the "philosophical," or the "humanistic" world in which you all live, the scientific world. A scientist says, "A concept stands highest -- the concept of the atom, the electron." That's a concept, you see. It's the -- by definition, the same for all physicists. Words to them already are just tools to express concepts. And names -- they don't know anything about it. I mean, they have never heard even of the -- of the assumption.

Now gentlemen, where we move by name, in the world, we are ends in ourselves. When you are introduced to a young girl, "Mr. Smith," and you are any good, there the lesson ends. There's nothing to be said more -- you may smile, you may kiss her, you may embrace her. But the great event of the day is that Mr. Smith now knows Mrs. Bran- -- Brown. He didn't before. Tremendous she knows his name. But if she knows some concrete creature in the universe, which is irreplaceable, which is absolutely single, she hasn't met this man before, now he can go after her like this Mr. Goldsmith who travels all over Europe to get his -- his bride. Have you seen it? No? Well, it's quite a story. Wie? And something happens. Gentlemen, when you are called by name, always something happens. All escapists {all} hide behind concepts. Only to show you, gentlemen, that in every minute of your life, you throw the rudder, throw -- follow the course; what to you is an -- is an end, and what is a mean is never known. A collector of -- of tools can make the tools an end of the -- of his delight, you see. And the same tool may serve as a tool. And this you do not know. You think that there is ever any line to be drawn that you know what is a tool, and what is an -- an aim, or an end -- a goal. This is not true. The same thing in every changing moment can be treated as end and -- or as means. This is the terror of life. And Franklin has said dogmatically, and you all believe it -- 23 hours a day you believe it -- except when you are in love, you always believe it. O- -- the only person where you say she is unusual is the girl. Now what is unusual? Something that can't be put to any use. What is usual? Something that is in usu -- that is, that we know the use for -- how to use it. A girl, you cannot. It's certainly not a girl that counts for something. The harlot, you know her use. But a real person, you cannot. She's absolutely useless.

Gentlemen, people are useless. That's the foundation of democracy, and this foundation Franklin has inherited, from religion, from the Church. And this is what all the deists, all these people who thought that God was a retired bureaucrat who once in His youth had the loins to produce offspring, and now He had gone to seed, and -- and the man had to take over, so to speak, these retired -- retired idea -- retirement idea for God, which all -- which Rousseau had, Voltaire had, and which Franklin brought into this country. This just means that they take it for granted that Benjamin Franklin is still received by the rest of society as somebody who cannot be used as a means. But gentlemen, you -- you wait 150 years with Mr. Franklin's gospel and you get -- Stalin and you get Hitler, and you get all the dictators who think that people are means. That is, the humanistic era has no guarantee, from 1750 to 1950, that the values which they inherited from the religious age of the Puritans, you see, will not just fade out. And now we know they have faded out. Franklin lived naively in protest against too much religion, against too much religious education, and in this protest, he was absolutely cocksure that nothing would ever happen to his personal integrity, that Mr. Franklin would always be a respected citizen, although he no longer went to church. You -- but the people treated him with the same delight, as though he was a member of the living body of Christ, that is, one of the angels of light.

This is secularism, gentlemen. The people tolerate anyone in their religious faith only as members of the same faith. When you come secularism, it says, "You will treat me, although I protest against the formulation of your faith," you see, that's very nice for a hundred years. So we get the -- the fact that the laity, and the secular man, and the scientist, and the -- everybody is treated as though he was a Christian, or a Jew. That is, a -- person who believed in the spirit moving all people, you see. But finally, in 1900, you get the uproar from the underworld, and the men s- -- man begin to say, "Well, I am clever. The other man is just a tool for me. I haven't heard the -- the message of the Holy Spirit. I haven't heard that God created all men. That's Bible story. { } Evolution we have. Survival of the fittest. Never heard that God -- man created -- was created by God in His image. That's all {childsuit}, childswear. That's nothing. So hit him over the head." And we have concentration camps. And that's Benjamin Franklin. That is, Benjamin Franklin without the {half} against which he protests, is intolerable, because it's just his own intelligence which makes him into a man. So he says, the other man seems to me rather stupid. So let's cheat him. Don't you see that the unity inside which all these nice utilitarians move, is something they can never create, the solidarity of the human -- spirit, in all men. One spirit in all, you see. And this is called "revelation," gentlemen. It's a

very serious business, that it had to be planted very strongly for thousands of years in the world before these damned people who run our liberal arts colleges abuse this and say they have it all from their smartness, from their science, from their thinking. We live in a scandalous environment, gentlemen, in which these people deny which is the premise of their existence. The premise is that my spirit is loaned to me, that I'm trustee of my intelligence, but that I ha- -- don't have any mind to my -- of my own.

If you don't admit that a man must be inspired by one spirit, he's the Devil. What else can you expect from me? I'm intelligent; you are not. Gentlemen, I must take advantage of you, but you feel I won't, because you very well know that any really intelligent person knows that he is not intelligent himself, but it's working through him. Everybody believes this when he speaks to somebody. You ask somebody about the road, and he tells you the truth. You accept it, that the man is -- is committed to the truth. Why is he? Because the great power of speech is not owned by the Dartmouth National Bank, nor is it owned by the trustees of Dartmouth College. They have the great privilege of being allowed to act as receptacles of this truth. And this is denied by Franklin, because he says, "There is nothing higher than my -- things which I call useful." In this very moment, the bottom falls out of the world. Don't you see this? If I am the judge of what is useful, I am allowed to lie. He says, "It's not practical to lie." But gentlemen, in this very moment, he says also, "When I say it's not practical to lie, it's not good policy, that I'm free to follow a bad policy. That is, I can lie." Obviously.

The truth is -- and the -- charity, and hope, faith, every quality of unconditional membership in human society can never be reasoned out by people who say that everything has to be useful. This talk about enlightened self-interest is just ridiculous. We talked about this before. You can't send a boy into battle in Korea and say it's in your enlightened self-interest to be shot dead there, on the ground. Can you? I don't see any enlightened self-interest in such a -- in such a -- a death on a battlefield. It's ridiculous. Yes, Mr. -- but Mr. Franklin always assumed that he was quite a brave man, and his comrades would die. They -- he went as -- he armed Philadelphia against the Spaniards. He bought ammunition. The Quakers didn't. He -- said, "My dear friends, if you are Quakers and can't buy ammunition, we have to defend the city, after all, against the Spaniards, stay at home." So he really was a very clever man. But he was a patriot, besides. And he did know -- knew how to fight. And you can't fight if there is not something unconditional, which is m- -- more -- bigger than your own means, you see. The existence of the United States he never put in question. That's why he founded

them.

Gentlemen, in Benjamin Franklin you have the great power that has governed the United States and without which no president of the United States so far has been able to be elected. You -- as you know, what has a president to be of the United States?

(Protestant.)

That they say, but that's very doubtful, because Lincoln was not a Protestant. He was -- belonged to no church. And -- Eisenhower, when he was elected didn't belong, as you know. He was baptized later in his li- -- later in life.

(What -- what is your question, Sir? What does he have to be?)

What is the secret which surrounds every president of the United States, the quality which he has to fulfill before he can be president, it's a quality which has never been mentioned, and always exists.

(To be popular.)

That's doubtful. Very doubtful. {Wiggin.} That's in order to be elected, but it's not a precondition for running -- making him a candidate. No, he has to be a Free Mason. He has to be a Free Mason, and Benjamin Franklin was the -- med- -- the great -- grand master, 33rd-degree Mason in America. This is the power of the lodge. No Sir, you don't know this. But Lincoln was. They always boast that he didn't -- he didn't belong to the Church. But he certainly was a Free Mason. A Free Mason. You have heard of the Masonry. Yes. You have to be that. Why?

It's very poignant, gentlemen, because deism is the God of the -- is the religion of the ma- -- lodge. It is this nice, philosophical cost-nothing humanism which says, "We have -- believe in God, too, just like the Church. We believe in immortality, too, just like the Church. We believe in freedom too, just like St. Paul. Only we believe it so that it doesn't cost anything. It's just a question of brain. We think it is a good idea." That is the -- the Free Masonry. And for you it is hard to understand the great power, the lodge has had in our life. But where do you find it daily expressed in your handling business, the -- the belief of -- of the lod- -- of the Masons. In your daily dealings, where is the lodge present? You don't know this. You don't know that the president has to be a Free Mason, and you don't know that every day at least 10 times you use it.

(You mean he actually has to belong?)

No, but that you express your belief in the symbols of the lodge.

(On the dollar bill?)

On the dollar bill, sure. Our whole coinage is based in the image of the -- of Voltairianism, of Rousseauism, and of Franklinism, because it means that you can have the -- the content of religion without its form. That's the belief of humanism, you see. That's secular, you see. I can have it all, because I'm the judge of its usefulness. So you open the dollar bill and you find there that it is all translated, as you know, into nature, the -- there is the pyramid, and the eye of Horus, and there is the astral new order, n- -- ordos -- novus ordo incipit -- and what else is there? There is the eye of God shining -- it's really the eye of Horus -- and a -- a little bit of Jehovah. Isn't there the Star of David on it? I'm not sure now. Have a -- have a look. Well, I have too big -- no, I need a smaller one. There had been a great debate -- that's the difference between Jefferson and Washington. Washington, of course, didn't care for these, and Jefferson forced him all these symbols -- down his throat, you see. You also see it from the stars. The stars are five-cornered stars and not six-cornered. The six-cornered star is the Star of David. That is, the Church has only admitted in its symbolism the six-cornered star -- that has very profound reasons -- whereas the five-cornered star is the Egyptian star. The pagan star, in which -- where the stars were deities -- which leads immediately directly to astrology.

Now, in 1776, there was quite a debate in the circles -- of the government about this -- the symbolism of America. There were two problems to be solved. They -- would there be a celebration on the birthday of the president? George Washington was told by John Adams that he had to behave like royalty, and that they had to celebrate his birthday, during his tenure, you see, as a holiday. And then as you know, the outcome has been the other way around, that we have now the 4th of July, the Constitution, the birthday of the Constitution. That's a step again into the Free Masonry: a piece of paper instead of living people. And you like it this way. But it is a very specific religion, which this country -- undertakes, a religion of law. And that has to do with our belief in natural law, you see. The cosmic law and the Constitution were equated to celebrate the Constitution, because man discovered here a part of the cosmic order as applied to human reason. And the natural laws cannot be broken, of course. You have to follow them. So if you -- we celebrate the {4th} of July, we celebrate the power of

men to reason. If we celebrate Washington's birthday, we celebrate the power of God to create good men. Man cannot make trees, and he cannot make men. But he can write a constitution, you see. So the Constitution in this sense is manmade and Washington is not. And that's the whole difference, because anything that is man-made is a means. But we people God fortunately -- are creatures of God and He -- as He created the violet, perfectly meaninglessly, so He created us, just from sheer exuberance, perhaps by mistake. But there it is.

We are not means. Once you've -- begin to conceive of other people as means, you are -- end with -- with -- with all the systems of tyranny. You can't have it, you see. It's too tempting. It's too obvious.

So this is Franklin. Franklin has taught every American that after all, all ends are means and can be treated as such. And that was always balanced by a non-Franklin stream. At this moment, it isn't. That's why I give you this class -- course. To -- you have today to revive the pre-Franklin elements in Franklin, because otherwise we -- we land in misery. Can't you see the danger, you see? That when everybody says, "I'm judging the world by my smartness and not by dogma," that then there is absolutely no basis on which this man can meet anybody else. It is dogmatically true that you are not allowed to murder me, Sir. I don't care whether your reason tells you so or not. If your reason doesn't tell you so, we will execute you. This is dogmatically true. And here and every -- what has Mr. Franklin done? He has poked fun at dogma so long that when you hear the word "dogma" you run away and say, "This is ridiculous. This is obsolete. This is superstitious." Gentlemen, you can't be in this class without dogma. The dogma is that we can't kill each other. That's not forbidden in the penal law, but that's true. That's the will of God, that He wanted to have one race, one human -- humankind, and everybody knows that he can't open his mouth and aim at truth if it isn't a truth which is valid for all human beings. And even if I have to wait for 50 years until you believe it, even if you die in the process, because you are too stupid to understand it, the truth is the truth just -- regardless whether you accept it or not. We can wait.

But your idea is that the -- that the truth can, you see, cannot wait for you, but that you say what the truth is. And if you don't admit it, then it isn't true. This is ridiculous. Nothing is changed because you say, "I don't believe in dogma." You depend on all the dogmas in the world. You believe certainly in the -- every human being practically in his life believes that God created the universe, that his sons, through suffering can redeem the universe, and that the Holy Spirit makes people live peacefully together. And yet everybody in this country says the Trinity is just a joke. No Jew in this country who doesn't believe

in the Trinity, practically. Everybody does. Mr. Einstein, or what-not. But they -- you -- you are not interested in what's behind you. You just live heartily and into the open and say, "There is no dogma, there is no premise, no basis for my existence." No -- I know what you're going to say. I'm not interested. I've heard this too often, Sir. You always say the same thing. Say something original, then I listen to you. This is just all -- what you had in your mind before you heard this. Now this is Franklin, gentlemen. That's why he's a great power. I -- I have to admit that he is the greatest power in America, to this day. The lodge is it, in all our symbols of life -- "In God We Trust," all others pay cash -- in this whole idea that when you say, "But this is useful," that you have justified even television, and that this is the last analysis. Gentlemen, I don't bow to usefulness. If something is useful it's one reason to -- not to have it, because if you surround yourself with all the things useful, you become absolutely blunted in your -- in your power to live. And on it goes. But these are -- this is dogma. All the rationalists in this country who say, "Dogma, ridiculous," they have one dogma, you see. But they are the masters of -- of telling us what the truth is. To me, it's so ridiculous, because they use speech. They think other people will tolerate them. I -- they -- I -- they expect me not to hit them over the head, and you even expect me to let you speak in this precious one hour which I have here at my disposal. { }.

Now gentlemen, the -- the punishment, the penalty for Mr. Franklin is always romanticism. The rationalists, like Mr. Franklin, create such a void that then you have to get as a reaction -- in England you get Wordsworth; and Victor Hugo you get in France; and the Romantic School you get in Germany; and in America we have Benjamin Franklin; and in Scotland, you have Walter Scott. That is, the useless is brought in as of another world. These Scottish knights and these red Indians, you see, are utterly unimportant for your business dealings, you see, they're just nice. So the soap opera comes in and this famous dichotomy, or tripartition that man has will, intellect and feelings, and in order to please your feelings, you have to get -- good feelings, you have to get *The Last of the Mohicans*, and you have to be flattered, you have to be soaped. And this is what makes America the most sentimental country because it doesn't believe in anything. So if you are so clever, then you give up, in order to be sentimentalized, or romanticized, and you get -- go to the opposite end. You get neon light, and you are just dumbfounded, and flabbergasted, and overcome, and put out, and "fascinated," as the word says, and thrilled, and tickled to death, and how all

these flapper phrases run. And, you see, what is fascination, you see? Something that, although it is useless, you cannot help, you see, paying for.

This is Mr. Cooper. Mr. Cooper is the beginning -- Mr. -- I -- Mr. Franklin is the beginning of great things. He's certainly the beginning of Mr. Hitler. But Mr. Cooper is the beginning of the burlesque show, because man cannot live by reason, so he has to create fiction. And the fiction world is -- after all always the exact complementary part to the world in which we actually live. So the heroes of the fiction story are very different from the heroes of great literature. I mean, Tolstoy's War and Peace or Dostoevsky's Brothers Karamazov, they are we, you see, in earnest. But the -- he -- the -- the -- this Natty Bumpo of course is not Mr. Cooper at all, you see. It's the other half, his -- his wish, his desire.

The heroes of great literature, gentlemen, are the undesirable, real creatures. And the heroes of so-called "fiction" are, you see, our wish-dreams, our wish-fulfillments. They fill out the void. Now, the greater the void you create in -- reality in your philosophy, the more distorted must be the other person. That is the price of empty philosophy. If usefulness is the criterion for the real life, then uselessness must be the criterion of the other half, of fiction, which it is. These Indians are no use to anybody. They can't even be integrated into the -- into the historical existence of society, you see. And therefore, they are so beloved. And the waterfalls, and the -- and the moonlight, and all these things are -- they are, you see, so much on the other side, that the Romantic School says, "This is for the feelings." Can you see this? Half and half. But they are two halves that never get together. The o- -- one is therefore called "fiction." Of course, Mr. Cooper didn't dare to call it "fiction" in his days. This was great art. It was "the novel," as it was called. We call it today, brutally, "fiction."

I would like -- would -- would somebody go to the Oxford Dictionary next time and report back to us how old the word "fiction" is, for this kind of stuff. It cannot be older than Cooper, because before, great literature li- -- was not allowed to just take refuge into the other half of -- into that half of life which the merchant, or the carpenter, or the housewife were not allowed to live out themselves. The great desire of a real writer is to make men whole. And the desire of the fiction writer is to stress that he offers that half of life, you see, which cannot be lived. And the better he does it, the more -- greater is his success.

So I -- have I done injustice to both people? To both men? If I have, that's what I wanted to do.

Now --

[End of tape]

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...I tried to concentrate not on the man -- Cooper or Franklin -- himself, but you remember the thing that is not done in historical monography -- or biography -- very much is to elucidate the premises on which the life-work of such a man is predicated: what he assumes to be established about which he doesn't have to talk, but which he presupposes. And I have, all in this course, tried to show you that historical thinking is not interested in Henry James, Sr., or in William James, Jr. That is a silly, or at least an unhistorical, an anecdotal, a newspaper, a journalistic approach. We are interested here, in this point, where we can see that the two are polarly related. Now I don't know I -- what I mean by pluri-aged, what is the whole problem of the head-on idea of American civilization, every generation just looking ahead of itself, in this very naive way, and therefore always being surprised, never being able to accomplish anything, because people who just keep running -- What Makes Sammy Run? you know, is this terrible book by Mr. -- what's -- Schulberg. They don't achieve anything in the world. They may make a pile of money and tomorrow it's all gone. They are the most uninteresting people. Yet to you, gentlemen, 158 million Americans are -- due to live this silly way, head-on, always forward, for -- onward Christian soldiers, down to Hell.

This is not Christ. Christ has never lived "Onward Christian Soldiers." To Him, the past and the future had equal rank, and He had to hear the voice in Heaven who told Him: what of the created world, and what of the not-yet created world had at every moment pre- -- the prerogative? There's no "onward" all the time. This whole rush -- rush -- rush is unhistorical. That's why America is unhistorical.

So if I have done anything to you, gentlemen, I've tried to open your eyes to the fact -- more I cannot do in such a -- half a year -- that there can be people who I think -- I flatter myself -- have this different point of view, or this different view of point. I have a different sight. They called it "second sight," in -- as a superstition, gentlemen, when a person could see that the future and the past were all together; and therefore that a child and his father must be viewed in unity. Well, it is obvious. You do this in evolution all the time. You do not treat an embryo before you haven't seen what becomes of the embryo. The -- the swan is a swan on- -- only after he has grown up among the geese, isn't he? Then you can suddenly see that the ugly duckling is -- is a -- a swan. So everybody knows that it takes some years before he can -- knows what it is all about, what the relation of this -- for example, this swan to his duckling family is. Now you have to

wait, unfortunately, until Mr. William James, Filius, has grown up and become 70 and dies in 1910, before you can write the history of son -- of Henry -- Adams -- Ja- -- Henry James, Sr. But people don't want to do this. They say, "Henry James dies at 1882. Therefore, the literal remains of Henry James, Sr., are there and that's a man. Dry bones." Do you think you can write the history of George Washington because he died in 1799? Or when did he die? When did he die? Well, you don't even know.

(George Washington?)

Wie?

(I think it was 1799.)

Obviously -- is it?

(Yeah.)

The -- we can only write the history of George Washington now, and the man who writes the history of George Washington 50 years from now, gentlemen, must write a different and a better story of George Washington, because he knows better. How do you think the story of Christ -- Jesus Christ would have run in -- in 100 A.D.? I can tell you how it would run, because we have found in the catacombs in Rome a picture of how people in those days, who wrote history, pictured the picture. There is a man, {Alexaminos}, standing before a cross. On the cross hangs a man with an asinine- -- head of an ass. And it reads, "{Alexaminos} worships his God." And so Jesus, as an ass. That is the historical picture of -- in 100 A.D. of Jesus Christ. And today we know better, gentlemen. So history is growing on you and me, because the more limbs of this strange body of humanity are developing, the simpler it is to describe the tree. Obviously if you see a little seedling of a pine tree, you have a much harder time to -- in describing it than if you see the whole pine tree standing there, because you just have then to take, you see, a very far-fetched view, and you see the whole countenance, the profile. And you know, every -- every tree has a countenance very much of its leaf and vice versa. The leaf has the form of a tree. So the -- the -- this you have to see first. I give you one leaf alone and never -- you never saw a whole tree, you never know that every tree has the same form as the foliage. It takes both, the big one and the small thing, in history to know anything. This you do not believe. You do not believe it. That's why all these histo-

ries that are written now about World War II, they are not histories. They are a kind of a -- attempt to organize material, but they all call themselves in a -- in a terrible, unfortunate expression, "historians." You know all these people who run around, don't shoot, but write histories? The non-combatants -- attached to all the staffs of the United States Armed Forces, they call themselves "historians." It has nothing to do with history. It's "recorders," they should be called, as they were in -- in more modest times. They are not historians. They are recorders, which is good enough, to me. "Clerks," they were formerly called in the churches, you see, the clerk. It was very powerful man, the clerk of the board of trustees, powerful man, as here in Dartmouth, you know. The clerk is really the man who does it all, and who -- who holds the whip. But we are so arrogant, we call these people "historians." So you don't know anymore what history is, gentlemen. History is not known unless you know it by its fruits. Therefore, that isn't history which you reduce to some origins, as everybody does in this country, to causes before. George Washington is not at all interested because he had no water closet in 1750. That didn't cause him to become president of the United States. He didn't say, "I have no wa- -- no W.C., no running water, no plumbing. We must have a country where plumbing is the best," and so we got the United States. That would be causation. That would be what you call "history." Obviously, you only understand what George Washington did, that he created a nation after there is an American nation. Otherwise you can never write anything important or pertinent into his biography. Why should you remember him? This you have to wait for.

Will you take this down, gentlemen? By their fruits, ye shall know them.

That's a very complete reversal of everything you think is scientific. History is not known by its beginnings. It is only known by its end. In the beginning, Christianity could very well be mistaken for five -- 50 other religions. There was Mithras, and there was Bacchus, and there was Isis, and there was Serapis, and there were any number of -- of -- of religions, and it looked just like one of them, but it wasn't, because it reduced all these -- religions to ashes, because the Christians do not believe in -- in -- in a -- in a -- such fancy gods, but they believe in the simple life of a child in the cradle. And that's all, which means that they believe that God created man, and -- there are no gods in between. But that had to be found out and understood. And took thousand years before this was beaten down, that there was no other god, but the father of -- of man -- the child in the cradle. It took -- a thousand years then before you get a history of the Church. It is impossible to write the history of the Church in 100.

Now the same is true of father, Henry James. Henry James is meaningless

unless we understand that he forced -- you'll remember -- forced his son to write in 1910, 30 years after his father's death, the "Moral Equivalent of War," and that he forced him to write *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. And that all the time, here this father in the grave was waiting for this little boy -- very nervous Harvard professor -- to come around and to join up with his father's problem. And everything is done in this, you see -- all history today is in this country -- dried down to dry bones, because it just means just single biographies. Everybody writes {Simpson and Quick}, history of one man. Gentlemen, history begins only when one man's life leaves an imprint on another man's life. And so, gentlemen, the smallest -- the smallest unit for history are two generations. That's another law which is important. Because by their fruits you shall know them, the consequence is that history only begins when you deal with more than one generation. Biography is not history. It is today, unfortunately -- I love biographies, I have written myself biographies, gentlemen, but as it is done in this country today, it's a destruction of history. You cannot write the history of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, or Woodrow Wilson by themselves. You can write now, for the first time, the history of Woodrow Wilson, because Franklin D. Roosevelt and Truman have governed after him. Now it makes sense to say what he really did, that he prophesied the Second World War. But as long as the Second World War hasn't happened, and nobody has followed suit, what is the meaning of saying that he died a disappointed man in 1923? The main thing we still do not know: did it make sense that he died a disillusioned man, you see? Obviously, it made very much sense, because he was the only man who knew the truth when he died in 1923 -- Wilson predicting World War II. Now that's the only interesting thing about him today. Now you have to wait. Before, you cannot know. You have to wait until another generation is put under the judgment, you see, of his own light, and his own promise, and his own prediction, and his own -- his own insight.

Well, this is the minimum. But you see, you gain a tremendous perspective if you know this, gentlemen. History is the time-binding power of men. Will you take this down again, that's Number 3. History is the power to bind time -- times that, by their very nature, would fall apart. History is always, as Nietzsche has called it -- Friedrich Nietzsche, the German philosopher, has written a very wonderful inauguration speech for his chair of -- of -- of history where he said about the use and the abuse of history for human living -- and in this speech he says that history always must be an article of faith. History will always be an article of faith. And there is no way out, and you hate this, because you think if history isn't science, then it isn't anything. Gentlemen, there is a history of science which isn't science. If you write today the history of science from Newton to -- to Einstein, that isn't science. That's history. What's history --

what's scientific about the history of physics, of the great physicists, you see? It is your belief that this forms the unity. You cannot prove it. You can say Newton belongs to the Middle Ages, and Einstein doesn't. So you can begin the history of physics with Einstein. That's your pleasure. You have to prove it. Your faith is then a different way from the run-of-the-mill physicist. And again, I write a history from -- of physics from antiquity to today, and I have another religion again, compared to the people who think that modern physics begins with Newton, with the man who -- concluded that the apple couldn't fall without good reason from his -- the apple tree.

Where you connect, gentlemen, your -- your faith, there is religion, your religion. Today you have this great problem in the United States with all the agnostics and the Jews counting one way -- and most of the humanists -- and not understanding that the coming of Christ makes any difference. I can -- out of hundred books written today on history, there are perhaps two that really believe that there is -- Christ's -- coming was the turning point in history. All the others try to obliterate it and say, "nothing has changed."

I got a paper today from a young lady in Harvard -- Radcliffe, who wrote on tragedy, and quite naively says that the Greek tragedy, and Hamlet and Faust -- that's all one story, all one -- the history of tragedy. So she writes a paper on the nature of tragedy.

So I wrote back, "I'm amazed, my young lady, that you are already so much through with the Christian era. I always thought that we had no gods, we had no cothurnus, we had no deus ex machina coming, and solving the Greek tragedy, and we had no hero who was worshiped in the Dionysians in Athens. We had Hamlet, which is something quite different. We have a Christian tragedy in the Christian era. And we have Greek tragedy, and they are as different as somebody and his mirror image."

That's exactly how they are, they confront. Renaissance physics -- Einstein and Newton -- are not the same as Greek physics. But they are Renaissance, and therefore quite different. But you see, you don't -- you look at me and say, "Quite a surprise." Why shouldn't you write on the nature of tragedy? Well, my answer is: for a thousand years, there was no tragedy, because the Greek -- the Eucharist, and the -- the Mass, spectacle of the Mass had replaced tragedy. And when Shakespeare was allowed to write tragedy again, it was within a world in which Hamlet was not a god and hadn't to be deified, but was just one mortal. So one function of tragedy has remained inside the divine service, in church, and the -- only the secular aspect of this old Greek tragedy has migrated on the stage,

and on Broadway, which is very different, really. If you read *Mourning Becomes Electra*, from O'Neill, then you know that has nothing to do with a Greek tragedy. Not the slightest. It's the opposite.

But you see, you live in this college atmosphere and you are, therefore, I think, the gravediggers of Western civilization, because the common men still live in the Christian era. They are good people. But your brain is absolutely corrupt. And you actually believe that you live simply sometime, somewhere -- it makes no difference whether it's 500 B.C. or 1000 A.D. -- to you it makes absolutely no difference. Well, I'm in -- up in arms with this lady. I told her, if she -- if this is true, if there is a nature of tragedy without any break in history, you see, changing all tragedy, totally and putting it in a light of -- of a universal faith and universal government of the world, then of course, concentration camps and gas chambers were the only result, because why shouldn't we then live as the people 500 B.C. did, or 900 B.C.? And since this lady is Jewish, she's very deeply interested in this problem.

The nature, gentlemen, of all these things which -- which -- of which you hear -- nature of drama, nature of lyrics, nature of music means that we have no history, that nothing has changed. And certainly not through the Christian era. Therefore, I'm talking to you about Henry James, Sr., and William James, Jr., all this time, gentlemen. But I'm really talking about the -- the B.C. and A.D. I have tried to re-invoke in you the fact that Henry James, Sr., is the only man whose existence separates William James from antiquity, from paganism. And in the same sense, Jonathan Edwards and the Mather brothers are the only people who separate you as the heirs of Benjamin Franklin from the concentration camps of Nineveh and Assyr. From the fi- -- the famous struggle for survival of Mr. Darwin. You all know that we are not in a struggle for survival -- survival of the fittest. You very well know that the first gesture you make is generously to help the weak. Everybody does this, here in this country, yet we proclaim by -- because we go back into antiquity more {and more} that only Darwin is right. Well, you would be lost, gentlemen. A college boy is so much weaker than a 15-year-old boy who doesn't go to a college, in all his nervous reaction, all his sensibilities, that if the educated classes in a country would be judged by Darwinian standards, they would all have to be wiped out, because what does it mean to be educated? To be more sensitive. To be more weak. To be more -- more impressionable. That means education. You -- we keep you artificially more plastic. That is, you are still a baby. Now a baby is more imperiled by its inherent softness than a man in -- in chain armor, obviously, or a tank.

So education means to deny somebody the right to be hard-boiled. That's what education is, to prevent you from being hard-boiled. Now hard-boiled is protection, and that is Darwinianism. So Darwin is a natural. Education is an artificial, historical. That's done on the faith of parents to their children -- into their children and on the basis of faith of the children in their parents. It is always based on this two-generation principle, that the next generation doesn't have to live in the same way as the previous generation. And that's what I have tried to show you in America, as a permanent question mark, you see. But the American people, as people, have always known this. There have always been good Christians -- sectarians, and Baptists, Southern Baptists, Southwestern Baptists, Southeastern Baptists, but some sect which kept the flame burning of a good relation between ch- -- par- -- parents and children whom they wanted to grow, whom they wanted to be bigger than themselves. But you live in this -- in this incredible idolatry of your own mind, of your own brain, and I -- I -- I think therefore -- good reason the colleges are going downhill in this country. Who's going to -- to let everybody waste his life four years in a college, when the result is that you don't believe in the Christian era, even anymore? That you believe the nature of tragedy. Well, the nature of tragedy will come home and visit you. We will then find that -- tragedy is na- -- natural for you. Why shouldn't you then live a tragic life? It's natural. It's not redeemed. It's not -- there is no -- no ho- -- no change. Everything is Greek tragedy, with the curse of the parents on the children in the third and fourth generation.

This is the -- what you live in. This is the whole Big Issue course. There is no Christian era here, in this college. But there is in reality, gentlemen, and that's why there is a college. But the college just abuses its existence today, and it does it since William James. And that's why I have tried to tell you that this is all right as long as a college boy can learn by being exposed to this nonsense, which you learn here, and this -- this unhistorical situation, that you have to re-enter history, which you do by the draft, for example, and by Mr. McCarthy, and by many other such things, because humanity just doesn't -- cannot go with- -- on without you. It needs you in the next generation.

Please.

(Sir, you -- you talked -- in the general perspective of the course, now, you've been talking about an -- an era of Christianity and you -- you never talk about the era per se. You always talk about the secularism, which is opposed to the era of Christianity. At what time in history could you tell us were all these things essentially understood in the sense that you say you understand them now and we don't. At what time did everybody take these things...)

Down to 1865, to the Civil War, and everywhere in Europe, too. You see, in 1870, it was -- the famous sentence was said, "God is dead," which meant that the times of men had no -- had no connections. What does it mean, "God is dead"? God creates and governs the universe. You say, "God is dead," He doesn't govern the universe. And He hasn't created it. Therefore, every dust -- grain of dust on this -- this -- every speck of a -- of a human being, of an animal of this country has only his own lifetime to fulfill. There is nothing over-reaching his beginning and { } -- he lives from birth to death. Now, Sir, my dear man. No, one moment. One moment. Let me finish my sentence. You see, the belief that God governs the world finds expression in this: here you are born. When were you born?

(1933.)

1936.

(3.)

Wie?

(3. 1933, Sir. That would make me 14.)

Now, here you live in the year 1953, don't you? And here, your son might be born in 1973. Now -- oh, wait a minute. I have to put { }. 1973, and he will be in college in 1993. Ooh. That's a long time. Now, the naturalist says that what is important in your existence is that you were born in 1933 and that you die in 19-- -- I beg your pardon. Expectation is longer. That you die sometime in 1980. That's arbitrary, but make it X. You die sometime. So your life line goes from your birth here, born -- died, here. This is his- -- your -- the naturalistic view of your existence. I don't care when you were born, Sir. There have been thousands of years in which people never remembered a birthday of a person. That's -- in any tribe. The day in which you were born were your initiation. In 19-- -- you came to college when?

(1951.)

That's the day of your birth, in history. And it is. So let us assume that this is the day on which you wake up. And it will be -- in 1963 that you will make a -- some decision. And then it would be that history would only be important as reaching to some time in 2003, when your son makes a corresponding decision

and because you went to Dartmouth, says he goes to Amherst. That is, when he opposes, or fulfills, or completes, by his understanding of what his father's generation has done, the meaning of what you have done by limiting it, or by adding it -- by underlining it. Now there are two views of -- you see, of the world. One is the natural one which makes the events, which happen between people coincide with their physical existence. And the other, which means that the words spoken by them, and the decisions made by them are bridging the gap of the times, between the generations.

(Well, what I'm trying to say, Sir, is that -- that the era which you speak of, I don't think ever -- I don't know -- has it ever existed? You haven't -- you haven't talked about it positively enough so I can understand the Christian era as a -- as a reality. You say it's a time in history. For instance, wha- -- wha- -- what's --) That's what I'm leading up to, my dear man. You don't read the catalog, and you -- of course, you do as you please. But I do also as I please. I give a whole course, 58, on the basis of 57, in which I try to show you what the eras are all about. So I can't do this today. And I can't do it tomorrow. But I am devoted to it from February to May.

It's really ridiculous. Don't you read the catalog? That's -- this all -- only the preamble for exactly your question? Certainly. But you don't read, you just take a number -- 57.

(Well, I should hope so. If you ever read it over again, recently, Sir, and -- matter of fact, don't read your own descriptions. Read some of the evidence in the { }. I can only go on the experience I've had. They've never yet coincided. I didn't expect it would { }.)

Well, gentlemen, since the leaf contains the tree, I have taken the liberty of trying to give you the problem of a history of the human spirit, as opposed to the history of the human body, or human bodies -- of the mortals in us, in the example first of the Jameses, and then of the second generation. You remember the Mathers and the second half-way covenant, the same problem. And we have seen it time and again, that in the relation of the religious and secular, there is this clash of a history without -- where it is just natural -- and real history, which is created by every generation which joins the march of time.

So to get into the hinge between two times, two generations, is the problem of the historian. That's the eye of a historian. That's why there is no historian in this country. And the best historian whom we have, Mr. Samuel Morison, I

told you, now writes the history of the -- of the na- -- of the war in -- in the Pacific, for the navy. And that of course has nothing to do with our -- the real historic problem: how one generation, you see, adds or detracts meaning from the previous generation. You take a boom-bust region, you take prospecting out in Montana. Well, in the '90s, as you may know, railroads were built for this -- to the silver mines there. There was a tremendous ado and then the same country just fall -- fell flat. Nobody is there anymore. Now we only can know that this was a rush, because we see, you see, the bust in the -- here in '95, this was the future of America, you see. It would be, now. And -- but it isn't. We have to know this now, that the people there were deserted. That is, that no second generation followed them. Now there are the Texans. And so what's the future there? I mean, they bought Montana, you see. They have a second dustbowl. And so each time you can condemn or naturalize a history when you do not follow it up. By your not going West, you say, "The frontier is finished." But it is -- some people just have not to go there anymore. Now all the people from California come in -- back to New Hampshire and Vermont. I don't know why, but it seems that they need a worse climate than they have in California. I wished only -- the whole problem of this course, gentlemen, is not the content. You hear about these people sufficiently -- Franklin and { }. I'm not going to -- to hear any more obscenities about Benjamin Franklin's illegitimate children. That's not my business in this course. The interesting thing about Benjamin Franklin is that in him there comes to the fore your own mentality. And this whole mentality is stultifying fruitful living, because Benjamin Franklin does not say, "By their fruits, you shall know them," but "by their causes," and -- you see. And therefore it is all -- everybody only to himself, because the man who -- who -- who doesn't plant a tree for his grandchildren, you see, cannot be convinced that he should. You can never prove to a man that it's worth prov- -- planting a tree for your grandchildren. There's a famous story of the general -- Marshall -- Marshall Lyautey. Did I tell you the story in class? Lyautey was the French marshall who subdued Maroc and was a very great man. You can see this from the sentence which he spoke when the war in -- First World War in Europe broke out. On August 1st, 1914, they told the marshall there was a war in Europe now. And he said very slowly, "A war between Europeans only can be a civil war." Now if they had heeded this word, you see, the Europeans, they wouldn't have been -- gone to a war. If -- only -- because they treated this war as a war outside their, you see, their own natural bounds could they afford this. Ever since -- Europe is just a den of lions and tigers. It never has become anything else after that, you see, no

longer a family of nations. And therefore the sentence is -- sums it all up in one sentence: that's a civil war. And that's the most cruel of all wars, you see. And it takes the longest to reverse, as you know, from the South. That's why there is no peace {anymore} in Europe.

But the second thing -- I wanted to tell you -- that gives you also a -- a scope of the -- and some picture of the man's scope. He was a very old man, and he was living in southern France on a -- on a visit -- no, only visiting there. And he was taken to a wonderful garden. And there was a tree whom he -- which he liked very much and he s- -- had his gardener with him. And he said, "Gardener, I must have this tree."

"Well," he said, "Monsieur le marechal, that's -- all right, but the tree takes a hundred years before it really looks like something."

"{Qu'ont} la plante, aujourd'hui." Be it be planted today, he said of this tree. This man lived in history, you see. "It doesn't matter that I'm dying, that I'm an old man. But don't lose any moment," you see. If it takes a hundred years, it's great -- high time that we plant it."

You can't find an American who would skip -- would even understand -- you didn't even understand the elegance of the phrase -- "{Qu'ont} la plante, aujourd'hui." That this be -- let this be planted today, because now I still can follow in the sequence of generations and do my share, you see. For a garden -- what -- what does it matter whether see this or not? What has this to do with history?

You must pray that President Eisenhower does nothing for his re-election, but does everything only so that hundred years from now there may a United States of America. Woe to you if he only does anything for his immediate aggrandizement, or for your vanity, or for public opinion, or for these radio commentators, and all these {jackals}, and jackasses, and wolves who try to turn you from the way of a decent policy, just because today they don't understand. You are surrounded by wild animals, who make it nearly impossible for anybody to govern in this country, because they cannot say "I'm doing this so that there are the United States in 2030." Here's -- do -- say that he does it so that there is prosperity today. How do you know that prosperity for today is a good thing for America? It's never debated. I think it's very doubtful that we can afford prosperity. Obviously, we have to lower our standard of living. That would secure the future of America. The only thing. But that mustn't be mentioned. Because you do not live in history, you live as -- so poorly as Heracles said of the man who

only works, you see, the journeyman, day by day. Your whole perspective -- horizon is just today. Can I buy a television set on the installment plan? That's the only question an American family is allowed to ask today, in politics. Is that a question for a decent people? Is that of any interest, that they should sit at home and -- and labor -- belabor the question whether they can afford a television set? This is -- nobody's concern. Whether they buy it or not has nothing to do with history, politics, justice, law, anything. It's indifferent. It's of no importance. But it's -- built up today as being the important thing the president of the United States has to solve. If he doesn't solve it, he's not a good president. How can you have a good president? -- Ich meine -- a hole -- and that's what strikes at everybody outside the United States, that we are only saved by the grace of God, because sometimes Mr. Nehru, and sometimes Mr. Atlee, and sometimes Mr. Churchill, and sometimes Mr. Bidault makes a clever remark, or sometimes Mr. Adenauer, and we come to our senses again and we don't live in a world of fools. But at home it's all -- just foolishness. Everything.

I haven't seen -- you see, th- -- this McCarthy business. Twenty years ago, everybody was a Communist, and for 20 years you let the people run rampant and now the stable is empty. There are no Communists in the United States, so we have a tremendous legislation against Communism. Isn't that just funny? The horse is stolen, now we lock the barn door. You'll never have horses again. Be sure. There will be no political life in the United States, because we now lock the barn so carefully that there can be no political movement. We will sit on any movement, you see, and say, "It's Communism."

This is all just funny. Can anybody take all -- any of these things seriously who has looked into the depths of God's creation, that God has created man so that he must die in his own generation and must -- his life must be continued by the second and third, and fourth, and fifth generation? And history only begins to be interesting if neither what you do nor what I do is important, but if we bear -- unless we bear fruit, you see, we are not important.

This I have tried to tell you in this -- in this class, gentlemen. And it is very difficult for me to tell you, because it's a question that is not raised, that this mystery of humanity, the mystery of sociology, the history -- mystery of history is never to be found by looking at the mass here -- a mob of 9,000 people and taking votes or questionnaires. The question is: what happens between two elections? I'm not interested in whether you elect Mr. Truman in one year and Mr. Eisenhower -- again. It has nothing to do with history. The problem is -- if you want to understand history, is why in one year the people elect Truman and in the other term, they elect Eisenhower, you see. It's in this span between the two elections

that history begins to become interesting, that two different generations, although they do the opposite, still collaborate. Isn't that obvious? How can any one election be interesting? Not at all.

But succession, gentlemen, and succession. That's the mystery of history. In what are we succeeded? In what's -- does it matter now that Mr. Eisenhower a year ago said he was a crusader? Everybody's down on him for this, and rightly now, because two-thirds of his legislation's just the New Deal. Can a man who crusades in Europe then come home on -- the head of the victorious army to the people who have made him supreme commander and says he is going to crusade at home against them? It's scandalous, but he doesn't know English. I mean, you cannot crusade at home, when you have -- have deserved the -- the highest honors in your own country as -- as commander-in-chief. Do you think that the Democrat soldiers can tolerate a -- a general who is crusading against them? But all this can be -- you can get away here with anything, because that he -- that he -- when he spoke of a crusade a year ago, you see, people thought he had forgotten his own book title, Crusade in Europe. So he made it a civil war, the election. A war. Here you go out against the enemy of humanity, Mr. Hitler, then you come home and say, "Now, I'm going to do the same at home." This he literally said, but it doesn't matter in this country, because nothing is held against a man what he said yesterday. You only hear what he says today, so you never understand what he says, because gentlemen, what we say makes only sense within the context of what was said yesterday, what will be said tomorrow. This gives light -- sheds light on what we are saying today. Otherwise you wouldn't understand what it means. It is only in the light of that which has been said before and that which will be said afterwards, that you even can understand what the phrase means.

You -- it is simply true, gentlemen, that as mere products of the football campus of America, you have no power to understand history. And that's why I've -- came -- have been driven year after year back to this problem that I have to gi- -- give you an introduction into where the historical eye is located. No individual, gentlemen, can look into history. I can only talk to you about history because I feel burned, or molded, or made into the carrier of this between-generation view, you see. This I have learned in a long life, to look between the generations.

To give you a very pertinent example, gentlemen, why these eyes today destroy you, you see: as soon as you look at the life of Jesus, and then look at Paul and Peter, you also destroy the history of Christianity into a natural history. Here is this one man, Mr. Jesus, and then there is Mr. Paul and Peter, and then

you get for the last 150 years the famous story that Paul ruined Christianity. Now Jesus, however, and the Apostles form together the apostolic church, from the very day. All Christians agree on this, that what one generation of Christians -- Jesus taught the Apostles -- they applied. The greatness of Jesus was the He said, "Goodbye, you do it now in my place," when He was 33, and allowed the -- Apostles to live a second generation and to prove that they had inherited the Holy Spirit. He could have lived on for 30 more years. Do you think He had to go to the Cross? He didn't have to, at all. But He had to make way for the freedom of life on this earth. And this He did -- that's His real sacrifice. Everybody has to die. Don't make so much fuss about the crucifixion. Other people have been martyred. And why is it an extraordinary event? Because He could have done better, what He left the 12 Apostles to perform so that people might learn that everybody -- even the fisherman, even the most stolid man -- had the same powers of -- the lowest of the low had the same spirit as the genius, the Son of God. And this is the greatest sacrifice a man can make, when he can lower himself, you see, below parity, and say, "I'm not needed. If -- if you love me, you have the same powers."

So when -- the fact of Christianity is exactly the fact of Henry James and William James. It's exactly the same thing, you see. The problem, how a father -- an older generation, Jesus -- can force gradually Peter and Paul to -- the orthodox Jew, and the simple tribesman, the fisherman, you see -- to act as the greatest genius, in His place. You know that Peter in the last minute still wanted to leave Rome, and the Lord -- he -- on the way from Rome to Naples he -- he -- Peter, you see, runs into Him, and what does He say?

(Go back.)

Wie?

(Go back, I guess.)

No. He's much -- He never says such a stupid thing.

(No. Well.)

(Quo vadis?)

"Quo vadis?" Peter asks the Lord, "Quo vadis?" Where do you go -- he asks this, his master.

And Jesus says, "To be crucified a second time in Rome."

Whereupon Peter understands and goes -- rushes back to Rome and is crucified in Jesus' place. Head down, even with double -- twice as great a cruelty as his -- his master. That's the story of Quo -- have you never heard of Quo Vadis? But you never understood it. It's the story of the two generations, Sir, gentlemen.

What I have tried to tell you is simply the famous course given by Mr. Bartlett in this college. I have told you about it. On universal history. Haven't we talked about them? But in such terms that you can understand it as the problem between your father and yourself. It's the eternal problem of humanity. That is only what Christianity has done: put the clock so right that you can see that is always the -- the story. It is the eternal story. Christianity is only the first time that the story was consciously lived between two generations. That is Christianity. That is the beginning of our era, you see. It is the beginning of man getting hold of his proper situation. That's all what Christianity is. The Christian era is a very practical thing. From that time on, more and more people -- first only the Apostles, and then the congregations, and then the bishops, and then the monks, and then the saints, and then the popes, and then the cities, and then the princes, and then the Puritans, and then the -- you see, learned how to live in historical relation to each other. It had to be studied. And now it's -- it's getting worldwide. Gentlemen, the whole problem between Russia and America is the problem of the accumulation of capital. The whole problem of the reproduction of capital is the problem of fathers and sons. Shall a father withhold his capital income, in a -- invest for his sons, in his big -- with his big factory system, or -- or shall he go and spend it? You know this is the problem of the capital excess tax. The problem of the -- the Marxians call it the "reproduction" problem. That's exactly the problem of -- of history, of the apostolic church now carried into the production of goods. Shall one-half of what we do, you see, be reserved to make other people, you see, produce? That's reproduction of capital, you see. Or shall we simply produce what we need and -- and do -- and eat it?

It's the whole problem of the -- of the capitalistic problem. This is the Christian problem. Never has before economy been baptized. The idea of -- which the world faced in the economic crisis of 1929 and in the Russian revolution is the problem: can economics, even, be treated as Jesus treated the Apostles? You don't believe this, gentlemen. But that's not blasphemy. That's my firm conviction. And I've written a whole book, The Autobiography of Western Man, on this topic, that the Russian revolution and the world wars are the last step of

bring -- even bringing our relation to coal, and oil, and electricity, and atomic energy into this same relation of a -- inheritance which has to be increased, and cannot be simply eaten up, you see. The problem is investment, re-investment, reproduction of capital {goods} -- accumulation of capital goods -- whatever you call it, you see. And you know, that's the key of the great Five-Year Plan in Russia, this relation.

Again, Henry James and his sons, the same thing. How much must I -- freedom must I give my son in his own generation to discover the truth? How much must I impose on him, you see? You remember what I said about genius and authority? Now the whole problem of the Five-Year Plan is genius and authority. Again, the -- the genius today could produce enough to give all the Russians all the eggs and the butter they need. But then there would be nothing provided for the next generation. The next generation would not have, as William James said, this endowment of having its own capital goods. Ja?

(Sir, if the historical example of this relation between father and son, or generations, is found in Christ and His relation to the Apostles Peter and Paul -- you told us when we were studying the Jameses that the essential thing that has to be passed on is the genius of the father to the son, not so much the authority. Well, in this historical example of Christ and the Apostles, what happened to the authority -- was it passed on, or was it not?)

Paul never quotes Christ, as you know. He's {completely free}. No words {has he}. The spirit is in him. We have -- the Acts says, "We have given over our souls to His spirit." That is, He has nothing anymore. But Paul declares, explains, interprets, commands, organizes, in his own heart, in his own name...

(In the name -- in the name of --)

...in the name, ja. But never saying that Christ has said so, never. That's not what we call "authority."

(Well, I think we definitely {quote} authority { }. But it occurs to me that he is using His authority when he's speaking in His name. And only because Christ lived and has this authority.)

But in Him, sure.

(Yeah. And this --)

It speaks directly. That is, freshly, from {genius}. The new creation. It's not quotation. It's not law. To authority -- it's quite right. I have -- I mean, there's a third thing, law, you see, which is not the same as {giving} authority. I mean, as long as the Apostles fulfill the requirement of sacrificing their own will to this authority, they aren't -- they are allowed to speak in { }. You're quite right. There is more to -- than genius and authority in this earth, because the -- the application of these apostles is their -- their own good will, you see, is of course required, you see. Oh ja, oh yes.

What time, please? Would you be able { } to finish your paper?

(No, Sir.)

How long is it?

(23 pages.)

Who has to leave at 2:45? Well, then we can't { }. Also, you will be then the first, next time.

We come back now to Cooper. In his case, gentlemen, we can study an aspect of the James problem, which again is unknown here. He discovers aristocracy, or he still keeps aristocracy. And as you remember in this paper, it was said that he is an aristocrat. And he -- he revels in Paris in the salons with the duchesses, and the counts, and the nobility, and the aristocracy of the spirit -- mind, and here he -- he is all for the natural red Indian, you see. So he has this cleavage in his mind, is that he is semi-democrat and semi-{ }, but as most Americans are, I mean. The -- I have not yet to -- I have still to find a democratic American. There's nobody who is taken in by royalty and by title as much of this -- on this campus. If I tell you the stories of hoaxes which have worked -- been worked on the Dartmouth community over the last 15 years, you would laugh. One pseudo-after another pseudo-title has -- has imposed on people. We were, unfortunately being a little bit sophisticated, able to look through these hoaxes, but they -- you have -- you remember one?

(Lady Montague.)

Yes. Lady Montague. Just happened a year ago. Well, she called herself "Lady Montague." She was a -- she was a domestic servant from St. Louis, somewhere. And she's -- finally she ended in jail. But before, everybody in this college obediently had invited her to their homes and feel greatly honored,

because she called herself "Lady," which only goes to prove that it is -- it is still effective to call yourself "Lady Montague."

Well, well -- I can give you a number of other examples. But it doesn't matter. Only I haven't yet to find a democratic American. You all want to descend from some royalty in Europe, and some -- everybody, you know, can have a -- his pedigree fabricated here, in some nice manner. And there's always somebody who -- whom you will not admit to your fraternity, or to your club. And that makes you feel good. You need always somebody who cannot make -- make it, because otherwise it wouldn't be -- be no fun to make it. And this is -- discrepancy is only normal. I have nothing against it. The only funny thing is that you decline to accept it, that you all say it isn't, and that you even sell democracy to -- to other peoples, when they come to see in this country that it doesn't exist. I mean, the Europeans, of course, laugh their heads off when Americans talk about democracy. I assure you, Europeans in many ways are much more democratic. I mean -- if I am a professor at -- at -- at Dartmouth, it is decided in -- here, in the ranks of the scholastic society that I can be no good, because here are no people of any -- who amount to anything in Dartmouth. They are only football players. If -- this isn't true in Europe. If you belong to any high school, the people would still admit that you can be good. Even if you belong to Dartmouth. But here, it's absolute -- the truth. A man at Harvard just doesn't talk to a man at Dartmouth. I mean, in the -- in the faculty. It's just -- no quality.

Only to show you that we all live by these discrepancies, and these discriminations, and no discrimination -- life begins by discrimination. That doesn't mean, gentlemen, that we shouldn't fight for the other, and only the thing -- how much more complicated. This much richer life is much richer than you want to know. The funny thing about man is that he has to have a -- several tenets, and to strive equally strong. For -- for example, we need a powerful central government, and we need decentralization. That's not a contradiction, you see. We need both. We need decentralization and centralization. People will say, "Well, you either have to be centralist or decentral." I don't see it at all. I'm a conservative, and I'm progressive, but I cannot be all the time, in every point a progressive, and cannot be all the time a conservative, you see. But man begins obviously when he's both. A man who says, "I'm always progressive," tires me, and a man who says he's always a reactionary, is equally unimportant. I mean, the people who are interesting are the people who at times are one thing and at times are the other. It's contradictory, sure. But it's very contradictory to inhale and to exhale. And yet life begins by this very fact. You eat and you shit. Now,

you cannot say, "I'll just go on eating." And you cannot say, "I'll just go on shitting." You have to alternate. What's wrong about this? You cannot have a -- I mean -- founded on -- any one of these principles.

But you don't want to hear this, because you don't want to be in history. I mean, Henry -- I have tried to show you that Henry James and William James are like inhaling and exhaling. You remember what we tried to say, that you cannot understand the one without the trust and the love of the other, that this father at his breakfast table pouring out his Christian truth, obviously, you see, wanted to bring down some seed into the ground, and had to leave it to the -- his faith, and to weather and wind, and to the years to come, what his son would make of it, you see. That wasn't his business. But his son, on the other hand, received from his father the old eloquence, the whole top- -- all the topics of conversation, although he was quite free to twist them around and to omit something. But here, the eloquence, we said, comes to the sons from the father. You remember? So there is a tie-up. You cannot look the life of Henry James into Henry James. And you cannot look the principle of democracy into people who allegedly always live democratic. You find it just as much in people who try to live aristocratic.

Now, this he does. And that's where you have the -- the -- premise of -- of Cooper, that there -- I have a quarter of an hour. I want to give you a -- a really important -- { } --

[Tape interruption]

...from his parents, that when William James gives up Henry James' Christianity, and says, "I'm a scientist. I know nothing {but what} my senses tell me. I have not this historical view of one, big stream of a Holy Spirit -- {going}." {Well}, what William James' position is, and yours, the psychologist's position, you see, confining himself to looking at this man and what he -- goes on in his mind. That's psychologizing. That's psychology, you see. Psychology is the application of the principle of nature to man's spirit and soul. And so he says, "I see that this boy wetted his bed at two, therefore his soul is wet, all the rest of his life."

And that you call now today "psychoanalysis," which means that you look for the importance of the man's actions in that which is confined between his cradle and his death, you see. Whereas obviously the New Deal has absolutely nothing to do with Mr. Roosevelt's infantile paralysis, or his digestion, but it has

to do with the development of industry in five generations. That he finally had to say that labor is not a commodity has nothing to do with psychoanalysis, that he was under the thumb of his mother. And any psychologizing about Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal is ridiculous. Utterly ridiculous. But that's what people tell -- tell you today, that you can find in his antecedents as a boy, as a boy in the cradle, the explanation of his acts. {Perfectly} fantastic. Every word he says is outside his own body. It is a -- has a meaning in the history of thousands of years when a man says, "new" and he says "deal." He uses words that are 5,000 years old, and therefore it has abs- -- it doesn't come out of him. It goes through him. He's just the carrier. It is -- but this is what people tell you today. They say that the electric light is to be explained by the isolation around the cable between two masts. Is this true, you see? The mast being everybody's physique, you see, and the electric light has a -- very little to do with the wood on -- of the poles. But that's what you are told all the time by psychologists, that the wood of the mast pole determines whether there shall be electricity in the -- in the c- -- cables or not.

What I do in the society, gentlemen, of men, for peace, or for war, or -- that has absolutely nothing to do with whether I am a cripple or whether I am six feet -- six f- -- six. But you don't believe it. That's all for -- that's -- you call this today the great secrets of the -- of psychology.

They didn't even touch religion. I mean, Mr. {Raveling} made a speech. Did you -- who listened to him? Did you go to his lecture? The -- the Symposium of the psychology department, you see. He didn't even -- didn't even see that this had nothing to do with each other, the -- the malformations of the psychologists and what -- in the history of mankind is considered a sin, you see. The idolatry of the golden calf, that's a sin. But has nothing to do with the malformation of the children -- individual children of Israel, you see. Not the slightest. They could have a good digestion, or poor digestion. They could be one-third left- -- or they could, you see, love their sister or -- it has absolutely nothing to do with worshipping the golden calf.

But this is what today people tell you, that your digestion, or your desire to have a -- to go to bed with somebody will then enact legislation. The Bible is very careful to warn you against it. As you know, in the pedigree of Jesus there are very questionable ladies, because the Bible wants to make sure that the great decisions of mankind have absolutely nothing to do with the morality of the people who do it. If you are -- whether -- if you are sen- -- sensitive to the current of history -- of the electric current, you see -- you can be a cripple, and you can be a criminal, and you can be stupid, and you can be a genius -- if you have this

senses -- this sixth sense of history, you are fit for the kingdom of Heaven. And if you don't have it, you can pass all the examinations with A, and you can absolutely stultify yourself to the decisions that have to be made. Hoover was certainly an A student, but he just couldn't stop the Depression. He had no p- -- sense -- no political sense. He's an engineer. Engineers just don't have that sense, I mean. I'm -- beware of the technician, gentlemen, in politics. He's the man who doesn't understand -- never, anything. President Conant is such a man. So they made him high commissioner in Germany. Doesn't understand a thing of politics. He's a chemist. And when he was made president, the old professor Whitehead, the great philosopher, the British -- heard this and said, "Why have -- it's impossible. You can't do this. You can't make -- a president of -- the greatest university can't be a chemist."

"Well," he said, "Why not? President Eliot of Harvard was a chemist, too."

"Oh," he said, "but that's very different. Eliot was a poor chemist. But Conant is a good chemist."

Only to show you that to conduct history, the affairs of men, is a thing by itself, which ha- -- cannot be reduced to any endowment, you see, with a good -- with a good physique, or a good brain, or any of such things, because it's a relation to the things before you and after you, and not to the things you can touch, and weigh, and see, and mix, and boil up in -- a chemical compound. What can these physicists do? Produce atom bombs. That's their contribution to history. That is, any natural scientist who enters history destroys. That's all he can do. The letter of Mr. Einstein to President Roosevelt that he should build the atom bomb, that will be the immortality in history of Mr. Einstein, and not -- that he had a good brain in mathematics and physics. It's very uninteresting. And that's his only contribution. But they all pose, these people, as -- as -- as peacetime -- peace- -- No- -- Nobel Prize winners. But the physicists' contribution to the world of our -- of man is destruction, power, mechanics. And it takes a long time of ministers, and teachers, and mothers, and monks, and nuns, and deacons, and -- and nurses to heal any one of the wounds that one of these big physicists can produce in the body of mankind. But -- in this country, all the values stand on their head. So Mr. Einstein is the great genius of peace. He -- he has a window in Riverside Church. Just brain power. It has nothing to do with what man is craving as a continuity of the human race on this earth.

Now, Cooper's -- and Henry -- William James, Jr., and any -- or Mr. Einstein, in developing any one in their own time, secular invention { }, always to a certain extent belong to the pre-Christian order. That is, gentlemen, if you for

one moment allow me to -- where is my -- here. Here.
You take Greek -- Greek science. You take the -- Christianity. That's the beginning of our era. Let's put this plus, minus, zero. And you get the year 1865, William James -- or Cooper, 1821. Mr. William James decides, "I'm a scientist." That is -- {he is} -- let us -- allow me to say this -- he goes Greek. He says this. He becomes an academic. "Academic" is just another expression for s- -- allowing a mind to concentrate on that what the Greeks did in pre-Christian days. The word "academic" is the word for the renaissance of the Greek mind. Now since the Greek mind is polytheistic, worships many things -- the arts, and the boys and the girls -- they love both as you know, and the -- the Muses, and the Graces, and Bacchus, and Venus, and everything -- they are polytheistic, and in this sense, any Greek departmentalization of the mind, the famous ivory tower, is always pre-Christian by establishment. A man who just goes zoologic -- in for zoology, as William James did in 1865 when he went to Brazil, says, "I'm not responsible at this moment for making peace between men of g- -- men of good will, but I am going out, because I'm interested in { }." Now that's all right. That is, in every one moment...

[End of tape]

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...generation problem. Now every man lives to the -- two generations.

When he becomes 70, he actually has lived two generations. If you now take kindly these dates: from 1819 to 1891. He dies in 1892, doesn't he?

(You said 1819?)

Oh, it makes no difference. I mean, it's over 70. It's the same problem. And you divide these lives, then you can see that Mr. Whitman lives not minus -- of 1819, plus 36, which is 1854, and that he then comes to life from 1854 to 1892. This, you see, these pe- -- nobody writes biography in this country. They don't understand it. They always talk about it. But this is a phenomenon. Now you get Mr. Whitman -- Mr. Melville and you see exactly what happens here. You have his life from 1819 to 1852. And his non-life from 1852 to 19- -- 1891. And that's why they are the most opposite characters in American literature.

Can you see this? That's phenomenal. I haven't -- find anybody who ever mentions this. It's like head and tail of a coin. The first -- one man lives in the first half of his life, and the other man lives in the second half of his life. And they only live half a life. And that's why Mr. Whitman is a burlesque, and Mr. Melville is a tragedy. The difference is -- it is a tragedy after you have lived not to live. It's terrible. It's really, you see. But it's very funny when a man doesn't love in the 36 years of his life in which he should love. And then -- when he then makes a tremendous fanfare, you see, of loving from age 36 to 70, when he should keep quiet and sit still, and raise a family, or build a house or -- you see, have something to do. That's burlesque -- that's funny. And that is the dating of his poetry, so immeasurably funny. Can you see this?

So I think, gentlemen, we -- you learn here something about the problem of the pluri-aged life. You have here the two most important figures of the literature of the United States showing that it is impossible to live in two generations, in a climate like this. They both have -- are confined to live in one generation. I mean, I can't think that out, gentlemen, but I put it into your mind to think this is the -- the connection of these people with America. They wouldn't have had to suffer this way in another country, you see, this kind of being stymied. You can only live in this country as a one-aged man if you are a secular man, because this country only lives by one generation. Anybody who tries to live through two generations, you see, like -- like -- like Melville -- out he goes. The pressure is such, you see, that he's -- he is killed at -- in '52. As you well know, it is true, liter-

ally true; everything afterwards just doesn't make any sense. And his -- his son is, after all, he himself at 8- -- not being able to enter the world. And there you see how important it is, you see, to -- to -- to connect the generations. Our children, gentlemen, and our parents -- they are very much clearer projections of who we are than we ourselves. The suicide of this son, of course, is not an accident. That's exactly the expression of Melville's own situation. And of course, the fact that Mr. -- Mr. Whitman couldn't give life to a mosquito in actual fact, you see, and then has to talk about love in the second half of his life, you see, when he should be a grandfather, that is his one-generation problem, you see. And I think with this -- with this arithmetic, gentlemen, you begin perhaps to wake up to understand what this 57 is all about. It's the question of the fact that we not only find generations living in history, but {that} you and me, we have to live through two generations. And since you don't want to do this, this country is always rushing from one sensation to the next and there is no continuity. There is no connection. Absolutely none. The impotency of Mr. Whitman is a strange phenomenon, and the sterility of the great fruit that Melville has -- left behind, you see, that he cannot bear fruit, that he has to -- cry out with Pierre, after he has left -- given us Moby-Dick. You see, Moby -- Melville is still an ancestral spirit, because it comes from the Bible and Shakespeare what he has to say. We'll hear about this. I won't anticipate this. Whitman is really leaves of grass. He is unicellular. Therefore he has to postponed living to his second half of his life, and has to fill it with this big noise, the second half. You must think, gentlemen -- that's very serious -- that this man was impotent and homosexual, and that is his poetry. And this country is mentally impotent and homosexual. It is, in all your description, you see, because love is fruitful only when it has a secret. Without secrets, no love. That isn't love. That's just sympathy. That's kindness, what -- what -- what Whitman tries to sell you for love. In order to cover up his impotency and his -- he may be -- not have been impotent with boys, but he certainly was with women -- he has to s- -- call "love," what other people call "I like you," I mean, you see, "I like to be with you. I --." His embraces are all impotent. They are all Coca-Cola at best, but I think they are only, they really are only -- how do you call the -- ginger ale, ginger ale. That's Walt Whitman's love.

Now that's very serious, gentlemen, because this is the enemy. In the modern society, you see, everybody passes who is amiable, who is smiling, who is friendly, who is sympathetic, who gets along with people. But gentlemen, the mother who has nine children mustn't get on with people. She must give life and protection to child- -- nine children. That's a dif- -- very different case. Fruitfulness is not amiability. And you all mistake lovable and amiable. And that's Walt

Whitman. And that's why there is absolutely no fruit in all these to- -- gatherings and togethernesses, and United Nations, and -- and World Federalists Now, and Youth for Congress, and Congress for Youth, and -- and all these convening -- gatherings, mass meetings, conventions, every -- everything we have, all the charity ladies with all their charities. That's all the impotency of kindness towards -- "embrace," he calls it, big noise.

It's very tempting, gentlemen, because it is -- it seems to -- to do justice to everybody. Gentlemen, if you want to do justice to everybody at the same time, you can't do justice to anybody at no time. It's impossible. The question of living is a question of timing. And it is not a question of all at the same time. Love is selective, or it isn't love.

Now, there's a great problem today, gentlemen, in the world. UNESCO, I mean, all these things are homoerotic. That is, I wouldn't call them "homosexual," in order -- because I don't wish to condemn them. It isn't a question of -- of the penal code or of morality. I don't care all these -- for these people as criminals, or as mental cases, but it is simply descriptively true that they li- -- like loves like in homoerotics. Like loves like, as boy loves boy, you see. And in real love, we love that which is the very opposite, which hard- -- is hardest to love. Man loves woman, because she's different. And that is fruitful love. And you have to take your choice, gentlemen, in your heart of heart. There is a place for comradeship. In the army, like li- -- likes like, buddies; they are the same. If you overstep the line and you fall into the homosexual trap, you become accustomed, you see, not to undertake the love of the opposite, and then the -- the world goes by default, because the world is only sustained by love of the opposite. The love of yourself is luxury, play. It's not necessary. It's nice, but it's not necessary. But the love of the opposite is necessary, because otherwise we die. The other is just pleasant, entertainment.

And here in this country this -- all this must never be said. Nobody tells you clear- -- in so many words, that between Melville and -- and Whitman there is this difference, you see, that Melville is bisexual, really, you see. And -- and Whitman is not. You may say that if -- if Melville had been Whitman and Whitman had been Melville, they would have had a very successful life in the outer world. They become writers from this very strange entrenchment and -- { } -- there would -- you see -- I can sit, and I am now here 20 years in this country, and as I said, I was shell-shocked by Whitman in the year of the Lord 1921 as a -- my real counterpart, as the enemy in the whole Western world. And I'm still full of amazement that these {plants} grow there. That this is there. It has, of course -- Mr. Whitman has of course to do with our big cities, with our big

industry, with our -- the detachment of the real ways of the sexes in the home, from the ways, on the roads on which Mr. -- he meets these people, where this all un- -- unpolarized light, so to speak, everybody like everybody else.

If you want to -- to find a method, gentlemen, of studying pluri-aged, and one-aged, and you must begin to see, I hope -- after all, the whole course is { } -- that this is the -- your first step into realism, that everything you speak about, that is ridiculous, because it's like the New York Times. It is just of the day. It has absolutely no significance, because you only know man if you see him in his -- both aspects as being the fruit of something and being the seed of something. Otherwise you don't know what -- who this man is. It belongs to Melville that his son commits suicide, and that he be- -- has to end up as a silly Customs inspector, in the harbor of New York with rheumatism. And it belongs to Walt Whitman that he hasn't made one woman either happy or unhappy, but that they still say in his town he was the dirtiest man ever lived in their town, in Long Island. They declined to -- call an avenue "Walt Whitman Avenue." The farmers there, they will have nothing to do with this man. So obscene he -- he had seemed to them. And to me it seems -- to me, he's an obscenity.

But, you see, what happens is that in 1819, Melville is born and till 32, his father protects him. And in 32, this protection is suddenly torn away. You have the combination of a private-school experience, you see, and then all of a sudden, the very opposite, his { }. So here you see the pluri-aged life of a child, you see, that what happens to the father, the bankruptcy and the death, you see, is in -- my life, what we said about the 18-year-old boy, you see, who then takes his life, that is the small, delicate Melville. In Melville it was still strong enough, he could pull it off and he supports the family from 32 to 51, but then it's over. Then his father-in-law takes over. You should have mentioned it when Mr. Shaw paid for his journey to Palestine. Isn't that true?

(Yes.)

Well, quite important, because it was, of course, some fatherly, you see, help coming back to him.

Always think in these generations, gentlemen. You see, they -- because now you go over to the other side. Since Mr. Whitman doesn't even know of the problem of generations, since everybody is at the same time -- we are all here, you see -- {Kramer}, isn't that right? I mean, we are all contemporaries. He had to live at least one generation in order to have anything to say. Because at 36, he at least was already his own heir, once. This you will have to live through, you

see. You will face one day the mirror and -- when you shave -- and you will say, "I have seen myself before." And that will be quite a second sight. Many people collapse at 45, because they have lived themselves too much. They have been with them too close -- themselves, you see. They get bored. Well, I -- you understand. This is the problem of -- of suicide. It is, that you can't stand yourself, because you're -- do you know? This is all. This is all. Out, you go. By the way. Does anybody know what happened to Mr. {Daley}? No? No? No solution?

{ }.

Wie?

{ }.

There -- because that's obviously a father problem, too. Father-son problem, from what I have gathered. Has anybody known him? Did anybody know him? Have you heard of him?

(I've heard of him.)

Well, you know, his father died in the war. And he has a -- a father -- fellow scholarship. That is, the Ernest Martin Hopkins fellowships are given to boys who -- whose fathers died in the Second World War. And so that is -- ja. You see? It's a very strange regulation, but there it is. So I was reminded of -- of -- of Herman Mel- -- Melville's, you see, son and his own { }.

So. I have to stop here. But please, see from -- that we -- see here that our heroes in literature draw into themselves the American problem of the two generations. That's a tremendous fact, you see, that they pay with one generation in order to be articulate in the other.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Philosophy 57, January 19th.)

... tree, the -- Pierre came out in 19- -- 1852, and it remained unread. And it was reprinted in 1929, as you have heard, for the first time. That is to say, this man lied -- lay buried for 80 years. He lived, physically, 40 years of this life of nonexistence. And you have to -- I hope you will carry away, from the last meeting and this, the fact that men like Melville or Whitman, can at times be condemned not to exist, which is real hell. You have heard that Walt Whitman did not live for the -- first 36 years. Now with Melville, the strange thing is that he did not live, was not allowed to breathe, so to speak, publicly but just physically. His son takes his life when he's 18, so the father cannot impart his spirit to him in the midst of the 60s. From 1852 to his death, he's dead. This is very serious, and we haven't even yet found expression to this. Are -- there -- his biographers are very silly about it. There's a book on Melville which is called Tragedy of Mind, which is ridiculous. It's a tragedy of the human soul. His mind was in perfect shape, a very great mind.

But in this country, you see, the whole academic world has a conspiracy -- which is much worse than the Communist conspiracy -- always to confound and confuse you by saying "mind" and "soul" are the same. You can study in Nietzsche, in Hölderlin in Germany, and in Melville, and even in Whitman in this country that soul is something utterly different from mind. The soul of Melville was saved by writing Pierre, but he had nobody to embody this, and his mind became very weak. He compromised after that. He went to the Holy Land and wrote a terrible, boring, stupid poem, because his father-in-law paid the voyage and it was a kind of sanitarium, kind of spa undertaking, and they wanted to rescue the poor man, you see, from his complete despair and despondency. And the soul was in hell. And to call Tragedy of Mind this -- this -- this book by {Sedgwick}, is a typical academic misunderstanding of our situation in reality, you see. When a man is feeble-minded, when a man has a tumor in his brain, he loses his mind, you see. But what he -- this man was roasted and tormented by was the -- that his soul was sick. Soul sickness is not the same as mind sickness. Tragedy is always a question of the soul, never of -- a question of the mind. It's not tragic when a man goes insane. That's a physical in- -- ailment, I mean. That's something very different, something secular, I would say. But the soul, that's your fate. That is your place made out for you in history. Now at this point, I only want to point to this complete misunderstand-

ing of modern literary criticism, which makes Melville into a "tragedy of mind," when for us it is a problem of the soul to live through various generations, and to represent other generations to the present generation. This Melville has done like nobody else, because he brings, as I've shown already in the dates of his publication, to us today, you see, something that has been lived in 1852, and never meant anything to the people there. He hasn't existed after Moby Dick in any way in -- in the -- and he died, as you have heard last time, a forgotten man. Nobody knew who he was, when the papers mentioned that he died in -- was it '90 or '91?

('91.)

'91. I think that's very important, the central issue, that we have to do with the soul in Melville.

Now some other factual things. Benjamin Franklin, and Rousseau, and Thoreau, and all these good people in -- in Concord, Massachusetts, as you know, have worshiped nature. The great step which makes Melville important -- seems to me in this respect -- is that as far as the time 1750 to 1950 is concerned as the typical secular line of American life -- from Franklin, you may say, you see, and the lightning rod, via Ktaadn to Mr. {Washburn} and our Arctic Institute, this taking on nature. Melville goes to the end of nature, to the South Sea and says, "Let's look at the real nature," and thereby -- always when a dream is practically realized, it comes to its end. In Melville, then again, our -- your generation, you see, which may still play with this fantasia of a good nature, that nature is good and just man is bad, or some such thing, nature has an ethical character of divinity or something, it is already overhauled, and is already corrected -- stands corrected, because he did anything you might dream when you go in summertime out to -- to -- to Alaska or to Hawaii and try to -- not to hunt the white whale, but to find the innocence of nature.

And in this sense, I feel that Melville again has rendered us a tremendous service by doing -- a hundred years ago, you see, in his South Pacific exploits, you see -- something that we couldn't even do -- do -- do today, because Bikini is already evacuated and is used for atomic bombs. There is no native anymore -- native paradise. No earthly Eden. So he has lived it in -- in good time and has left us this desperate attempt to find that which Rousseau proclaims was there before kings, and popes, and priests, and -- and cities, and k- -- , you see, and tyrannies existed. And I feel -- would you make this -- this point? Any line of vision, or dreams -- any utopia -- comes to an end when the utopia is constructed. Socialist utopia -- Thomas More's -- comes to an end when Mr. Lenin and

Stalin do it. And now we can see what a Communist plan does mean, you see. And so in the same sense, Melville's realization of the primitive nature in his going to the South Sea is a tremendous medicine, I should think, to put the vision, you see, in the place where it has to be either done or dismissed. You can no longer afford to, as you -- as your -- the former generations still did before the Second World War. As you know, Thoreau was very much en vogue. Who has read *Ktaadn*, by -- by Thoreau? No one? It's all over? That was a favorite, you see. {Sidney Cox} stood here for -- for this -- who has still met Mr. {Cox}, you see? He was the last of the Mohicans, really. And he believed in individual salvation by meeting nature. We still have one man on this campus who suddenly can stop on this campus, and you ask him what he's doing, "I commune with nature." And then he has intercourse with divine nature. He's a remarkable man, but I think he's absolutely crazy.

You have to -- however, I do -- leave this to you, gentlemen, since you are young. It is still your temptation as Americans to believe that nature in itself is good. I was brought up with this romantic notion. I have come to know that God did not make nature good and us bad, you see. This is -- good and evil are not to be found in nature, the evil as little as the good. And it is both wrong to proclaim that nature is evil or that nature is good. It is just -- has nothing to do with these qualifications which only belong to you and me. This is I think of great importance.

So would you kindly date this? 1750, the dream of a -- of a holy nature, of a -- the Emersonian, Thoreau, Franklin dream -- that nature is good and we are only stupid because we do not appreciate the goodness of nature, you see, is in Melville drawn -- brought to its conclusion. And the greatness is, however, that it takes a hundred years before we -- you and I -- put Melville in this place. Nobody in 1850, you see, accepted this {message}, so -- that although its utterance, accidentally printed in 1850, the great sermon of the Franklinites in 1750 -- secular, nature, salvation, you see -- just -- Voltaire did -- said this, the encyclopedists did it, with -- Mr. {Wilson} has written this book on Diderot, you see, who had -- who held to this belief. In 1750, the dream. In Melville's own existence, the realization how far at -- can we execute it, so to speak. And in { } time, the imperative. You have to say goodbye to the Enlightenment, gentlemen, or America cannot survive, or the whole Western world cannot survive. This is a big order. And you as individuals will -- do not even know how big the order is. But it means that the purely secular, in the sense that the secular can find its frame of references, it's the principles of explanation, its way of interpreting life by watching the spider, or by watching the bee, or the anthive, you see, leads to

terrible things. I -- you know how all anthropologists still are in this -- temptation. They look at the bee, and they look at the ant, and then they say, "You must be -- beehive or an anthive," you see. {Can be}. I mean, this -- this -- this -- or {Our Poor Relations}, by Mr. {Ruten}, you know, the book on the apes. People are still -- in all special fields of human interpretation today completely hipped on this nature business. Nothing is explained for you and me when we know that this occurs somewhere in nature, because in nature, it is neither good nor evil. What we must know -- whether we should do it. Now in order to know what we should do, you see, we are not helped by any observation in the -- in the state of the animal kingdom, for example. This has tremendous consequences.

I would say, gentlemen, this was then here the universal dream. Here it was the practical attempt -- of which, by the way, the emancipation of the slaves is a -- is an outcome. You have to do it now. If all men are born equal, for Heaven's sake, we must even have a civil war. You see, nature must be respected. Now we know, as you well know, that the assimilation of two races is a very painful -- process and has ver- -- cannot simply be based on -- on an abstract proclamation. That has to be done in time, and in due time, and with many restrictions. And this is here I think your -- you are provoked to dismiss the frame of reference given by the term "nature," because you cannot say that by nature you are anything. We are nothing by nature. Man is that which -- being which has in every moment to get a new nature, obviously. Every generation has to get a new nature.

So if I may put here this figure of 1950, you see how Melville is in eclipse for a hundred years, that his voice carries into our ears with much more meaning than it did in his own day, which is, in itself, gentlemen, a tremendous problem of the generations again. If you put here the figure 1890, and if you will recall that I said this man lives one generation, his soul can embody; and another generation, his soul has to live disembodied. And you see that another 40 years it takes before he has heard, and now you -- we can embody his problem, so to speak, in actual -- actuality. You will perhaps see that the whole system of this -- of this lecture is again applied -- I have tried to show you that what we call "Old Testament" and "New Testament," "antiquity" and "Christianity," "Church" and "state," "world history" can be ex- -- seen even in the working of two generations, that this is the analogy, but not one generation. The last century -- liberalism, you see -- has tried to find the life of Christ in one man's life. This atomization, the life of Jesus, you see, is just -- we live by everybody -- is wrong. I have tried to show you that between two generations, the secret of real living can be found perhaps, but not between -- in- -- inside one life. And I have

drawn your attention in Melville's case to the fact that, after all, he covers two generations. That's not a one-generation, you see. That's in himself a double problem. And he pays with -- by one generation of his existence for the glory of the other.

So the primary atom of history, gentlemen, are two generations, not one generation. I think that is a tremendous item to be learned again in Melville's own existence. We did it with William James and Henry James. Now I do it inside one man's existence, you see. This is the first unit, the first digit, so to speak, you see, in counting time in real history.

And this is very difficult for you again, but it does away with all the Enlightenment. What we called "nature," gentlemen, was timeless life -- that is, just one generation, the matter of one age. And this frame of reference of Benjamin Franklin, or of Cooper -- that it all matters, you see, what one generation thinks or does -- this must be repudiated. This isn't true, because all the sufferings of Melville are only meaningful if you accept the fact that he paid by one generation for the other, waited for further generations to come, to do justice to his -- to his ending as a first man in America, the dream of naturalness. Something else. In his *Pierre*, he undertakes to show that a man who is really "self" still needs the other sex. In the sister, the man who does not want to live beyond his own generation -- he doesn't want to be son or father, who breaks away with the old ancestry and doesn't want to have children, will still have to be supplemented by one other human being of the opposite sex. It's a very profound thing in this *Pierre*, that the possible fiancée who -- with -- from whom he could have children, and his real mother and father, who -- project his life into the past, you see, are replaced by this child -- sister out of wedlock, {which is} pure nature that is simply the contemporary person, you see, in his own ex- -- selfhood -- selfishness.

Now gentlemen, this is, I think, the greatness we have to ascribe to Mr. Freud and the whole problem of today, of psychoanalysis: that man -- even if he escapes into space, into self out of time, when he unable to procreate, or to feel procreated -- that he still needs one other person to fulfill himself. That is, the natural man of psychoanalysis are still two -- very different from Rousseau again, and Franklin and the self-made man, you see, and the individualism of the -- of the 19th cent- -- 18th century, where the people say, "A equals A." Well, it isn't true here in -- in Melville's case, so what do we say? This "A times B," this brother-sister proposition, be -- as the self, you see, that has to be sacrificed as it is there. They both perish, so to speak, into nothingness, into just their own

moment of fulfillment.

This then is -- already outside the vision of -- of Rousseau, and of Thoreau, and of the self-contained, self-autonomous, you see, reasonable being, because man is haunted by sex, and he isn't "self," you see, with -- reason doesn't do anything to his real existence. The -- so reason is replaced by sex. And I think we should subscribe to this. And again this is only meaningful in 1950, gentlemen, that nature, which -- Melville re- -- places the secular nature in the place of reason in 1750 is, so to speak, valid today because you would say today what we find as natural in man is his sexuality, but not his reason, because with reason I have ulterior motives, you see. And depth psychology shows that you can reason out anything if you want to have something, and usually somebody of the other sex. That's just rationalization, as we say.

So there is a second thing to be learned, gentlemen. His -- he replaces the vision of self as a homo sapiens, of the rational being, by the -- this definition, so to speak, in Pierre, that the self would still have to break all laws of the universe to fulfill itself with the next of kin. Not to step into time. When self is considered a being in space, incest is the consequence, as it is in all modern literature, by the way. When you have no task in life to fulfill, not to free the slaves, not to -- go west, not to discover the universe, not to -- not to invent the airplane. That is, when man has no historical task to fulfill, you see, he is thrown back on his sexual nature much more than on his rational nature.

All this I wanted you to under- -- to begin to see how miraculous people live. And this last point I wish to make, before I stop here and leave the rest for the next meeting, is this: if you go beyond 1750, backward, in Melville's ancestry, you find Shakespeare, and you find the Bible. You find the King James Version of -- of 1611, and you find another 150 years thrown in for good measure, so to speak, for his wavelengths, for his vocabulary, for his eloquence. You know this very well, as a reporter, don't you, I mean, and he -- you -- that he's -- just very knowingly read Shakespeare before he wrote Moby Dick, to fill himself up with the whole -- with the whole barrel, so to speak, of -- of spirits of -- to -- to get this eloquence.

Gentlemen, when we -- any literary man, any man who really speaks, any orator -- I too, here, gentlemen -- when I want to convey truth, it isn't myself that speaks, but it's time, a great stream of time out of which my words emerge. And I only let them pass through my receptacle, my vessel of clay. You must learn again that a teacher doesn't teach as long as he speaks himself. That's nonsense. You have this idea that -- and if you are decent receptacles of the

truth, gentlemen, you don't listen yourself. You listen with responsibility that is, even if you don't do anything, you will still have to pass on the truth to somebody else, whether it's your child or your friend -- that is, in a real emergency -- you may say, "I didn't heed the warning of the class in -- Philosophy 57, but you may need this, so I pass it on to you. Try it. I mean, this strikes me as pertinent to your case." In every case, gentlemen, that we speak, we travel on some wavelength that is beyond our own generation. You too, in listening, and this is the most difficult thing for you to -- to think, that -- I am not talking to you at all as mere "selves." I cannot talk to a "self," because "selves" have ulterior motives. I do not talk to you for letting you pass an examination. I'm not interested in this. You may be interested in this, unfortunately. But that's a by-product of the course. If I would think, "How do I make this boy bypass a course," you see, I certainly couldn't teach you anything.

Therefore I -- try to save the truth beyond you, through you. But you are just the -- the -- the -- the hose through which the water must be -- you see, poured so that it reaches out into the future. Don't take yourself as a -- never ask this question, "What do I get out of this?" This is impossible for you to solve. The truth is not there to be taken -- so that you can get something out of it. The truth is much more important than you, because it connects you and makes you out of selves into links of the whole edifice.

Therefore I -- try to save the truth beyond you, through you. But you are just the -- the -- the -- the hose through which the water must be -- you see, poured so that it reaches out into the future. Don't take yourself as a -- never ask this question, "What do I get out of this?" This is impossible for you to solve. The truth is not there to be taken -- so that you can get something out of it. The truth is much more important than you, because it connects you and makes you out of selves into links of the whole edifice.

Therefore, gentlemen, Melville has a second wavelength on which he travels with -- in his eloquence, he covers three centuries. Here is the year 1600 that reaches America poignantly once more, after the divines and their servants have exhausted themselves, after nobody's -- reads the Bible. But if you read Moby-Dick, you still read the Bible, because the -- the perception is still there of a cosmic universe in which God has man -- has loved man so much that He has sent his inborn son into the world. The cosmos, the whole creation is -- is in Melville.

This makes you perhaps understand why his -- his importance begins only today. It took him a whole century to get a hearing, because he is reaching

be- -- backward -- beyond -- Franklin and Cooper, and -- and whom d- -- else did we have? Well, I would say Emerson, or Thoreau, but whom else did we treat? Well, even beyond Edwards with his -- division of the natural man and the religious man. In -- he is still a man of 1500. That is, before this country is -- is reached, so to speak.

This I think is terribly important that you begin to see that this is the reason why he couldn't be heard in his generation. Anybody who travels on a wavelength that is so long, of course can only get a hearing by ears that are not given to the immediate, only. Now you will admit that in 1850, this country slunk into the Provi- -- Missouri Proviso, The Sociology of the South was written, the '50s have -- the Know-Nothing Party was founded -- that is, the early McCarthys. In 1858, they tried to -- yes, they tried to write the McCarran law even worse than today, you see, taking away full citizenship from the -- from the newcomers to this country. Everything in the '50s was exactly of the same class of hopeless, faithless, immediate selfishness, and without this -- that's why the Republican Party had to be founded in 1854, you see, because it was such a low ebb in -- in America. You can hardly imagine. If you read The Sociology of the South, where slavery is recommended as a -- the natural institution, you see, as final, as -- as the best thing to be -- you must read this. The Sociology of the South is a very important book. In Europe at the same time there was written the book on the inequality of the human races by the Count de Gobineau. And it was the moment which God really seemed to hold His breath, because sla- -- all the injustices were suddenly consecrated, seemed just, you see -- life seemed to have -- lose all its direction. In France, the -- the workers had been, as you know, crushed by Napoleon III, so the reaction was everywhere. In this moment, Melville tries to {cry}, you see. And there is no reaction. And in his Pierre, he pro- -- so to speak predicts that selfish man that must come out of such a spiritless life. If every generation is only left to itself, this is the result.

The whole endeavor, I try to make you, is to build carefully out of this two-generation unit the larger units of history, gentlemen. Once you understand that the times do not consist of one moment, and then more moments, and more moments, but always consist of the dialogue inside every one of you, between what you have received and what you have to hand on, then you see that this dualism, of holding onto part of the past and creating something in the future, is the two-generation principle. And it's worth looking at this, because it explains what we have to do today. It explains that -- for example, the teacher-student relationship, the parent-son relationship -- is at the heart of all our understanding of living, because it has been marooned. It has been abandoned. I mean, the parents just do not dare to tell the children anything.

Today we get a call. Mrs. Huessy wanted to go skiing with a young mother who needs it badly. She's completely overworked. She has a 14-year-old daughter. The daughter has decided that she wants to stay at home. She feels -- doesn't feel well. She went out too many evenings. It's a very simple thing. So the mother says, "She would feel lonely if I went skiing." So I -- since this girl doesn't go to school, she must stay with this girl. This is this kind of parent-slavery, which you have today. It's utterly ridiculous, you see, why -- if she -- the girl would go to school, she would allow herself to go skiing, but of course this child is just -- has to sleep out, so to speak, because she had too much pleasure the last four years, the mother must even have no pleasure on the fifth day. The logic is -- you see, too -- too exalted. Well, they found a wonderful way out. The younger boy of 10 decided then not to go to school, either. Then the mother said, "Now I can go skiing, because they both can play together."

But it is this idea that for the first 20 years of life you have only to have pleasure and willfulness, you see, and after this, you have nothing, absolutely nothing. This is -- we have Heaven first and hell later, today. You will see that, when you have to wash the dishes.

So come forward with your { }, will you?

(I don't know that I have time to read it, Sir. I might run a few minutes over.)

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(January 21st, 1954. Philosophy 57.)

...seven and -- no, it was in -- a course then called American Philosophy in 20. A boy from New York gave a report on Henry Adams. He stood up there. Was a six feet -- foot six tall boy, blond and very healthy looking and he said, "Gentlemen. This is us, the part of us that has to be buried." And he made quite an impression on the class. That was during the war even, 1942, I think. Henry Adams is in all of you, in all of you, much more than you are inclined to admit. It's there in a very primitive form, but it's there. And it is all the negative elements of your time with -- for which you are not in the sense responsible, but which is -- may explain to you what original sin is. That is, it has just -- is around you. It's everywhere in the nicks -- nooks and niches of your veins, and of your vocabulary, and of the environment, and of the wavelengths on which you can speak to other people in your fraternity or at a commencement, or wherever it is. And therefore it is so terribly important that you should see this man, because such a report is -- the -- the two reports are the beginning of your power to master him. If you shun him, if you say, "That's not for me. I'm an optimist," or so, you have not -- at all really conquered him. He's there. And therefore I want you to understand that in no other case is it so much your own life that is at stake.

We -- you can say that Mr. Adams has made an attempt of a Newtonian sociology. A Newtonian sociology would be perhaps a good summing-up of what you gave us, I mean -- you -- you see. The third person, you see, an inanimate object -- and I like very much your -- your -- explanation of his being driven into this third person to escape the conversation with his wife and the confession that he was, after all, a -- a man who had been loved by a woman.

The third person, gentlemen, in all these modern psychologies and sociologies of the naturalistic caliber is a repression. If you speak of yourself as "he," and if you try to speak of mankind as "it," as is perfectly possible -- modern man tries even to treat of man as "What is man?" There is now this new book by Mr. Hocking and {Blanchard} and all the rest, which begins with the chapter, "What is Man?" Now, if what is -- man is "what," then it is "it." This is -- still one step further than Henry Adams. He -- at least said "he," you see. But Mr. Hocking already says "it." And all psychology says, "What is man?"

Anybody who asks "What is man?" must get as an answer, "He is something." Now man is neither "what" nor "something." He is -- the only thing you really know is that you are somebody to whom somebody has said -- is saying all the time "thee." You are "thees." When the Quakers say, "to thou and thee," they very clearly place man in his right frame of reference. This man, as long as his wife was alive, was to her, "thee." You may call it "you," but this is ambiguous. I only choose "thee" to make clear that it is not "thou." "Thee" is a very important form of "thou," because I become somebody as a child in the cradle, because my mother smiles at me, you see. "Me" and "thee" are clearer for a status of man than "I" and "thou." That's why I have a -- some grudge with the modern fashion of talking of the "I" and "thou." I have -- nobody can be "I and thou," because you are either "thee," you see, or "me," through the other person. That's a very great difference, you see. If "I" and "thou" are only two people, then they are still two "hes," or "he" and "she." No difference between the {undeclensed} -- the unchanged "I and thou." It's really just a projection of what we had formally with "he" and "she."

The radical change is when you see that this man, as long as his wife was alive, in 1885, he said -- had somebody who told him, "Henry, put on your rain-coat. It will -- it's going to rain." That is, he is under orders. Gentlemen, where we are loved, we are under orders. And this being under orders keeps a man sane. As soon as you are not under orders in any respect, you are in great danger. That's why a monk takes a vow of obedience, because the monk thereby is aiming at perfection. A man who has no orders to take is by this very fact imperfect. That's why the dream of the self-made man is so terrible, because a man who has no orders to take cannot be free, because how he handles this order shows his freedom. But if you con- -- think that freedom consists in no -- having no orders to fulfill, then you have no meaning.

The second thing that follows, gentlemen, if the "thee" is that first starting point for my health, for my sanity, then the "I" is the real response. Because somebody gives me orders, I can then turn to the world and say, "In the name of this order which I have received to be such-and-such, I can tell you." The "I" is always the answer to your calling. When a painter says, "{Paint thee}," it is because he knows perfectly well that he has to crush the world by his painting. So he must be very cocksure that he has received this command to be a painter. If you are weak, and the painter meets with no success, and the public says, "You are a fool, we won't buy your pictures," then the weakling who hasn't this real order must, you see, give up painting and become a plumber, or a statesman, or what-not, you see, and say, like Churchill, "Painting is only for my pleasure. If they won't buy my pictures, I'd better become prime minister."

But where you are serious, gentlemen, you can resist -- in y- -- in you -- as "I" -- the disapproval of the world outside. You see, "I" is a force in life, which is indifferent, more or less, of course -- only in degrees -- to the disapproval of the rest of the crowd. Mr. Mc- -- Eisenhower must say "I" and he must be indifferent to your pleasure and displeasure, because otherwise he can't be president. But he must have received his order to become president from a source which has nothing to do with your -- my approval or disapproval.

Now what I'm driving at is -- gentlemen, is that man is always in this triangular relation, and that Newtonian sociology, which makes him an inanimate being, is not just reducing man from an "I" into a "he." That would be not the tragedy. But what you are faced with, in your own thinking is that you try to consider yourself as being deprived of two relations, not of -- only of one. You are not only treated impersonally by statistics or questionnaires, but you are also treated without this dangling command over your heads which tells you what to do. This is declared to be { }, not existing. Now, no "I," gentlemen, exists without this -- this "thee" and the marriage of -- and the father and the grandfather, especially -- express this. When he was on the staff of his father, he had it just naturally, you see, as having to work within a team in London. And no doubt about it, of his loyalty, you see. And James -- Henry Adams' problem is that he outgrew those natural situations of command and obedience, of loyalty -- and we all do. Only in his case, he -- they lasted somewhat longer. They -- you already have outgrown them at this moment. Perhaps when you go to the army, you have it again. But your first loyalty -- now this man was privileged. He had a father, and a grandfather, and Jefferson to worship. So he -- in three layers he finally got rid of his loyalties. But you must see that Adams is the better American, and the better model case of your own life, because his loyalties carried him to his -- to -- until 1877. Only when he resigned from Harvard and was -- finished his history of the Jeffersonian administration, was he through with his loyalty, you see, with the things that ordered and commanded his respect, his service, his explanation, you see, his -- application of their life.

Of course all this is only another form of describing you once more the Henry Adams and William Ada- -- Will- -- Henry James and William James situation, because I tried to show you that William James, as long as he said "I," had always the eloquence of the father in front of him, who had made it conducive to him to speak in his own name, but within this frame of reference of a loving father who had preceded him, and whose vocabulary, or whose way of speaking he could supersede, but who was still there all the time. We have talked about this at great length, but I want you -- to furnish you with some vocabulary which

is now not taken from the real situation of the James family, but from this modern ideology of the "it" and the "he" about man. The -- Henry Adams was in a way still less degenerate than you, because you actually think that the question "What is man?" can be asked.

I've just published an essay in Germany in which I refute this. In the name of the laity, the layman, I say all these experts who ask this question do something -- senseless, ridiculous.

So would you kindly see these four stages: I, two, three, four. That's the abnormal sequence through which, so to speak, or -- in which direction our poor Henry Adams traveled. And you all find yourself already in this fourth, hapless stage. Anybody who asks about himself, "What am I?" can never find an answer. Never. So the question has to be dismissed. And as long as you do not dismiss the question, you are a Newtonian sociologist. A Newtonian -- Newtonianism is superseded, is ridiculous.

To put it from another angle: if you take the fixation of the atoms, everybody will -- mentions his -- second thermodynamic law, which is entropism. Up above this, as you -- very rightly said, is for the living things, devolution. Above this in society is -- there is degradation. Above this, there is crisis. And above this there is catastrophe, the end of the world.

Now I do not agree with you, gentle- -- {Reed}, that he did not prophesy correctly. This isn't -- he did prophesy I think correctly. All prophecy says a little more than what happens. But you cannot dismiss the two world wars from not being part of the prophecy. That is the catastrophe of the democratic dogma. After all, we have today a -- absolutism, state absolutism with Mr. -- Mr. -- the people raging in the state department on mere suspicion. We have a new form of government. There is no democracy in the United States at this moment. We have a complete change of all the -- all the principles of government. And we have two armed camps. And we have the atomic bomb. And before, we have destruction and complete -- certainly -- destruction of Europe, which -- in -- of course, entails the vision of Henry Adams, that by 1917, the human mind -- you'll remember, {Reed}, will have to take a jump, because it will not longer be able to deal with reality, and we'll not understand it any longer. Well, that's exactly what happened, when the United States plunged into the World War I. Ever since, the Unite- -- people of the United States have not known what they have been doing. Do you know what we are doing now? Nobody knows. We're just in the dark. And they are always -- ever since 1917. Man has lost control. In Europe, they lost control in 19- -- 1819, is -- is my guess. In America, it happened a

little later. We had here a kind of respite. But do you think we are not drifting at this moment? Just wait and see what happens in three days in Berlin. You will be surprised.

Well, look at this. These are five forms of { }. What -- which term is lacking here, gentlemen? Which makes the naturalistic mind, the "he" mind, the "it" mind, the inanimate object mind seemingly scientific? If you look at these entropies, and devolution, degradation, crisis, and catastrophe, which very simple experience of humanity is not in it? They are all negative terms.

(Salvation.)

Wie?

(Salvation.)

I speak of negative terms. What happened to Mrs. Adams?

(Death.)

Yes. She died. Now, you see, in the days before the inanimate dogma, the "it" dogma of Mr. Henry Adams, people were naive enough to say, "I must die." And they tried to build an -- edifice of creeds, and faiths, and beliefs around this very simple fact that all men must die. And so the word "death" appears in all traditions before 1600 at the foremost place. You will see that all modern science tries to evade the term "death." This is -- has become unnecessary. We have the machine age. We shall replace all the appendices, and eyes, and brains, you see. We have an artificial brain, and Mr. Lindbergh went so far to invent an artificial heart, as you know, and death is unnecessary. And when you -- when people can help it, they don't speak of death. That's unappetizing, I mean.

A friend of mine, I told you, died in his own house, very meaningfully to the great blessing of his family, and the neighbor said, "How indecent, not to go to the hospital," because a -- decent man is not seen when he dies. It's obscene, you see.

That's the p- -- point of the -- that's -- would be the point of the dyna- -- age of the dynamo, you see. Death is never to be mentioned. So you can see that all the people, since Herbert Spencer, and Stuart Mill, and all these apostles of the Enlightenment for -- the human society, Mr. Comte, and Henry Adams -- foremost in his books -- have to project the reason why they have to think so

hard into terms that omit the cause of their thinking: death. It's all projection. And you know what projection is in psychoanalysis: it's an inability to face the cause for your -- mental processes.

Modern man cannot fathom why he thinks, as long as he d- -- isn't confronted with the simple truth that we think because we have -- must die. Or some -- our beloved die. But I mean, it is just as urgent that we think, because your parents die, or your comrade in arms in Korea dies, as you yourself die. I'm even inclined to think that we -- we think, our mental operations are feverishly at work more, even, because other people die, the people whom we love, than that we die. I don't think that man's mind is just concentrating on his own survival. He's much more puzzled when somebody he has taken for granted is suddenly eliminated. That's a very hard thing to believe, and that's your thinking. Any gap in your -- in that what you for -- take for granted as your environment makes your thinking. And death is the form in which this -- this occurs, that you must think. Without death, we would not think, you see. Any boy who wouldn't have fea- -- to fear dying -- fear death in some form would sleep with 10,000 women, would go to all kind of debt, because after all, if we do not die, there is no vindication. Why shouldn't we behave very badly, like the Olympian gods? And you know, they behaved very badly, because they couldn't die. Not to -- not to die means that you are unpunishable.

What I have tried to say is, gentlemen, that the era of -- from 1600 to today, in which -- into which you are born more than -- than people in -- on other continents, because of the history of America, these people from -- Mr. Descartes onward -- Coperni- -- and Galilei, too, to today, all live under the superstition that by projecting death into some process in nature, you will escape the nearness of death in your own life. This looks so objective. Entropism is the getting colder of the whole world -- well, it freezes out, and we would, you see, die in the process, but very indirectly. All this is indirection. Nothing is directly pointing to you. It is all indirect. And this is what the scientific generalization always does.

Any generalization, gentlemen, you see, omits the -- the real motive -- the ulterior motive by which we are forced to generalize. And only he is master of his destiny who knows what makes Sammy run, what makes you and me think. And we do think because we must die. If only we would live, we would not think. And since most Americans have removed death from their thinking processes, consciously, they make -- give the impression very often to me that they cannot think. I mean, most American boys and girls -- as you know, girls no less than men, and politicians and men in the public eye -- I have the impression that

they are all like Grover {Vale}. They cannot think. They think anything that's needed at this moment -- they're pragmatic. Today they think that the Communists are bad, and in 1940, that the Communists were wonderful. So they think every day, but is it thinking? That's reflection -- like a mirror. You hold a mirror before them, and they -- it will show the -- the picture of the moment. A kaleidoscope is not thinking. The American mind, gentlemen, is not thinking because the -- I think I gave it in the other class, this -- great sentence of a man who died a thousand years ago. He had on his tombstone: "He fluctuates, who wants to live forever" in Latin. Very wonderful word. Will you take this down? He fluctuates, who wants to live forever. And to think means to stabilize the truth beyond your fluctuations. And the American mind wants to fluctuate, and therefore it has no truth. No truth whatsoever, except for the unimportant things of the inanimate world. I mean, how oil behaves, you know. And how stones behave. It's -- it's rather uninteresting. We would like to know how you behave. But this is un- -- impossible with this -- with this {pipedream}.

Now take Henry Adams' situation within these -- gentlemen, this would be the {farrest} future, the catastrophe, which he prophesies for 1922. The crisis would be on hand, the present. The degradation would be the immediate past, so to speak -- yesterday -- or even today. The devolution would be the -- from 1600 onward, from America's founding, from the Pilgrim Fathers. And the entropism would be the universal law of all the past. If you put it in terms of Henry Adams' relation to time -- allow me to put it strictly this way -- to him the -- the -- all these times before 1600 are his museums. That's a museum past, or "antiquity," they call it. The {virgin} is very old, it's ancient, it's gone. You cannot revive it. Put here the word "antiquity."

As to America's devolution, degradation, this is -- if you take the whole thing -- this is the tradition, or the "history" you can also say. This would be the loyalties. This would be your task. And this would be your destiny. Any man, gentlemen, is faced with all these five relations, you hanging in this network. Certain parts of the world are definitely over. You cannot go back to the tertiary or the -- you see, or the -- any geological age, before our time. That's antiquity. Wherever you draw the line, you see, you say, "This is no longer anything," you see, "I can do anything about it." With regard to tradition, it's different. You can do something about tradition. You can keep this tradition of Jeffersonian democracy -- you can keep alive. Loyalties to your father, in -- as in London, when he worked at the embassy, you can enact. They are still operating. The task, that's your own. And Henry Adams said, "I have nothing to do in this world." He absolved himself, after his wife had died, from any task. Isn't that true? And destiny he only described in term of his entropism, you see, which is certainly

the opposite, the negative destiny. The destiny of the earth is to turn burn up -- to freeze up, I should say. Not to burn up by atomic energy, but to freeze up, to die by -- by -- {inernition}.

So you see there is a great relation between these minuses. This is all minus. Every word here which I have put is plus, because even a museum is plus, because it is that which has to be respected of the past. The beauty that was Rome, the beauty that was Greece, you see. That is, museum, but not indifferent antiquity, you see. Something highly respectable.

Here we have five pluses. I think that's quite interesting, gentlemen. You can describe the scientific bluff of the last hundred years as putting everywhere the minus before the -- instead of the plus. Only in Henry Adams' case it's so very purebred, it's so very complete. Most of your -- the people you meet are half-baked. They have one minus: "Decline of the West. That would be no task for us, it's -- you see, Europe is doomed anyway, and we just retire into isolationism or whatever. No task. Let me alone." Or whatever -- how you express it. That would be just a minus with regard to the present-day crisis. If you say, for example, that you are against universal service, that means that you -- not even this minimum of a task for a modern American is given to you. "Let's evade the draft," as most Americans at this moment think. "Let me alone, and I've be- -- we have been confused enough for the last 35 years." Degradation -- you see it from Mr. Edgar Hoover, or from Mr. -- Mr. -- how is this man called in the state department who makes the investigations?

{Scott McLloyd}.)

Wie?

{Scott McLloyd}. {Scott McLloyd}.)

Yes, yes, yes, you see. Suspicion makes law. Well, it does. It is the demo- -- degradation of the democratic dogma, the dogma -- the government is there without the support of the people, and it has -- a right to suspect the people, and suspicion is enough to be fired. That's a new one. It's the degradation of the democratic dogma, as it is inevitable, gentlemen. In -- in Cleon, the tanner Cleon, after Pericles, had -- produced the very same effect in -- in Athens. The abuses of democracy must always lead to some form of absolutism. And that's what we have all over the world. Wherever you look, it's just inevitable. Abuse leads always to some -- you see -- other form of government. And you can only hope it's very mild with us. We -- I mean, we have -- we are blessed still that we go

slowly in this. But the degradation of the democratic dogma certainly has done its -- its -- has worked -- wormed itself into our history. And 70 years after Henry Adams, even the man on the street knows it. He w- -- at that time, he was the only man who knew it.

Now gentlemen, if you now look at *The Education of Henry Adams*, let me now -- or say one thing more. If you see that destiny, task, loyalty, tradition, and antiquity, which we may call "respect," or what we no longer do ourselves, "reverence" perhaps is go- -- better word still than "respect," that then you see that his great tragedy was, of the naturalist, that he in a way tried every one of these directions of action -- for action, but I think he never understood as you and I must understand, gentlemen, that we do in our lives these five things -- five different things in time, at a different degree of directness, of immediacy, of exposure to God or reality, or the Devil, or whatever you call the open road of real life.

When the war is declared and you are sent to Pearl Harbor, that is a catastrophe which is -- takes over and your des- -- the destiny of America is at stake. Your life disappears as a -- in importance. You have no -- task of your own. It is the destiny of the nation, and you may believe very well, of mankind which on December 7th, 1941, was suddenly challenged. I'm -- I feel this way. And a man who is asked to enter upon an enterprise of these dimensions of undecided openness, where the whole destiny of man may take a turn in a new direction, is dealing with firsthand life, the question of life and death. And you can be sure that where there is no risk of death there is not the highest degree of life. That which cost- -- doesn't cost life, you see, usually is not very important. A martyr is more important than 10,000 books on theology. That's obvious, because one is ink and the other is blood. And General Booth is 10,000 more -- times more important than the people who wrote at his time that Christianity was finished. Since -- thanks to the primitive spirit of General Booth, who founded the Salvation Army, there is still another branch of Christianity alive today. And all the people who -- in 1870 who wrote up Christianity as finished -- they are just forgotten. They are not very interesting.

All this deals with -- with death. "Destiny" means that we have to decide whether we'll believe in a cause and are willing to die for it. Now, Henry Adams said, "We'll die, anyway. Therefore, nobody must die for anything." His wife, of course, defied him by her suicide. And that is the great tragedy, that he never understood in this perversion, in this distortion what life is all about in -- under Ivan the Terrible in Russia in the 16th cen- -- 17th century. Yes, Ivan is the 16th century, isn't he?

(Yes.)

16th century. The first journalist of Russia wrote that politics was only serious when heads were at stake, that all other politics are just a game, as they were in American democracy, you see, down to 1917. You get persecution, and you get McCarthy, and you get all these things today, because politics begin to become serious, and then they require risk, you see. Before, it's just a game, and makes no difference. It's just a -- a racket. Now rackets are not serious, but politics is very serious.

You know, civili- -- generals in peacetime want to make a career, three stars, four stars, five stars they want to get, these West Pointers. But Clemenceau, Georges Clemenceau, the great Frenchman said, you know, the Second World -- the First World War, you see, wars are too serious to be left to the generals. You understand? Wars are too serious to be left to the generals, because to the general, that's a civilian career. That is something within his life. But for Clemenceau, it was a risk of his existence, of his -- of his -- of his reputation, of his after- -- life and -- as Churchill now writes in the -- in his memoirs that in modern wars, the leaders are just executed who lose the war. The reason is because we have so competent officers, generals. And since they make it just a lifetime career, and not a question of dying on the battlefield, somebody has to pay the penalty for wrong leadership. The generals are not the ones who pay any penalty. They get a pension, and a lackey, and a car, and a staff.

It's very serious, gentlemen. We have so much competency, so much expert knowledge in an army, that the real leadership of the army can no longer be in the expert. Never can an expert lead in catastrophe, gentlemen. Catastrophes invite much deeper forces of men. There -- the -- are -- is always a religious situation in which the man who has faith is the important man. Not the man who has an office. What's an office? Lee -- take Grant, he has to be -- he's swept into office, you see, because all the generals are nobody. He's a drunkard, and he's bankrupt, and he's nobody, but he can win battles, as Lincoln says. So give me any man who can win battles. If he has no antecedents of a general, I still make him commander-in-chief. The commander-in-chief is not just the general with five stars. It's a great mistake. I'm afraid but we just {learned that}.

Gentlemen, catastrophe is inherent in our exposure to death. Catastrophe invites us to invest our life into a -- the risky business of dying for the good cause. That is the character of cri- -- catastrophe, and the destiny of man, gentlemen, will never be found by shallow philosophies, or by shallow theologies, or

by sermons on Sunday. The -- what your des- -- what you consider the destiny of mankind becomes only known by those acts of you where you risk your life. Any -- young man who jumps into the river to -- save a drowning child does more to the destiny of the human race than all the nice programs written in ink, you see. That has nothing to do with our destiny. The man may lie. The man may have illusions. He has dreams, you see. But the man who jumps into the river, says -- what does he say? What's in this act so great? What does he proclaim as a destiny of mankind? Which dogma is -- prevails in such a moment, can you tell me? { }.

What? What is -- what -- why is a man who -- who saves -- at the danger of his own life -- a drowning child, why is restoring the destiny of the human race into reality? Because he believes in the solidarity of the human race. That is, he defies the idea that man was created single, as an individual, you see. He says, "The opposite is true," you see. We have created an -- nobody can be saved without saving the last, other man. That is Christianity. That's all religion, gentlemen. You cannot be saved unless everybody else is saved. That's the difference from the -- an objective point of view of the scientist who says, "I describe your life, and I describe another man's life, but I know nothing, you see, of your destiny." Well, the destiny of man is very simple, gentlemen. Since we are on this earth, the solidarity of the human race is the whole problem of history, isn't it? What I'm trying to -- have tried to show you is the very profound solidarity between the various generations of man. It is very easy to -- jump into the river and to save a drowning child, or to go into a third story where there -- a blaze and save a baby in the cradle. That's nothing compared to the difficulty of saving your grandfather from oblivion, because you are inclined to put fire to his memory, and to have him drown. And so I told you, William James woke up to the fact that his father could not drown. That's -- that -- then meant -- begins when there is solidarity. When you feel solidarity with a Stone Age Indian, then you begin to live as a human being; 58 and 10, as you know, are devoted to this. Now, let us look into this further please, gentlemen. Tasks would be lifetime appointments. That is, not the whole life from birth to death, but purposive living, which is only one-half of life. You see, if you are president, or judge, or teacher, or professor, or a research man, this is not your whole existence. You have still your private life, you have your friends, you see, you have your -- your offspring. Your vocation, to most people, this looks as the whole of life. It's only one-half of life. It's only the waking part of life, you see. You are not this when you sleep. But a man in prison who is to be executed, these poor boys in Korea, they are there under destiny. That is, their sleep is wrecked; their nerves are

ruined. Their total existence is involved, which again, people st- -- don't seem to realize at this moment with these -- with these poor prisoners. Well, we had some argument about this in this class, I suppose.

And I only want to remind you that any prisoner is nearer to the destiny and the catastrophes of the human race than all these smug people who go on the subway to their offices downtown New York. That's why you have to pray for prisoners. They need it. And you cannot be indifferent to their fate, as everybody seems still to be, with these Korean prisoners. That is your participation in the faith of the human race. You have no religion if you are not deeply more excited over these prisoners, and more interested in the -- in the investment of \$1 billion of General Motors, because the task is a lifetime task, but it is not your whole existence. It is not in this total sense life -- your life and your death. That's why a man in business retires at a certain age and dismisses it because it isn't he who is this business, you see. It's a part of him.

The loyalties, gentlemen, make you into an appendix of something that has lived. You live on. You are lived by loyalty. If you are, in your town, distinguished -- like Senator Taft -- if he had stayed in Washington, he would have remained just an appendix to his father's memories. But he went to Ohio, and that was a very clever move, a very intelligent move, in order to build up once more his own, you see, -- following and his own loyalty. And I think that's his greatest political act, in -- in -- in -- in -- in Taft's life, that he began from scratch again, and did not simply live on the loyalties of the people to his father's memory.

So, loyalties, gentlemen, are once more removed from the challenge of your individual soul, of your own life. They are still very alive, very much alive. Anybody who is junior, anybody who follows in his father's footsteps -- don't say that he is not carrying on life, but he is not creating it. He is respecting it, he is continuing it, and that's -- needs to be done. So it is -- in the sense, however, of challenge, of risk -- it is the third degree of vitality. Don't mean that I'm disparaging any of these vitalities. I'm a museum character by -- by birth. That is, I would love to have to do only with antiquity and antiquarianism. I'm a philologist by nature, so to speak, and I worship at old texts, and old vases, and old -- old pyramids. But I had to learn in my life that there is a very severe order of direct responsibility and indirect. Tradition, gentlemen, when he wrote -- when -- when -- when Henry Adams wrote the history of Jeffersonian democracy, he wrote a very good book. It's -- I recommend it to you. It has come out now in an abbreviated edition -- condensed, rather cheap. It's very good reading; a very brilliant writer, he is. And another man -- a man here at Dartmouth, a professor,

would be proud if he only had written this book his whole life, and done nothing else. And that's enough for the ordinary man, this one work of his. So he is -- Henry Adams, after all, is a man of some capacity and some scope; because that's just a sideline between 1870 and 1877: he is a professor at Harvard, and so he has then this professorial book coming to him, you see, as his output. How many volumes?

(Nine.)

Imagine! Well, as I said, nowadays a modern man at Harvard s- -- just says, "That's all I can do." And then he gets the Nobel Prize for bad literature.

So this man just, as a sideline, wrote up his -- his -- the tradition of America, the Jeffersonian tradition. And finally he went to France, and saw the 12th century, and fell in love with the museum and did this.

So if you would kindly see. This is here London. This is here his history book. This is his Saint-Michel and Chartres. He has -- that's The Education, and that's the degradation of the democratic dogma. That's his other book; instead of a vocation, this -- this accusation of his time, which doesn't offer him any task, negative to his task.

I think what is the trouble, gentlemen, with the scientist is something which you can study in -- in Adams. We all live today a monistic life, something -- anything that happens in any one year seems to be on the same level of historical happening. That is, here in 1954, let's say, you graduate, I write a book, President Eisenhower is -- is moving -- giving a message to Congress, war is declared in -- in Berlin or what-not, I don't know, and France and England are severing their ties with the United States, and you put this all on the same level, and you say this -- all this happened -- as a gazetteer really does -- and say, "This is all what happens." And I think all scientific thinking, gentlemen, has no yardstick of evaluation, the directness or the indirectness of an event, with regard to real life.

Now I would suggest, gentlemen, that we live in five rings of immediacy.

And that any event that demands death, sacrifice of life is first-rate action. That anything that -- asks personal devotion, that is, somebody saying "This is my business, since it is nobody else's business," you see, this taking-up of something that nobody else does is already second, but very great, very needed; that anything third, loyalty, is to be carried on, is in the third ring of mediated life. And so on it goes, gentlemen, until we come to the mus- -- objective description of

myself, or the Museum of Modern Arts, or ancient arts, or what-not, where I try to look at myself as an inanimate object, there I live the world of museums and the ivory tower of Dartmouth College, or however you describe this attitude of looking at things. Wherever you have this attitude of looking at things, you are in the fifth environment, in the fifth sphere, so to speak, you see. You are outside the realm of risk, obviously. You see, when you look at the -- world as consisting of things, you have forgotten that you are mortal. You have forgotten that the whole world may come to an end. You have forgotten, you see, all danger and death. You have finally projected all this into a process, you see, that takes care of itself without your having to do anything about it. And that fits modern man. And that's you.

And since you grade the dignity of your thinking in the perverted order of thinking that you think better when you think in the fifth sphere of -- of indifference, and objectivity, and that you think least when you know that the destiny of mankind is at stake, you are counted out. You are degenerates. You are frozen. You are on the side of Henry Adams. That's -- is his tragedy which he has lived, so that you may not live it, that you may reverse the process, that you may not think that in these five circles, the fifth circle is the best, the Einsteinian circle. That is Einstein here. That is the entropism, the -- that's the law of the universe, or however you call it -- the relativity, here. Let's put it here. "Relativity" is the purest expression of this, which makes no difference for the physicist, whether he does blow up the universe by the atom bomb. He wants to construe it, so he leaves it to us and say, "Do what you please. I don't { } when to use it, when not to use it," you see.

I'll give you -- in a moment, again, shall give you a little -- oh, Heavens.

My time is up? Would you allow me another five minutes?

(You want these { }, Sir?)

{ }. This would be the sphere which you -- what you use -- call "criticism," or "free criticism," or "free thought." Instead of a personal task, we -- you sit there and say, "The times are really very decadent, and very degenerate," and what can you do? Weeping on somebody else's shoulder, you see, and have a cocktail and say, "It's really too bad." That's what most of us do, instead of a task. The task, gentlemen -- that's what the contemporaries of -- of General Booth did, you mean. They criticized already the downfall of -- already then of the Church and Booth said, "I don't know. { } -- people have to be saved." And you { } absolutely right, you see, then I'll save them five minutes before the end." So I prefer always Booth to the critics. Booth and { }, {he had} a very good name.

This here, you see, you see very much in American business: tradition, loyalty kept going. But I wished it would do more. Men should follow their pa- -- fathers in their footsteps, if there is any hope that the office or the business can be kept alive, because there's so little loyalty in this country that I think we need every bit of loyalty and fan to some little fire, and some little flame. I think -- you find it -- all the -- quite some feeling about these loyalties. I -- they remind me of the alumni fund. It's not a laughable thing. It's a remarkable achievement.

Then you have traditions. The traditions are not represented by physical bonds of the grandfather. But the Pilgrim Fathers today and Jonathan Edwards, and Cotton Mather, the men I have tried to invoke in this course, you see, they are tradition. But the loyalty has to be re-tapped, re-attached. Isn't this clear. I mean, there is no loyalty to Jonathan Edwards. You have considered him a fool. And Cotton Mather -- he's notorious because of the Salem witch trials. Certainly, you see, a negative tradition. But you see, he's still within a context of which we have a certain immediate understanding, although gone through a very critical mill. And this would be then the revered part of humanity, Jerusalem, and Palestine, and the so-called sacred places, which nobody thinks to be sacred, but he talks about it, like our poor Melville, going there in 1858 and -- and finding just def- -- decadence is there. And doing -- being unable really to see more than a museum.

Gentlemen, no -- no. This is all wrong. Pardon me. I made a -- I made a -- quite a --. You obviously -- pardon me. Going all wrong. So you see, here is the destiny, in the center. Here is the task. Here is the loyalty. Here is {tradition}. And outside, there is the relativity. Now, I have not -- I could have put in perhaps one ring in between physics and -- and history, the biological -- or medicine, but it wouldn't -- it wouldn't change the -- the importance, gentlemen, of this scheme. The scheme means that by modern man thinking, by modern man thinking, he is hip to think at the most indifferent, the most superfluous, the standard of living, the relativity, the machine. The -- this is all very nice, gentlemen. Everything -- all the four others are living. But what you have to solve is to care for these prisoners, and to drown -- to save drowning people, because otherwise the whole meaning of all the four other rings disappears, because then you have no direction.

Gentlemen, here at the kernel of your own existence, and of everybody's existence today the direction in which we are meant to travel has to be reaffirmed. And this is the center of being. The meaning can never come from this periphery. Never can physics give any meaning to your existence.

(Sir, would you say the -- the outside ring is important to us only as the inner rings, or {essentially} more important? In other words, we realize that the most important is -- what you're calling there as the inner ring, and you can also attach importance to the outer rings, too, but if you say...)

Well, let me put it this way, gentlemen. Every man is at stake here. Some men are delegated to the periphery. Some -- more men are delegated to the traditions. Still more men to the loyalties. Still more -- more to the courage of personal task. And all -- everybody, child, woman, and man, are -- have to be dedicated to our destiny. This must be universal. But this is the { } for a few. I don't have to understand physics. Let Mr. Einstein do that. I don't have to understand chemistry, you see. These are things for specialists. And we -- they are delegations from the core of mankind. They have forgotten this. They think they are making us. They are making us. We are delegating them. I allow Mr. Einstein to be a physicist, because I am {then a true} layman, and you do, you see. The child of man, the child of nature, the -- God's child, the man who is sure of the solidarity of the human race, he can even keep solidarity with the scoundrels who threw the bombs on Hiroshima. But if everybody would throw always bombs on Hiroshima, gentlemen, there would be no mankind; there would be certainly no meaning in our existence. It must remain an exception, isn't that true? Cannot be the rule. Now who sets the rule, and who says it is an exception? Can the man whom we hire to be the exception -- the physicist -- can he set the rule for our existence? He cannot. We allow him to think in such general terms about the universe, that it doesn't matter whether it happened 600 million before Christ or 600 million after Christ.

To give you now a last point of -- it's not so much a pointer to your understanding of this disease of the -- Henry Adams' and your own mind. Gentlemen, Henry Adams had 60,000 -- 19 thous- -- hundred years going before. When we take 1600, he had 300 years forward-looking. You said 70 still remaining, but this means that if you begin a second -- wie?

(Seventeen { }.)

Seventeen. Oh, yes. Quite. Well, but this comes, you see, if you divide his history, you can really put the incision in -- into 1600, and 17 is the last part of the 300, from 16- -- beginning with 1600.

({ } from the 12th century.)

Oh no, not the break. The break is in 1600. 1200 is the perfection of the 90,000 years.

(Then turns around and goes the other way.)

Exactly. So, that's only -- as you said 17, but I think it's just a quibbling of words. But whether it's 17 or 300 it would be short in any case. But I think it's only fair for him -- to him to give him the 300, you see. You will see that it makes a little difference. I want to point out that Mr. Henry Adams is very, very much wiser still than the modern evolutionists or -- or -- he has, as you know, 600 -- in fact he has 1 billion years for the universe. You don't have to say this formula for the length of the universe, with the -- which really is a billion -- a billion years.

Well, that's the past. And as their future, they have the Third World War, ask Mr. Oppenheimer. That is, whenever -- let's { } {has taken} tomorrow, it {hasn't} taken a few years, and they have no future. And they have all the past. Gentlemen, museum thinking, physics thinking has only the past. It has no relation to the future. You only know the future if the destiny of man is at your heart. Anybody who knows of the solidarity of the human race by any one act -- by feeding a little baby, or by freeing a prisoner, or by eloping with a girl knows more about the future, because he incorporates the future. What is the future, gentlemen? {Infinite}! The future is just as long as the past. There is not a word of truth in all these figures about the past. They must appear that long to a man who begins to sit -- to think with one-fifth of his brain, and his heart, and his mind. I can think that out, too. But it -- what does it mean? No proof {to this}.

Any man who is free about time, who -- to whom his parents are just as alive as his grandchildren, has absolutely no preference for the future or the past. I have no such preference. What has to come to life -- if it's 5,000 years old, it has to come to life today, a Negro plastic, or -- or the -- the -- the discipline of a -- of a primitive tribe. We need a -- this discipline. Let's have it, you see. Initiation, or dancing or something. What does -- I do I care how old it is? It's no question for my judgment, because I feel it's part of the destiny of man which began to be fulfilled. Then let's have it. Let's save it, you see. It has to come to life again.

Gentlemen, we learn from Henry Adams that you cannot live as long as the future and the past are not identical twins to you in your decision. Any man who knows anything of catastrophe, of destiny, knows something about those things that have to be lived eternally. If you know the destiny of man, you know that civil rights must exist in any generation, that they cannot be simply dismissed today because of -- for pragmatic reasons. If you know that there is a

destiny at stake, what do you care about Communism and capitalism? Man is obviously bigger than any one of the two. That's not important. You're more important. The solidarity of the human race is much more important than any of these side issues, of one generation, of one century. And the whole course, I hope, I have tried to build up on the assumption, gentlemen, that although you live consciously in opposition to the previous generation and in frustration by the next generation, you only have a full life whenever you are able to deny this distinction. Whenever your father, and your son, and you yourself live in one center in a glow of decision in which there is no such distinction between past and future, that is -- has always in all times been called the "religious attitude." And it has always started with a victory over death. And it has always started with the frank facing the problem of one generation dying and other coming to life. Death is at the center, you see, of the problem. And that's why anybody who never mentions death is not fit for the kingdom of Heaven.

Thank you.