

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Eric Hutchison: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to welcome you, one and all, to this meeting of the Forum tonight. And I'd like to address a special word of welcome to our friends from outside the seminary community.

(We have a rare privilege this week in having in our midst in Union one of the remarkable figures of our time, Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy. Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy is at once a scholar and a man of action. He is a scholar who has been constantly immersed in practical affairs. And he is a man of action who, throughout a life of service in many causes, has maintained a rigorous discipline of study, which has given him commanding authority in a wide range of fields. Yet at the same time, and characteristically enough, he has been constantly fighting the domination of the academic approach to life.

(He was appointed a lecturer in law at Leipzig University in 1912 at the early age of 24, but was soon called away to active service in the First World War. As for many others before and since, this experience wrought a spiritual revolution in his own life and gave him a new insight into the weaknesses of our civilization and a new vision of the power of the Christian faith and the commands that it lays upon us. So it was that after the war, when he was offered three tempting opportunities for responsible work in the fields of politics, of religion, and of scholarship, he turned his back on all of them. To commit himself to one would have been to satisfy a part of himself, but would have been to betray the larger vision which had come to him. And so he turned instead and took a job in an automobile factory, and edited a weekly journal on labor affairs.

(From this developed his own passionate belief in labor camps as a means of restoring unity to life. And he worked in a number of specific projects in Germany to bring this as a reality into the life of the German people. In 1923, he was appointed professor of the history of law and sociology at Breslau University, a post which he held until he was forced to leave the country in 1933, when he came to this country, first to Harvard University and then to Dartmouth College, where he has been a professor since 1935.

(These perhaps somewhat external facts are but a preliminary to meeting the man himself, but perhaps they may help to see a part of the background of his thinking. But if I've been somewhat hesitant to speak of this, I feel even more hesitant to speak of his thought, and just say a word: that -- that he's provocative is certain. But that this is good is also certain.

(He has told us in an article he wrote on liturgical thinking that he has carried through a revolution in his own thinking. A revolution which, I'm certain, puts him in strong opposition to much that we take for granted. He can open for us new and exciting perspectives, which I think we ignore at our peril and at the peril of those who come after us. This afternoon in a small meeting which some of us had with him, he claimed to be a champion of orthodoxy. And he is one of the most unconventional thinkers today, precisely, I believe, because he has seen the startling challenge of orthodoxy more clearly than many. And he will no doubt reveal to us the dull conventionality of much that we might call heresy. (Tonight we're trying an experiment in the Forum. Instead of inviting another speaker to debate with Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy, we invite you. Each and every one of you will be the person with whom he is debating, and I hope he'll provoke you considerably. And I hope you will challenge him vigorously. I'm sure that's what he would like. And without further ado, I would present to you Dr. Rosenstock-Huessy, who will speak to us on "Before and After Karl Marx, Prophecies Fulfilled and Unfulfilled." Thank you.)

I don't know what I like. I would like to have finished. It is very difficult nowadays to meet other people's minds. And I'm always reminded of the -- when I try to speak to men with -- involved in departmentalized thinking of today, of the weatherman of this great city of New York. The other day he was interviewed about the smedge or sm- -- how do you call this? There's a special word for it -- and he said, "Oh, if I only could get the weather into a laboratory, and test it there and experiment with it. But here, what do I have got -- what have I got? I have these vast masses of air moving by themselves, guided by nobody but themselves."

That I thought was wonderful, "guided by nobody but themselves." Now it seems to me that this is the perfect simile of humanity at this moment -- tremendous masses of hot air moving by themselves and guided by nobody but themselves. I think the "but themselves" is really the climax. Not only "guided by nobody," but even making this vain attempt of -- of being guided by themselves. Is this true, then it is no use talking about before and after, because obviously, then every time is just a mass of hot air, trying to move, guided by itself. And sometimes you get the impression. And in order to create this impression, we have surrounded ourselves by newspapers, and radio, and the other mass media, and they certainly are only guided by nothing but themselves.

I have however felt -- I have never talked on Karl Marx before in my life. I had

no reason. Now I feel that perhaps he may help us by placing him -- to get out of this terrible idea that we are just hot air, and that we are just moving by ourselves, each time, each day, each year, each generation lost to its own myth. Because obviously this air is exactly what the parallel people in the social sciences and the humanities have condescended now to recognize as being in existence. Hot air, and they call this myth. It's not a long time that an illustrious member of this faculty wrote a book on the mythology of Christianity as compared with the theology of Marxism. Isn't Christianity also such a hot air, guided by nothing but itself? Or -- certainly we cannot put ourselves into a laboratory and experiment with ourselves. The American people tried this in the First World War to treat the war as just an experiment, with which they had in a laboratory and which they could give up, because it didn't work. But the Second World War has shown us that this isn't possible. War is very serious. You cannot experiment with war, and -- just as little as you can experiment with -- with children or with housewives. You can divorce them, but you cannot experiment with them. And -- our forefathers believed that we were God's experiment. And He has, I think, furnished us certain means of feeling that we are not guided by ourselves, and not hot air, and not myth. And that Christianity came into this world -- and Judaism -- to make it possible for men to emerge from their mythology; that the dissolution, the dilution, the diastasis, the -- that the catalyst of mythology is a faith which is patient enough even to give up one's own day and time and its mythology by connecting the times. And that's why I have called this -- these two lectures, "Before and After Marx." I shall simply try to introduce you into the situation as it in- - existed before Marx or in the days when Marx arose in 1847 and after Marx, as we see it today, 30 years after the so-called "10 days that shook the world" allegedly and didn't.

Before and after Marx -- that points out that perhaps we have here in the last century a secular analogy to the great pretense of revelation that only this was revealed truth. Only this was valid truth, which could come back, generation after generation, as the same truth, although the people in every generation first looked at it and dealt with it, in the language of their own day. If Marx perhaps could be a prophet, then we would look back into our own story and say we have heard of prophets. They seem to be a necessity for the fulfillment. There seems to be certainly just hot air if people try to reap where they haven't sown. And they are certainly just one's own mythology when every generation and every day has its own invention, and its own art, and its own science, and its own psychoanalysis.

But if the parents and the children and the grandchildren -- if generations

after generations of Heaven and earth from the first day of -- since -- when God began to create this universe, there has been a necessity that these people should all march with diversified roles, but battle the same enemy of death, the same enemy of destruction, then perhaps the last century offers a reintroduction into directed and interpretable history of the human race.

So Marx has been called a prophet and he knew he was one and he certainly was one if ever there was a prophet -- a prophet of doom. And that reminds us of the fact that Christianity could have never come into this world if it hadn't been the fulfillment of a promise. Just as little as the Jews could have gotten into the promised land if it had- -- they hadn't been outside for a long time. So that more than one generation is -- are -- is needed before we can speak of truth. And the victory over my own myths is actually required before I can say that I participate in the life of the spirit.

And the fashionable thing certainly is a thing to combat, or to overcome, at least, or to reconcile with the non-fashionable.

And it also brings up this question if we cannot learn to distinguish these various phases with great precision which come between prophecy and fulfillment. We say simply today "prophecy" and "fulfillment," but I think for the last 1900 years, we know a little more about these phases. They are not just two phases. One says this is going to happen and then it happens, as this nice relation between the Old Testament and the New Testament seems to say. As you know, Jesus was not recognized by the Jews. And so the fulfillment wasn't just the fulfillment of the promise.

There are -- seems to be four stages or -- to be disentangled. And again in the Marxian story, we may be able even to identify these phases. There is the prophecy. There is the coming. There is the defeat. And then there is the Gospel. Or to put it in the Christian language, there is John the Baptist. And there is Jesus. And there are the Apostles. And then there are the four Gospels written. The story is -- can be told. But it cannot be told except in the Apostolic age and even after the Apostles, partly at least, have died, let alone the Lord.

So the fulfillment is very different from the prophecy, and if fulfillment and prophecy were just as simple as people who today live -- try to live in antiquity always seem to take it -- all the Biblical critics and the people who judge the church history from the outside, the -- then it would of course be that the promise is already known -- that the fulfillment is known by the promise. Then we would ch- -- simply because something is prophesied, then already would know

how the fulfillment must come about. That of course isn't true. The fulfillment always looks so that the people who have prophesied it hate it, and just don't like the fulfillment. But it is fulfillment just the same. And that's very interesting that the prophets and the Apostles are the trans- -- are transformed one into the other. As you know, the Church puts in the -- in the sculpture of the cathedrals the Apostles of the new order, in the place of the prophets of the old order, because the Apostles came after the fulfillment, but before the fulfillment is recognized, before the Gospel story is written, before Matthew, and Luke and John and Mark exist as Gospels so that we can then have this nice pastime of preaching on it.

It's a very painful story divided into four chapters -- prophecy, fulfillment, apostolicity, allegiance to this fulfillment, despite the defeat of a worldly character. And then only the meeting of the {world} demands to be introduced in through the secret and to recognize what has happened. Four phases.

I think that the 19th century was faced with the fact that myth of one age, the newspaper news, or the progress of science and the eternal truth were completely mixed and confounded, and thought to be the same thing. Philosophy and revelation were just one and the same thing. Well, you said, "Well, revelation, we don't need this. We have theology." Well, theology is -- is certainly not revelation. And it has nothing to do with historical incarnation. Theology is about incarnation, but it isn't itself any process of incarnating the spirit into the world. But prophecy is. Apostolicity is. And the Gospels are. And so when this terrible mistake of the philosophers, of the French Enlightenment, of the German idealism occurred, it is no wonder that four evangelists appeared whom we may very well compare to the four evangelists of the Gospel. I don't know if this means that the order of things has been reversed throughout in the 19th century, perverted so that the evangelists came last in the process of the incarnation, and in our case in the 19th century, the "disangelists," as we may call them, the prophets of doom, came first. That would mean that after the -- disangelists, the Apostles would come and the catastrophe, the crucifixion of the human race in the two world wars, and now we may write the story as prophecy fulfilled.

It seems to me a little bit like that because there have been four -- not Gospel writers, but devil writers or disangelists, as I like to call them, and one of them is Karl Marx. But before we specialize on Karl Marx, I think it is necessary for you and me -- if we use this word "prophecy" with any meaning, and with any power, and without any vagueness, but with real precision -- that we should see that Marx doesn't stand alone. When he was buried, Friedrich Engels, his comrade in arms, the great refuter of Marxism because of his indispensable

friendship and love for Marx and his family, something utterly unpredic- -- unpredicted and unforeseen in the annals of Marxism, this relation of Friedrich Engels and Marx, a very human story. He said at the grave that Marx had done for society what Darwin had done for nature. So we have every right to feel that Marx himself felt that he was a brother in arms with Charles Darwin.

We have here two disangelists. And there are two more, obviously; one is -- the third is Nietzsche and the fourth is Freud. What have these four disangelists to proclaim? They have something to proclaim. They have to proclaim the dissolution of history, the end not of history, but the fact that there is no history, but that everything has to go in reverse. The children have to be emancipated of their parents; otherwise they can't live. Therefore they cannot inherit the -- the inheritance from their parents. There is nothing to build upon, the Oedipus complex has to be eliminated.

Marx is a case which I shall look into, after I have spoken of Darwin. Darwin certainly has eliminated the victory of the we- -- weak. Now the story of mankind obviously is this tremendous miracle that whenever the armored cars and the tanks and the sauriae and the elephants and the mammoths come to the end of their wits, that it is the weak child which starts a new generation, that frailty is the only way of conquering the future. And -- but Charles Darwin said "No. Survival of the fittest." And the fittest the -- the most brutal one -- dog eats dog. The -- the -- the ridiculous character of the evolution theory is in this: that he didn't see that the nature leads always into blind alleys and that the creative act begins with the -- with giving up the -- of the form that is achieved and going into a greater plasticity and a greater frailty or a greater weakness and not in a greater -- into a greater strength.

We live here as human beings on this earth at this moment only because we are so foolish that we can reorganize in every generation totally, because we know nothing for a longer time. All the beings in nature are the same for thousands of years, and this would be too boring for us. And we would be so strong that we would die from our own strength, from our equipment.

So history there is reduced to the past -- that -- the human story, which -- consists in this complete reversal of all the values in this revaluation of weakness and strength, is denied. In Marx, as you know, history is divided into promise and fulfillment in such a manner that they have nothing to do with each other -- that nobody is blessed and can go to Heaven in the time of class wars. And in the classless society, there is no longer an incentive to be wicked.

This complete split of history again is the abolition of history. As you know, Paul Tillich has very often stated very clearly that a de-demonized history would no longer be history and that it is quite arbitrary, this Utopia in which no longer it is necessary to fight or to have any struggle or to have any split, to be overcome or to be reconciled.

So we have in Marx this strange separation of war and peace outside each other. The whole history so far has been a history of class wars, of endless class wars and the end will be without class wars and therefore without history. Of Nietzsche, it is more difficult to speak for me, because I certainly have been educated by Nietzsche, more than by the three other men. This disangelist is already, as you may know, just as Marx too in his -- has attempted to reach the land beyond the catastrophe. And he has not painted this new land as a Utopia, as a classless society of Marx. What he has discovered is, I think, half-and-half truth, as with the three other disangelists, too. He has discovered that there is nothing true, beautiful and good in this world -- that -- which you can read in Shakespeare's "Hamlet," already -- that only our thinking makes it so. And that we -- our values themselves change. And that our forebears may perhaps lead us, but certainly not our concepts or our ideas. He has destroyed humanism. The history of humanism, the idea that we were the neo-Greeks, that the Renaissance, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, the Epicureans, or the {materi-} -- it doesn't matter -- that the Greeks were to be lived by Pierpont Morgan in the Morgan Library a second time. If you go into the Morgan Library, you will see that the story there begins with Cosimo de Medici and Cesare Borgia and then it ends with all the -- with all the incunabula, with all the great prints of the classics of the 15th century, and the beginning of the 16th century. And it was a great time of 400 years' length in which we thought that humanism had to be revived. Nietzsche, but Marx and Darwin and Freud as well, have destroyed the Greek -- Greek myth of our own time, of our own last centuries. And they have forced the theologians and the Christians, as far as they still think they should be this, to separate the cross and its Greek environment. After 1859, after The Origin of Species, and after the Communist Manifest of 1857, and after Freud had found the Oedipus Complex in the '80s, and after Nietzsche has -- had said, "Thus Spake Zarathustra," it is impossible to believe that you can get away with the sermons as they they were were preached over the last hundred years in which there was no difference between the Good and the True and the Beautiful on the one-hand side, the ideals of Plato; and faith, love and hope of Christianity on the other. And I still should -- shall see the congregation that does know the difference.

They think it's all so beautiful and so true and so good, you see, that it makes no difference. However, faith, love and hope have to be -- guide us when we don't know what is good, when we don't know what is beautiful, and we don't know what is true. And we don't know, either, any one of the three, because the ideals don't speak, but God does.

But these Greek ideals therefore had to be destroyed by these disangelists and I think they have rendered us a tremendous service by attacking officially Christianity and the history of the human race and by -- in fact only being able to disentangle the plaster cast around Christianity called humanism, or liberalism, or capitalism, or whatever they call it. All the -isms. No -isms around the Cross. But these four disangelists of course, they work -- did their work between 1847 and 1889. You may say that this was the time in which God died in humanity, in the -- His old form of a Greek philosopher, and of a theologian, and of -- of a thinker, or of a rationalist, or of a mind, or of an idealist. Still in this country 90 percent of the Christians think that Christianity is idealism. It certainly isn't. It's -- came into the world against idealism, because idealism is a myth. And I -- I think we -- really these four men have -- at a time when the preachers and the theologians were not able to -- to render this service, have freed us from the equation of Greece and Golgotha.

How did they do it? The -- Darwin, Marx, prophets of doom, prophets of brutality, prophets of ugliness, prophets of sickness -- Freud the same way, or Nietzsche. Insanity, even. On the other hand, the Church is convinced that everything was in the best of -- we lived in the best of worlds, and progress was guaranteed. It was not -- only in 1893 that the first theologian woke up to the fact that perhaps a man called Nietzsche had gone insane for good reason, reminding the people that there could be a judgment day, there could be a doom, there could be the great catastrophe of the Western world which he proclaimed in 189--89, then went into his subconscious for 11 years, then died. And then after 14 years, this cataclysm began which is just now in its last travails.

We are behind the times as Christians. Very much so. And we have -- can only gain time again and gain access to the powers that rule the world by -- and influence them, and become one of them ourselves -- by admitting that the children of darkness -- children of darkness certainly saw much more clearly in the night than we did. We had too much sunshine.

As you know, these prophets of doom all became sectarians. Nietzsche de-



clared that he didn't want to have anything to do with the -- of -- academic profession. Marx, who said he didn't want to have anything to do with the bourgeois society. Freud certainly was an outcast of the medical profession. And only Darwin got his own clan behind him. These four men struck. Charles Darwin certainly forwent the blessings of the Church, which in England in 1859 still mattered. Karl Marx was an exile in London, as you know. He forwent his safety, his happiness throughout his life. Without his great wife, he certainly would not have survived the ordeal of being chased out of Germany, out of Belgium, and out of France. Nietzsche went insane.

The price then of these disangelists was an existential sacrifice. And I think the thing we have to learn from these men, first of all, is that the truth in its own time cannot be proclaimed with any power if the man who proclaims it is not quite indifferent to his own time. Indifference to one's own time is the condition certainly of entering the kingdom of Heaven.

I have a very dear friend. He is an historian. The Ford Foundation was founded; he immediately gathered 24 colleagues at Harvard University -- all historians, to devolve a problem -- a program which would convince the Ford Foundation that they had to support these 25 important people for the next three years. I asked him what they would propose. He -- they said they would propose exactly that for which the Ford Foundation would be ready to give them money. And they even talked about it. They told me. This man told me, his teacher, such an affront, such an impudence, such a shamelessness.

It's done every ti- -- day in Eur- -- in America and Europe at this moment. If you have research to do, anything goes. Research is just another way now of the PWA. It is shameful, gentlemen, and you see that these prophets of doom, these disangelists, at least have one benefit. I don't believe in their truth, but I believe in their way of life. I believe that they were decent people and I believe that our modern scientists are all corrupt for money.

I want to see a man who cannot be corrupted by money, before I believe him. I know people in cancer research who have thought differently because they could only the -- get the grant on one theory and not on the other.

This is the greatest lesson, I think. It has happened outside the Church. It is a Christian lesson. It is a story of real prophecy, becoming effective all the more because these people were out of tune with their own time.

But now to introduce you into the beauty of that time when these disangelists

arose and we just didn't know yet that we would have to give up humanism and these nice ideals of the True and the Good and the Beautiful; that truth, and beauty, and goodness was the by-product of sacrifice, and love, and hope. But we didn't begin with these ideals. And we couldn't see them, because God remains invisible and you cannot face Him. To -- we these people who want to visualize the ideals are certainly just idolaters and pagans. Any attempt to have the beat- -- the vis- -- beatic -- beatific vision, whether it's a -- clothed in the terms of the mystic in the Middle Ages or in the terms of the idealist in modern times is forbidden.

Now in 1847, all this was very obscure. When the manifest of the -- Communism was printed, there was a great unity still between the classes, the nations, between the denominations. I must remind you that at that moment we had here in this country the Millerites, the last great eschatological movement -- in Vermont. It started, as you know -- may know, in Putney in 1842. They expected the coming of the Lord right away. You had the Oneida Socialists. That is, a socialism which was completely compatible with every other way of life and society, and Socialism not -- was not a sectarian belief. These socie- -- Oneida Socialists have flourished in this country as some of you may know, for some decades very successfully. There have been any number of other similar experiments, all started at the end of the '30s and the beginning of the '40s of the 19th century. And I try to bring back to you for this moment, for the end of today, this time before Marxens decision to pay the penalty of striking out against existing society by withholding any allegiance, any loyalty, any support of it. And that is the same as -- as I think, in the case of Nietzsche and in the case of Freud that this striking power, this going outside, this forming a picketing -- picket line, so to speak, outside the existing workshop of mankind, is the reason why we still mention these people and have forgotten the optimists of the '40s.

But at this moment, I invite you to look into the story of, for example, men like Kingsley, and Carlyle, and Ruskin -- these Christian socialists who surrounded Marx and Darwin in their beginnings. They have done a very excellent job. They tried to harmonize the most contradictory things and they believed it could be done.

I here have a letter written by one of the leading socialists to Karl Marx, and putting very clearly the issue of harmony and war in terms, and laying down the law that he would not become a Marxist, a Marxian, for this very reason. And I think when we -- you read this letter, it will not be difficult for you to discover that for hundred years now, if you think now of Mr. Malenkov even, and the Third International, and the Comintern, not much has changed, that we are still

moving -- in this same century, or the same situation of an either -- seeming either-or between the people who forego the benefits of being contemporaries of their society and the people who cannot forego this benefit. Obviously this is -- since this is before -- Marx, before the Cold War, before the two world wars, before the rise of the great contrast between a Western half of Christianity and an Eastern half of Christianity -- because that's what it is -- obviously, we will have to come to the certain conclusion at this moment, if we shall feel really free to speak of a pe- -- our period as really being after Marx. If we just remain, as Mr. Proudhon, in the situation of not understanding Marx simply, then we -- I certainly would have no right to speak tomorrow night of prophecies fulfilled and of the fact that we really have a right perhaps -- perhaps to say, partly at least, that we live after Marx and his disangel -- disgospel, or however you like to call it. As -- I also feel that we have a right to say that we live after Darwin, and live after Nietzsche, and live after Freud. But that is, of course, an invitation. And everyone of you must find out -- himself whether he is before Marx, or a Marxian, or after Marx -- or whether he is a pre-Freudian, or a Freudian, or a post-Freudian.

And so, this is up to you. I don't -- cannot psychoanalyze you, because I don't believe in it. But every one of you knows that in part he is living in 1847; and in part he is living in 1890; and in part perhaps he may try to live in 1957, not to speak of 1984.

Give me five minutes to read this document, because I do feel that the good people in our own company -- and we ourselves perhaps included -- would be quite proud if we today could write such a letter to Mr. Harry Dexter White. First he -- he makes two points. The letter is written May 17th, 1846. That is, a half a year before, or -- yes, half a -- it's eight months before The Communist Manifesto was written. It's really in the cradle, so to speak, of all these tremendous ideas of the following century. He makes two points. One, that he doesn't want to become a new dogmatist in economics, and that he demands from Marx, for Heaven's sake, not to proclaim a new dogma in economics. And secondly, that he doesn't believe in violence. He doesn't believe in the use of force in economic reforms. And so, this is what he says:

"Although my own ideas on the organization and realization of social aims are more or less fixed -- well, at least with regard to the principles -- I think all the more it to be my duty as a socialist and the duty of any socialist to conserve for a long time to come still the ancient form of the dubitative, of doubt. I profess before

the public as my firm conviction an anti-dogmatism in economics, so to speak, of an absolute character." I have to translate it from the French; so you understand why I do it haltingly.

"Let us do research together, if you like. If all the laws of society, all the ways by which these laws are realized, all the progress according to which we may succeed to discover these laws, mais -- but for God's sake..."

...pour Dieu, in French...

"...but for God's sake, after we have demolished all the a priori and the dogmas of the times before, let us not think now in turn to indoctrinate the people. Let us not fall into the contradiction of your compatriot Martin Luther, who, after he had reversed the Catholic theology immediately went out with the great reinforcement of excommunications and anathemas to found a Protestant theology.

"For three centuries, Germany has been occupied with nothing but the destruction of these new plaster casts of Martin Luther. Let us not cut out for the human race this new worry of a new strait-jacket. I applaud by wholeheartedly your idea to supersede one day all mere opinions. I also welcome your bon and loyal polemics. But let us give to the world the example of a scholarly toleration, which is pres voyons..."

...prudent, perhaps...

"...and since we are..."

...as he very modestly says...

"...we are at the head of the movement..."

...everybody always thinks this...

"...let us not make ourselves the heads of the new intolerance. Let us not pose as the apostles of a new religion, even if it is a the religion of logic and the religion of reason. Let us encourage all the protestations. Let us disregard -- or let us berate all the excommunications and all the mysticisms. Let us never consider any question as exhausted. And when we have used our last argument, let us begin again, if it is necessary, all over with the eloquence -- with

eloquence and irony. At this condition, I shall like very much to be associated -- with you. If not, not."

If you don't fulfill this condition, no. That's the great declaration of war between Proudhon then. And this book here is the vindication, of, you see, the terrible price Proudhon had to pay for his letter, because this is written against Proudhon. And ever since, no decent Marxian has, you see, heard the name of Proudhon without sneering. The second thing is:

"You mention that we trouv- -- fi- -- find ourselves at the moment of action. Perhaps it is necessary that you -- we are quite clear on this point. You obviously believe that a reform is impossible without a Putsch, without something with which one day, one time..."

...it's wonderful in 1846...

"...{jadice} -- which long ago was called revolution and which obviously is -- is a real earthquake. In my opinion, this is obsolete. For a long time, I shared your conviction, but my last studies have made me reverse my thought on this completely. I think that society may be able to change the ways of its wealth in a -- from the inside, and that it is not necessary to destroy property in a new night of St. Bartholomé, but that instead we can roast it on a small fire."

So, 1846, the whole line is drawn. Here is the most radical socialist. The man who wrote, "property is theft," "La propriété, c'est {le vol}," and who says to Marx, "No."

What did Marx then mean? If you use an American simile, you will understand what these disangelists undertook. In America, ever since the Declaration of Independence, down to 1920 or to the McCarran Act, this country has remained stand-pat on its constitution, and has practically never changed it, because every immigrant had to take an oath on this constitution and time had to stand still. This country which boasts that it is so very progressive is the only conservative country in the world, as this -- as you know, because it has a constitution dated from 1787 or '89, and it hasn't changed it. And it's still there, although of course -- well, I won't say anything anymore. But the judges know more about it.

But the -- still, we had a movement on foot -- millions of people like myself

coming to these shores and trying to find shelter. At this moment, you cannot change the form of the shelter. The shelter has to remain the same. Now in Europe, Marx tried to do exactly this, to draw up a program which could serve as a -- as a shelter for the last man to join the ranks of the proletarian army, including the daughters of -- of all the -- of all the employers, who had to become typists and secretaries. That is, the mass, the ranks of the employees have now, you see, become so large as you know that they have 63 million jobs; and we mean by this, employees.

So all these hundred years, Marx said it is not important to be -- to doubt or to progress or to change one's mind, but to offer one symbol of recognition and identification to these masses, just as the American Constitution has offered all the newcomers to this country this firm identity -- symbol of identity: that it is one country with the same principles for 150 years, regardless of the date of landing in this country.

With this simile, I would like to finish today, because the century -- this last century then, perhaps becomes visible to you as really extraordinary, as the founding of a secular church or secular movements having the same practice as the early Christians, but trying to achieve the opposite -- not leading man into the fulfillment of his purpose, but declaring at the same time that man couldn't do anything about this fulfillment, that the class wars were something that you cannot -- couldn't do anything -- the economic development would take care of that -- Charles Darwin proclaiming in the same way that the struggle was endless; Nietzsche telling us that man had just to go from one sensation, from one superhuman effort to the next, and Freud dissolving every task of tradition, of inheritance, as too sacrificial, as too destructive, as too oppressive. Let us see tomorrow in a -- how far we perhaps can have the great privilege to reap where we haven't sown and how far these four evangelists of doom may allow us to have peace in our time.

[applause]

(Hutchison: Prof. Rosenstock-Huessy has kindly consented to answer some questions now, and after perhaps 10 or 15 minutes, the committee invites you all to join them down in the faculty lounge for coffee and a further informal discussion with Dr. Rosenstock-Huessy. Has anyone got any questions now?)

(If it isn't too long a one, Sir, I would like to ask about the distinction between Christianity and myth.)

I mustn't have made myself quite clear. It is important to the history of Christianity that the time of the founder is, so to speak, extrapolated. That is, that he lives on this earth, but is not recognized, is a failure, and is from the cradle to the grave one living sacrifice. Now "sacrifice" means the forgoing of the temporary success, or shape, or hue, or per- -- perfection in one's own day, of one's achievement, of this famous pursuit of happiness. Jesus obviously didn't pursue His happiness. And the myth of any profession, of any department of life, of any time is that which is necessary for the achievement of this temporal end. You cannot get engaged without being crazy. But that's a myth. You have to say the word, and then you get married. And the story of your marriage includes this mythical situation of being engaged, you see. Every decent bridegroom on the -- his wedding day is very sick, as you know. It's a terrible ordeal. I don't know about the lady, but I know about myself. I had a migraine, and -- migraine, you call it.

And now, I mean very much -- I mean, Wagner says it very beautifully in "The Master Singers" that craze or frenzy is necessary for the achievement of any one temporal aim. And this always gets around itself -- this consciousness you see, which is mythological. You cannot see yourself, you see, in this state of frenzy, as others see you. And you must have the power to -- not to compare notes with others, you see, but to stand, so to speak, your own frenzy. And the divine, or the demonic in this moment is necessary for its fulfillment. Nobody can go over the parapet in -- and advance in Korea without either alcohol or patriotism. And so that is frenzy, because here these psychoanalysts sit, or these psychologists who advise the Army and -- and tell you the mechanism how to arouse patriotism, these scoundrels. They think they are outside the myth.

Now fortunately they aren't, I mean, they aren't as bad as they make themselves. But there is no achievement in the world. You can't go into an examination without some such mythological frenzy. And this, however, is not -- is only the beginning. This frenzy is -- levels off and afterwards, you must not despise the myth, but you must recognize its -- its place. Now Christianity has made the discovery that man needs frenzy and passion to achieve anything. The misunderstanding of the Disciples, their devotion for the Lord, you see, their squabbling over the seats in the kingdom of Heaven were inevitable. They had -- had to do this in order to learn, you see. So their myth, while Jesus was on earth -- very -- very poignant, just terrible, complete misunderstanding. Everything. Not only Judas. Peter just the same, and John, you see. Even John. You know, they -- they -- they -- he -- they -- he discusses where his seats will be in -- in Heaven, in the sky. Well, so with everybody.

There is no way of growing, except by going through the myth, through your mythical period. So legend and myth have their necessary place in the life of the race. And woe to these people who now give them these children's books without myth, instead of telling them really fairy tales, really mythological and legendary stories. They tell them scientific stories. All this enlightenment about sex and all this nonsense. They want to deprive people of this -- this -- the time in which frenzy must find expression in a myth. Who wants to know anything about the sex organs? They want to know what it means to be in love, which has nothing to do with sex. The Sleeping Beauty is a much truer love -- certainly interpretation of sex life than the whole biology -- everything taken together. But we have just, you see, tried to make the myth of the man of 40, the sci- -- his science, you see, his frenzy for his work into the only myth that is permissible to mankind today.

Well, every age and every sex and every nation has, of course -- they must have their own myth, otherwise they cannot -- they cannot pass through the ordeal where they cannot be recognized by the rest of the world. Any moment in which you are in solitude, you are mythological, because you are wrapped in this cloud. But if you believe in prophecy, if you believe in fulfillment if you believe in -- pardon me -- in promise, you see, if you believe in grace, you undergo this frenzy, this -- this, your own passion in the knowledge that it is a phase, that this is not the whole story.

I mean, take Jesus in Gethsemane. It's a great -- as you know, it's a great tradition that He really believed one moment that God would allow the cup to pass in the frenzy of His -- of this ordeal. And He -- that's how He became human. Without this prayer, He would not be our brother. And yet it was all obvious that it couldn't be.

Well, this is the human situation, that at no one time where we are acting are we allowed to know what's happening. This is ridiculous. { } the -- the -- the -- a man who is creating, as soon as he wants to know what he is doing while he is creating, splits into object and subject. He wants to stand before the mirror and he is impotent. And impotency rules the world today because of this: because people think that self-knowledge is more important than creation. Creation you -- creative -- can only be when you forgo self-consciousness and have -- even prefer a wrong interpretation of what you're doing, you see, to knowing exactly analytically what you're doing. How can anybody otherwise ever get engaged in his five senses? Marriage is based on this power still to have frenzy. The people don't get engaged today. They just have a -- an affair together and they call this marriage. That isn't marriage. I mean, oth- -- you see, real -- people who are



really married cannot be divorced, and since so many people are divorced, obviously they never have been married, because they have been told that they must not be in a frenzy; they mustn't be in love. So they aren't. They have just -- they are just in sex.

They -- I mean all this, Sir, you see. Love, after all, is -- is this power to be alone with your passion in the spiritual sense, you see -- that something has befallen you which nobody else at this moment can endure. Very often the lady herself isn't yet ready. Well, great love that cannot endure, that cannot wait, that cannot court, that cannot woo, is not love. And there is so little love today in the world because if it isn't immediately understood, "Let's get married," then the boy says, "Well, then it isn't right," instead of -- of -- of writing poetry for three years.

That's his myth, you see, the three years of poetry.

So, pardon me, but we have to -- to see now that myth is the one -- one generation's -- situation or one-phase situation of the human mind in disconnection with the other phases, you see. And the more passion, the more powerful this one phase is -- with something -- take the inventor. Don't you think Mr. Lindbergh or the Orville -- the brother Wrights were obsessed with this plane? If you read -- I have read their life and their correspondence -- I mean, terribly narrow-minded people -- they really thought that the salvation of the world depended on -- on the aircraft, you see. Now we know it, the -- just the atom bomb depended on it. Is this enough, Sir?

(Thank you very much.)

(Hutchison: Any more questions? Bill?)

(What was the myth from which Marxism stood apart, in order to create its -- its own myth?)

The harmony, the -- the humanistic myth, that anything in this modern society, because they had all Greek names, called themselves Caesar and Alcibiades, that for this reason, harmony would win out -- the True, the Beautiful, and the Good -- that the capitalistic society was, you see -- could not help leading to harmony. This is the idealism of the time. And that's the myth of the -- the times of philosophers, where the philosophers tried to be kings, and instead, became journalists. Well, that's what it is. It is the time where the philosophy was put in the headlines, the editorials of The New York Times or the -- then it was the -- Mr. Gordon Bennett, as you know, here instead, and where the -- where really the people thought that -- that philosophy would do away with all sufferings of

humanity. This is a great era, I mean, it's -- people believe it. In the beginning of the 19th century, this was -- this what -- to what I wanted to lead you up to -- 1847, people really believed that the -- the harmony of hu- -- the human mind, of the human reason was such that everything could be dissolved. Is -- does this satisfy your -- with your question? Sir? Where is he? Where's Bill? Wie?

(Hutchison: Any more, {Lyle}? { }?)

(Was Christian idealism ever a creative myth? I mean, a -- it was a frenzy, we might say, a vision ... )

Well, I think Christianity came into the world against idealism. And that when it was said more and more since Marsilio Ficino and the neo-Platonists of 1500 that perhaps we could replace Christianity by idealism, that then there was no Christianity. I think that Christianity and idealism are devoid of all meaning. You can put them together or you can also say that it is a wooden iron. It has absolutely nothing to do with each other, because the Father and the Son obviously declaims that man in no phase of his existence is the whole man, as created by God. And the idealist says that "At this moment, I have at my disposal all the mental powers than can be equated with the divine spirit." That's a very simple dis- -- distinction between idealism, and the belief in the Trinity, that the Holy Spirit has to pass through the de- -- two generations of the Old Testament and the New Testament, of the Father and the Son, and that the -- idealist says that "I know God, because I am God."

This is very simple. No time in idealism, you see. No way of going through your mythical phase and -- and skin -- and shedding it. There's no time element in idealism. No history.

Would you kindly take it very seriously? I think the whole crux of the matter is really that in Christianity, there is promise, because the Old Testament is received. It's necessary. Why do you go to church? Because that's the part of Israel that is the law that is still there. That's not Christ- -- that's not the fulfillment, that's the promise, when you baptize a child. Do you think it is free when it is baptized? It doesn't even go to the toilet.

It's ridiculous. If you treat all -- everything that goes on in Christianity as not be -- having to do with these great four phases of promise, of fulfillment, of apostolicity, and of the story --the Gospel. Every one of us, if he is really living at all, goes through these four phases, because you have to be true to your own calling, to your own moment of divinity. No artist who has received the divine

spirit, you see, who not has then to be his own apostle, that is, to serve without remuneration in a very hard -- think of Gaugin and these people. There is apostolicity to a mission that -- that really didn't pay dividends. And now we -- we fructify from what Gaugin did for the freeing of the Western mind, from its Greek and idealistic patterns.

You can look everywhere in the world and these four things stand out, that a man who does not respect the high moments of his life and puts his future -- the rest of his life under this highest moment, is not fit for the kingdom of Heaven. You must recognize the great moments of your life and then you have to obey them. And that is life like the Cross. That is the fulfillment. It looks very different, as I told you, from the promise, because it is a very, very long road afterwards, after the revelation, after the greatness of the moment has occurred.

But all this is today not -- people won't apply. Think of any man who decides to be -- take the Orville Wright brothers or -- take Robert -- or Bob Mitchell who -- or take Admiral {Symmes}, or any man in the secular field whose -- who -- who -- on whom it fall -- whom it befalls, you see, to carry through one thing which at one moment got hold of him and he knew that nobody else was going to do it if he didn't do it. Well, it takes them 30 -- 40 years, you see, and you have to go from Jerusalem to Rome to do it. Or from Pontius to Pilate, as we say. Don't you see that your own life is full of this mir- -- miracle and this law and this order? Only idealists, they don't want to see it. They never have discovered their truth, because it's -- it is the True, the Good and the Beautiful. But everybody's truth is -- has to be discovered in -- during his own life, and then he has to follow it out and to obey it. And if he can do it in company, in friendship, in marriage, in family life, in -- in your profession -- as the doctors, for example, can do it in brotherhood -- all the better. But it is still one thing, you see, to discover the great task and then to carry it out obediently. The Lord forwent this privilege of carrying out. He -- He knew He had to put it on other shoulders to make it visible, that one man's life and all mankind's life is the same life. There's no difference. The history of the human race only consists in being exactly as loyal as Jesus was in the various stations of life. There is no other history. Or, at least not to me.

All these, what they call history has nothing to do with the real events of -- in humanity. Ja?

(Dr. Freud came in for a bit of -- of -- shall we say, attack -- here. I just wonder, can you point -- point up -- where is the crux of Freud's error, as opposed to

the other three disangelists?)

Well, I think that there are four things which this disangelism -- is there still time to speak? I don't wish to keep you.

The -- when this era started, 1846, when Mr. Proudhon wrote this very optimistic letter to Marx and said there's neither violence nor agreement necessary, the -- the -- the idealists were in -- in the upper -- had the upper hand. It was a philosophical society. It was a time when Unitarianism ruled the world. And there was no divinity necessary, anymore. Man -- humanity -- humanism had completely conquered. That is, after all, Unitarianism. And you know they were very strong at that time, and very rich in America. And these Unitarians were very good people. They believed that philosophy had to rule theology and that you didn't need any more -- anything more.

Why were they wrong? They didn't see, I think, the miraculous character of peace. The doctrine which Proudhon, for example, had to fight, was that peace was natural and war was unnatural. We know better. We know that war is natural and peace is miraculous. They thought that speech was natural and thought -- or philosophy, perhaps -- was miraculous or divine. We know that it is very easy to have opinions privately, but it is miraculous if another man understands you. That is, we know that speech is miraculous and not natural.

We know these two things. We know thirdly that sex is natural, but love is supernatural. We know that there is no love without sacrifice. We know that my great predecessor, Giuseppe Ferrari, whom I think to be one of the very great thinkers of the 19th century -- and that's why he's completely forgotten -- was -- discovered a great Christian truth in unique language when he said that love is desire -- we would say today of course in America "sex" -- desire and sacrifice in balance. These -- we, you see -- you asked about Freud. Mr. Freud has completely forgotten that the story of love is in three phases, too. It is desire, on the male side. It is the victory to be loved, and then the willingness to live -- love in return. That is, there are three phases in the lovemaking process. The male desires, and proposes, and courts, and hopes to arouse love in the mate, because this woman is not interested in the desire of the mate, but in a -- in his provisions for a home, and for the future, and for a long life. And he -- she will only do this if she feels that she can love this individual, this monster. For this, the male responds with his love, because he's so moved by the sacrifice, that he now begins to love -- which as a male in the beginning, he just doesn't know how to do.

It is a great error of our society today that they always confuse sex and love,

whereas love is the third phase and can only be acquired by a male being, after he has experienced what it means to be loved. That's why motherly love in this country spielt such a terrible part in this love process, because the boys do not wait till the girl loves them. The girl only goes to bed with him -- pardon me. But the -- the mother stays, and that's the only love they have really experienced. That's the -- the mother complex in this country, the generations of wipers -- wipers.

It's a very simple thing. Nobody's at fault. "At fault" is the wrong philosophy which says that you can have it all at once, that love is at the first -- at first sight. Desire is at first sight. Let's be frank. But Mr. Freud is wrong when he thinks that's the whole story. There the -- the -- the story begins only and he omits the recognition that somebody loves me and that I'm so overwhelmed by this experience that somebody new whom I didn't know before, who isn't my mother, that somebody in this wide ocean, or desert, or the wilderness, or Sahara of the universe is good enough to pin her eyes on me in such a way that she trusts me, that this trust, of course, has to be answered by my love. And in this sense her faith and my love have to be, so to speak, squared.

All this is forgotten today. And certainly it's very terrible that it is forgotten. There is no courtship in this country. Sex is always mistaken for love. And they call it love and they mean sex. Or they mean kindness and call this love -- this -- it's not so simple, gentlemen. You cannot -- you marry because you like this girl and you are kind to her. That's not the process of becoming one in -- in a sacramental sense. It is much more serious that you have to wait till you really can be sure that she loves you. And that means that she trusts you spiritually. That the word that you say to her can -- is held by her to be the sacrament of -- of -- of -- of the Word, in the logos sense of St. John, that this word is spoken with such power by you that you wish to be tied by it for the rest of your life.

In this very moment, you can be -- a friend of mine, some of -- may have heard of you -- Franz Rosenzweig, once said in his Star of Redemption that love was a very strange process, because it had to be renewed every morning and it was very miraculous: one loved every morning a little better. But it -- one shouldn't think that love was a constant, but it was a rediscovery, or a re-awakening to this love. And then it could be felt to be more miraculous every day, and more grand, and more comprehensive, and more encompassing. But the main fact is that we could not think, since it was a living force, it was just as much as breathing something that we had to let -- to surge up again and again. And the idea that it had just continuity would kill it. And they should -- one shouldn't equate boredom and marriage.

(Hutchison: Would you like to adjourn now to the --?)

As I said, I am at your orders, Sir.

(Hutchison: Any more questions?)

(I'm surprised at the amount that the good doctor has been taken in by American advertising and the popular novel in these last comments. To say the American scheme, so-and-so, seems to me to be living in a world that is not -- that the average, the common man, in -- in dealing with the problem of the reality of life, has -- has actually moved into the area of which you seem to approve.)

I'm convinced of this. I think anybody who escapes college is absolutely sound in this country.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Hutchison: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to welcome you all again this evening to the Forum for the second and last of the lectures which Professor Rosenstock-Huessy is giving us on the series entitled, "Before and After Karl Marx -- Prophecies Fulfilled and Unfulfilled." Professor Rosenstock-Huessy.)

Since the audience in New York of course changes from day to day, I had better say one result of last night. Men would like to experiment with the weather, we said. The meteorologist of New York State, you remember, complained that he couldn't get the weather into his laboratory. And just as much, Mr. {Gardner Murphy} would say that he can't get the human soul under his instruments. That's the -- so the psychologists say they don't know whether the people in religion, or poetry, or politics are right, because they haven't the laboratory. They can't experiment. And most of you believe that the day will come when this all will be done in the laboratory. But the weatherman, as you remember in the story yesterday, was a little wiser. He said, "These masses of air, they are guided by nothing but themselves, and I can't get -- in the laboratory." And then I reminded you that man would be like hot -- this hot air, these masses of air in the air, if we had to wait before -- until we could get ourselves into the laboratory, but that fortunately we got out of this state of hot air by the fact that we are an experiment carried out by a power that distributes from generation to generation this functions -- His functions, and which makes prophets and fulfillers; which promises and which disappoints, and which crucifies, and which gospelizes, and apostolizes and finally writes the Gospel story. And we said that in this strange voluntary connections, from generation to generation -- of which to you as theologians, St. Paul is a great shining example -- era, and generation, and eons are founded {and} that, in the Christian era, the key is found to this power of forming cycles that go from promise to fulfillment. And we saw also that this is not just a simple way from 1 to 2, from A to B, but that it goes through the tremendous phases of the promise, the prophecy in which the Lord speaks, and He alone, and the answer given by the creature as the Thou that is appealed to, that is in- -- commanded, "Take Thee to Egypt and lead my people out of Egypt," the second person; and then the apostolic age where "We, the 12" take over; and the thir- -- fourth age, where this is all written down in the Gospel story. We had -- it becomes history and can be what you think is the beginning of the word "objectified." It's the end always of life when something becomes the object. Then it's over. Then you can give it to the psy-

chologist, to Mr. {Gardner Murphy}, but then it is utterly unimportant.

Today I have to apply this to the march from Karl Marx, and Darwin, and Freud, and Nietzsche -- these four dis- -- disangelists, these four people who wrote the Gospel before the catastrophe happened, who began at the other end and destroyed and dissolved humanism and its unholy alliance as idealism with Christianity, who stripped us naked of our complacency as citizens of the academic world; of seminaries, and universities, and colleges, and made us into -- back into animals, into individuals, into class warriors, and into insane men in a frenzy.

These -- the gospel writers of this strange type, these four -- Darwin, Freud, Nietzsche, and Marx -- began obviously a century in 1846. And I tried to take you back into those heydays in which the division between Marxians and liberals took place, in which Proudhon explained the liberal gospel once more in the last minute, so to speak, to Karl Marx. And I could show you, I hope, that for a hundred years, nothing much has changed in this array of two mentalities: the constant doubter on the liberal side and the man who doesn't believe in force and the constant striker and -- I tried to show you that Karl Marx became, so to speak, the symbol, or the shelter, the roof, under whose guidance all the strikes of the following hundred years could be explained, so to speak, by the Bellona, the Mars, the god of war, of class war, who Marx was able to embody for these people in their despair.

Today I shall take you through two more phases of this century, to make clear to you that there is such a holy experiment which allows us direction in history and a march through time with meaning, because there are volunteers, free men from generation to generation, who together con- -- form a connecting link, a meaningful past, a real galaxy of shining stars, just as the saints of old in the Christian church. We have to speak of the downfall of Marxism and the victory of Marx. But I have a handicap there. We'll have to speak of war and peace. We'll have to speak of revolution and Kladderadatsches and catastrophes. And the blight of American Christianity, as you know, is pacifism, that you still -- believe that the Christian church can deal with one-quarter of reality, with the sexless man -- male human being in business. That's by and large the picture the idealist has of man. This person is neither a woman, nor -- nor a virgin, nor a mother; it's the worker. It's the secretary, writes the -- serves the typewriter. And it is peaceful and kind.

That's one-quarter of reality. This country has had more wars in the last 150 years than any other country in the world -- Europe, and China, and India, et



cetera. Yet, this is not made a part of reality in this -- your thinking and you think that you're Christian ministers when you abstain from the digestion of war, which comes under the Lord's command, "I'm -- have -- shall bring a sword."

So gentlemen, I -- and ladies -- I feel very handicapped, because you will say that is all my private whim, that wars and revolutions are the content of the history of the last hundred years of mankind. Despite the fact that one of -- or the other of you may have been to Korea, despite the fact that one of you is a chaplain in the United States Army, he is a pacifist. That's a great mental luxury. And I was exposed to this and I have to make a little -- a little detour, to lead you into this, because I have talked to -- to a member -- illustrious member of the faculty of your college today, and even there I could not see any willingness -- although the gentlemen certainly is not a pacifist, he was very strong against the pacifists, in fact -- but he cannot see the connection of our economic history and the world wars. That's too much, here -- talked of the elasticity of the -- of the bourgeois class to adapt themselves to new conditions. He did not see who had adapted this class to new conditions, two wars, that is.

So I may tell you a little story that happened to me a fortnight ago in class. I had reminded them that the economic history of the last 1500 years consisted of three great epochs in which each time a new way was found of prolonging peace and escaping the necessity of war and military conflict. The monasteries of the early Middle Ages, the cities of the late Middle Ages, and the market-seeking economy -- which you call capitalism -- of the colonial, mercantilistic and the so-called capitalistic centuries, that each time a new wave was found of intensifying the peacetime economy to pro- -- to extend the terms of peace, the ti- -- periods of peace. And I showed them that war was normal and natural and peace was very incredible and very miraculous, and to be re-created from moment to moment, and quite unexpected and only to be hoped for, but certainly not simply to be believed in.

And the -- a Jewish boy after class said -- rather, he thought it was very witty -- "Well, you -- one sees this man's German background. He of course has to talk of war." So I took the opportunity in the next class of talking at some length of the new general class -- the class of generals in Israeli who run that state and their ideology and the military character of the experiences of the new state of Israel. I wished I knew a way of convincing you that what I have to say has very little to do with German militarism. But it has very much to do with my willing-

ness to obey the order that God seems to have given to men, to allow the mind to take possession of everything given. You bodily, either by your brothers and friends, or in person, have been in uniform. And you exist; and we have here only this peaceful meeting, because Hitler did not land on these shores 10 years ago.

And you will be asked to sacrifice 30 percent of your budget to military armament -- to armaments. Now I think it is not laziness only and stupidity, but it is folly and crime then not to begin to ask you whether man is not perhaps placed between war and peace, and whether it wouldn't be wiser for you to study not always your little peacetime society in the suburbs of New York, but perhaps to see man as alternating between his situation as a warrior for these penates, for his home, and as a worker, an -- a wage earner, an employee and a nice little sugar daddy.

As long as you don't do this, certainly theological thinking is very irrelevant and very insignificant. It is foolish. And every serious man is right that he doesn't listen to you. Why should he? He has to embrace the total of the national budget. He cannot just live on your niceties on Sunday or Saturday afternoon or morning.

So I think gent- -- I may ask you to understand that this is not my special national brand of political thinking, but that it is an honest attempt to obey. And it is so terrible in this country that one has to say these primitive things, that the mind, as much as the body, is not free to think what he pleases, but that it is an instrument of obedience. If you don't obey God, then you have to obey General Eisenhower. And if you don't obey General Eisenhower, then you have to obey Mr. Hoover. That is, obedience is necessary, but it can be obedience to the creator, who will give us, I think, the freedom to think about war and peace without fear and without prejudice. But if you only wish to think about peace, because that's so much nicer, you will not think at all.

And I need not tell you that this is the general state of society in America, that the people just don't think at all, because they only think about a little, little fragment of life. They know of these other parts of life, but they don't think that perhaps war is part of the destiny of man. Since we have been created, war is always looked at as caused by tyrants or by aggressors or by -- wouldn't you perhaps allow me the suggestion that perhaps wars come from the end of time, from this famous eschatology of which Professor Grant and other teachers of you now begin to speak again, that perhaps war is the way of mobilizing us from our laziness and complacency towards the appointed end of the human race. If you

look as -- war -- at war from the point of view of the Aristotelian final cause, you would perhaps stop of talking about the causes of war. There are many causes for peace, but there is no cause of war, because it is the creation in its pre-human state itself. The war -- world without the living Word is at war. And each time a new word has to be spoken, which then may create peace. But as long as this word is not spoken, you have the Cold War or the Hot War or the Warm War or the Lukewarm War. I think in this country it's the Lukewarm War.

War is from the end of time, and not from the beginning. If there was no war, you wouldn't -- we wouldn't reach our destination. You -- I just remind you of the fact that the Mexican War brought one-third of the United States under the domination of the United States. After all, that's very simple. Of course, you also got Puerto Rico later and perhaps we had -- we shouldn't have gotten that. But wars certainly -- they are perhaps not manifest destiny, but they are beckoning us from the end of time. This was known to our forefathers a hundred years ago. They went in various directions of including -- of -- in making the attempt of including war into their thinking. Marx did it. And he said that unemployment and crisis would lead to wars between the nations, and that a final clash would finish this chaotic society's peaceful endeavors. And there would be a jump then into the classless society.

Proudhon wrote a more important book, I think, than Marx on war, because he had more vision about the virtues of war. He wrote a book, which I recommend to everybody who wants to make a beginning, to think about the next century. And it's called, *La Guerre et la Paix*, "The War and the Peace." It's written in 1861, and it's -- as you see, contemporary with Tolstoy's novel. It is forgotten, the book. I think it's not right that it should be forgotten. It's a good book, because it stresses the fact that certain things can only be achieved by war whenever the people who have lived in peace are no longer willing to make the sacrifices of the previous war, when they wish to have the cake and eat it too, when you -- then you have to have the next war. Now after 30 years, usually the people go soft and do forget that at one time, they earned this peace by heroic sacrifice and loss of life. And therefore then, they want to have the cake, as I said, and eat it, too; and will not pay the penalty which they paid 30 years before. So then the next war obviously is due, because the peace has been eaten up. It has been devoured by the complacency of the second generation, or maybe the third. That's in every case to be distinguished.

Proudhon says, and this is, I think, the lasting contribution of this book in two volumes -- just as much as Carlyle, by the way, in his *Hero and Hero Worship* -- also a book which is despised in this country because it is so true -- that

force is a part of the real creation. Force, take -- think of the labor forces. And that force therefore cannot be despised. It is impossible for the United States -- say -- I say now, in addition to this -- to give votes to Cuba, or to Panama, and to Cos- -- to Puerto Rico, or to Costa Rica and think that you can transfer force. Force is a creature of God Almighty. This mighty republic is very much inclined to think that it can part with energy -- part of its energies by bestowing votes on these unhappy republics. It is impossible. You cannot get rid of your responsibility by farming out votes in the League of Nations to these -- they don't become more powerful, perhaps you become less powerful. That's all that happens. This power which is vested in the Cons- -- United States at this moment, cannot be transferred, as little as you can transfer one of your legs to somebody else. But that's what the whole American thinking is about. Can't we rid ourselves of our power, of our force, of the vehemence of energy and vitality, which pulses through our body and of which -- I don't know why, people seem to be ashamed. And Proudhon says whenever force is despised, whenever force has no organic and creative outlet in peace, when people try to replace it by shareholding companies, with votes -- every man a vote -- then something terrible happens. This force must find an outlet, because it is true in the creation of our God, there are only forces. We too are only forces; and we are real forces. And the forces that are able to build the Empire State Building and the George Washington Bridge -- they are to be respected as tremendously creative forces which do not occur in other parts of the world so easily. And so these creative forces have to find a -- a real recognition by your minds, gentlemen, or you go on talking about individuals, and pacifism, and -- and then there will be the next conflagration. And that's how the world war happened. It happened against the will of the liberal mind, who had doubts about everything and no use for force. The people of 1846 therefore have a prophecy for us: Don't forget the creative and positive meaning of war. That's part of the prophecy of Proudhon, Carlyle, and Marx. Now we come to the second chapter tonight: the downfall of Marxism. Marx, the prophet -- and Marxism, the organization -- are obviously an utter contradiction, because if the economic forces, as Marx foresaw or predicted, or foresaw and predicted -- it's not quite the same to foresee and to predict -- if the forces of capitalism are self-destructive and lead finally to the great Kladderdatsch, to the great cataclysm of capitalism itself, as Marx thought, then the founding of the First, the Second, and the Third International is foolish. The founding of a Communist Party is impossible, meaningless, and the doing anything about this catastrophe -- cataclysm is impossible, so to speak, would be a refutation of Marx -- the Marxist doctrine that these forces of capitalism have to beget the new society themselves. And everything that you try to do by willpower outside

the economic process itself is ridiculous.

Well, this contradiction struck, of course, people from the very beginning. But people wanted to do something, and so they went and organized. I'm not speaking of the unions. I'm speaking of the Communist Party, of the International, of the Socialist Party in all countries. The contradiction has been -- that's the old -- old story now. I need not go into any of the details. But the downfall of capital- -- of Marxism obviously occurred, and the victory of Marx, if -- and now I have to ask for your one second of faith, and not of just understanding -- and that's perhaps more as a person in New York is willing to give.

When we entered the catas- -- era of catastrophes in 1904 with the first Russian Revolution and the Russo-Japanese War, in this prelude of the -- of our era, of our own time, it was shown that our revolutionary era would consist of a strange order of things very different from what Marx had foreseen or known about revolutions, that wars would begin the game and revolutions would follow. The Russo-Japanese War began and the famous Red Sunday of January -- 22nd, in St. Petersburg, followed. In the French Revolution, as you know, it was the reverse. Paris began and Napoleon was the consequence -- the Napoleonic Wars, I mean.

So we have here the real embodiment -- the incorporation, the fulfillment of prophecy, or of the disangelists' gospel in -- beginning in 1904 with this prelude which sets already the form- -- it gives the formula, the recipe for everything that has happened since, and that ends in the Korean War in 1950. War first, and revolution as its consequence only or its -- as its acknowledgement or as its recognition. The war mobilizes the masses of the workers and changes their social situation totally. The peasants of Russia can make the revolution in 1917, because they are in the army, instead of being in factories.

In 1914, when the First World War started, Marxism was repudiated by the working masses, because they all voted the credits of war for their respective governments. Marx had seen in England before a kind of what he called "super-capitalism" or "super-imperialism," which would take in the English workers and allow them to come out jingoistically for the imperial causes of the British Empire. But he could not have foreseen that in all the industrialized areas of the world, the workers would go to war against each other, and that in the only country that was not industrialized, his gospel would be followed. It's a little bit like the Jews rejecting Jesus, and He has to go to the Gentiles with His faith, that -- the fact that the Russians took to Marxism and the Europeans didn't -- the Europeans being the Jews and the Russians being the Gentiles in this case.

Certainly nothing happened in the way in which Marx had predicted it, and everything happened as he had predicted it. He did predict that the national economies would break down. He did also predict that they would do it heedlessly. I have been old enough in 1914 -- and there's at least one man in this room who has also lived through those days knowingly in 1914 -- all Europe went to war without any purpose. There is a famous document in your own literature which proves this. In 1913, one year before the crown prince of Austria was murdered, the alleged cause of this war, of the world -- two world wars, by the -- large -- the ambassador to the Court of St. James, of Mr. Woodrow Wilson, Walter Page, wrote a memorandum to the president of the United States saying that there was no doubt that within 12 months, a world war would break out, because the go- -- coun- -- nations of Europe had nothing to live for. Wouldn't he be good enough to invent a scheme in the tropics, or at the -- at the Northern Pole, just to give them something better to do than to turn their arms against each other. So you could see that the -- in America it was possible to foresee the end of these national markets, these national purposes, these national imaginations, these national progra- -- programs. They had nothing in their head. They were just as empty as the three men in Teheran were found, when they had to decide over the future of Europe. They had no idea about the future, so they said they didn't know.

The heedlessness of the wars is the great identification of these events with regard to the Marxian prediction. So, Point 1 of my thesis is that Marxism was refuted, but Marx was not refuted. There's an absolute unwillingness, however, among the Communists, as well as among the liberals, to see that the world wars are fulfillment. The scourge, it seems, the sufferings, the crucifixion of humanity, has not been big enough, and large enough, and total enough to make economists or historians sit up and -- think, "Isn't this the fulfillment of a prediction?" "Oh no, it isn't. The documents prove that it was just thought out 24 hours before it all started, by some ultimatum, or by some diplomatic step, or by some such ridiculous telephone call."

Gentlemen, that is, by and large, the abdication of the intellectuals, the so-called intelligentsia in our modern world, that they have been proven unable to connect the times, to connect prophecy and fulfillment. I think that's their biggest indictment.

The desperate attempt to find in the -- in the -- as some law schools do, just to give you an example of the modern man's mind, to -- to find in the -- in the

stomach-juice of the judges the reasons for a decision of the Supreme Court, as I've heard people actually debate in a law school -- how to influence the digestion of the judges so that the case is decided in favor of the pleading -- of the plaintiff. I've heard historians say that the history of the human race depended on our glands. Well, as long as people believe such nonsense, they will always be taken by surprise. They will always be hot air moving by nothing -- guided by nothing but themselves, and they'll all be astonished. We are the best informed generation, and the most surprised. We know everything, except what must happen tomorrow. But we need not. It's all predicted and prophesied. It's all there. History is in our marrow and in our bone. From our mother's womb, we are the citizens of all times, if we only would like -- want to hear and to listen, but we don't. We want to know. That's something quite different. That's disobedience.

The downfall of Marxism is illustrated by this pamphlet, which I highly recommend as the -- the downfall of the Piltdown Man. It's called, "Shakespeare: A Marxist Interpretation," by {Smirnov}, one of these outputs of the Russian ministry of public instruction in 1936. But that wouldn't be important. But it was especially edited for the New Theater League, 55 West 45th Street, New York City, in 1936. They even have printed their names here, but I don't wish to give them away.

Shakespeare was with the Marx -- Karl Marx family a favorite. His daughters had to enact it, and he recited it, Shakespeare, for pages and pages. He thought he was a great genius who enlightened Marx. But if you read Mr. {Smirnov}, it is the other way around: Marx enlightened Shakespeare. I have no time, and I haven't even the brain power to show you how satanically stupid this pamphlet is. But I would think that it should be prescribed reading for theologians. I mean this very seriously, gentlemen. If you do not study this aberration of the human mind, the communist writings in this country in the '30s, you do not understand what you have to learn or what you have to come up to or what you have to overcome. What -- how the sovereign power of the spirit really has to do something with this game, this puzzle here, this crossword puzzle of Mr. A. A. {Smirnov}. It is, I think, in all -- I've read many of these things, because as you may know, I have written a book on the revolutions of the -- of the last thousand years -- it is of all the documents of the human mind, the greatest platitude, and yet, the greatest separation of Marx and Marxism, between Marx and Marxism. The genius of Marx, the worshiper of Shakespeare, and the stupidity of Marxism cannot be better illustrated than by this Marxist interpretation of Shakespeare. In -- in one -- saying it in one word, it's moving in circles. It says absolutely nothing, because it knows beforehand, before -- without being able to

prove it, that Shakespeare is a great genius. This he accepts -- on hearsay, I should say, you see -- and because he has absolutely no reason from his own thesis to believe that it is a great -- that is a great genius. There is no place for this, you see, in his own ideology. So he's rather desperate. Sentence after sentence, and page after page, he's -- he has some epithet, you see, which says it's really great, but it shouldn't. And it shouldn't, it shouldn't, it can't -- because he's torn, you see. Shakespeare doesn't know to which class he belongs. Obvious he didn't.

The downfall of Marxism, gentlemen, came from a premise -- clearly stated, I should say, in Marx but overruled by his own ambition -- that since the thesis and the antithesis and since classes in his own time opened his own eyes to reality, that perhaps other conflicts in other centuries were able to state their own differences in the terms that we have to learn and hear in the Age of the Reformation, or in the Age of the Franciscans and Dominicans, in the voices of these people. I think that for Marxism, I have a right to deduce my claim that just as the 19th century talked in terms of capital and labor, so obviously these other periods talked in the terms of their own conflicts; and we have to learn their lingo, the lingo of the 16th century and the 17th century before we even know what they were talking about. And to find behind all these str- -- struggles of the past the same conflicts, as in the 19th century, is really against the sacred Hegelian and Marxian problem -- positions of dialectics, because the self-consciousness of capital begets the anti-self-consciousness of the proletariat. Well, all right.

Then why should not the people in the other centuries have stated with the same genius as Marx for the proletariat, stated their case in such a way that the interpretation of Marx is not available, is not applicable to these other centuries. They were, after all, Marx's equals -- Cromwell was -- you see. And there's absolutely no reason to -- from his own premises, to allow him to carry over his thesis and antithesis in their own -- in the same phrasing and the same words, and Mr. {Smirnov} is so very useful for you to learn just this, that Shakespeare has to be read and not interpreted, and that the critic of Shakespeare is not the genius, but Shakespeare is the genius.

Famous vote taken in my class: who is the better man, the critic or -- or the artist? Majority vote: the critic.

Now if the big catastrophe of these two last wars for -- I ask you for this ounce of faith -- is the prediction of Marx, as I firmly believe, then the new century is not the century of labor and capital, but of war and peace, of a world that is one already in two and that, by the way, fulfills the prediction of Proudhon that the end -- final state of society could neither be a world government ever, nor could



it be a league of nations -- that's all in this book here of 1846 -- but it ha- -- would have to be the antagonism, the creative antagonism of two great powers. That's the state of affairs as we have, which is very human. There is husband and wife, so I don't see why there shouldn't be Communism and America. Brother and sister, at least, quarreling.

I have reasons to believe that if I had time, you would even follow me in this argument that these two great powers -- world powers are in a new position. They are not just like the Bourbons and the Habsburgs of old, for -- out for equilibrium of power. At this moment, you just look at the map of the world. Russia and America are both so preoccupied with digesting the spoils, with organizing the tremendous areas that have fallen to their sway, that it will take 50 years perhaps before they are knowing where they stand, how far they have -- they have managed to regalanize Brazil and Manchuria. Nobody can envy these two -- poor great powers of this task to galvanize these other areas into life and action and the famous standard of living. And that is -- obviously a very disagreeable task. So it is much cheaper to talk about the war between Russia and America; but unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, you are not going to see it happen. We will -- are going to see happen, however, the -- the -- the development of two tremendous armed camps, who will have to tackle this great creature, war, as Marx and his century had to tackle this gro- -- great, great creature, production, peacetime production, economy, commodities, capital, labor. The headache that this war will give us as a creature, as a creatura belli, as the liturgy of the Church would have to call it, as that ever newly created being called war, that is the topic of the next science, I'm sure, of the next great enterprise of the human mind. Whoever partakes in this task of mastering the reality of war and thereby then for the first time perhaps becoming able to subject it to arbitrary treatment, or to management, whoever participates in this will belong to the people who have re- -- done repentance for the impotency of the last century in the life of the Church, who was without prophecy and fulfill- -- without crucifixion and without fulfillment and had to leave it to these disangelists to prophesy and to gospelize and to see fulfillment.

I do think that the two world wars amount to some such metaphysical or religious dignity of an event of a world order. I told you that I know very well that very few people are willing to step up to the time of Marx or go after Marx, that most of you prefer to live before Marx. And so therefore, in order to encourage you to believe that perhaps something has happened that allows you to take stock and to say that prophecy and fulfillment now lie behind us in such a way that we can live and include this great story, encompass it into our way of think-

ing, not because it is before us, but because it already has shown up a great deficiency of Protestantism of the last centuries, and thereby make Christianity a power in life again, which it isn't today -- I want to show you how -- what happened between the two World Wars very briefly with regard to these United States, who after all, when I landed on these shores were, as you know, quite unconcerned. Although they were in the throes of a terrible depression -- had this unemployment of 11 million people -- still in this year in which I landed had jurisprudence, in which the pre-Marxian truth was held that labor was a commodity which could be sold over the counter. That, in the face of 11 million unemployed, who had certainly no counter to sell their labor at, was quite some boldness of the academic mind, the judicial mind, of the educated people in this country.

Well, in 1935, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States saw the light and he voted as a minority -- in a minority vote that this wasn't so, that labor was not a commodity, because after all it seemed to him that the worker marched himself in person into the factory, and he couldn't quite see where the counter was which separated the man and the -- his labor. Next year, the minority of the Supreme Court became a majority and voted this strange concept of 1846 out of existence. In the same year, there appeared a book, the first book of a recognized, decent authority -- a man who could be a full professor in a university -- on the theory of unemployment. If you look up the books on economics in this country especially, any year before 1935, unemployment was mentioned as undesirable perhaps, or also as desirable because the wages were then very low. It was an afterthought that it was treated at all. In William Taussig's book on economics, it isn't mentioned at all. That went through many editions in this country.

Marx has conquered in this country by this simple fact that ever since 1929, the unemployed have not -- no longer remain the annex of the economic theory, but the key, and the opening gates -- way, so to speak, into economic thinking, for any reasonable man in politics. Mr. Eisenhower wants to balance the budget, and he wants to do many things of 1870, but he also says that -- as soon as there is an economic depression in sight, all the big steam engines of the fire department of the United States will be mobilized, budget balanced or not balanced. In other words, you see the revaluation of values. You see that on the one-hand side the lip service is paid to the order of things: before, the unemployed were a liability which had to be turned into an asset, but that since 1929, something tremendous has happened in the United States: our unemployed, our liabilities, which must be treated as assets. That is the secret of a new era, that this

which is minus in one era, becomes plus in the next era. It is always the sinner of one society that is the cornerstone of the next society. The proletarian, the unemployed of the 19th century today is the man at whom all the guns of legislation will shoot first, when a crisis occurs. There will be 63 million -- million jobs in one form or another, whatever happens. When this occurs, gentlemen, then people have changed their minds. And of course a change of mind is the only change that matters, the metanoia. The metanoia is not repentance for your little moral sins, gentlemen, but it is the rethinking of your own place in the world, and today it is better to be on the side of the unemployed, because then you may be sure that you will be taken care of.

I had a friend, an older man -- his son is in this room --and in 1913, he made a speech as the head of employers against the idea of collective bargaining. And he said that he would all his life be for free bargaining. And he meant at that time, of course, the bargaining between the employer and the single worker. In 1929, the same man had advanced to an even higher position of influence and authority. He was the president of all the chambers -- the organizations on the employers' side for bargaining with the workers. And in this capacity, he had to make a speech, and he violently came out against the government, which at that time said that it would arbitrate in strikes and would -- with the National Labor Board, you understand -- dictate the tariffs between the labor and capital. And in order to defend the autonomy of the industry, he said that forever would he stand for free bargaining -- only that 16 years only after his first speech, he meant in this term "collective bargaining." This is metanoia: when the same man, without knowing it, you see, uses the same word in the opposite sense, within half a generation. This has happened between the two world wars.

And there again you see the strange situation of the liberal intelligentsia, of which this man was a very decent member, as president -- as a -- of a great business, and a very responsible position. It's afterthought. The world war had already done materially away with national markets, for all practical purposes. It had Balkanized Europe in such a way that this couldn't last, that a new order of things had to follow. Austria was destroyed, Turkey was destroyed, et cetera. But thinking is a slow process, very different from what you think in the Horace Mann School. Thinking is slow and life is fast. This is another thing which you have to meditate over, because we all have -- I too -- we have to learn that the intelligentsia is the latest group usually to understand, not the first. If they do not make the sacrifice as Marx, and forgo the benefits of the Ford Foundation, then they are the latest to understand. They are blinded by their dependency on the means of making a living. Very important that it took this

man 16 years. Myron Taylor of the steel trust said the same thing about collective bargaining, as -- if I remember writing in 1937, when he came back from Italy and invited Mr. and Mrs. John Lewis for lunch and had a little card and on which it was said "Collective Bargaining." Nice lunch menu.

The conversion of the -- of capital, of business, of the intelligentsia to the catastrophe's meaning happened between the two world wars. And therefore, this in-between twilight of between the wars is of great importance. There the intelligentsia discovered what had happened. They discovered the solidarity of the army for the whole nation; that in these modern wars, it became clear, and I think it should be clear to you when you read this word "shelter," in your houses and homes, and on your bridges, that the solidarity of mankind came into the experience and knowledge of the people from a corner on which they had not ever expected it, from the simple threat of war, the threat of war which today includes children and women even more than the soldier at the front, because obviously the hydrogen bomb is not going to be -- wasted on the infantryman in his trench. Now, with this reversal of danger, the solidarity, not of the nation -- there is no nation that can go to war alone -- but of these two great blocs of humanity, has been realized in a very unpredicted and unpromised -- -promising, you may even say -- unpromising way. But it is noth- -- not -- nevertheless the great answer to the outcry of the manifest, Communist Manifest, that there is only the solidarity of the proletariat, and no other, and that the others live by free competition where dog eats dog. This no longer is true. Dog may eat dog, and ma- -- dog may like to eat dog. But no trespassing. It isn't allowed anymore. The potential soldier, the potential member of the armament race -- you may denigrate this as very poor, very external, very cheap. To me it isn't. It's very sublime that men who try to squabble about peacetime economy and to divide the interest in peacetime between the capital and labor is now suddenly overtaken by this much greater truth of war, in which these differences between capital and labor are of utter insignificance, can just be {ruled} out.

I could go now back -- my time is up, as I see -- but I could go back and remind you that, of course, Lenin himself made this great leap away from Marxism into the great prediction of the catastrophe when he in 1899 already said the -- "It isn't necessary for the peasants to be revolutionized. We can make the revolution with unrevolutionized peasants." In a way, he foresaw then that the soldier-peasant would do exactly his bidding even more than the worker-soldier, of whom he had to execute quite a number.

All this is my way of saying, in a very short and too-short way, that these

three great acts of this drama, or four great acts -- the prelude, which sets the recipe: war first, revolution second -- in the Russo-Japanese War; the First World War, which makes it obvious that the nations have no future, because they have no purpose beyond themselves, because they go into this war in despair and despondency. I could show you the statements of Grey, the English statesman; of the emperor of Germany, the -- on the other side. Utterly hopeless, without any expectation of any meaning, of any outcome, of any -- that may -- would make sense, and yet going.

My friends in the German general staff on August 2nd thought the war was lost. I had two friends there, two brothers who were both captains in the general staff in Berlin. And they both were convinced, and their superiors too, that this war was madness.

That's very significant. It's part of the -- the -- the description of the capitalistic society of the 19th century which Marx had given. Well, the new centuries in which we are, into which we are dismissed by the fulfillment of the old prophecy, and for whose new prophets we are waiting, is a century after the great crisis of -- predicted by Marx. If you do not want to take this step, life must become very grim and meaningless for you. You cannot then understand that all those squabbles, of which the daily papers sometimes still make mention, are over. The questions -- you see it, from the way the Taft-Hartley bill has had to be handled, I think rightly so, that the desires of making the closed shop a part of the American Constitution couldn't be fulfilled, because that's after all the -- the central argument, the central question. Are we responsible for the flourishing of the lifetime president of a union?

This is all over. The unions in this country are really to be pitied. They only had 10 short day -- years of triumph. It's too short really to relish it. In -- in England, they had at least the Labour Party government for a short while. But on the whole, these conflicts, these contrasts are very minor from now on. The sooner these people see this, the more they can concentrate on the solution of the next era. In this era, it will not be dialectics of capital and labor. It will be the dialogue of two great camps, and dialogue is not quite the same as dialectics. It is not thesis and antithesis, but it's partnership of two people who have something very different to say, but who have to say it to each other in a conversation. Anybody who can create a conversation between the East and the West will deserve well and will do something for peace. Anybody who talks about dialectics will not talk at all. You just be abstractionist, let -- putting other people in pigeonholes. If I am in a dialogue, I am not the thesis, and the other man is not the antithesis, obviously. It's ridiculous. Just tell your wife when she listens to

you that she's the antithesis.

These are the two things: for war, solidarity; for peace, conversation -- which will dominate, because the prophecy of Marx is honorably fulfilled. Honorably, because he has been recognized in his demand for u- -- solidarity. Fulfilled, because the nations in their nationalism have come to the end of their rope. Yet, in this honorable fulfillment, there's also a victory of the spiritual tradition of the Bible. Because it is the friendship of Engels and Marx; it is the devotion of Jennie Westfahlen, Marxens wife; it is the faith of the working man in Marx and in the word of Marx that has really allowed us today to see this prophet as a prophet, to know of his existence. Who would mention Marx if he hadn't been put on this pedestal of loyalty, and allegiance, and reverence by the working man? I think he is -- has given them this shelter. I think that really all the strikes fought in the last hundred years have been ennobled, have been treated more generously by the fighters, because they had this great program, this great proclamation explaining the strike, every one strike as part of one tremendous outcry for solidarity of the human race in work.

Again, I invite you to -- not to be blinded by the Marxians against the greatness of Marx. They never mention the strikes. But after all, the strikes are the real story of the -- of the suffering of the working man in the last hundred years. And the working man himself partly has been cheated out of this heroic story a little bit, I feel today, by his union leaders who are selling him on wages. No strike has ever been fought for wages, despite all the {utter} aspects. They have always been fight for -- fought for the dignity of man and for the solidarity of the workers. And that is a religious item. That is an act of neighborly love and an act of belonging, or -- an expression of the deep feeling that all men in this tremendous division of labor are together in one great enterprise, regardless of the place, and the factory, and the individual shop in which they are working. The unity of the process of production all over the world is the other experience of the world wars, which is a triumph of the story of our era, which has said that not only the spirit of man must unite in prayer on Sundays in one -- one creed and one faith, but that even our hands may be -- by the scientific process -- be led in such a way that all production all over the globe is really one. That's incredibly Christian and incredibly ecumenic. I think it's a better ecumenicity than all the ecumenicity of the churches.

As you know, Lenin recognized this, when he proclaimed in 1917, "Communism, that's the Hindenburg program in industry, plus the Soviets." And in this outcry, he united war and peace in the most -- convincing to me -- convincing manner. We have General Eisenhower as president, as a kind -- a kind of

minimum general, in order to bring to the attention of the American public that there has been fought a war, the consequences of which must not be forgotten for industry. West Point has published a new textbook, Economics of National Security, which another attempt to show that war dominates peace, as it should, because otherwise if you -- as long as war dominates peace, there hasn't to be the next war.

Let me then end this very briefly: that society was a creature of special order and rules, production, a secret to be studied, is the great discovery of the 19th century. And it has become conscious -- we have become conscious of this very much. That war is still a strange mis- -- strangely mistreated part of our destiny has to become the topic, I think, of the next century, because always the fulfillment of one prophecy is in itself the question mark which invites the next prophecy. In this moment I feel we stand. We stand at the end of the era predicted by Marx. And we stand in the beginning of an era in which the first word is not yet spoken, because war itself has not yet been addressed, spoken to as a part of creation. It has been pooh-poohed. It has been studied. It has been analyzed. You have generals. But that isn't the problem. The problem is to understand that there is no peace without war and no war without peace. William James spoke of a moral equivalent of war at the end of his life. And he died in despair because he felt that he had wasted his whole life and had only discovered in the last minute what he should have thought about. Well, perhaps you begin. There is an English statesman who once very simply said, "In we are; on we must." Thank you.

(Hutchison: Professor Rosenstock-Huessy has kindly agreed to answer some questions now for a few moments, and then we will adjourn again as last night to the faculty lounge for coffee. And I hope those visitors from outside the seminary will join us there too. Anyone any questions? John?)

(Professor Huessy, you raised the question that war created solidarity, and I assume that you meant a solidarity among -- on the part of the two camps. I would -- I would appreciate your pointing to those particular aspects in this camp, the American camp or the Western camp, where you see solidarity. I see division, and not solidarity that has been created in this camp today. And if I see some solidarity coming, I see it coming under the form and force and power of one whom I think needs a lot more talking about than paying attention to war or peace. Where is -- wherein lies the solidarity of the West, or of America?)  
I would like to have somebody ask me questions who has been here yesterday.

(Thank you.)

(May I ask another question?)

(Hutchison: Please.)

(In the beginning of the lecture, Freud, Darwin, and Nietzsche were execrated as people who stripped man of his human dignity. Yet Freud, Darwin, and Nietzsche in their respective fields concentrated on man's struggle for existence -- Freud in the -- in the conscious and subconscious realm, and Darwin and the war among the species. And Nietzsche more or less glorified the whole subject of war. Now aren't they more or less apostles in keeping with the manifest destiny of war or the idea that war is the -- is the process in the unfolding of civilization?)

I'm delighted that you ask this question. Obviously you are right. But it -- it has been said of all these four men, in order to -- to show you the paradox in which this -- their doctrines move, that they are the devil's elixir for Christianity. That is, they have shown this, the devil's side, the night side of our life as still in existence and still necessary -- and always necessary. This spur of the fear, of the desire, of the great passions, the lust for power, you see, all the class conflict, but showing at the same time the necessity of transcending this conflict, not by their preaching, but by painting the situation so -- in -- such intolerable terms that something -- men, we were driven out of our complacency, and had to do -- and were perhaps better -- more willing to do anything than -- through all preachings of Christianity for 1900 years. It has been -- Nietzsche has been, I think rightly, called the negative preacher of Christianity, you see, the devil's elixir for the revival of the Christian faith. There is some great depth in this; that as long as we kept this black undercurrent of war, of belligerency in our nature, you see, under cover -- or just called it in general the sinful state of man -- it was not really conjured up from its depths and couldn't be mastered. It is really at this moment that hell has risen. But when hell rises, it can be redeemed. As long as it is -- we are blind to it and don't look into the abyss, you see, it will always explode. It will always break up. As soon -- that's what I have -- tried to tell you when I said -- spoke of this creature of war which has to be conjured. The other conflicts, too -- it is true -- you are right, Sir -- that in confronting us -- ourselves with this, we enter really an era in which we will allow the demons of hell to speak, and not to conquer. I mean, to be there, and not to conquer.

May I remind you that this Christian church has tried to era- -- organize itself



as Heaven in the first thousand years. If you go to the famous monasteries on the promontory of Athos, in Greece, you will still find this -- the heavenly hosts organized there, in full swing. They are so heavenly that not even a feminine chicken is allowed into the monastery there. No sex.

Well, I mean that you know perhaps that the architecture of the Byzantine cathedrals is really a ca- -- an attempt to depict Heaven, very seriously. For centuries, people have devoted themselves in the monastic orders to an attempt to praise the Lord in adoration, just as the angelic choir. This is literally true. Obviously since Dante and the Crusades, man has opened up purgatory. You just have to read Dante or Goethe's Faust to know that the topic of the second millennium is purgatory. That's more or less a civilian mind. Purgatory.

Now we do enter the third thousand years of the Church in which hell itself has to be redeemed. And the redemption of hell will be -- look very different from Dante and Faust and it will look very -- und Goethe -- and it will look very different from a monastery of St. Benedict or St. Basilius. I'm quite serious, but it's no time now to go into this. I'm very grateful to you, because it is hell which these people have revealed. But they have only revealed it. They have forced us to acknowledge its existence. You understand? But nothing is said, so to speak, how to treat them. I really have a hunch -- again, I cannot prove this to you now -- that the Gospel is written first about this hell. It's {only} perverted, I mean, because hell is perversion. First they say, you see, "We will destroy our -- your world of humanism, of Good, True, and Beautiful, of idealism." Then the catastrophe happens, following out their recipe into the gas chambers of Auschwitz, into the concentration camps, into every gruesomeness, into the bombing of Dresden, into every destruction possible, and every one of the nation -- warring nations has its full share in these hellfires, in these really -- real hell. You are still so sheltered here that you just don't know what after all has happened to one half of the human race in the last 50 years. Twenty-five perced- -- percent of the people -- of the humanity only live in the same places at this moment in which they lived 30 years ago.

(Hutchison: Would anyone else like to ask a question now? Or would you like to -- perhaps we might adjourn, Professor Rosenstock-Huessy, down to the -- )  
Now. I would -- I'm -- this is an old student of mine, this chaplain. And I would wish to answer his question, but I thought the others should have the first choice. So, you don't mind?

If there only was a division in this country, Sir. All these divisions don't

amount to anything. They are not serious. What's the division between Mr. McCarthy and President Dickey or President Conant or who --? These are not divisions to speak of. You are too impatient. I mean, you are too sentimental. You are too touchy. You are too soft. These are not real divisions. What's the division between John Lewis and -- and the president of the st- -- of the coal miners? Where is there any division? They are all thinking in the same terms about more refrigerators and more consumers' goods.

(Hutchison: Any more questions?)

(Do I understand that { } there is no such thing as a -- as a war of -- of ideas? Must be an armed conflict, is that what your position is?)

Well, would you make su- -- I would -- do not -- I'm not sure that I understand your question. Ideas make for war. Idealists are the real war-mongers, because idealists think that they -- their mind is divine. And you can't argue with these people. Platonist is a dangerous fellow. An Aristotelian equally well. They believe in the mind. So you -- the -- the mind is unbreakable, you see. The only person you can deal with is a man who is willing to change his mind. Now any man who is a philosopher can't do that, you see, if he has one philosophy. If he has many, that's of course better. So ideals make for war. That's perfectly true. So the fewer such i- -- idealists we have, the fewer wars we have. The -- Moscow is certainly -- these are ideologists, aren't they? So that's the -- the danger, that's the impenetrable thing about them. They are Platonists.

(Or the power of {a ballot}.)

Pardon me?

(Or the power of {a ballot}.)

Oh, that's only true of Brooklyn, I think.

(Dr. Huessy, would you care to comment, if you would, I think, in keeping with the finale of the lecture, apropos of your statement that the new era will herald a -- the necessity for a -- a dialogue between the East and the West. And by your words, it would seem that the possibility of discussing any element of capital and labor has vanished with the last century and certainly with the wars that have passed. The religious issue is certainly not one that would receive an amenable ear, at any rate, in the -- in the East. Would you care to say any word as how one could begin the dialogue. We have the problem, say, Winston

Churchill says he wants to go to Moscow. But what will he say when he gets there? Wher- -- what words do you speak, what language do you speak? There are no values.)

Well, don't you think that an era always begins this way, that the thing that has to be done is at the beginning impossible? Otherwise it wouldn't be the task. It is impossible. I have read -- written in the preface of my new edition of the revolutions that I hoped one day this book on revolutions could be read in Russia. It cannot today. A friend of Lenin tried to have it translated five years ago and in the meantime, he died; I don't know if a natural death.

So I think it is this fact that it cannot be done at this moment by correspondence or by any cheap means, which suddenly makes it so absurd to speak of Marxens attempt to try to drive the wedge between labor and capital in such a way that -- labor would cease to talk to capital and would become, you see -- on s- -- go on strike and become labor. Class conscience, you see, immune against the temptations of capital and all the -- the ideologists around capital; the journalists, you see, and all the -- the people whom the -- the -- the -- the paid pens of the capitalists. Now this process has -- we have seen happening to a certain extent. In 1914, it failed for Europe. These poor workers were all benighted enough to take up arms for their fatherland, and did not have enough, you see, blocking of -- as antithesis, and so the whole thing fell through with this wonderful idea of thesis and antithesis, you see, because they did talk, and could be talked to. As soldiers, they took orders. They were -- you see, they stood at attention, even.

Now, obviously, therefore Marxens vision was one of going apart, of a catalytic, you see, process in society. Our process is the opposite. We begin with real separation. They are apart, and the less industry therefore is in Russia, the more these powers of Moscow have to stress that they are apart. There -- the more the ideology of antithesis, you see, is important, the more cities will be built, the more cars that will run, the more sti- -- you see, refrigerators will be built in Russia, the less it will be necessary always to stress the antithesis. But at this moment, it's the only way in which you can govern Russia, that you insist that they are the antithesis, because they don't -- aren't the antithesis, so they have to be told that they are, you see. The -- the consciousness has to make up for the facts. Now, a consciousness that is so beleaguered, and so bombsh- -- you see, so -- so bombed by -- by propaganda and argument, be the antithesis, otherwise there's no reason why we are hostile to the E- -- West -- cannot be reached. That's the reason why I have to talk to you about it, that this breaking up of

this Iron Curtain -- or however you call it, you see, this mental partition -- that schools, like Plato and Aristotle, at this moment have reached proportions of dividing the world, you see. Philosophy's now really dividing the masses, the -- 500 million people here and 500 million people there. That's a great task for a super-philosopher. Now Christ came into a world beriddled with philosophies, and showed that the philosophies would not solve this problem. And I do think that's exactly a similar problem today. Then the schools had to be closed and -- or to be redeemed, and today, you have to -- the -- the -- all these people whom -- which we have expe- -- -posed to -- to -- education, you see, now have to be redeemed of their education.

(I hope I'm not exposing myself too much, but I -- I -- which means I'm fearful that I am -- take the risk. I must take the risk, because I'm here to learn. Do I understand you correctly, Sir, that the divisions, based upon our idealisms, are not as real as the divisions based upon our military camps? It seems to me that the real divisions in this or any age are the divisions of our minds; and that if we could get out of our camp and into the Russian camp, we'd find less dividing us there, as far as their uniform is concerned, than perhaps, as far as their minds are concerned. In fact, one of the problems after the conquest of Germany was to keep our men from fraternizing with Germans, with whom they had no real divisions.)

Oh no, it was all sororizing. You -- my answer to your question would also touch on -- on your question once more about the division. Soldiers are the same in all countries. Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Zhukov can get on very beautifully. And that's nothing to laugh -- it is very serious, that it's all nonsense that a general has more sympathy with the -- with the tailor in his town. He has much more sympathy with another general. And it's very serious, because we have built artificially these things up to say that a general is -- is more interested in a college professor. He certainly is not. Just ask the people at Columbia University. So, it isn't true. Armies, warring armies need each other. There's great respect for each other, and very easy friendship. It is all pacifistic idiocy to say that people who go to war -- each other hate each other. They love each other. That's why they go to war. Well, obviously. Very true. They help each other to their per- -- completion, to their perfection. What would be the world without decently and honestly fought wars? This -- last war has been poisoned by pacifism. The brutalities of this war, the treatment, the wrong treatment, the impo- -- impotency of making peace has all come from the preaching that war is wicked. That's why you were excluded from any influence, all the theological -- the schools of Christianity. The Christians had made themselves impotent of making sure that

the generals, and the officers, and the soldiers would treat the people not as enemies in a -- in a sense of the heart, but as enemies of their political order, which is something quite different, because obviously on the other people defended another order and they were just as honorable and generous as we were. But the -- the Church has done this, the Church by its neutrality as to the problem of a decent warrior. What have you done in -- in educating your soldiers for being good soldiers and loving their enemy?

A great story -- you may know that one of the fa- -- most famous Christian charities in Germany was founded by a man called von Bodelschwing, in Bethel, Bielefeld. He was even spared by the Nazis. There has been no case of euthanasia in his -- any of his hospitals for the idiots, and the feeble-minded, and the old for which he is famous. He has a great center there in Germany. And -- English bombs did fall on his hospitals, but otherwise he's still there.

He wro- -- once said to a Danish pacifist, who complained over the fact that he had fought in the French and German war and said, "What do you do, when you are killed by a bullet?"

He said, "I embrace the enemy who fired it, and say that he -- I -- he allowed me to die an honorable death for my country, and that this was in -- within God's judgment," and that he was his friend.

There's no enmity between decent soldiers. Even if you shoot the other man, there's no hatred. Only civilians think this, up behind the lines. I mean, some {Crosby}, or some -- some { } -- but that's all nonsense. A commentator may make such remarks on the -- about the Japanese or the Russians or so. But decent soldiers have always loved their enemy. So has Grant loved Lee. What's -- bout -- what's abnormal about this? It's obvious -- { }. People go to war, really -- to a real war, when they are equals. What would this country have done for the last seven years without Russia? And our antagonism against Russia when we have no -- not Germany as an enemy, we would have fallen asleep. Nothing would have happened here. We would have now a wave of unemployment in this country, no prosperity, except for the fear of Russia. Thanks to Mr. Stalin, we have kept awake. It's wonderful. Just, you see, have a good enemy, and you are taken care of. But your friends, beware of them. They put you to sleep.

Do you wish to abolish the reality of enmity in this world? Don't make yourself ridiculous.

(I wish to overcome it with the reality of good.)

The victory is only after the struggle, but you wish to ha- -- give up and abolish the struggle and therefore you have no life, but sterility.

(But Sir, there's a greater struggle, and that is for reconciliation. And it's a real struggle.)

(Hutchison: I see the hour is getting on, now. It's getting on to 20 to 10, and I think we'd all like to thank Professor Rosenstock-Huessy for his extremely stimulating and extremely provocative talks to us all. I -- I would venture, perhaps, to read a quote from a book, which he has written, *The Christian Future, or: The Modern Mind Outrun*: "All genuine speech remakes both listener and speaker." I'm sure that we have all gained a lot, and perhaps I dare venture to say the same about Professor Rosenstock-Huessy. But meanwhile, on behalf of you all, I'm sure we'd like to thank him very much for his evenings with us here.)