

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

We make most sense to those who have taken 57. Who has done this? Obviously, those of you who have been with me in the same course either in the spring of last year or this fall of the current academic year by now know how difficult it is for people who don't take such an introduction to understand history. I try to lay down the law today and next time, and I want all of you, because so few have taken 57, to write a short report on the two first lectures. Right after the lectures you do this best, so that I can find out what you have understood, and what you have misunderstood, gentlemen. Obviously, you will misunderstand it.

That cannot be helped, because, gentlemen, the -- reason why there is a whole course on 57, preceding this course, is that modern American boys are absolutely immunized against the -- understanding of history. You cannot understand history because you will not understand history. And since you are dogmatic about it, it is one of the -- one -- many dogmas by which you live and which are -- all can be summed up in the wonderful statement of every one of you that you don't wish to be dogmatic. Anybody who says, "I'm not dogmatic, Sir", can be sure he has dogmas. It is one of your prejudices and your -- blindnesses that you say you are not dogmatic. But there is a minimum of dogma necessary to understand anything. Because if you have no -- frame of reference which is safe, then you yourself are the only center for referring everything to yourself, and who are you, yourself? A bundle of nerves. A bundle of illusions. A bundle of fictions. Sham. What is man, the single man? He is -- you are not able to understand anything by yourself without a frame of reference toward which you refer things. Could you understand any movement of the earth without having a frame of reference of the planetary system? So how can you understand history -- the human history if you refer history to yourself? But that's what you think -- that's the consequence because you are not dogmatic. And -- a dogma is a point, a fixed point of fixation, the pole -- or the famous point of Archimedes when he said that, "Give me a -- one fixed point and I can lift the universe out of its angles." You have no fixed point. And therefore, history to you is a book with seven seals.

Now we have opened this book in the other course, of 57, the result is, gentlemen, that what I sum up today is more or less the outcome of this first course. But it will simplify {my lot} if you take down these simple rules -- of thumb which we will lay down now. And you forgive me, then, that I am dogmatic now. I only want to reveal to you your own -- the emancipation from the one

dogma you have that you can understand history by not referring it to any fixed point. This is impossible. The second thing I have to apologize for is not so much for the first two lectures where I have to be dogmatic, but for the other lectures, which is history. And stories have to be told. There is no other way of telling a story but telling it. As I well know, you all despise lecturing. You think that lecturing is a necessary evil. You prefer Esquire. This is much nicer to look at a girl who has nothing to wear. But history is the story of how to take off the clothes. That's much -- can -- has to be told. The secrets, the revelation of history can only be told in words. There is no other way of history. It's not as in chemistry. In chemistry you can go to laboratory and you boil something, and bubbles -- and it explodes, and then you know that this is an explosive. Because your nose is blown off. I can't blow off your nose by history. Obviously, you see. If I can excite you, and convince you, it is only by telling the story. History is in no other way to be conveyed to anybody except by listening to the story. So please understand that of all the topics in a -- college, history cannot be reduced to mathematics, to figures on a blackboard. It cannot be reduced to visualizing by pictures. If you look at a pyramid, that's not the story of the pyramids. We'll talk about the pyramids and you will very soon understand why a picture of the pyramids is the last important thing about the pyramid. Now that's again your dogma, that it isn't so. You have one -- more dogma, as you all know, that lecturing is poorer than looking at things or going to things.

The famous story of the Dartmouth student who came to me after he had been taught what psychoanalysis was and there was nothing in his brain that -- that had to be analyzed, but he had just nothing there. But he had money. And time, obviously. So in January he came to me, a few years ago, and said, "Professor," that was already in the '30s. "I'm off."

I said, "Why? The term is in the midst -- we are in the midst of the term. What are you doing?"

"I'm off for Vienna."

"Why?"

"Well, I have taken a course in psychoanalysis and I must see Freud."

So I said, "The man has a cancer of the face. He won't appreciate your looking at him at all."

He said, "But that's the only way in which I can really understand psychoa-

nalysis."

So he went and looked at the cancer of Mr. -- poor Mr. -- old -- Freud, and thought he had understood psychoanalysis. This is what you think, that by going to see something -- that's how you travel to Europe, for example. Do you think you see anything? You see something, yes, but certainly not what makes Europe tick. These things -- God cannot be seen, gentlemen. And anything divine, or inspired, or great, cannot be seen. But you would like to see God. And people even in this country are such poor theologians that they do not know that it is blasphemy to try to see things. But the best cannot be seen. It cannot be seen. You can go to Vienna 50 times a year and see all the psychoanalysts there, you see, and you simply don't know what psychoanalysis is for this reason. Quite the contrary, I think. If you see these people, you would get frightened. Perhaps you wouldn't -- and know it was nothing for you.

So, please. This is the second thing, then. Today we will say certain dogmatic things about history. But beginning next week, I am obliged to tell you the story and then, please believe me kindly that there is no roundabout way of -- technique of not giving this in the form of lectures. You are today believing that there is something else than lecturing for everything. This is true, as I said, of the natural sciences. Botany, I can take you to the garden, to the arboretum. And I certainly should like to take you to the zoo, to show you the -- well, our poor relations. But the human history consists of something always that goes against what can be seen.

I today have a -- now I have a friend who is -- just going to marry a very rich girl. I know that they marry despite the fact that she has money. But the world can only see that he marries her because she has money. What do you do? All you see is that she has money and he has no money. It takes some intricate understanding of the whole situation to understand that it was a very difficult resolution on his part to marry her despite the fact that she had money and the world might think that he married her for this reason. And since he is a very honorable man, this was a real stumbling block, because he felt he couldn't lower himself, you see, to this suspicion that people would look down on her, because somebody had married her for her money. You see how complicated life is. We always do the historical things against what can be understood by seeing -- looking at it. That this is a marriage, you see, on a higher plane than for money, cannot be seen. But it can be told. If I would tell you the story of this couple, you would believe me. And so gentlemen, history is -- has to be told, because otherwise it cannot be believed. If you see history, then it is just chaff, just -- the human below -- mortal beings having to eat, and having to work, and

having to sweat, and having to produce children, and then die. That's a very simple story out of which you think history consists. But the story is unbelievable if not told. Will you take this down as a formula? History would be unbelievable, unless it is told. This is the reason why it has to be told. Christmas story, the New -- whole New Testament is unbelievable unless told, because what can you see? A dirty, Jewish boy, in a manger, lying in a crib. What's important about this? Isn't the ass and the ox -- next by -- much more important? They fetch a price. The baby fetches no price. All the children are murdered next day. So certainly the children -- child is completely worthless. Unfortunately, when you hear this story, the whole reality is refuted. It's just the opposite. The child is priceless and the ox and the -- and the ass are not priceless. They can be sold for a very miserable price. But for you, who are people of facts, good American boys, only the ass and the ox are important, not the baby in the -- manger. Unless your mother has been wise enough to tell you the story. But if you read the funnies, you only see the ass and the ox. And that's why you are all so asinine, reading the funnies only. Because in the funnies, the people are reduced to ass and ox. There is nothing told about them that is unbelievable. It's only too believable that the timid soul is a timid soul.

So gentlemen, you have never realized this, why we have to tell stories. Because the story is -- would be unbelievable, unless told. That's why any good story has a -- has such a point to it, you see, that wouldn't have expected it. It has to be told. You have never thought about these things, because you even believe that you can smatter, and talk, and prattle, without effort. Your language to you is nothing miraculous. Gentlemen, that I can talk to you, and that you even can talk back to me, occasionally I hope, is miraculous. It's unbelievable. We'll come to see that man has created in his history the unbelievable fact that people can understand each other, for their motives which are are not to be seen, as ass, and ox, and the price on the commodity in the 5-and-10 store. You are not a 5-and-10 commodity. And I am not. And the people of whom we are going to talk are not. And because we are utterly priceless, you and I, the story has to be told. Because, gentlemen, when we tell a story, we mean to say that anything that is important in this story cannot be seen, not be measured, not be weighed. It has no quantity. Usually we say it has -- what? It has a -- ? Quality. A quality. But that's not good enough, gentlemen. It is an act. An action. Acts, as a play, on the stage, which is the clearest action you can have seen. You have seen Henry V, perhaps now, Henry IV, on the stage, have you? Or Harvey. Even the rabbit on the stage, you see, is unbelievable. That's why he couldn't appear, because a 6-and-a-half-foot rabbit is unbelievable. But you can believe it as a story. In so many words. Now gentlemen, the whole human history is not quantity, but it is quality.

And it is more than quality, because it is quality in the process of being created. So gentlemen, the content of history -- first dogma, which I want you to believe at this moment and not to understand, because it is unbelievable -- is that history is the story of how new qualities are created. It is the inheritance of new qualities, the transmission of new qualities. It is the great story of how, for example, you have become Americans, although 300 years not one of you was American. And now you all believe that American is a native quality. You even speak of native Americans. Isn't that very funny? There was no such American 300 years ago. And the quality of your two long legs has been created. And the fact that you are the best football players and the best ice cream eaters in the world -- this has been created. Now you take it for granted. But gentlemen, that's a story. How did it come about that there was a nation, and is a nation on the globe that has never existed before? Americans! So, history would have to contain, for example, the story of how the new quality of being an American entered the scene. History is the story of the creation of new qualities.

Who is taking science as a major? Anybody? You know that the inheritance of new qualities is the great bone of contention between Americans -- with the Western world, and the Russians at this moment. Have you heard of this? Well, I think the Russians are right, because the Western people have lost their brain completely in their laboratories. Gentlemen, look at yourself. You all take it for granted that physically you can -- spot an American. Not is -- typical -- is a normal American, but you can spot an American all over the globe. Now how -- that's a physical thing. That's a quality which can be seen. And yet, it has been created. How can any American deny that there is a transmission, an inheritance of an acquired quality? It's just impossible for me to see how these geneticists do not see how funny they are. Here they are all composed of -- of themselves, the compound of something, you see, it's something new. All these American geneticists, they are all down on Mr. Lysenko and all these Russians, who in their desperation, because in Russia everybody is a born Russian, you see, for 2,000 -- 1500 years. These people there had to compensate by knowing that there could be something different from Russians. And we, who are newly created, just in the melting pot, we have the theory that no new quality can be created. It's a very funny contradiction.

Well, we'll go into this at much greater length. At this moment, I just want to shock you out of your sleep, so I say something which will seem to you blasphemous. Because the only blasphemy you can perpetrate in this country today is against natural science, because that's your god. So let me blaspheme and say all the natural scientists of this country are very superstitious because they cannot see the forest before the trees. They have special theory in their little field, and

they cannot see that they themselves represent a new race. They do. You look it. I could spot you as an American anywhere in the world, you see.

That's the first thing, then, gentlemen. History tells of the unbelievable event of the creation of new events. Now when -- why is this unbelievable, gentlemen? Well, if you take your mind, your brain, and -- then everything that is here can be logically reduced to some other cause, and nothing new can ever enter the world. It is impossible, gentlemen, by your reason, to prove that something new can happen. The Greeks and the Jews said Christ could not be -- have been born. It's impossible that anything new happens. Everybody said, "People will never fly," until Orville Wright did fly. Then they all said, "We said it, always. That was very simple." Will you take this down, gentlemen? There is a tradition in human behavior. First, when a new thing happens, they say it cannot happen; it's impossible. The second thing is, something else discovered it; not the Wright brothers. Russians now say they invented flying. And the third is, we knew it all the time. That is, gentlemen, today everybody believes: the Americans, well, that's just one of the many races of the universe. Yesterday they said, "Oh, the Americans -- that's not -- they're not really something new." And before, they said, "There could be no new race." That would be an example. The people at home in Spain said to Christoph Colomb, of course, there couldn't be another world, a western way to India, you see. When he discovered it, they said somebody else had discovered it, and took all the honors from him, and put him into chains, as you know, and Amerigo Vespucci got the name, even, in honor for his nondiscovery of America. And we call it America now, instead of Columbia. And then third, the -- everybody settled down and they said, "We knew it all the time." And so you have now the Greenland saga, you see, that the people from Greenland discovered it, you see, and it is a purely Nordic hoax, the whole of America. You can -- cannot be people with dark hair who discovered America and has to be the blond beast. Well, all right.

That's the story of everything new that happens history, gentlemen. There are three parties. The first part -- or the first --three layers -- three periods about historical understanding. The first is: the new thing is not new and is impossible, because nothing new can happen under the sun. The second is: oh, this man doesn't deserve the credit for the newness. There is no heroism; there is no genius. When Christ and His martyrs were just beheaded, there came up the famous sorcerer Simon, in Palestine, and said "We don't need Jesus. We don't need the Apostles. We have noses. We have the same wisdom just on our own." You know, and he jumped from a tower in Rome, trying to prove to the emperor Nero that he could fly. And St. Peter and Paul had to come to his -- so to speak, to show -- expose him, and to show him up and he died a very pitiful death.

Gentlemen, in any moment, a great inventor has his caricature next to him who claims the credit from society that he is the true and only new beginner. Always. That's essential to the human brain, because you people will never, at no moment, even at this moment, you will not believe that something utterly new is happening at this moment in the world, because your logic says it cannot. A and B lead to C. But history tells you that C cannot be reduced to A and B. Christ cannot be reduced to Judaism and Greek philosophy. He is something new. A flight by Orville Wright cannot be reduced either to the flight of the swallow or the flight of a kite. It is something third, you see. It's one thing that has never been combined before with these old systems. That's the combustion motor -- engine. You could have a glider, before, you see. But you couldn't -- and you could have a kite. But you couldn't have the combination of the Wright { } or the engine, obviously, is the ingenious idea -- heavier than air, you see, but movement.

So this is the difficulty of history, gentlemen. The difficulty of history has nothing do with science. History, that's point 3 of my dogma, is no science, and shall never be a science. Because science tells you how one thing follows out of the other. And history tells you how one thing came into life, which was denied by all the others before, which -- of which all the things that were there said it can never happen. History is the story of the unheard-of things. And science is the story of the deducible things. Now you all look into history as though it was a science. Most books even that appeal to your pocketbook, to your money, try to sell you history under the guise of science. But that's a hoax. They know what the -- poor education you have. You only believe in science, so they think they cannot sell their wares, their historical wares, unless they tell you, "I'm scientific." Gentlemen, the New Testament is a very truthful story, but it certainly doesn't -- perpetrate the hoax of modern historians, who tell you that history is a science. History is not a science. History is the way of convincing you that all the time new elements of life are created. History is the story of creation. Or it is nothing. If you can reduce Hamlet to nothingness, to all the plays that were written before, then it wouldn't be worthwhile mentioning Hamlet. We mention in history only the things that cannot be reduced, and cannot be deduced and cannot be derived at logically from things already in existence.

Take an -- very simple example, gentlemen. As you know, at the -- in Gettysburg, there was a speaker, Mr. Everest -- Everett, from Harvard, who spoke on the battlefield of Gettysburg for three hours. And he was a very famous orator. He was a senator of the United States. He represented Boston, the hub of the

universe. The most educated part of the globe, in their own estimation. And he talked for three hours. And yet as you well know, his speech is forgotten. And it is forgotten because you can analyze his speech into Harvard, into Massachusetts, into oratory, into professors, into any -- all the elements that went into the making of the three-hour speech. And that's all there is to this speech. And once you have analyzed this speech, you could write it yourself and improve on it. And then there was, as you well know, a three-minute speech, the Gettysburg Address, which was thrown into the wastepaper basket after it had been delivered, which not one of you could either think up, or compose, or reduce to logic, rhetorics, or any such thing. And that is something unheard of. And that's why we commemorate the Gettysburg Address by Abraham Lincoln, and we have forgotten the senator of Massachusetts, Mr. Everett. And Mr. Everett had the guts to write to the president of the United States after both had spoken and said he could only hope that his three-hour speech had not failed completely to convey some of the ideas which Mr. Lincoln had so masterfully expressed in three minutes.

He -- do you begin to understand that history must consist only of the things that cannot be rationally analyzed and deduced? Otherwise there would be no history. If you think of chemistry, then you can deduce, and reduce any element -- any compound to its elements, can you not? And now the elements to electrons. That's science. But if you could reduce the Gettysburg Address to the 272 words out of which it is composed, and 172 of them, as you know, are monosyllabic -- one-syllable words -- then it wouldn't be the Gettysburg Address. If you can prove that The Iliad and The Odyssey are only patchwork, and that the Gospels were written by somebody else 200 years later, as the people have tried desperately in the scientific {age}, as you know, then please don't read the Bible, and don't read The Iliad, either. And if you can prove that Shakespeare is really composed out of the unpaid bills of Mr. Bacon, then don't read Shakespeare. That is, once you can reduce something great in life to something else, it ceases to be a topic of history. Can you please -- will you kindly mind this?

There happened a nice story to Mr. Hutchins, a former president of Chicago, the unfortunate inventor of the Great Book hoax. And a friend of mine went to his course of the -- on the Declaration of Independence, and The Constitution of the United States. It was in the great city of Chicago. And the result was that the chairman and the speakers debunked the Declaration and the Constitution as a purely economic document of the interest of the landed gentry of this country. You see, they were all great landowners, so they wrote a constitution for real estate. You know that's Charles Beard thesis. Some of you -- who has heard of this? That's the famous economic interpretation of American history. Well? My

friend, who was innocent, and just liked to hear stories, although she was from Chicago, which is a handicap, went to see Mr. Hutchins in person -- who was a friend of the family -- and said, "Mr. Hutchins, do you think that it is a wise idea to have a Great Book course in which it is proven that it isn't a great book?" He shrugged his shoulders and said in desperation, "Well, what else can you do?"

That's by and large the attitude of Chicagoans towards the greatness, towards greatness. Reduce it to its money value, to its real estate value. Gentlemen, don't bother. If it has only a real estate value, the Declaration of Independence, don't read it. It ceases to be an element of history. Anything that can be reduced to something else is historically non-existent. Non-existent, you see. It's just something else. So why mention it? All the apes of the French Revolution, all the imitators of -- Shakespeare you can forget, because they can be reduced to somebody else. Somebody else was their model. They imitate it. So please, gentlemen, the -- anything that -- would you take this down? That's an important rule, and I -- again, I want you not to miss it. You read it nowhere else. Every year there is a conspiracy of silence about the place of history in your minds. You come here to this course with the naïve idea that history is just one of the sciences. Isn't that true? A social science. It is no science. It cannot be a science. Science has to do with things that can be reduced to something else. History is the knowledge of those events that must be known in themselves. You cannot reduce the discovery of America to anything else but the discovery of America. Or it ceases to be. And oh, if you could prove that the -- that America was not a discovery, then you don't have to know it anymore. Then it enters the limbo of forgetfulness. In history, nothing must be known but the unique, the unexpected, the unheard-of, the surprising, the unbelievable. I'm back to my first knowledge that we tell the his- -- story, because otherwise it cannot be believed, you see. It is against all the calculations that everything great in history happens. You are only interested in history because it is surprising to hear that people conquered against all odds. The odds prove, you see, that the opposite must happen. And the -- man proves that something happens that you did not expect. Otherwise it wouldn't be an historical event.

This is so simple that of course every person who hasn't been ruined by -- college knows this. Every -- simple kind of people. But since most of the people here in this country are now shunted through these terrible channels of liberal arts education, you don't know anymore the most primitive thing: that history is the record of the unexpected. And so you have lost sight of the fact that we live in a very miraculous universe. If I speak of miracles, you say I'm an idiot, because

I am not scientific. Gentlemen, you are the idiots, because you think that you have your life by science. You have the -- your life by the great miracle that your parents were able to marry, which is most miraculous, because it is against the whole Kinsey Report.

[laughter]

Well, please -- what does the Kinsey Report prove? It proves that we all suffer from unfulfilled poss- -- oppor- -- possibilities. That we have a hundred times all kind of ridiculous ways of not satisfying our real desire, and now we are invited by Mr. Kinsey to believe that because there are hundred failures, there is no fulfillment. But gentlemen, what do you expect in nature? In the nature of the world, it is only one percent that's success. So the statistics of Kinsey prove the great miracle that once upon a time in every man's life there comes the opportunity for doing right, by getting married. And the more he has gone astray, the stronger it proves the case that it is miraculous to get married, that love is really a wonderful thing. And sex is not. Sex is as plentiful as blackberries. So out of the Kinsey Report there emerges the proof that we all owe our lives to two miracles. The -- I mean, the more difficult a thing is, the more incredible it is that we all, more or less -- you all, too, gentlemen -- must believe that you can overcome the difficulty. That's the interesting thing about it. Everybody -- do you think that's a new invention of Mr. Kinsey to know that most of our efforts to love are aborted? That is since Adam and Eve the case. That's why we are not in paradise. Of course, the -- all the animals know when it is time to mate. We can mate all the year around, so we never know when it is time to mate.

[laughter]

Well, gentlemen, you may laugh, but please accept it also as true. It makes the thing all the more miraculous. The Kinsey Report proves that marriage is a sacrament, because "sacrament" means a miracle, by the grace of God. And it is all against the Kinsey Report, and that's why every marriage is an unbelievable story. It has to be told. Your parents have to tell you that they actually got married, that everybody gets married in his own way. It's the most original story. Every marriage that is really marriage is wrested from these statistics of the Kinsey Report as a -- miracle, as something absolutely unexpected. Did you ever hear such a story? Just like the story of this man who marries the rich girl, you see, not for her money. Have you ever heard of this? Is it to be believed? Well, I can tell you it is true. You understand? That's the whole content of any interesting story.

So gentlemen, history is the record of the unheard-of, the improbable, the unexpected, the paradoxical -- as they say now in philosophy -- in modern times, the thing that can otherwise not be believed. And therefore it is nothing scientific. It is anti-scientific. If this makes sense. I don't put much value on saying "anti-scientific," but that's a loan with science. Long before there is any science, we already have a miraculous story to tell, of our own existence: that two people emerged from the -- quagmire of mere sensuousness, and mere sex, and mere -- well I can't give all the details of our troubles, because the lady's in the room, but everybody knows this, gentlemen. We are in trouble. And your presence on the other hand, proves long before you have the trouble that you have gotten your parents out of trouble, by being their legitimate offspring and making them forget all their trouble, and sacrificing for you all their libertinage and all the Kinsey Report possibility.

Now, the second dogma, gentlemen, {of yours}: history is very short. That again is against the dogma -- I once walked -- had to live in Calgary, Alberta. I don't wish you to -- have to live there. It's a wide reach there -- out in the wide -- in the country. And their wonderful rodeo -- once a year, a stampede. But that doesn't make {up for} the other 360 days. They have a new housing development there and they are built so regularly, these oil-drill houses, that if you stand {and} look out of the window of your own house, you can look through eight other houses' windows!

[laughter]

So you see, it's perfectly scientific, absolutely scientific, all the eight houses in Calgary -- no story to tell.

But I walked out there in -- I had no money. I had to wait till my money came, so I was in a very peculiar position. I had to walk out to the zoo they have there. And -- that's three miles from town. Was a very hot day in August. And I arrived there and found myself surrounded by tremendous concrete rocks, which you always could read, "600 million years," "900 million years," and then they had a little skull on top of this. Or some bones, and they prove to you that this mammoth, or this ichthyosaurus was 900 million years old or 400 million years old. You know that's the hobby today of the sciences. The scientists have -- don't understand history. So they have invented these big periods. I don't believe in them. I think you will live to see that all these epoch -- periods are reduced to very much smaller numbers. But if even not, I want you to understand that real history cannot be longer with regard to the past as it is with regard to the future.

If you want to control historians, most of them being only pseudo-historians and calling themselves scientists today, if you want to control them, check their balance between their future and their past. The modern physicist has the shortest future and the longest past. As you know, they have figured, the astronomers, that the universe is 10 -- 10th power of 10 old. One billion years. But they can't say anything about the next moment. About tomorrow. And I hope, of course, that their own fears come true, they all be blown up by their own blast. Hoisted by their own petard. They deserve it. Because the modern physicist has no future. He has no expectation for the second coming of Christ. Certainly not. He has no hopes that mankind will be unified. The only expectation he has that -- is that his atomic -- hydrogen bomb may go off. So his future consists of one minute and his past consists of 900 million years. And that they call history. Gentlemen, any man has as much future as he has past. Will you take this down? Any man has as much past as he has future. There's a strict balance for any group as -- with regard to his future and to his past. The genuine life is everlasting. And therefore it is as old in the future as it is new in the past. That again is a hard lesson for you to understand. We are talking of history because it was new once. And we are talking of the future because it will contain -- must contain the same old elements of life. And that's why old and new cannot be an absolute contrast. You have a misnomer, "history," today in all your textbooks, for the simple reason that these people elongate, procrastinate, prolongate the past. But if you ask them why all this trouble? Why do we build all this { } they say -- because it will -- must -- will be blown up tomorrow. Isn't that a funny {vision}? So that the meaning of all these hundred millions of years consist in the hydrogen bomb. And something more deader or more boring is even the stratospheric literature which now your younger brothers are reading. I hope you don't read this stuff. A completely dead stratosphere in which the people are dead, too, who circle around it. Because what you are -- I mean, not one of the idiots which fill -- are filling the columns of these stratospheric journals are worth to live. They are not my brothers. They are just idiots. Feeble-minded. They have nothing in them that -- why shouldn't I crush them like a flea, if I could, these stratospheric animals that populate the -- these novels and these periodicals? Circling, circling, circling, circling at a constantly higher speed, and somebody then firing a gun. That's the best thing they can think of. Gentlemen, the emptiness of the imagination of these people about the future is terrifying, because the future probably will look as they make it. I mean, they have the upper hand. They dominate your vision. And so 1984, the famous novel, is just a poor, poor example of what you may expect, the -- of this brave new world. The Russians even have a novel, as you may know, The Bed Bug. Heard

the story? They have the new order, the brave new world, I mean, the stratospheric non-entities, and inanities. But there's one peasant, left over of the old czaristic times, whom they have preserved by some mystical -- in some mystical way. But he has also preserved a bed bug, next to him, in his rags. And when he comes to life, he feels so miserable that the only being -- living being in which he can recognize his soul is the bed bug. And so the bed bug becomes his most cherished friend of this poor old peasant. And the two, so to speak, are the remnants of the more imaginative and more cherishable era which the machines have to { }. So he is denied entrance into the mechanical future, because his future has no future. Nobody knows why we should live in this mechanized, stratospheric future. Too boring.

Gentlemen, the true history isn't that -- like that. True history exists only since people assume that life was not eternal recurrence, but the entrance of newness into the world. What you call history, what is taught in our departments of history, fortunately is much better than the theory about history. You learn about the Renaissance, because there had been no renaissance before -- no Raphael, and no Michelangelo. You hear about Dante in the -- in such a course on history. You hear about the Declaration of Independence, that is, we actually doing quite a good job in the facts we mention in history. They are all the unheard-of facts. The new facts, the unimportant facts -- the important facts, the surprising facts. Nobody can really destroy history completely. You always mention in history the important facts. There is now a professor in Harvard who does the opposite, and forces his students to assume that a new era began in 1874, because that was the year in which they first had hard-top streets in New York City. But it is unimportant, gentlemen. It is not an historical fact that there was blacktop in 1874 in New York City. And it hasn't helped them, because the streets are just as dirty in New York as they were before.

But to make out of the blacktop in New York an historical event, that takes the idiocy of a scientist, who has nothing to do with the living history of the human race. Because the living history of the human race is the story in your own life. Think of your own biography, gentlemen. If you want to study the proportion of past and future in a man's life, in a nation's life, in mankind's life, I -- you just address yourself to your own life. And you will find that your life story is as interesting, with regard to the past as you still have a future, which might be interesting. An uninteresting man who has nothing to expect in the future, always has an -- uninteresting past. Isn't that true?

So the interest in any past history depends on the future. Past history can only be interested -- interesting, only as long as the future is interesting. And there-

fore, gentlemen, you have -- are blocked towards history, because the future which you expect is so boring, so drab, so uninteresting, that of course you are not interested in the past, because you do not assume that the interesting events of the past will have any bearing on your future. To me it's different. I do think that I have to know everything about the past, because my life is still responsible for taking up the slack, for bringing to life again any one of these miracles of the past again. And if it is among my grandchildren, or my great-grandchildren, I am responsible for life -- rebirth on this earth, and you are too, gentlemen, by the way. And therefore, your future could be interesting, as long as you would appropriate the past, the miraculous events of the past, and say, "The future must consist at least of containing all the miracles of the past, and more to come." Gentlemen, history -- the future of history is always the revival of the miracles of the past, plus those miracles that are necessary to make this revival possible. Will you take down this mathematical formula, which is mathematical? The future must always consist of two elements: the revival of the miracles of the past, or the perpetuity of the miracles of the past, plus those miracles without which the revival couldn't happen. Take marriage. The miracle of marriage must happen in the future again. People must get married. But since, in our modern times it is much more complicated to get married, because the women want to work out of the home, there are more miracles needed now to make a marriage a success than they were 5,000 years ago. It was easy, so to speak, to get married 5,000 years ago. Today it is more difficult. So we need a few more creative actions to build a society inside of which marriages between people who are in business may be successful. And that will lead to a different society. So the exciting thing is, gentlemen, we need in every minute the return of the old miracles and the addition of new miracles. And that's why history is so breathtaking. Now gentlemen, you already see that history does not contain the recurrent patterns of life that are prehistorical. But it creates -- it turns to the past in order to find newness. You look into the future for newness. The historian does the opposite. You think tomorrow will be sensational. I say to you the greatest sensations have happened in the past. I also say to you the oldest things must happen in the future. People must get married. So the historian, gentlemen, reverses the natural habit of your mind. You think old things are old, and future things are new. The historian tells you that old things once were new -- can you see this? -- and that most of the future things must be old, to prove that they were miracles worthy of your repetition. Gentlemen, take two examples. Speech is old. {We will} -- I will teach you to understand how speech ever came to exist in humanity. It's a great story, the origin of speech. You will agree with me that you cannot deprive your offspring of this miracle of learning to speak. That's a very old story

that your grandson must learn English, isn't it? But you are responsible, sir, that this speech be repeated. You cannot die in good conscience if you have voted for Esperanto, or any of these idiotic things which try to kill language by artificiality, because these people do not understand what speech is, how speech is created, how -- what a miracle it is to speak. You are responsible for this. But most American children are all for the United Nations and for Esperanto. I am against the United Nations and against Esperanto. Because I do not believe that something that has been paid for by 5,000 years of sweat, blood, and tears can just be replaced by some textbook or an artificial language. That's not how you can teach your grandchildren to speak really, by basic English. Just the same as Esperanto. Just as awful.

Now, gentlemen, there you see your balance between future and past. If you do this Copernican turn, which you are asked to do in history, then you suddenly see into the future the worthwhileness of the things past. And you look into the past, the sensational character of the future. What -- when do you appreciate history? When you can read Admiral of the Ocean Sea by Mr. Morrison, that is the discovery of America by Columbus, with such breathtaking tension and attention that you think you can't understand how he ever did it. Isn't that true? That's history. The history takes you back into that moment in which it seemed impossible. Perhaps you can take this down -- this formula again. History takes you back into the past to the moment in which the event seemed yet impossible, in- -- unfeasible, and because it takes you back to this moment, you realize that it was a miracle. Because if the historian cannot give you the feeling that it might have come out otherwise -- America might not have been discovered, or the battle of the -- Gettysburg might have been lost -- if you do not get this feeling, then the historian has not done his part. Because what has he not done, gentlemen? He hasn't freed you from the superstition of distinguishing old and new, past and future. A free man -- animal, a free-living being, gentlemen, is as indifferent to past and future as it should be to left or right. If you have to go through a right door or through a left door, because you want to go to "Men" -- to the rest room, you go either left or right. Wherever it is; it makes no difference to you. If you are very superstitious, you may say, as you know, you don't go through the left door. You only have to go through right door. There have been people who said they wouldn't go left. All the Republicans think so.

Well, if you compare this, gentlemen, it is just as stupid to say that the past is done and the future is not done, you see, as if you say I can never go through a left door, it has to be a right door. But you all have this superstition before you have heard history. That's why your parents tell you the Christmas story or tell you their own love story so that you may understand that the past is just as real

in your own life as anything that could happen tomorrow. So, gentlemen, history does something. It does some kind of levitation. You know what gravity is. Gravity is { } if I throw a text onto the floor, the world must grow old and the older it grows the colder it grows, and so we are all going to be dead. That's not very interesting. History tells you that at one time long ago, the world was doomed. And the next time it was doomed. It was doomed every day. And by a miracle of levitation, of going against gravity, the world has always overcome its own self-destruction. It has been saved time and again. And this is the content of human history, gentlemen. The waves of levitation -- you know what levitation is -- { }. But we all live by levitation that America is today a great nation has been done by levitation. Levitation { } as against gravity. { } Levity, as you know, is light. { } And history is the story of the victory over gravity. That's why it cannot be scientific. Science is the story of gravity, of the effect of gravity. And history is this -- is the knowledge of the effects of levity. That's why it is so cheerful, of levitation. Everybody who gets married is an example of frivolousness. It takes, I mean, against all statistics that anybody nowadays should think that he can get -- be happy, you see. Statistics prove that he can't. But he can. That's the funny story about it. You see, when you read a statistic, never say, "Heavens, 99 percent are dead after a year, only 1 percent survive." Always say, "I am going to be the 1 percent." That's the only way in which you can live. So gentlemen, we have developed a certain number of rules. What time is it now? Wie?

(2:40.)

Let's have a break here.

[tape interruption]

Next time, of course, I'm going to show you the application of this by the short survey. Today let me add some more points to the fact that history is not a science. And that it is -- no way in which it can be reduced from not being told. You -- history has to be told, we said. History is the acknowledgment that we stand between two fronts, facing backward and facing forward. The man who thinks that he can look into the past without at the same time having formed an opinion on the future is wrong. History betrays one's own vision and expectation about the future of mankind. Gentlemen, why has the scientist no prospective history tomorrow? Why is he only interested in blowing -- been blown up by Mr. Einstein's and Mr. {Debohr's} and Miss Meitner's invention. By their own -- really hoisted by their own petard. Because, gentlemen, nature has no history.

Nature is as it is. A horse is a horse. If you do not cross-breed it, always be just a horse. By cross-breeding you can achieve a mule. That is, gentlemen, the change of the universe is entrusted to man only. All the other parts of the universe follow a lawful pattern. In the universe everything except man can be reduced to something else. We can say of an atom it is nothing but electrons. We can say of a molecule it is nothing but atoms. We can say of an animal is nothing but a quadruped. And you can say of a quadruped it is nothing but a cellular -- multi-cellular being. You can reduce everything else because it is what it is. Therefore, gentlemen, if you have 900 million years allegedly in the history of nature, and you have the scientist standing here at the beginning of mankind and look into the future, to him, the man himself is just one minute. Mr. Einstein or any mathematician or physicist has no normal relation to history, because he stands at which point of time? At the point of time where man crops up amidst the universe -- the natural universe, for the first time. And so our story is { } -- how many years? Well, you say it's 6,000 years. Well, let's make it 20,000 years. Ten thousand years I suppose it is worthwhile telling the story. These last 10,000 years to them are just one minute. Therefore, if we add the atomic blast, it is just one more second, so to speak, of this minute.

Gentlemen, the scientist has no normal interest in the way gone by -- among humans, because he begins -- his interest begins there where the world is scientific. And the world begins to be scientific back of us, behind us, you see, where { } the lawful order and repetition and can be deduced from ecodynamic, thermodynamic, and other laws. The lawful order of the universe, gentlemen, and history, therefore, fall apart. The lawful, deducible order is to the scientist -- that's the general view -- is here. Therefore, whether we say 20,000 years today or 1,000 year or one day to the scientist is of no interest. However my history, of course, is this way: when five -- first five days of creation had elapsed, the miracles begin. Man begins to speak. He begins to court. He begins to marry. He begins to invent. He begins to populate the earth. Finally he builds railroads. Finally he has airplanes. So the story is the story of man's free acts, unexpected acts. That's the real history. And therefore, this little bit becomes terribly large, because, gentlemen, from the first day in which man began to act on this earth, he had a vision what had to be accomplished. And he undertakes these great acts on earth in order that the whole way may be done, may be traveled. Gentlemen, the first man is the man who had the same vision of what has to be accomplished, as you and I have. We would { } just { }. There can be no other history but the history of those achievements of the past which form part of the ultimate goal. That is, I told you before, that the past must be looked upon as already -- rungs in the ladder towards the goal. Otherwise it wouldn't interest you. Why should we know of anything of the past which we no longer need?

But as you know, if you would climb a ladder and you would cut out some of the rungs of the ladder below, it's a very dangerous performance. Finally the ladder would just not carry you anymore into the future. So your future depends on your recognition that any rung which you have to climb from now to tomorrow has just the character of {those} rungs on which your ancestors climbed up first. And you cannot saw off these lower rungs. They are part of the future. Gentlemen, history is that part of the past which is still future. Which other- -- without which the -- your own aims and goals would make no sense. The discovery of America obviously is the condition under which it only makes sense that you can perhaps travel to Mars tomorrow. If the -- earth isn't at least one, you couldn't possibly figure out the idea to fly on Mars.

Therefore, gentlemen, if you cannot imagine that anybody should ever forget that the earth is one, you must assume that every child born from now on is able to understand that the earth is one, although it rotates. And although you have -- you cannot see the whole earth in one -- with {one's eyes}, you and -- although there is summer in Argentina, while we have winter here, all these strange contradictions do not alter the fact that there is one earth. This was discovered one day. The history of this, which is now indispensable for our further action is history. History only contains those elements, gentlemen, which must be considered the rungs of the -- our own ladder into our own future. So we appropriate somebody else's act in the past, as soon as we recognize that our future is at stake. And it's only because of your and my future that we are interested in these dead kings, and dead pyramids, and dead graves, et cetera, you see. Not for their sake. What do we care? If -- as far as they were only interested in their own belly, let them be dead. But insofar as these people did something which we would have had to do, unless they did it, they are we, in a former chapter. Can you see this? Gentlemen, the past is only interesting as a condition of the future, but not as a condition of the present. This you always read in these boring textbooks which treat history as science, that you have to understand the past, because otherwise, you can't understand the present. Gentlemen, may I make one, bold statement? Nobody understands this state, the present. Nobody. That's why it is so interesting. Do you think Mr. Dulles and Mr. Molotov understand the present? Obviously not. They are in a fog. But if Mr. Dulles or Mr. Molotov would know the counsels of our creator with the destiny of men, they might find a solution for the present-day troubles. But since both aren't too sure about that, they cannot.

Any man of faith in the future can find a solution for the present. I told you, gentlemen, man is that strange monkey who can look backward and forward in time. And no monkey can do this, because no monkey can hope that all the other

generations of monkeys will collaborate with him in the ladder into the future. The monkey cannot do it. One monkey, that's all there is to this monkey. History is not a monkey {business}. Will you take this down? It's {worth} { }, because you believe that it is just the story of monkeys. That's how modern history is written, unfortunately, by this debunking business. It's the story of economic interests in America, the Declaration of Independence. It is not, gentlemen. History is -- are those elements which enter the time, despite the self-interest of man. Despite the self-interest of man. Whenever man has done something which was not in his self-interest, it belongs to history. When mar- -- when Lincoln was martyred, Stanton said, "Now he belongs to the ages." What does this mean? Something very simple, you see. That his physical existence of breathing, of eating, of shitting, of spitting, of vomiting, of Mr. Lincoln he had a very -- he always had obstipation, you know. He had a very poor constitution. He was a very ungainly looking creature. You wouldn't have liked him. At all, I can tell you, physically. He was a very, very -- he had great handicaps. And probably they wouldn't have accepted him in Dartmouth because he couldn't fulfill the rec requirements.

That's a serious story, gentlemen. When Woodrow Wilson came to this college in 1909 to inaugurate a new president, he said, "While I'm looking around here in Webster Hall, I'm asking myself whether such a college could produce a person like Abraham Lincoln. And I'm compelled to say that it cannot." That's your indictment, gentlemen. That is very serious. Abraham Lincoln had a natural relation to history. He read Shakespeare and the Bible. He wasn't a member of any church. He had never gone to college. But since you -- the way you read Shakespeare, that incapacitates you and the Bible, too, ever to become a man as great as Abraham Lincoln. Because you do not read the Bible and the -- and Shakespeare with the feeling that you have to continue what they have done. You don't. You don't read it as miracles. You read it because it is still required. And anything that required reading is dead. And isn't worth being read. Obviously. So I'm sorry for you, because the greatest things in the world, gentlemen, which should make you -- tremble, are required reading in life. And therefore you are in great danger that you miss the best. That's why I cannot bring myself to give any assignments in reading in -- of great books to you. Because it would ruin forever your relation to these great books. Isn't that true? Classroom reading is doomed reading, is worthless reading. If you cannot read this against my will, in secrecy, and pay a high price of -- of the risks, that when you are discovered, you are flunked, you are severed from college, then it is not worth reading. Read forbidden literature, you see. Read all the Bible as forbidden literature. That will help. But as long as it is prescribed reading, you see, it's worthless, because it is not miraculous. So you -- that's why Woodrow Wilson came to the conclusion

that colleges breed mediocrities, but they do not breed Abraham Lincoln. So I -- why do I -- did I say this, gentlemen. Stanton said of this man, "Now he belongs to the ages." He said that Lincoln would live for what he had not done in self-interest, but for the union, and for the human race. Very simple, gentlemen. That belongs to history which a generation hasn't done for themselves. Anything that people have -- do for themselves is unhistorical, is social. Psychological. Usually psychoanalytical. That's so very interesting, you see. It's the wastepaper basket, your anal- -- what you carry to your analyst. It's worthless. Do it. I mean, wastepaper baskets are quite good, but you have to burn what's in it. And I -- it is to be hoped that something on the best remains important, although the rest goes in the wastepaper basket. In history only that counts which is not thrown into the wastepaper basket.

And therefore, gentlemen, the wastepaper basket is any one man's own time. That's our wastepaper basket. Anything that is going down, in your own time, that perishes with your time is not historical. All the millions, the father-in-law of Mr. Winston Churchill, the grandfather of Winston Churchill did -- lose all the millions. They are just down the sink. You know he was married to a Jerome, his mother was a Jerome of New York. And she had a very terrible father, one of the types of the upper 400, speculator on the stock exchange, and eight horses one day and no horse the next day. And who speaks of him? And even Mrs. Jerome, Miss Jerome, the mother of Winston Churchill, betrayed her Wallis Simpson character when she married after the death of her great, first husband, Randolph Churchill, a much younger man, and has never been mentioned again. She's out of history, because of { }. She was a very good wife of this very great invalid, Randolph Churchill, who was a brilliant leader of the House of Commons, decades ago, and the father of Winston Churchill. When this man died, she was fed up with history, and with importance, and with society. You can't blame her. And she married for love a journalist who was 14 years younger than she. And she was never heard of again, which is correct. She said, "I have now served enough." Randolph Churchill was very sick for years, and so she got her private happiness. But she's out of history. Whereas as the wife and -- of Randolph Churchill and the mother of Winston Churchill, she survives in history. She's important. As the fact -- the great link between this country and England, and the fact is that Winston Churchill is as much an American as he is an Englishman.

And that's -- is historically important, because it is a step beyond one's own generation. It connects two generations, you see. It gives Winston Churchill a position his father couldn't hold in the world, because he was just --

Gentlemen, anything that is more than one generation is interesting to history. Anything that is limited to one generation is a freak. History is concerned with powers that can face backward and forward, and these powers must be at least of three generations' duration. Nothing is interesting, not even Joe DiMaggio, as far as it goes only in his own generation. All you think -- people think the sensational is not historical, it is just play. All the sports records, for example. It is of no historical importance who won, the Giants, or the Dodgers, or the Tigers. You can dodge that issue. It's not a gigantic issue at all. It is an attempt to escape from history, the sports are. And as long as you are such sports fans, you are quite immune against history. That's why history is made on your back. I mean, the American people are the people, including the president, with whom history just plays football. You play football, history plays football with you. Two wars, world wars, not meant by the {nation}. Isn't that a funny story of a nation that never intended anything that's happening to it? We said we were not interested in Korea. And next day, we defended it. And we were not, you see, the -- {Wilson} was the man who kept us out of war, and next day he was in the war. And Roosevelt on September third, said they would be no blackout of peace in this country and I have told you { } in the Second World War, sometimes. You have forgotten it again.

Anything in this country that happens with regard to history is against the American grain, because you do not wish to belong to the ages, like Abraham Lincoln. You want to go to a college. And colleges are anti-historical institutions. That's the final handicap, gentlemen. This college invited a man, a lawyer, to speak on the future of the liberal arts college in 1943, and I was present. It was in Dartmouth 105, just below, down below here. And he was asked to tell us what the college should do with regard to the world war. And Mr. Roscoe Pound, of Harvard University, stood up there and said, "Oh, you know, wars come and go. And the colleges are there forever. So forget about the world war, and do nothing about it." That was his recommendation. And that -- as long as such a state of affairs prevails in your education, gentlemen, you cannot wonder that you have no understanding of history. History is, of course, the sum of those events which change your education, you see, which make it necessary that the liberal arts college changes its methods, for example, of teaching history, among other things. And so what can you do with a college in which it is the great pride of the alumni that the Nugget must be rebuilt on the same space? You know there was a great debate when it burned down, that the sentimental alumni said, "Well, you cannot go to another place. I mean, we have to come back with our -- in our drunken state and find it there again."

This dreamlike existence of the college, you see, is what many people think is

the essence of a liberal -- on education. Gentlemen, history are those events which remould human education. The sum of all the events of history could be said to be those events after which a child cannot grow up in the same way as it grew up before. Wouldn't you agree? Think of your own children. Obviously the things you would have to understand and know were -- would be those events in history which made it necessary and indispensable that your child must go to school, or should go to kindergarten, you see, or should serve in the United States Army, or should not serve in the United States Army. If you are the history of the Mennonite sect, you would insist that your child not go to the -- you see, to the Army. And if you are -- then decline to belong to a church, you will be swallowed up by the state. And he'll say since you are -- have no religious convictions, I put my convictions of my, you see, ultimate finality in this place, and your child -- son has to be {killed then} for it. Very simple. The state always makes up for your -- the gaps in your own spiritual armor.

But anyway, gentlemen, history is the sum of the events which make it necessary for a child to grow up differently than before. Other events we will not mention. They are not historical. Because Lincoln now belongs to the ages, your children have to learn the Gettysburg Address. Isn't that true? If he had only lived in his own time, like professor Everetts, the senator, you see, your children could grow up without ever hearing of the Gettysburg Address. Isn't that true? So nothing would be changed by -- by Lincoln's life or existence in your child's education. So we call history those events which have made it necessary -- a different way of approach of any man born afterward.

Is my time up? What time is it?

(2:30)

Yes. I'm sorry. We have missed a hanging. You have to run.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

I hope that by now it is agreed that history is a dangerous article of faith, because it has to be told. Nobody can understand history who hasn't either listened to it, or is willing to tell the story. All history, then, gentlemen, is between speakers and listeners. It is not between professors and students. It is not between a chemist and his assistant. It is not across the counter between a salesman and his customer. I can't sell you history. History is not for sale. The greatest thinker of the 19th century, Frederick Nietzsche, has said that history must always remain an article of faith. That's why the poor man is called an atheist. Atheist. Nietzsche you always hear under this slogan, "atheist," by the poor benighted great Christians of our days, because they don't understand that they had lost faith in history, and so somebody else has to -- had to represent it, so that the belief in God could be restored. Because gentlemen, history in little bits makes God a liar. Will you take down this phrase? History in little bits makes God a liar. There can be no God, if there are 23 civilizations. Or at least if we do not discover what is the meaning of the 23 civilizations as one. Obviously there can -- and no -- can be no god in government of the world. There can be no meaning in the creation of the world and in its preservation and in its redemption if there is not one history. The pluralism of history is the greatest atheistic enterprise of our age. And that's why in this moment America is much more atheistic than Russia. Because Russia, although it officially denies a belief in some three letters -- G-o-d, which after all is a word -- they believe in the power of God in history. And you don't. You believe that you can just do as you please. And you are all atheists. But whether you go to church 20 times on Sunday makes absolutely no difference. Do you think that God can be worshiped by lip service? It cannot. This is an atheistic country, with the help of all the liberal arts colleges of the land, and with all the departments of history that are broken up into geography. Gentlemen, history and geography are opposites. History deals with our patching together all the times of men. And geography patches together all the spaces of men. But what you see around in this country today is geography, not history. It's all geography. They talk of Russia. They talk of America. And they believe that when a man is born in Russia or in America, he is an American and he is a Russian. Don't they? You do. You believe it, too. Which is utterly ridiculous. Everybody who is a human being is it, despite his environment. That is, we are in history, gentlemen, although we poor creatures are licked by always getting stuck in the mud of space. Any decent man is a legend, as Abraham Lincoln was a legend in Siberia. That's why he is a great man. If only the people in Springfield, Illinois, would think that Abraham Lincoln was a great man, he couldn't be one. That would be local, you see, a parochial, a local

approach. And that wouldn't make him great, in any case. It's impossible. Gentlemen, history deals with the fact that it always -- the times always break into tidbits. And that therefore, when you think of the times, of the Dark Ages, and of the Middle Ages, and of the ancient ages, and of the future, as being after all something you have nothing to do with, then you make God a liar. And you certainly declare that there is no God. History in little -- in little bits makes God a liar. It's a very good sentence. Anybody gets 10 dollars who proves to me who has said it. I would like to know it. I had written it down, you see, but I forgot to add the author. I would be very proud if I was the author. But I'll have to tell you frankly this sentence is a quotation. And if perhaps you can help me in Baker Library, it must be somewhere. So begin to read tomorrow.

So the unity of history is our problem. Either there is one story, or there is no story that deserves to be told. Now, we take with us, gentlemen, however, this great experience. The atheist -- the atheist knows all about space. Mr. Einstein knows all about three dimensions, and therefore, because he knows that so well, he declares of time, of all things, that it is a fourth dimension of space, which is the most stupid utterance any human being has ever made. Physicists are allowed to be stupid about time. Because, you see, what is completely extrapolated in the statement of Mr. Einstein, that fourth -- time is his fourth dimension, that's the lifetime of Mr. Einstein himself. That's the lifetime of Mr. Newton. Where they are -- they in this fourth dimension, they don't exist. However, the progress from Mr. Newton to Mr. Einstein is what we call historical time, don't we? Now this is -- that isn't in the -- in this whole concept. It's just omitted. And that after Mr. Einstein, people will rise to criticize Mr. Einstein, which also Mr. Einstein expects. Otherwise he wouldn't be a good physicist and a scientist if he wouldn't expect progress.

So, gentlemen, this is the dead time of the space-man, of your spaceships, which horrifies me so much, because the modern spaceship business is the expression of American atheism. But your youngsters, your younger brothers, have this stupidity in their heads. It's a terrible indictment of their complete lack of any human soul. I just was at the Hanover Inn eating, and there were five mothers, and one brat of 5 years, a boy. Or six years. And they asked him where he would be seated. That's the stratosphere, mind. Here this -- this child was not allowed to obey orders. You can only be in history if you have orders to fulfill before you give commands. But you leave this brat in space, standing there. He stood actually three minutes, because all these four -- five ladies bowed to this stupid ass of a child and asked him, "Where do you want to sit?" Now this boy has no direction. He has no orientation. And you demand from him that he

should know where he is to be seated. That's the modern American brain in space. No direction. And that's ed- -- you call education. It's criminal. All these five ch- -- mothers should be sent to a reformatory school. That's where they belong, because they denaturalize the human soul. The human soul wants to fit into -- to be threaded into a sequence, and where the older people sit, there the young sit -- the child wants to be by. And you have reversed the order, because you think everybody's just sitting on his fannies or standing on his feet. Do you think that in space you know where to go? Do you know in space on the campus I can turn you around and 20 times you wouldn't find your {own way} to Carpenter 13. But somebody told you. That's why you're here. Isn't that true? You believed him. You hadn't heard anything of me, except that you should go here. You had -- you didn't know it yourself.

All important things, gentlemen, in life one knows because one is told. And you deny -- modern education denies the American child the privilege of being told. And therefore time, you see, for all these poor children which in this benighted and darkest of all ages -- man has never dared to do this. This is the first age in which man is left alone in space. That's why you have all the breakdowns. All the solitude. Everybody needs a psychoanalyst to be allowed to lie down on a couch, instead of running in circles. The couch is only the symbol, you see, that he finally has -- can stop running in circles, because he has no direction. The couch, you see, is so wonderful, because at least I can stand here because you kindly listen to me. But a man who has no direction -- he's so panicky, he has to lie flat on the ground. That's the couch of the psychoanalyst. It shows that the man has lost all direction. And therefore, gentlemen, my course here just is an attempt to rescue one or the other in -- among you -- I can only rescue a few -- from this terrible lack of direction, because man has only direction through time. There is no direction in space. You don't know in which direction in space to turn if you don't know what comes next in your life. Do you go -- whether you should go from here to Pittsburg? Or to Europe? That's in space, isn't it? But the command comes, because somebody more mature than you, something that's waiting for -- to be done, tells you you have to go wherever it is. Wherever it is. Where God tells you.

Now look here what you have done to space, gentlemen. This the people in psychology call the past. This they call the present. And this they call the future. And then they tell you that you are here, and that somebody else was there, and that this is in the future. That's the fourth dimension of space, this {time}. Gentlemen, this is how you live, here. That is, here is your present. Here is the future. And here is the past. And you are held in the palm of this hand of time, this cup of time, this beautiful unity, which we call one class lecture. And from 1:25 to

2:45, we have a present. We have a -- this hour, gentlemen. And you know what the essence of presence is, which natural science doesn't know? This presence, of which I am going to build our whole story of mankind, means that we are free. In the real present, man is free, that -- I can prove this to you, gentlemen. I came in. I'm now ranting. I'm now shouting. I'm now saying something to -- down -- as long as you kindly lend me your ears, I can retract. I can confute. I can say it all was a joke. Until you leave this room, and until we stop this entertainment here, this interim, this interlude, the times are exchangeable. The present is -- those in 57 know it -- must know now -- by now what I mean. Who was in 57? {Collins}. That the past and the future, you see, change -- exchange roles. That it is, at this moment possible to say something at 2:45, and you reorganize your thought and said, "I -- now I understand what he meant when he came in at 2:25." You've never thought of that, gentlemen. But I have to prove to you that this is possible within one hour and-a-half. Now Christianity, gentlemen, is the proclamation that all the wrong alleys, all the dead avenues, all the dead-end streets of the past can be turned into assets, into human freedom, that the present, you see, is so much bigger that there is a -- what they call the remission of sins, that is freedom. We are really free to mend everything. The slums of our cities. The bad races, that -- because they are bad races, you see, not just the illiteracy, but really the physical neglect of the Hindu race because they marry their child- -- their womenfolks too -- too early, you see. So that they are decadent. It can be healed. The healing of the nations the -- consists in the creating of present in which anything that has happened before can be reversed. Former -- generations called this conversion. We call it "reversion," perhaps, you see, because you don't know anymore what conversion means. It means that something that already has happened ceases to have happened. Would you take this down? That which has happened ceases to have happened in the same sense. It changes direction. It -- suddenly becomes meaning -- positive meaning, when it looked as though it had a negative, you see, construction to be put on it. The whole history, gentlemen, of the human race is constantly the turning of liabilities into assets. Of minus into plus. Or of dead-end streets into open avenues, into triumphant gateways. And that's why the ancient times, which -- which did -- wasn't -- were not conscious of this -- of this deep secret of life, that the end had to be turned into a beginning -- why it ended with the crucifixion, why -- with a death, which was turned into a triumph. The end became the beginning. That's why we, in the middle of time, gentlemen, have a new era. The new era in which we live means nothing. It's a very unimportant event there in Palestine {on the way}. Some one man was crucified. What do we care in the time of concentration camps, and mass slaughter, and Korea, and naphtha bombs? Look so stymied. Well, gentlemen, the very tiny event which makes for a new era is just this: that ever since people are free to know that there's freedom, that anything that

the human race has befallen before can be turned into an asset from a liability; whether it's a Greek tragedy which today we play in the form of Henry V, you see, or of Hamlet, or of the old Greek tragedy even, you see, it's all back. Now, gentlemen, this is then the present, gentlemen. Any man has as much history, you remember, as he has future and past. They're must balance -- balance. Nobody has a past who has no future. Nobody has a future who has no past. Self-made men have neither past nor future, and that's why they are so boring. And always lose their money, as you know, in the next generation. You always get the Gloria Vanderbilts and the Barbara Huttons, and the -- these other nice gentlemen, because from shirtsleeves to shirtsleeves is just three generations. You see, they are out of history. Who cares whether there is a man rich for a while, except we care, because he built Carpenter and Baker. But I mean, we got the money. He's dead. Because we can go on forever, with the help of the alumni fund.

Present, gentlemen, is a very difficult thing, because we people die. And so history is concerned with creating enough space of -- between past and future. History is the creation of an interval between mere past and mere future, in the automatic sense of this kind of time.

Now, in order to fulfill my promise then, to really deal with meaningful history, with a story that waits to be told, because otherwise it cannot be continued, remember that was the connection -- you have to tell the story of the unbelievable -- I want to {state} at what moment of time we are at today. What's the future of the human race? I must tell you that there is still a future, because as I said, the people of the atom bomb don't believe this. What is possible, still ahead of us? The earth is known. The wickedness of man is known. The steam engine is known. You have even television, so you think that everything is known. Well, I think it is true that we may say that we had -- ho -- we palled, we pause at this moment between the second and third millenium of our era. The year 1944 is only a few decades away from 2000, and you may just as well say that a whole millenium at this moment draws to a close. Forty years really makes no difference, you see. And what is this? It is concerned, this whole last millenium, with the discovery of America, for example. That is, with things in space.

Now things in space are things which can be made visible. So gentlemen, man in the last thousand years has discovered the visible world. You don't have to take my word for it. That's what the natural scientists tell you. They have discovered the whole visible world, have they not? They have microscopes. We have telescopes. We'll get bigger microscopes. And we'll get more refined microscopes,

and so we'll see better and better. So the visible world is more or less discovered. And well, you can say, gentlemen, put it this way: that past which at this moment is what you call your present, and what is made the present of these poor stratosphere kids, you see, who have to know where they should be seated on a table of grownup people by themselves, just out of their own scientific organization, I suppose -- these poor people at this moment prolong the last thousand years, which we will, by and large, date to the year 1000. I have some reason for it. Iceland became Christian in the year 999. And that's the last country in the West that, you see, became Christian and, so to speak, began to march in line with the others. So there is some reason to say that really it -- it doesn't matter, in the year 1000 -- the world turned in to the discovery of space. Because as you know, these Icelandic people had -- began to discover Greenland and on it went from there. And the Normans then went all around the world, and even discovered England. And otherwise there would be no America. So we have to be grateful to these people who landed in 1066 and all that, in Hastings, you see, and began to unify the visible world. They really did it. I have great respect for this. Has anybody read -- who's the great Frenchman, the great last poet of France? He's diplomat, { } "{Le Bois de Soit de Sauterne}". Don't you know the --? Just -- this moment, slipped my-- the name's slipped. It will come back to me. Well, he showed the -- the de- -- conquest of the Spaniards of the 16th century, in this famous drama. It's like a Faust.

(Candide?)

Wie?

(Candide?)

Claudette. Claudel. Claudel. I {got the second}. But it helps, you see. Every little bit helps. Only to show you that man -- poetry, too, is concerned with the discovery of the visible things. Goethe's Faust is, you see. The -- of course, Shakespeare is. Just the prologue of Henry V shows you. And all the Elizabethans are, Raleigh and Drake and all these people, you see, discovery of the world. Please? (What was man doing before he began to discover space after he --)

Oh, we'll see that. Just a minute! Just give me time, will you? That's, of course, what I try to be- -- or begin, just to set out to, but I just have to take you and to make the last thousand years very small. And the small -- last thousand years are just preoccupied with one big item: space. And that's all I have said this, so far. Obviously this calls for supplement, you see, implementation. You're quite right.

Now, I suggest, gentlemen, that anything that happened since 1900 which is important, and fruitful, and forward-looking, has nothing to do with space, but with time. Space is only at this moment anybody who becomes a physicist is on the conservative, the reactionary side. That's reactionary to be a physicist today. I hope some of you -- discover this in time, and although they could be good physicists, prefer to do something. Because gentlemen, the best people never do what they are fitted for, but what has to be done. If you shall wait, you see, in history, for the people who -- who are fitted for something, you'll never get the people who are fitted for, because they always have first to be created by the people who hear a command. But this has to be done, even though we don't know it, yet -- how to do it. The type of the next thousand years, gentlemen, the human being, hasn't been yet created. It's in process. And I know a little bit about these things, you can assure me, because at least for 50 years, I have tried to live out of space into the new topic of history that is time. Time, gentlemen. Today, everything that has to do with something fruitful or with the future has to do with the problem of times.

Give you a little example, gentlemen. How long you in your life should stay on in one -- at one desk, in one office, in one business. Because I suppose you wouldn't be at the lathe, or at a machine so much. You will all be seated somewhere at a desk. Now the most important question of future technology is: when does the soul of man get killed by working at the same desk? The question whether you can stand the same environment three years or five years, or just one week is one of the most vital questions in your own life and in your married life. Because the happiness of your marriage, with -- and your vitality with regard to your own wife will depend on your courage to give notice at the right moment to the boss and say, "Sorry," you see, "I'm no huckster." Who knows The Hucksters? Oh, you all should read this book. Who wrote it?

(Frederick Wakeman.)

Wie?

(Frederick Wakeman. Wakeman.)

How do you spell this man?

(W-a-k-e-m-a-n)

Now, gentlemen, may I recommend this book very highly, because that's the

problem of your own life. Wakeman. The Hucksters. I mean it. Because there in a nutshell you have the problem of timing. This man had to know when he had enough. You remember? And it was all very promising. He made a lot of money. He could get very rich. But that wasn't important, because he had to -- you have to live your 70 years, and if you are a moral wreck at 45, the \$100,000 you make a year has absolutely no importance. It all goes into the sink of -- either the analyst, or the divorce, or gambling, or something. Usually into all three.

Timing. When to marry. That's the secret today. Most people marry out of season. { }. When to work. When to pause. The whole problem of the peace in Europe is a question of timing. President Roosevelt knew this -- he was a very great man. Not in his dealings with the world so much, but in his deep feeling of the pulse of time. He said in 1943, as I recall, or maybe '42, "This time the peace must under no circumstances concluded right away after the fighting is over." The great crime of the Treaty of Versailles was the attempt to have a peace when, as the great American poet has put it, in our veins, the storm is running still. When in our veins the storm is running still. Do you know who wrote this? John J. Chapman. John J. Chapman, who lost a son in the Lafayette squadron. And he wrote a number of poems in memory of his son. And of course, you see, in this war it was the same. This country began to hate and to be wild and furious in Christmas 1944. You are too young to know this. The American people never took the whole thing seriously before. At the moment of ultimate triumph the Germans turned around once more and beat them for three days in Bastogne. And that they resented very much. You never know the psychological point, you know, at which the famous straw breaks the camel's neck.

Now, America went to war in a nasty way, as something serious. And not with this kind of overflow, "Oh we'll do that, too," you see. In the -- December of '44, perhaps you take this down gentlemen, because it shows you that we missed everything in this last war, because we had absolutely no sense of timing. In the First World War, the United States tried to make the peace too early. In the Second World War, they entered the war too late. Too early and delayed is the ban of the animal out of history. This country is still like a colt. It has just, you see. In playtime, gentlemen, there is no serious timing. It doesn't matter when you do one thing or the other. In serious life, everything matters on the hour. There is -- how is the famous saying? -- There is a tide in the --
(-- affairs of men.)

That's what it is. That's what the ancients called astro- -- meant when they said that the stars set their course and we have to follow them. Gentlemen, as-

tology, when it was discovered wasn't as stupid as it is today. It was the recognition, you see, that there is only a once in every decision. And that if you are too late and too early, you are just as dead as Spain is at this moment, or Bulgaria. That is, they have been. They're dead. Corpses. They stink.

Gentlemen, the spirit of life is offered every group and every individual. But once he has passed it by, it never comes back. Never comes back, because the spirit against the Holy Spirit cannot be forgiven. Because it is just destroyed, the very minute you go -- let it pass by. That's the famous word in the New Testament which few people do understand. It just means, gentlemen, that if you at the right moment haven't turned down the bribe, you cannot become commissioner of police -- the police of New York. But there is, as you know, a famous man, I think it was Mr. O'Brien, who -- who was it? -- who was famous because at the right moment, he turned down one bribe. And that was enough. I don't know if he turned down all the other bribes.

That, gentlemen, makes life so interesting. You have your routines. You go in the morning at 8 o'clock and kiss your wife good-bye, and then you have -- you had breakfast, and orange juice and eggs. And what can happen? You have all the vitamins for the day. But you have no idea that perhaps at the next corner there is an accident which will involve you into lifelong trouble, because you become partner to this accident, you see. And the way you behave then, if you are a hit-and-miss, you see, a hit-and-run driver, you see, may ruin your whole family for the rest of your lives, because you are not prepared to acknowledge that this accident which happens at the next corner has any relevance to your routines, you see. And so you are overruled by the accident, hit-and-run, and there comes the police, and everything is taken away from you and your family is made miserable and you go to jail, because you could not face the call of this moment, you see. You had other, more important things to do. You have, of course, rationalized it inside yourself. You have told yourself that you had to go -- be in the office, otherwise they might fire you. Gentlemen, the greatness of modern man is that he must risk being fired if he has an accident, you see. For example. Now gentlemen, the accident doesn't have to consist in something of this type, superficial type. It can be much more serious. It can mean that because your wife is weeping, you have to stay home, although you have to go to the office. You never know. Perhaps she is weeping just from jealousies. Then don't stay home. That's not a good reason. But they have -- may have a very serious reason, because she may have cause to be jealous. This I didn't, you see, assume.

So, gentlemen, we today are just in the same boat as the great nations. Most

people are beyond their capacity of entering history when you look at their lives. I unfortunately know many Dartmouth graduates who died, for all practical purposes, at the ripe age of 27. They all were -- are all great objects, of course, for the Metropolitan Life Insurance. But otherwise they are no longer interesting. They are counted out. Nations are counted out. Cities are counted out, you see. States are counted out. Because they do not -- they do not heed the time. You know this in small ways. You know that New England at this moment is counted out in the woolen industry because the unions here can't understand that they must do something to keep -- stay in business. Everybody knows such a thing. That's too small perhaps to strike home with you. But in some such way, every one of you gentlemen can miss the decisive hour, and you take down one sentence, gentlemen. The historical moment never returns. Never. That's why I'm so pessimistic in -- in -- at this moment with our diplomacy. The -- Mr. Molotov five years ago said to the great powers that he would not undergo the same treatment as they gave him five years ago. You have -- don't know all these things. And he was full of spite and vengeance and vindictiveness at that time in London. And his last remarks were really appalling. So we went down on our knees for the last two years and asked him for a conference. And now he -- he gets his satisfaction, his vengeance, his vindication because he can wait -- could wait. And we could not. The timing is also a question of waiting. And we have made the greatest fools of ourselves. I have wondered why the French, the English, and the American {insist} that Mr. Molotov should have a day of triumph in court -- his day in court. We all were quite { } understood the situation and they are placing all the traps and all the aces. And they had even told us beforehand. You can read it in the final speech of the London Conference in 18- 19- -- you know this last conference at which they -- was it Paris or London? I'm not too -- absolutely sure at this moment -- where he said, "Gentlemen, the next time, we'll meet on my terms." So Mr. {Bedau} is meeting him on his terms. Very fascinating. The man who has time, and the man who has no time -- always hops in -- into the next airplane as we do. You see, we have no time. Mr. Hoo- -- Edgar Hoover in April 1946, according to the newspapers, was going to Japan to reform the Japanese police. Very interesting. He's a good man, obviously, in his field, and you know how long it took him? To reform the Japanese police? Thirty days. Thirty days, because there was an airplane. Gone now are the times of camels. They gave you the right sense of time. Nobody could reform a foreign country its police force in 30 days at that time. So it could be reformed. Now it's all done, and nothing ever happens. It's a joke. So all the occupation of Europe, you see. All over in a hurry. Oh, that's all over. So all the good things we did, you see, and they were very good, they are

all done in such a hurry. The mothers said, "The boys had to go home." We demobilized, as you know. We sold, we burned, we stole all the war equipment in Europe and in Asia, because -- why not? It has to be demobilized. Why, nobody knows. Nobody knows why this is necessary, gentlemen, that now we are bothered with having no army, because we didn't have -- not -- keep the army in 1946. Can I under- -- do you -- will you tell me? You see, because this is democracy. I can tell you why. Because it is a forgetful humanity which does decline to move in time, but only in space. So when they move from Europe to America back, that's space. Then they saw something else. They saw Main Street and the movies, and so they no longer lived in time. And that's why America is today the most backward country in the world with regard to history. It is. I assure you. Nowhere do we have the initiative. Whether it is Egypt or Argentina with Mr. Peron, we are all -- all cornered. They laugh at us, because we are in such a hurry. We have no time, for nothing. We have the next election coming. As though this was -- isn't -- aren't the elections subordinate to the future of America? No. You subordinate the future of America to the elections. And it is even said in this country! Openly. Frankly. That everything is done for the next elections. Do you think a great country of 160 million people can rule in this manner? It's impossible. So we get some {of course} we get some McCarthyism, some cold dictatorship, because somebody has to rule this country in the long run. It's all a joke. No time. No relation to time. But if you say Nevada, Nebraska, then it makes the heart beat higher. If you have read the last poems of the last 20 years in America, it always has to be at least -- 48 states have to be listed to make the heart beat higher. Plus Puerto Rico. Gentlemen, is this poetry? It's all space. Dead.

Gentlemen, space is not connected with feelings. It is not connected with the heart. It is connected with your legs, and of course, they are especially long. I envy you. But because I have short legs, gentlemen, I know a little bit of what is interested in timing. In timing, it isn't the long legs, which walk longest. Yes, sir. Now, we'll say it this way, gentlemen, to give you a little map of the world's history. From the year 1000, to the year of grace 1945 or 2000, I don't care, man was interested in space, and therefore he discovered what is called the world. And we shall call the world the visible things, the things visible. From now on, if we shall have any future, which is still doubtful -- we can burn ourselves to tid-bits, if the Americans have their way -- perhaps we'll have to be -- put -- taken under control. In the year X, of the future, the goal will be to make every human being, every nation, every tribe, the stone-age Indians of the Amazonas, the province of Brazil, and even the people in the Bronx, live in the right times. That may be very fascinating. It will be the question of intermarriage. When can a

stone-age Indian marry a girl from New York without bad results? Not now. It will take three or four generations before these groups can mix. The same question with segregation and the Negro, you see. It's not a question whether, but when. When. I think when you have Negro princes, you can marry, you see. The white girl can marry a Negro. If you have no princes, and just waiters, and elevator boys, don't do it. There's not enough to marry upon, you see.

All the marriage problems of the human race are problems with timing. And gentlemen, they are problems through the generations. You cannot solve this problem in one generation. It is quite impossible. You have to admit this. Somebody can leap ahead. One white person. It's so wonderful, mysterious. Nobody knows it is perhaps possible that at this moment a white woman from Boston can marry a lift -- elevator boy in Alabama. I have -- know -- I know such a person. She came from one of the best families of Boston. And she married a masseur, a colored man. And they live not very far from here, in the mountains. And it's a daily struggle. And from the outside, it appears as an impossible, and as a wrong, thing. But gentlemen, if this people have known the price, so to speak, it's not up for you -- for us -- for you or me to judge this. It may look from the outside more impossible than it really is.

The wonderful thing about history is, gentlemen, that we march by echelons. You know this expression, "echelon"? There is no other word, unfortunately, and that's French. We march staggered. So at this moment, already, some people live in the third millenium, in their interests in life. And others live still -- backward, in the second millenium. Some at this moment are space-minded. I think the majority, wouldn't you say? And other people are already time-minded. That is, they give more interest and more emphasis to this deep mystery of timing. And it's high time, gentlemen, that you rescue timing. You know in whose hands it has fallen today, the problem of timing? Who does timing in this country? The politicians. And as long as you have such sneer for the politicians, you see, there will be too few people concerned with genuine time. Because one thing you must admit, the politician times, and you don't. Now he only times superficial things, like elections, you see. So it is a very limited part of life which he times. But he does it for you, because we can't do it. And the way you talk and say, "That's just politics," just shows me that you do not understand life. Because politics is a very small foam, a froth, something on top, the scum, so to speak, of the whole problem of timing, with which the whole world is concerned, since the beginning of creation. So gentlemen, the politician is, so to speak, the proof that something is wrong with timing, because he is in a despicable position with you. You say, what does he do? He just figure out elections. { }, doesn't he? Now, gentlemen, I agree. Timing is a much wider field. But we have allowed it to

crumble and to shrink, so to speak, to so little bits of life that the rest of life is not taken care of. When a boy of 19 comes to the -- tells his mother that his bride is 27, she says, "Well, { }" and even arranges for the wedding cake. These tragedies happen every minute here in this country.

The other day, I was asked to celebrate and even to have at my house a wedding of a boy of 27, with a 39-year-old lady who had been sufficiently operated to be unable to have children. Now the hoax of it. Why do they have to marry? They can live together until she is 99. I don't care. But that's not a marriage, a 27-year-old lusty and healthy boy. It's a scandal. A scandal. Nothing but a scandal. But people are so unfree, such liars and such weaklings that they have to get a wedding certificate, because otherwise they can't get one room in a hotel. Why do these people have to be married? Nobody cares. She is not fit for marriage. She is -- and that's the whole story. But you are such cowards. People have the best marriage in this country, the most important are the ones when the man is 72 and she is 79. They marry here when marriage makes no sense anymore. Because they are so eager to have it all, you see, officially organized in space, the one apartment. I told you, I suppose, of the lady who -- 49's a true story. Just now married a man 90 years of age. Marriage.

So gentlemen, all institutions of timing today are perverted in the institutions of space. Why do they marry? To have a one-room apartment together, or a hotel room together, you see. That is, space dictates to the most sacred motions of the heart. Now, gentlemen, the heart is given us as the pre-eminent indicator of time, of timing. We have no other. When to do something we can only know from here. The brain can never tell you. The brain always sells you the opposite. So gentlemen, the next millenium at this moment is { }, because we will have to start on timing, because today timing is destroyed. Gentlemen, any one era of history -- will you take this, too? -- any one era of history endangers something so much that the whole era is needed to restore the thing jeopardized, the thing destroyed. We come to that. It's a very important law of history. And the most important law today is that timing is so deeply destroyed at this moment, you see, that man will have to concentrate for centuries to come in order to restore the balance. Can you see this? All -- the New Testament has always this expression that, you see, there is more joy in Heaven over one sinner, you see, that does penitence than over 99 just -- that is not just meant for individuals, gentlemen. But the thing wrong, the injury done today by our souls to timing, you see, makes this the underdog, and the underdog has now to become the first, so to speak, you see, the king in the new era. It has -- what has to be minus it now in 1954 will have to be plus. It will have to be put in the center of the map. And have -- timing will have to become pre-eminent, or there will be no United States,

gentlemen, I assure you. Your generation will have to learn patience. The one thing you haven't learned, in all political issues. The whole conservation problem -- program, is a case in point, you see. You know that when the Republicans came in, there was great danger that the cattle grazers in the West, you see, would overgraze again. I do not know what is happening. Does anybody know? Who is from Texas? They wouldn't come to my class.

So, let's have a break here.

[Opening remark missing]

... with timing. And the process, gentlemen, of timing are all contained in what is called -- in what is called society. The theme of the future is not the world, but society. And there is a definite opposition between society and world, which we are now going to define carefully. You all confuse the two. World is everything visible and measurable. Society begins where any one of us knows that one day he will also have to be its opposite. An apprentice knows that he -- one day he's the master. In the world of today, there are neither masters nor apprentices, because timing has been neglected. Therefore, this whole social process of how an apprentice becomes a master, or how a disciple becomes a teacher doesn't take place in America, so you have neither students nor professors, but you have only progressive individuals. Yes. Because you don't have the social experience of being first on one side of the barricade and then changing into the opposite. Sons must become fathers, must they not? But of course, individuals become nothing. Mr. {Epstein}, your self-made man. He's never a son so he's never a father. He's just funny. And most males today in this country are very funny, because they have declined to be sons, officially, spiritually. Heirs, they are all self-made, so they stay put. They are neither one. Society, gentlemen, is the unity of opposites. The Marxians call this in a very limited sense the dialectical method. But this dialectics of Marxism is just as small as a politician's timing is with regard to all timing. The dialectics of Marxism have discovered a great truth: that in society, gentlemen, you never are one thing for all -- ever. You always have one position at a time, and your life consists of finding the right moment when you have to become the opposite of yourself. It's very important that a private becomes a corporal. If he always is a private, he certainly is not a very good private, because potentially a private is only a man, you see, who is fit to become a corporal. You will admit that there is some truth in it. That a man who cannot even one time become a corporal hasn't learned well enough to be a private, you see. That is, gentlemen, as in all birth, as in all actions of life, we beget our very opposite. When I have eaten, I stop eating. I must do something different from eating, because that proves that I have eaten well. If I have not

eaten well, I can go on nibbling all day long. I never stop eating. I think it's the same with shitting. if you never stop shitting, something is in disorder.

Don't you see, gentlemen, that society consists of the recognition, the mental recognition that the fact that you think at this moment, here, or at least I try to think in -- in your stead, must be spelled by some game. And vice versa. You cannot play 24 hours a day. You must not. You will play much better if for several hours a day you try to think.

In life, gentlemen, in the life of society, every one role re- -- cries for its very opposite. Now, in the world, gentlemen, when man lives in the last thousand years, lives in the world, he establishes states, and in a state, once an American, always an American. Once a German, always a German. That is, gentlemen, you are all worldlings at this moment. You are all treated as though you could not become your own opposite. You are all treated as though everything was fatal. Fate was, so to speak, you see, the whole -- poor people in Europe really do think that once a Frenchman, always a Frenchman, you see. Now, the people who came to this country didn't believe so. But you are beginning to believe it, too, like the Frenchman, at this moment. You try to forget that the great honor of the Americans is that once they were not Americans, and that they showed the power of being one thing, a European, and later an American. And that's the only superiority the Americans at this moment still have over the European nations, gentlemen, that they changed their allegiance. And that's the real problem of the Know-Nothing party here, called McCarthyism now. But 200 years ago, they were called the Know-Nothing party. They had exactly the same bills in Congress in 1858. Yes. And they said no newcomer to this country can become an American voter. They'll give him property rights and so on, very much like the McCarran bill. And you can deport such a man afterwards. Now they go to this foolishness and say that the law can decide whether a man can be an American. Do you think that's possible? That's space-mindedness. As though some authority in space can decline life, can state things, you see, which just aren't so. We are saddled with all the uncanny and un- -- disagreeable Americans for good. They are just as much Americans as you and I. No law of the state can do this. But gentlemen, take this down -- the word "state" is an application of the principles of the world to man. The word "society" is an attempt to give man his specific changeability, his specific character that in difference -- distinction from all men -- things in nature, he is only a man when he goes through opposite phases, stages. The very natural thing for a man is to migrate, for example. The very natural thing for a man is to be at first a bachelor and then a husband. So you must have laws which respect bachelors and husbands. You can't make a

law that privileges all husbands. You see, and say, "Bachelors cannot go." On the other hand, you cannot have a society in which only monks must govern, you see, because bachelors -- bachelors are better -- they claim to be better than husbands. That would be a state society, as they had in Spain in the 17th century. And they had it in the colonies, you know, in Mexico. Gentlemen, state is the seduction of the human being, statehood, because it tries to implicate that man {first} behaved like nature. Society is the recognition of something human, of something specific in man, that he begins only to live as a human being when his present state of mind is dismissed as transient, as temporary. You cannot build houses on any man's mind, because it's fickle. They say, "Frailty is -- thy name is women -- woman," but fickleness, thy name is man. That's as it should be. That's why we cannot base life on the mind. It's a mistake. Society must be larger than any one man's mind. That's why you can't have an -ism. You cannot run any country by capitalism, communism, liberalism, idealism, any -ism, you see, because these are all passing fashions of the mind. You know this. That's why Christianity, you see, says man is fickle. Formerly they called this "sinner." But this is just an obsolete translation. It means he's fickle. And he ought to be. This is not in itself an indictment, you see. Not at all. Your mind must change. You know this very well. But you never make any use of this, strangely enough. And you still think that on the transient ideas of your mind, you want to have a philosophical system, on the philosophical system, you wish to build a utopia, and on top of the utopia, you then wish to have a secret police. Because whenever the mind rules, you must have the secret police. Because when the mind rules, you have tyranny. Because it's arbitrary. Because any one-minded stage is transient. If you establish any fixed order on something so transient like your or my mind, gentlemen, you see, then woe to the world. That's what the Russians at this moment do. They make the mind law. But we are not so very far away from it. Only fortunately we have so many diversity of minds, you see, that nobody's quite serious about his own mind.

Gentlemen, the mind in society cannot be master, because the mind must love its opposite. It is only by the marriage of two minds that you can have procreation in humanity. And the people must remain of different minds. The marriage doesn't mean that they are of the same mind at the end. Where is "the marriage of two minds"? What quotation is this? Well, I -- I have stolen this, the marriage of two minds. Huh? the greatest love poem of the human language, it has been told -- called. I think it's Sonnet 82 of Shakespeare's Sonnets. Bring Shakespeare's sonnets next time. We'll read it all together. It is worth it. And it -- has more secrets about history and about time than you -- than you believe.

Gentlemen, let's go back. What's the story from zero to 1000? It is not the story

of timing, society. It is not the story of space, spacing, as we now may call it. Spacing, including discovery, technology, placing things -- matter, in the right place, you see, where you can get a -- hold of the source materials. Building railroads, to all the harbors, you see, Panama Canals, Suez Canals. Let's call this the last -- effort of the last thousand years spacing, for the fun of it, ja. Let's call the task before us timing. Then obviously, gentlemen, we have 1,000 years concerned with the world. And 1,000 years ahead of us concerned with society. But it is also known to most of you that before we had world of church history, Christianity came, and as I told you, it came with the Christianization even of the Icelanders. Even of Mr. Stefansson's ancestors. And so many nations were only very poorly baptized. They { }. And it had tremendous consequences. As you know, all languages spoken today are church languages. Instead of Anglo-Saxon, you speak today English, which is Anglo-Saxon, plus the language of the church, of the Bible. Instead of the Germanic, we speak German, that is really Deutsch -- in Germany, you see, not Germanic anymore. But completely changed over by the Psalms, and the liturgy, and the Bible. In Germany. The word "French" shows you -- {tells you the same story}. And Spanish, and Italian. It is no longer the pagan Latin language, you see, but completely done over by the worships, the divine service, and the language of the priesthood, the clergy. That is, gentlemen, the church has since 1000 always been with us as an accomplished fact. And in the first thousand years this has happened. We'll see what the Church has done. It has created one people. The peoples of Europe, the very expression, "peoples," you see, are peoples who are headed in the direction of freedom. We call a people a group that is still free to change. Very different from a "nation," for example. Nationalism means fixation. But when you get people, they are still inarticulate, perhaps, but they are changeable. They are amorphous. They are free from their prejudices. People have a future. Will you take this down? And the church has changed wherever it goes. It changes the given data of the people in the world to poss- -- new possibilities. It makes people. We'll see that there were no peoples in this deep sense, in antiquity, at all. You don't know this. But I recommend therefore that they Church has created those peoples who then are able to space, and must now then become able to time their lives in freedom. Every one of you can take an air ticket and fly around the globe. Like this poor girl, you know, in 96 hours. You read this in the paper, no? You should. It was a record-breaking event. An airline, for advertising purposes, put a young stenographer on an airship, and she was not allowed ever to leave any airport, and so she made it in 96 hours around the globe. That shows you what we do with regard to spacing. We have -- all the people can do this. She's just a simple girl. No money, you see. And she is sent around it like any king, or any dictator, or world -- world governor today. Space is there for everybody. The people of

this world have conquered space, have they not? And now we can only go down on knees and say, "{Dearest} God, don't let us -- don't -- let us not perish, let us not perish because we have conquered space."

So the next order of the day is timing. Because if you don't, this poor girl certainly shows the criminal character of our times. Here she was, with the opportunity of her lifetime to see the whole world, and she had to sit in the planes and go around the earth, you see, and go crazy. She'll never forgive herself for the rest of her life, she has missed her opportunity. You see, that will never come back to her. And she was very sad and just ate sandwiches. Well, she was sandwiched between the two millenia, you see, of space and of time, you see. And space won out. And there was no time for anything, you see. I think such a -- the airline would be condemned to death 100 years from now I hope, you see. Because timing will be all-important. Nobody would care for spacing. Just as little as you now care for the Church, because you take the Church for granted. Because the Church has made peoples. What this means, we'll see later. Gentlemen, I have tried to show you that we are at this moment vaulting between the second and third millenium of an era, which had three tasks to make all people so free that they could go into the future. To allow them to conquer space. And now to allow them to organize society. We have therefore three great thousand-year topics, themes of history which deserve your attention. Church, for the people. The world, for space, world war, world revolution, world society, world trade, world economy, what not. World geography, world history. And now we have the social problems. Society, as the organization inside which man must be allowed to know when to do one thing and when to do the very opposite. So, you can put it this way, when, what -- and this, gentlemen: how. Or who, perhaps is the better question, you can put it both ways, "how to." As a peoples, you see, that the hero of history since the year zero, is the whole human race. The hero of history is developed as the people in the first thousand years. The carrier, the bearer. Can you see this? The man -- the stem of the tree. Then this tree goes and creates its environment, space, space. All the roots can go into Brazil, as well as into Asia Minor. And now, gentlemen, this tree, after having put down roots all over the globe, must grow into the heavens of the stars, of the galaxy, of the circling suns and moons, because they know the time. Up there, at least, you have an analogy of our problem, you see. If man -- you and I could move like stars, like constellations, rise in time, and set in time, you could have peace. So I hope you see that -- history is the most wonderful thing in the world. I think it is. It is the self-knowledge of the whole of the human race, shared by every one of its fellows -- members. It is not your story. And it is not my story, gentlemen. But it is the story of how we all entered one

story. That is history: the story of how every man born from woman becomes a part of the whole story. That's history. And I think I have proved you a little -- as much that it is perfectly possible without any superstition, and without any denominational or scientific bias, to see that history is a story by itself, in which the Church and the sciences all have their accredited place, of course, you see, but which all underlie one condition, gentlemen: the whole people must move through space and time.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Let's round out this scheme of history. Has anybody ever seen -- or owns, perhaps a little chronology called The Little Ploetz -- famous German book translated into American slang. It is better than 1066 And All That. Who has -- who knows 1066 And All That? Only one. That's a -- humor, you see, humoristical world history. But a serious one, a skeleton of the events of history is just a list of data. That's -- would be a very great help, if some of you would buy this book by Ploetz, or take it out of the library, so that some of you can consult what really happened in history, date year by year, because what I am now -- I can't do this in this course and I shall tell you why. I -- we have now to round out now the whole era of history, the whole times of human endeavor into the impossible, into the surprising, into the unexpected, into the unnatural. This -- not simply a question of dates. We have -- I hope -- I have made you -- understood that we shall distinguish in our own era three different endeavors. The church, to create a free people that can, in freedom, get into space, and can get freedom determine its times for every member of society. Spaces and times. In the last thousand years, we said, from the Christianing of the Icelanders to the days of circling the earth by guided missiles or in -- 96 hours by a stewardess, we have conquered space. Will you kindly note that I said we have. Space is conquered. And I said to you, everybody who now is out to conquer space belongs to the past. Our kids play with space and the spaceship, et cetera, because children always play with the past of adults. One of the great fictions in this country is that children are ahead of their parents. They are always behind. That's why they are children. They are not yet in history. You prepare yourself for your life. That's why you are in prep school or in a college. And one of the great heresies of America, why it has no relation to history, is that you have been told -- has been really dinned into your ears that children are ahead of their parents, that they are the future. Gentlemen, I assure you, when you look around, of most fresh, vigorous people, their children are the handicap. Most children of leading people, like James Roosevelt are handicaps to their parents. They are far behind.

[laughter]

This is serious, gentlemen. You are not ahead of your parents, because you are born later. But that's what you believe. You're far from this. You haven't even caught up with them. You haven't founded a family. You haven't sent a boy to school. You don't -- are not in history. You're playing with everything. And these playboys are told in this country, which is really the end -- that's why this world at this moment comes to a very quick end, why America is played out in pol- --

Welt-politics, because you think that you are, because you are younger than your parents, that you are ahead of them, just automatically. But gentlemen, obviously the story of history is that here you are born in a cradle, guinea pigs of life, or pigs, { }. And then we try to lift you up hard upon that level upon which decisions are made and real events can take place. And you are over here at this point, and most of you try never to enter this point; but just get a job, an irresponsible job somewhere and escape this responsibility. So here you are, on this way, from non-history, from pre-history, from nature, into non-nature, where something is done, some inventions are made, discoveries are made, resistance is made. Where people, when Pearl Harbor is bombed, just say, "Now we shall throw out the Japs," and when Korea happens we decide that we will not allow the Russians to stay there. That's nothing -- not playing with life, but that's entering a new era. Making an epoch-making event come true. You can't do this. Far from it. Now you believe because you are born into -- in 1935 that this is a reason to think that your parents are obsolete and you are modern. Gentlemen, because you haven't even ever reached this level of performance, you are the drawback, the dead weight of any society. The children are, because it takes a terrible effort to lift them up to really doing things. All the young gentlemen, all the people of age are under the tutelage of the older, and they have to use -- waste most of their time in getting you going. But as long as you believe, gentlemen, that people, because their date of birth is Arkansas No. 1, with this new -- you know, these new numbers that they give everybody, and that people who didn't fall under this wonderful law by which every American is numerated, you see, are obsolete, are mistaken, gentlemen.

At this moment, there are very few people do -- making historical decisions in this country. You can count them by the finger of one hand. There are hundreds who try to prevent the United States of making historical decisions. And there are millions who just haven't reached that level of maturity at all. Well, this is important, gentlemen, because you understand perhaps now that while the children are {stee- } playing with the stratosphere, the people in government, our secretary of agriculture, for example, Mr. Benson -- is forced for the first time to time harvests outside the harvest season. That's called planning. You know what happened to butter, and you know -- see what happens to coffee. And we have just gone on luckily for 200 years without ever planning any such thing, because there was a bounty. But, gentlemen, at this moment "plan" means to establish some time limit beyond the stock exchange rate of every day and bring on the harvest of the -- in August, and the -- July. And planning is one expression of man's sudden fear that he comes too late with everything, that he has no time, that he has lost time. This world plan, whatever you may think of it, gentlemen, means one thing, that man has lost time. And therefore, at this moment, wherev-

er you look in political decisions, what people try to gain is time. And the third millenium is with every political responsible body or man who tries to gain time, but you gain -- try to gain money. You try to gain things. You try to gain cars. You don't try to gain time. You think you have plenty of time. You have no time, gentlemen. It's later than you think. Time is lost. Time is wasted. The more people work, { } the less time they have. The more they think everything has to be done today or tomorrow. To have time means to feel that what you do will take effect in a hundred years from now. That would have -- mean you have gained time, see? Now, give me one man in this country, except myself, who at this moment thinks of the year 2050 in earnest. That's forbidden in this country. He's an idiot who does this. And they say you can't do it anyway. I assure you, gentlemen, I can. It costs a certain price. But it's very important. It means that some people should do that. I'm not interested in you, unless something of what I tell you will reach you in the year 2050. Then you would help me to gain time for this great country. And otherwise, if you don't want this, ju- -- there will -- this will be a very small country. Somewhere completely eclipsed outside the rest of the world, like modern Spain. Just accidentally still there. Can happen very quickly. Some atom bombs thrown on Pittsburg, and the steel output going down, and it's all over. But on this no human race can live, on such externals, you see. But if you had some faith in the importance of reaching the year 2050, which is very short, you would be real people. You see, all the medieval cathedrals were built without any foreknowledge of when they would be terminated. And most of these cathedrals took 80 to 90 years to build. So here were people who began to do something and were quite sure that their great-grandchildren would still continue to build these great cathedrals of Chartres, or of Amiens, or Strasbourg, or Paris. And they did. For a hundred years, they had unanimity of purpose. You haven't even unanimity of purpose with yourself for the next two days. Something else happens, and you say, "Oh, I just forgot it." Make an appointment with a professor and next day, you don't go there, because you had something more important after that coming up. You don't even say, "Excuse me." You just forget it. { } whole life. It consists of organized forgetfulness. That's what you are. Organized forgetters.

But you should be organic begetters. Have you thought what you should -- what your grandchild should inherit from you? Well, with the inheritance tax, you say, they -- he can't inherit anything. You have no ambitions, gentlemen, which is very nice, in itself, but it is outside history. It is an amusement park. It's Coney Island. Therefore, you are in space. You go on an island, you go on a trip, you go to Europe, you go to Brazil, you fly -- somebody told me -- wanted to sell me a ticket to Bermuda the other day, and that's where you all go. But that's just going places. And going places always leaves a sour taste in your mouth when

you return. Nothing accrues.

Gentlemen, this problem of timing then is already -- is already with all your responsible leaders. And it isn't with you. Take the tax system. At this moment, the last free democracy of the world, the United States of America, abolishes citizenship by having this man, this incredible man put over this machinery of tax-paying without the individual -- 35 million American citizens having to report their taxes themselves. So gentlemen, the factory, where you work, or the bank, or the insurance company pays the taxes instead of you. It's a head tax, which is levied now on the great corporations. You have no relation to your government anymore. Now taxpaying gives the vote. So very soon, the corporations will say, Dear government, you have first learned -- freed yourself from all this paperwork. Mr. Andrews promises, you know, great relief in expenses, in not getting these income tax returns, you see. He just gets them by indirection. And he leaves them to the manufacturer to turn in these tax computation. Well, very soon, I'm sure, within the next 10 years I would say, there will be a law which says that 10,000 employees of General Motors pay a head tax of so much. An average will be fixed, you see, for the different classes of employees. And no name will appear. They -- people will not have to go into the detail of these deductions and special cases, you see, illness, et cetera. And so for every employee, General Motors will pay for -- to the government let's say \$500. That's the next step. Now gentlemen, if this goes on for another 20 years, you have lost your vote. That is, you will be manipulated, because that's exactly corresponding. You don't pay -- no longer your taxes, but now you will begin to tax -- this year, it's very strange that the Republican administration should do this, you see. It is the most anti-individualistic measure against free enterprise that ever can occur. I've seen it, what made Hitler come, exactly the same tax law. The Weimar Republic made exactly the same foolish thing. I protested, I protested here, but of course I had no power to make myself heard. You will see the end of the dictatorship of the corporations or of whomever. But not -- no longer can you govern. Because you have been made once removed from the -- from your communication with your government. You are no longer a person talking freely, because you pay taxes, you see. You won't talk any -- say anything, as you already begin in your fear of the FBI. And you will sit back and say, "Somebody else is paying my taxes for me." And you do not even sit up and take stock. And you talk about great issues. Gentlemen, this is a great issue. Is it mentioned by anybody? By the tax expert? By the political science men? By the religious -- religion-men? About what do they talk? Things 500 years past. They -- are these the big issues? This is a big issue with your own life, gentlemen. You will no longer be privileged to send in your tax returns. My own father has brought me up with the conviction that a citizen must be proud for paying taxes, because that is the basis of his

political status in a free country. And that was in Germany that I was educated in this spirit. He always has told me, when I was a boy, be proud when you are able to pay taxes, because that makes you a power in a country. And that's the only power. And that's taken away from us, and nobody says even "Snap!" There you see what happens when people are just treated not as great agents of the future. You are not treated as the ancestors of the human race. You are not treated as the beginners of the new civilization. You aren't treated as the great-grandfathers, or great heroes. You are traded -- treated as cogs on the wheel, { } as some element in space that has to govern or, so to speak, organize into some spatial arrangement, the big machinery of commerce, and trade, and manufacturing. You are all in space, gentlemen. And you have no future. You have a predictable future. Most of you I can already now bury and give then the appropriate eulogy. Yes! When I was young, gentlemen, then it wasn't so very different. When I went to school in the big city of Berlin, and when I was asked what I was going to do, I said, "Certainly I'm going to leave Berlin."

They said, "Why?"

"Because," I said, "in this big city ... " it's the same now in New York, "...I can write already now" -- we were -- I was 17 -- "the birthday address for the 70th birthday of all my com- -- chums in school. It's predictable. One is going to be a lawyer. One is going to be a doctor. I foresee everything more or less. The apartment in which they are going to live, you see, around the corner in the next block, et cetera. And that's too much for me."

I don't want to know so clearly in which pre-fabricated environment I'm going to be sunk. So that's why I'm here. It is certainly unforeseeable that I should end up in Dartmouth College. But it's quite interesting.

And under the circumstances, I think I have more of a future, because I am -- from that time on, from { } a boy -- I wasn't older than you, when this dawned on me that the whole problem of the human race, beginning with the first Russian revolution, 1905, which I experienced when I was younger than you, that ever since I have made this resolution, the only important thing for civili- -- mankind is to gain time. And you have lost time -- had no time since 1890, and America lost its freedom of time in 1910. And for the last 30- -- 44 years, this country and Europe both have been without time. They were kin behind the events. If you think of the Depression, and if you think of World War I and II, you will admit, Pearl Harbor and 1929 bear out my contention that this country is running behind in its timing. It has no initiative. It has no freedom of action. It is

trying always to cover up one hole after another. When it is over in Korea, begins in -- where? Indochina. And when it's over in Indochina, it begins in Ceylon. And on it goes. And we're always running behind and we're always trying to hold the thumb under the pump. But usually the water isn't stopped that way. It's a very funny country, gentlemen, this country, in which everybody knows everything. We are the best-informed people, you see. We have the Associated Press. And we have the commentators. And whom don't we have, according to information, you see? But we have no idea what happens tomorrow. The Russian people have no information, but they know what happens tomorrow, I can assure you. That's their only one advantage. Because they have no standard of living. We have the standard of living, so we stand. We stand like the oxen before the new gate.

This is all literally so, gentlemen, and I think I have a {total} right to tell you this, because I really -- it's no boast of mine. But it's just my vocation. I have not done nothing for the last 50 years but try to think out this change from 1000 years of space discovery to the future of time discovery. This is very serious. I'm not the only man who has done so. Bergson in France has done so, and there are many people who are thinking in these lines today. But you don't here this. All the thing you hear is of the moment. Nothing is of eternity. I would be very satisfied, gentlemen, if you would begin to think that 30 years is already a small eternity. Hundred years is a magnificent eternity. And the eternity of which you hear in church doesn't exist. We know nothing of eternity out of time. There is no such thing as eternity for human understanding. That's pious fraud. But we know of history. And we know that life on this globe must return by our own creation, and that 30 years are more difficult to gain than one day.

So now, let's go back and place this tremendous miracle of man having stepped out of nature and done everything unexpected against his nature for the last 2,000 years and ask us, how did this begin? There is of course, an era before our era, which we shall call, "Before Christ" or antiquity. We call it also B.C. Looking backward before man becomes one people, one space, and one time, you see, there is -- are eras in which people speak many languages. In other words, where there are many peoples, where there are many spaces, and where there are an infinite number of times. Gentlemen, antiquity is in no way different from our time, except that everything we have unified, there exists in multiples. Every ancient empire thought it was identical with the whole world. That is, in India to this day you can find people -- the strict Hindus -- who believe in many worlds. The discovery that all the world is one, is a discovery only of the last thousand years. When you read Mr. Nehru's strange glimpses of world history -- who has seen this book? Nobody? I thought you were all interested in interna-

tional relations, or what -- how you call it -- inhuman relations, I think. Everybody in this country seems to know Mr. Nehru personally. However if you look into his book, you find that he is crazy. He is, because he combines the Hindu view of history and the Christian view of history in a hodgepodge and that's not feasible. They are contradictory. The Hindu view of history is that there are many worlds. And European, and Western and Christian view of history is that there is one world, see? The Hindu view of history is that every world has its own calendar, its own time, its own rhythm, its own gods. The Christian idea is that there is one God, one world, and one era. And now this poor man -- therefore he has called it "glimpses" of world history, because it's really a combination of disorder with some Western influence that there might after all be one civil war. To take advantage of us, you see, to fool us. There are no history. But he can't find it. So he jumps. The book is a very tragic book, gentlemen. And it shows you how difficult it is for people outside the privileges of America and Europe to believe in the Christian era. And you people who are already through with the Christian era and think Christianity is obsolete, you can learn from Mr. Nehru's book what it means for a Chinese, or for a Hindu, or for an African negro today to become a Christian. Only through Christianity does these people understand that there might be one space and one time. Because the Hindus believe that there are many spaces, many worlds.

So gentlemen, that universe in which we have lived during the last thousand years, is a discovery in which nobody in the year 1000 quite believes. They believed that there were many worlds, that -- God was residing somewhere outside the planet Venus. And if you could make it and travel to the sun you would find again another world, you see, with other laws and {other rules}. We don't believe that anymore. Don't we all believe that there is just one universe?

So we come to a definition, gentlemen, of the past. In pre-Christian days, there were many peoples, many worlds; and now we'll see that there were many times. We'll call therefore our space, this universe of ours, that's the world of all possible worlds, out of all worlds, a world of worlds. The Church has created a people of peoples. And society, gentlemen, you see, must be -- suddenly a time of all times. Out of all times, or it will not fulfill its purpose of unifying the times.

Unifying out of all times. So we learn something by looking backward. People of peoples. Because we learn what happened in the past. What was created in the past was not one people, but peoples, in pre-Christian days. There may have, as we will learn, may have been spoken at one time 100,000 different languages on the globe. And every one language, of course, belonged to a different tribe. And we'll call any group with a special language in antiquity in this course we'll call one tribe. And we'll say, gentlemen, that in the future, this society will be a -- the

tribe of all tribes, instead of having this rather fantastic expression, the time of our -- all times. We must con- -- found a society, gentlemen, in which every tribesman can find his appointed group. Everybody must be allowed to speak his own language and to time his own life, and yet it must be in some way one. How to do this is the great problem. We haven't solved it by a long shot. But in the antiquity, people were satisfied if everyone belonged to one tribe, so there were innumerable tribes and, put it down -- one man belonged to one tribe, but there were many tribes. In society, we shall belong to many tribes, you see, but they all must be contained in one society. So gentlemen, the problem is to change the man- -- place of the many of the one. In antiquity, once you were a --Apache or a -- Sioux, then you were this all your life. This was what you were. Or you were Egyptian, or you were a Jew. No change possible. You remained it all your life. You had no access to any other order. In our society, gentlemen, you can shift. You can change your profession. You change your place. You can change your language. You can change your denomination. You can change next to everything, you see, but all the denominations, and all the activities, as we have seen, belong into one unit, the great society of the future. So unity is placed elsewhere, now as it was in pre-Christian days. The same is true, gentlemen, of the worlds. You lived either in the Roman Empire or the Persian Empire. There was around China, as you know, a great wall, and that was China. And that was a world by itself. And outside there was just, from the Chinese point of view, something negative, something, you see, worthless, something to be avoided. The desert, or the Mongolia, or the nomads, you see, or the enemy, the same with the Roman Empire. You may have forgotten it, but sometime in school, you must -- may have heard that around the Roman Empire, there also was the so-called limes, the big wall, you see, with stations around, running through -- across Europe, and England, too. Half of England was omitted from the limes, you see, and two-thirds of Europe was omitted because the Romans also had the bright idea to declare that their world was, you see, Roman. And the rest of the world was another world, another universe in which other laws applied.

So many worlds, gentlemen, and forgive me, I use this word "world" explicitly to remind you that it is not natural to use to word "world" in the singular. That's an artificial Christian belief. An historical belief. You and I believe that the world must be treated as one. But every man who's parochial tries to prove to you that this is -- cannot be done, you see, that in Wisconsin, that's a world by itself. And every moment, the worlds try to go out -- get out of hand. Every part of the globe all the time declares that it likes to be a world by itself, if you don't prevent it. Now, as to the peoples. As you well know, the Church has been preceded by the Jews. The Old Testament is the promise of the New Testament. The Jews are

the people of promise. That is, the Jews invented that life which is more concerned with the future than with the present or with the past. A life which to you which is so normal that you think you are apt to live it. You are all progressive; you all look forward to something. And you are always in great hurry, because the best is still to come. In this sense, the Old Testament has had a tremendous influence on the Puritans, as you know. They came for the future. Well, this in antiquity was created by the chosen people. But the chosen people, as you know, waited for the other nations to see the light. So even in the existence of the Jews in antiquity, there is this acknowledgement that there are many gods, and that they still are not superseded by the unity of one people. The chosen people, you can also say the promised people. We'll see how true this is, literally. You will read the 96th Psalm and you will find that it says so, even literally, that the chosen people are the people that do not exist yet, but that are to come. That's the true meaning of "chosen." Did anybody go to my chapel service on Tuesday, by any chance? No. Well, there I talked about this.

So, gentlemen, the pre-historical times consist of the creation of all the tribes, of all the worlds, and of the children of Israel. That is, the pre-historic history is the history of many, many tribes, and many, many empires. Now you'll understand if I make a bold statement that in this sense, if mankind moves on these three levels -- tribes, empires, people -- that we have a pre-Christian history down to the two world wars. China was an empire of antiquity in 1911. Christianity hadn't made a dent. And therefore, gentlemen, your whole picture of history is so completely frustrating and distorted because you misunderstand the Christian era and say that something happening in China in the year 1700, let us say, is an event in the Christian era. Of course, it is not. It is still an event in the pre-Christian story. Now, it isn't. Through Communism, the Chinese for the first time have entered the Western idea of one history, you see. And therefore at this moment, there is no longer a specific pagan pre-Christian Chinese history. It would be quite wrong to say that, you see. Now it is within one historical stream -- for better, {for good} -- that doesn't make any difference, you see. Destructively or constructively. You may approve of it, or you may admit China to the United Nations. That makes no difference whatsoever, of course. Your personal opinion about the -- China. But the China after 1911 is a part of the Christian era. And the China until there was -- as long as there was a son of Heaven, couldn't be a member of the Christian his- -- story, because the condition of the Christian story is that there is one people, you see, and no -- and one world. Now if you have a son of -- Heaven in Peking, you see, that meant that they had a special heaven, so they had a special world. Therefore they didn't belong into one world, you see. They didn't recognize even that they should belong to one world. They declined.

Now, if you would think on these terms of history, then you would see, gentlemen, that what we call the Christian era so far, is the gradual entrance of pre-historic groups into one stream of history. So that the history, which we call the history of our era, which I put up here, means the gradual threading-in, the threading-in of pre-Christian stories into one stream of history. So we would say that China entered world history in 1911. That's not arbitrary. That is simply so. India probably entered it with the occupation by the British, you see, and the French in the 18th century. Not before. But a little earlier. That's why India's fate is so very different from Chinese -- the Chinese story. It is much longer already, although a colony. But it is in part a oneness, gentlemen, and don't look down on colonies. You are a pagan country. It's better to be -- become a colony than to become independent. Nothing could -- worse can happen -- worse can happen to countries than to be independent, you see. It's not a good idea. You first have to be inside history, then you can -- perhaps become autonomous and independent, you see. But the Puritans, when they came here, they would have been scared dead if you had told them they were independent, you see. The last thing they wanted to -- they wanted to be Europeans, Christians, you see, loaded with the old tradition of the Old and the New Testament, wouldn't they? Otherwise they would have gone crazy. They would have, like the Indians, moved in circles. So gentlemen, the people in 57 know how difficult it is to understand this term of independence, of how complicated the American independence is. The comp- -- American independence rested on the certainty that the -- America was within the stream of one world history. Otherwise these people here, you see, wouldn't have written in the Declaration of Independence -- what did they write? When ... wie?

(The course of human events ...)

That's the course of events, gentlemen, and the course of events are not American events. They are the course of events of one's history. They are therefore a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, you see. That's the recognition of the universe, of people, of space, and of time inside which this step has to be justified. The poor Chinese, the poor Egyptians, the poor Aztecs of Mexico, they had nobody to whom they could appeal with, you see. They couldn't appeal to the opinions of mankind, because they were a world and a law unto themselves. See the difference?

So, will you kindly begin to understand that what I call "Christian era" is a freely forged chain of surprises of surrenderings, of people turning towards one

history, one space, and one time, voluntarily. By {connecting them}. So every step in the history of the last 1950 years has consisted in the fact that the Chinese, for example, in 1911 said it is more important to belong to the world at large, to have one history with all men, and to recognize the notion of one people than to stay separate. So the three elements of our history, gentlemen -- one people, one space, one time, or one church, one universe, and one society -- is the way by which all the pre-historic elements of life enter the unifying influence of the Christian era. Nobody -- neither you nor I -- no Malayan, no Hindu, no Chinese can escape this sequence. First you can only enter the universe of science, of technology if you recognize that one -- we all have -- are of one mind. You cannot build a steam engine in China or a dam in India without recognizing the universal science, you see, which is the product of one people of God, of one spirit, you see, one truth for all. A people, gentlemen, says this is good, and this is bad. Another people says something else is good and something else is bad. If you form one people, it means that the same thing is good for you and the same thing is bad. Now all these Easterners, all these Southerners, even the people I think in Argentina want to be participants of the truth. So they do form, even Mr. Peron, one people with us, with regard to these things that they consider to be valid. What I have -- what is so often forgotten -- difficult for you, people are today down on missions. They say Christianity has forfeited the privilege of preaching the Gospel. And you think you can bring people -- machinery and -- industry as articles of export. And take -- can do business with Arabs, for example, by selling them -- taking their oil and giving them gold. This you cannot do. I'll tell you a story which I think illustrates this whole point. That for 1954 years, the world has only been allowed to unite in the sequence: Church, space or state, society; and that no other sequence is valid. We have this Aramco. Everybody knows what Aramco is, is this? Do you? Who doesn't know what Aramco is? Well, it's the Arabian-American Oil Company. They pay \$750 million every year to this scoundrel, the -- emir of Arabia so that he can buy airplanes and bomb the Zionists in Palestine next day. This is what we're doing. On the right-hand side, we are supporting the Bronx, and on the other side, we are supporting the Arabian preparation for war. If -- nothing so silly has ever happened. Seven hundred fifty million dollars one of these potentates alone gets in cash. It is flown in in planes with the gold bullions. I have a friend who has to count them, in Jiddah. He goes nuts, because he knows that this is a crime. He is our diplomatic agent there. But what can he do? That's the contract with Aramco. That we give a robber, a pirate, a nobody, the money to arm and to disturb the peace in the Near East. You call this commerce. Some people call it capitalism. Some call it trade. But it is certainly stupidity.

This goes on under your noses, and your children will bleed for it. Now, what have they done? These Aramco people erect schools, hospitals. They are very well-meaning. They are as well-meaning as any lady in New York City. All out for charity. And so they also erected a great tent city for the workers. And on the tents there is flowing the flag, "Allah is great, and Mohammed is his prophet." That's paid by the American money, the flag of the Arabian infidel. And that's tolerance, isn't it? Or it's good business. It is very, very criminal. I came to the -- into the Egyptian desert, gentlemen, one day, you were with us. And there was a Frenchman exploring the desert. He was a real hero. Any Frenchman alone is a great man. Only when you take Frenchmen together they are unbearable. It's the same with you, gentlemen, you see. One American is a bore. Ten Americans are very nice. With the Frenchmen, it's the other way around. One Amer- -- Frenchman is interesting. Ten Frenchmen are intolerable. Doe- -- have you never heard of this cliché which says that one man in the nation is very different from the nation taken together? You must have heard this story. One German, a scholar; two Germans, a glee club; three Germans, the world war? Well, one Englishman, you see, a missionary; two Englishmen, a football match; and three Englishmen, the greatest nation on the earth. And one Frenchman, a hero; two Frenchmen, spirit -- a spirited conversation; and three Frenchmen, a mess. And one Italian, a singer, a tenor; two Italians, a duel; three Italians -- who knows? Three Italians, panic. But they were -- it's with every nation. That is, gentlemen, one, two, and three of the same branch constitutes something utterly different. Can you see this? The only difference are the Georgians. One Georgian, one prince; two Georgians, two princes; three Georgians, the Comintern.

Now I wanted to say that this Frenchman therefore is a very important specimen, because as I think really, this is my firm conviction, and if a German tells you this of a Frenchman you may think that this is quite serious. And I think that every one Frenchman is an enormous creature, is really a specimen of the human race. The more he is alone, the greater he becomes. This you cannot say of an American. The more you isolate an American, the more terrible he becomes. You know how our American people behave in the West Indies when they think they are out of bounds. They are just shameless. It's terrible, the women even more than the men. Because an American is no good as soon as he is without Americans. It's very interesting. I don't know why it is, but it's a fact. No indictment. People are so differently organized. Now a Frenchman, as I said, look at the -- France as a whole. It is just terrible, you see. But not the single Frenchman. I come back to my story in Egypt. Therefore this was a very great soul. He had nothing to live on. The Americans in Luxor, Thebes nearby, lived in luxury, and with all the vitamins and calories you could get, and he had no bread, and he

had no fresh meat. His next space from where he could refuel, so to speak, and -- get his, get his victuals was a day's, a day's journey away. He was visited by an equally spirited French lady, a reporter, and I was also impressed with her great superiority of spirit and courage -- two noble people. And these two people showed us the ruins and the excavations, and we got talking about the Aramco business, with the tents, with the flag of the prophet flying there, paid by American taxpayers' money, by alleged Christians.

And he bro- -- burst forth and said, "Tell the people in America that they must not do this. This is a crime. I'm living here among Arabs. You must stop at the decisive point. You must not commit yourself to the sham and fiction that you seem to abdicate. At this moment, where you abdicate your Christian background, you abdicate every right of justice, even of -- just being treated justly. They -- you abdicate your rights of commerce. The fact that you do this means that you will lose your concessions. It's the most stupid policy there can be. It's cowardice! And it's forbidden under God. It's blasphemy, of course." But who -- which businessman in this country believes in blasphemy, when it seems to be good business. But gentlemen, blasphemy always kills the idolater. The temple of the idolater will always be destroyed. And all the Aramco business will go down in sulphur, brimstone, and you always laugh about Wigglesworth {Fullman} with brimstone and hell. Gentlemen, there is brimstone and sulphur. It's in this world. The judgment comes. You will lose every bit of investment in Arabia. We must. We have no right to keep it, because we have, you see, forfeited the background under which these Arabians kowtow to us and say, "You are the people who make for one world for one time." Yet only under one condition: that there is one people {today}. That the neighborly love, you see, is a reality { }. And that we preach it and praise the Lord for this unity of the human race, and do not go off a tangent and play somebody -- and pray -- and praise somebody else's god. Fantastic! But people laugh.

Gentlemen, a friend of mine is the vice president of { }. And he went to the -- state department people nearly down on his knees and said, "We must not do this, ple- " -- he's in Aramco, I mean, they are one branch, one of the four investors. This is a very fine man. His boy, by the way, went to Dartmouth. I had to bail him out because he got drunk. Well, this man -- father -- the son is very stupid -- but the father is in a responsible position, and is in history. And he knew, because he has a very excellent background, that this was condemning our future in the Near East. That these Arabs would despise us for doing this, because they would say they still had a place, and we had none. And perhaps it is true that we have none. But then we are out of history, gentlemen, because the authority to ask all men to enter into one space, can only be based on the dogma

that you are all brothers. Otherwise, the one space is the only -- an invitation to rules then, you see. Then -- that's just the law of the jungle. And that is there, the law of the jungle.

It's very exciting, gentlemen, if you can -- you haven't -- you have not lived enough in the rest of the world to understand that such a story is much more important than all the things in The New York Times, just as the story of your tax return, gentlemen, is much more important than all your resolutions on the freedom of speech or whatnot. Who cares for your resolutions? But everybody must care for his communication with his government. Only to bring back the fact that these are the items, gentlemen, by which is determined at what moment in history we are at this moment living. And we are living at a moment where the conquest of space has blinded greedy people to such an extent that they neither want to know where they came from, nor where they are going to, you see. They are just in Arabia. They are just like this terrible man who tries to smell gold on this Orozco mural. Gentlemen, the sense of smell is given us for timing. Odor, smell, scent, is the greatest sense in the world. It's the political flair. It's the sense about the future. This picture of Orozco is so dramatic and so serious because it shows you that in this country people have tried to find smell in gold, and therefore they have lost direction. Because you and I, gentlemen, you know very well that what doesn't smell good, don't go there. Smell gives us direction. It's the greatest sense. Eye is misleading. Never fall for the eyes of a lady, for the looks of a lady, I wanted to say, pardon me. They may be painted.

So gentlemen, this is the burial in space, this mural of Orozco. That's why it is such a great picture. It is the end of a thousand years of conquest of space. No future in the picture. He doesn't know anything about that. That wasn't his business. But gentlemen, go here, next door and look at the mural. And this is just corresponding to what I tell you what is happening at this moment in Arabia with the American people building tents in honor of Mohammed.

The pre-history, gentlemen, of the Christian era, then consists of three chapters -- but we'll see there is to be one more chapter. The tribes of antiquity, that is, the India- -- red Indians, the Germanic tribes, the Celtic tribes, the Italians, the Greek tribes, all what we call the tribes, we'll have to consider as the elements out of which the future society will have to be built. In the future society, our people on the reservations, all the Irish policemen of New York, all the people in the Amazonas basin, they will all be part of it, must they not? I mean, if there is to be one cooperative society in the future, all these groups that are smaller than nations, you see, but that are somewhere -- are integrated will have to belong into this. The second part of our story of antiquity is how is -- was any one of

these empires created? China, Egypt, India, Mexico, Peru? And the third story: how did the Israelites get out of these {two} {too} chaotic, multifarious, you see, empires and tribes. How did the 12 tribes and the kingdom of Israel, you see, learn to behave as the people of the future?

We'll see, gentlemen, that any tribe looks into the past. A tribe is always built on ancestor-worship. Ancestors. Any people is based on the future, the free future. That's Israel is the first free people, because it has the Messiah complex. It is a kind of complex, only to be interested in the future. And what is a world, gentlemen, what is the Aztec world? What is the Chinese world? It's a cyclical world which is only interested in the present, in eternal presents. So we get in antiquity three different problems. How you create a tradition of the past. The tribe is backwardly minded, looking this way. Any empire is present-minded; it looks -- is cyclical. You know most people today think in cycles again. All the businessmen of America are Egyptians, or Chinese. They think in business cycles. Everything returns. Booms-busts, booms-busts, booms-busts. And the -- here, the people, the prophetic group in any country -- the artists, for example, the poets, the prophets -- they look into the future. And so we'll have to deal with the Jews as the creators of the future.

Now I have to -- had to say so much, gentlemen, to give you a picture of the history which I am going to tell you. Any one empire, and any one tribe of antiquity can get its own story told as though it was not one out of many stories. I cannot tell you first the story of China, then the story of India, then the story of Egypt. But we must take one of these specimens and then you must allow me to believe -- to say that this is a fruit of the tree of empire builders, you see. Empires look that way. And then we must look into the tribes and get as much evidence as we can. We'll do this first. And again, if we were in Dartmouth Hall, it would be very simple. There on the left-hand side of the entrance, on the left side, on the northern side; have you ever -- you have gone to Dartmouth Hall -- there hangs a pedigree of the languages. Have you see this? This tree? That's very much what you have to keep in mind if you understand why if I give you one experience of a tribal history, the creation of one tribe, we have in a way learned the existence of all the tribes. You will also understand why there is a tremendous variety of tribes, why all these tribes went wild and created, as I said, a hundred thousand different languages. Why did they? That has deep reasons. Why are there still so many languages? And why must we keep them? And why must you go against any world language, and against all basic English? Why is it a crime in history now to destroy the last remnants of this great creation of the many languages? You see, America is so feared in the world, because it tries to abolish Welsh, and Celtic, and the people in Wales, as you know, they want to

Speak Welsh. They want to speak the {Walesian} language. Gaelic. You must understand that. You must become proud that there is in New Mexico, some people are still allowed to speak Spanish.

Why that is so is a very mysterious reason, you see. But it would be the end of the world if all people would have to speak one language. Then there could be no family life anymore. That's very profound, gentlemen, very mysterious. But you people -- who has acted in the Shakespeare play? None of you? Not one? Not even with the lightning or the decorations? No? Nobody has participated in the players? Who has participated in the players? You have, I know. Who else? Please go and do. Much more important than any course you can take. Why, gentlemen? Because then you will understand what language is. That language is something without which you cannot live. It's a victual. And therefore as all victuals, it cannot be manufactured. Once it is killed, it is killed. It is as delicate as the -- as the vitamins. So when I always hear the chambers of commerce in this country boost the one language and the one calendar, I know that we are on the way out, gentlemen. We'll see that empires live by the manifoldness of the calendar, by the respect for free times, for different times; and the tribes, the groups, the families of man live on our respect for the difference of language. These are two very serious items. And at this moment, you know, we are back at that moment -- { } with the green flag of the prophet, I'm afraid, where we surrender all this and where the chamber of commerce can come forward and say we should have a calendar in which Easter can be predicted for the year 1975. Now gentlemen, the frei -- the free migration of the date of Easter is the victory over the Egyptian cycle of the Egyptian slavery. That's a symptom of it. We'll have to learn this. Every empire is known by its own calendar. It's a fixed calendar. Every tribe is known by its own language, you see. And the church -- Israel is known by its Psalms, by its own prayers. Israel has no fixed calendar and Israel has no, you see, fixed language. Jews speak -- {always} the language of any country in which they live. But they have one prayer.

So we have three connotations, gentlemen, of the three equipments. How is a language created which binds together the ancestor and the posterity? That's a people -- a tribe. Not a people, a tribe, we'll call it. An empire that is strung together by the same calendar. And the people are together -- tied together by the same prayer, whatever this prayer is. We pray for the standard of living. That's our prayer. That's why we are one people. It's not very much. But actually every American prays for that, or at least we are told by the businessmen that we have to.

So you see we have to do with three miracles. Any one language is an unex-

pected miracle. One day it didn't exist. Next day it exists. From then on, there is a variety of languages possible. We'll see why one language could never satisfy men by the very fact that one language wasn't good enough, there was -- would be competition, you see. That is, the first era of our history, gentlemen, is competition between tribes, competition between tribes. The second is, competition between empires. And the third is the exodus from empires and tribes. Now gentlemen, there's one group that doesn't fit into this scheme of the three great chapters of pre-Christian history, and the three great chapters of our own era.
[tape interruption]

And after then the empires were put into this, the first era covers perhaps the years from 10,000 B.C. to 3000 B.C., the era of the empires covers the time of 3000 B.C. to 1911 of our era, as I tried to tell -- show you. In the years between 1911 and 1918, five empires were destroyed: China, India, Germany, Russia, Austria-Hungary. So the last empires went, you see. There is no emperor of India anymore. There is no emperor of Austria. There is no emperor of Germany. There is no emperor of Russia. There is no emperor in China. That's quite a story. Only to show you that I am really in tune with the big events. You never hear that in history that the world wars really were fought to force the last remnants of pre-Christian orders, you see, into the common history of the human race. That's why the empires, the different worlds, had to go. So we have no sacred cows any more in Boston. Unfortunately they have no cows, either.

So we have two stories. 10,000 B.C. to 3000 B.C.; 3000 to 1900, but that isn't

quite true because, you understand, many tribes were created much later, after 3000 B.C. For example, the American tribes probably only get over here, let us say 1000 B.C. That's as you know still controversial. It doesn't matter. Already were empires rising, while there was still going on, you see, the expanse of tribes, too. They didn't follow each other auto- -- mechanically. But the waves of tribalism were still going strong and already people had discovered that they could live in a different manner in a world by themselves and -- as empire builders. When this had happened, gentlemen, there was one group of people, the Greek tribes, who were exposed in the Mediterranean to the view of the Babylonian empire, and the Egyptian empire, and the Hittite empire, and the Persian empire. That is, these traders, on their quick boats, the Greeks, in the Mediterranean, in the eastern part of the Mediterranean, were tribesmen from the continent of Europe who were suddenly brought in contact with the Egyptian empire, especially, but also with the Babylonian empire and the Persian. As you know the great battle between Persia and Greece is the story of Greece itself. It's the freedom of -- the battle of Marathon. You may have heard of Aeschylus or you may have heard of

Epaminondas -- 50 years ago all your forefathers here in this college would have known by heart the great sentence about the Spartans, the Lacedaemonians, when they were killed in Thermopylae. Has anybody heard the great verse? Three hundred Spartans defending the straits of Thermopylae, and the stone only reads: Stranger who passes by, go to Sparta and tell them that we are lying here, faithful to their laws." Or, even better, "that we are lying here as demanded by their laws."

Well, this is the great story of Greece springing up in resistance against the empire. But these people, these Greeks, gentlemen, made a compromise between tribe and empire. We'll learn that the Greeks form a chapter in pre-history, that's why it is enough to know of Greeks. That's why you still read Plato and Aristotle, because in all Greek things, you have as much influence of the empires as you have of the tribes. Anybody who knows Greek, gentlemen, is in touch with the whole pre-Christian story. And your abolition -- abolishing Greek, your not knowing anything of Greece is very dangerous, because you no longer have any yardstick, for example, for these { }. So that's why you are great despisers of Christianity and say, "That's an old story," because you don't know how young the story of Christianity is. The Greeks tried to do a compromise between tribesmen looking to their ancestors and empires living in the present, without the promise of the Old Testament, without the coming of any messiah, without future.

So we have in Greeks and Jews, gentlemen, two people who form a kind of summary of antiquity. The Greeks are the blend of the tribesmen and of the empire. Every one Greek city, as we shall learn, constitutes one such little political, you see, blend. That's why we call today still this whole science, you see, of life in the past and the present "politics," you see. And in church we call the life to come. That's the Israelitic branch of our existence. Politics is that what the Greeks have taught us: that you have to compromise between the tradition of a group, of tribe -- a tribe, you see, and the geographical claims of part of the universe, you see, of some space, which we call today the boundary of a state, for example.

So we have four chapters in pre-history. This is all I have to say today. One, the many tribes. The second, the many empires. The Jews, an attempt to rid themselves -- and mankind -- of the many-ness of the tribes, and the many-ness of the empires. The Greeks trying in every moment to get a synthesis, a compromise out of tribe and empire. So we will have four chapters for the pre-Christian story. Thank you.

Here is somebody. Did you already give this list? About the reports -- they will be ...

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Student introduction: Philosophy 58, February 23rd, 1954)

[Opening remarks missing]

... don't know that much about culture. And one small correction in this report, gentlemen. Important in your notes. Don't say that the Chinese are a people. They're aren't a people to this day. The people in Canton to this day cannot understand the people in the north, that they are an empire. And that's geographical. That's a unity in space. They have a wall around themselves. You don't know this, but there are still many tribes and many peoples in China. So don't call the Chinese so simply as a, you see, a people in our specific sense of heading toward the future. If you go -- went to China in 19- -- 1800 as the -- or 1700 as the Jesuits did, there was no expectation of any future in China. Just the cycle, you see, of eternal recurrence, of return. That's typical of the empire, you see. So you should think all China empire. It's quite important to make this distinction, you see, because never has there any -- been any messianic, you see, prophecy in China. And I think already now you may begin to understand that these words cannot be bandied around arbitrarily.

I had a friend who was a Harvard graduate. He was in process of graduating. In June of his graduating year, he came up to my place and he said, "In Harvard, I have been taught one thing in political science. There is no such thing as people. There are just individuals." And he grew up with the healthy contempt of the sophisticated people in Harvard, that "people" was a sentimental fiction the -- of the old-timers in this country, who still believed that there was a people of the United States. Certainly that was the time when Harvard had no future. And on the other hand, I forced this boy, who wanted to learn something to stay with me. When he entered Harvard, I said, "I'm going to talk to you, but only if you stay three days and two nights. I'm not going to give you an interview," as he wanted to have. I said that's the curse of our time that people do not know the quality of time. If you want to learn something in a new environment, the minimum today, as things stand in this country is two days and three nights, and we have never allowed any visitor from the cities to come up to our house for a shorter stay, because it's a fact that men are so space-minded that they can drive to seven places in one day, by -- with -- in their car, you see, fall upon these un- -- innocent inhabitants of these seven houses, have a cocktail or lunch and drive on and then say they have seen seven people. They haven't, you see. They have not. They have the illusion that they have met these seven people. They know noth-

ing about these. That's how you travel through Europe. Great harm is done because you come back and say you have been to Europe. You have not been to Europe. You have carried all your blindness, your illusions, your prejudices into Europe, and come back with the same. Like the boy who went through 16 countries in six weeks in Europe, and then got brawling with his comrade on the boat home, because he said, "Yes, we have been to Austria."

And the other said, "No, we have not been to Austria."

So, he said, "Yes!"

"Well, how can you prove it?" said the other boy.

"In Austria, the porter had a blue cap."

So that was Austria.

Now, I'm quite serious, gentlemen. I tried to sell you this proposition that time is of the essence, today. And people who do not know how to time their lives are licked. They have a neurosis. They have a syndrome. They will break down. They will go to Brattleboro. And you see, the lack of understanding of the time problem goes to such small things as your visits with other people, or visit of other countries. You are -- you have no friends, you have just roommates, you have chums -- you are chummy. You are nice to everybody. Do you have friends, gentlemen? In order to have friends, you have to give them time. And the -- as I said, I would say this is not a -- this is a mere experience, a rule of thumb. A very queer one. That, if -- before I will talk turkey to a man, I must have his time for two nights and three days in the same place with me. And before, it's no use talking, because he -- I must first talk to him. Then he must be allowed to get in -- up his opposition. The second day must be a complete failure; he must discover how far we have misunderstood each other; and we, of course, have totally misunderstood each other, you see. And so on the third day, we may then draw the synthesis, and we may come to some agreement. That's why sermons are no good today, because the minister usually -- he's obliged to preach one sermon. So the whole sermon is one big misunderstanding. The Archbishop of Canterbury came 20 years ago to this country and said, "Out must the sermons go. Mis- -- misunderstood things come over the radio now, in editorials, and in magazine articles. So the -- so the church must always offer the opposite." So he told the people in -- in -- at Harvard Divinity School, begin to preach long sequences. Never preach a sermon that lasts less than six weeks. And that's very serious, gentlemen. For 20 years, I have never given a single

lecture in this country, although this is the country of the single lecture. I certainly could have earned a million dollars. I don't give single lectures. Because in a single lecture, I can only just begin to learn how this man, who listens to me, uses a different vocabulary. And everything is different with him. You see it from this case here with China. You said it doesn't matter to say -- call this, you see, a people. It matters very much, because the Chinese just aren't a people as we think of them in the West, you see. So we can't treat them right. They want to become a people now, you see. That's why they need some tremendous promise like Communism. It doesn't matter what the promise is, but at least Communism has a long- -- range future, you see. So this hasn't happened for 4,000 years in China. And so if Christianity is to have the coming of Christ, you see, the coming of the Lord in its Gospel, our missionaries would have kept China in the Christian fold, and they tried it seriously. But unfortunately our ministers -- our missionaries were all told at home that they should become doctors and teachers instead. So we did. And there was no Gospel preached, you see. But just schools, and education, which you think is wonderful. But gentlemen, no country can live on education, because education has no future. Future is for the adults. Future is a promise what -- what's this country heading for. Who cares what you're heading for? You're heading for a career. But the career must be inside of some move -- body politic that moves forward, that has a mission, that has a destiny. Now a hundred years ago, everybody in this country had manifest destiny, you see. So hundred years ago, Japan and China took our Gospel, you see, because they felt we were going places. But the last 50 years, we abdicated ourselves. We said, "We give you science." Well, science has no future. Science is a technicality. You can't live by science. If you are scientific, you'd better not marry, because you may make a mistake, you see. You better not write poetry, because what's -- there's no money in it. If you have science you are licked, you are inside the present only. The useful things of today you can know what to do by science. Can you ever create a new conscience by science? Can you ever create -- create a new hope? You can't.

So this is very serious, this little distinction, because I'm very determined to stand my ground in telling you that I and you are invited to embark on this watershed, on this great divide between a thousand years of mere space-consciousness in the West, you see, and suddenly waking up to the great mysteries of time. If you would not laugh, but take seriously my proposition that human beings today cannot meet, really, at a short -- in a shorter time than two days and -- three nights -- three nights and two days, or how is it? Two nights and three days, it's a minimum, really -- it should be longer -- then you understand the weekend. Why, instead of the Sunday of our ancestors, the weekend is now the sanctuary of the human soul, because there you have two nights and three days,

you see. Because people feel that such a weekend is already worthwhile, whereas a Sunday would be too short, you see. Nothing could happen then.

As you know, in California they go out every fortnight, the employees of the stores into the mountains or wherever they want to go from Friday -- from Thursday evening to Monday, because it is so im- -- preeminent the need to have one coherent span of time, you see. So they are away from Thursday night to Sunday, and they walk the other -- work the other weekend. Which is better, you see, than to have each time such a fragment of hours. Can you understand? This is all in the center of everybody's life today. And it is also central in the life of the nations.

So now I am in a position to put before you our program. We'll have the fate of the tribes, of the empires, of the Greeks, of Israel. And we'll have Church, state -- or let us call it the world of states, and the great society. And I tell you once more here, quite modestly and humbly, we can say that we stand here. We have seen how the world was filled with states. We have seen how the Church entered the world. We have not -- we have yet to see how society will organize work all over the world in all men, in all tribes, in all -- the whole family of mankind. So this we do not know, yet, but we are waiting for. And these two things, how the Jews were replaced by the Church, the old Israel by the new, and how the world became one world of civilized states. We have -- have this in our bones. This has happened. And before our entry into this first chapter -- just make it seven chapters -- we will now add one more distinction between antiquity and our own era.

There were innumerable tribes. A hundred thousand is a low guess. And hundred thousand languages. There were at least 30 different empires, that's going by the score, so to speak, not by the hundred thousands. And then there have been -- has been the philosophy and the poetry of -- and the art of the Greeks, and there has been the prayer of the Bible, people of the Bible, of Israel. Now in all these four cases, gentlemen, every member of the group was encased and imprisoned totally into its own {grouping}. If you were a Greek, you couldn't be a barbarian. If you were a Sioux -- Sioux, you couldn't become an Apache -- Apache without -- there was some ceremonial, but it was very difficult. If you go to the -- into the history of this continent, you can see that the Indians were quite incapable of becoming civilized. It hasn't worked. Our attempts, you see, to civilize these people -- make them into city-dwellers was impossible. Once a red Indian, always a red Indian. And you know now how they -- sick they are now in their souls because they are slickered, so to speak. The government supports them on the worst possible land, which we have been good enough to leave

these poor people, you see, and they can't live and they can't die. It's a really very pitiful sight, because they are still ancient people.

I had a friend among the Indians, a chieftain, who said to me that he managed to make his whole tribe turn Lutheran, because he said it was the only way, Christianity, of making these tribes able -- his tribe able to change into a new era, to give up the rituals, the chants, you see, the magic, the dances -- but at least be free again to be people like you and -- me. Very serious, and very fine man. And he himself became the first minister of the church inside this whole tribe. The Stockbridge Indians who now live out in, I think, in Wisconsin.

This is very serious. Take this down, gentlemen. In antiquity, every man was only one thing, and not -- no other. There are to this day, in the empire of China, tribesmen, who are strictly tribal, who have never settled, who do not recognize agriculture or -- private property of land. They cannot be absorbed by the Chinese. The empire has proved incapable of mending the ways of these nomads, who live inside, so to speak, the wall of China, you see, but tend their own hunting ground and their own move- -- free movement still there. Ancient -- the antiquity, gentlemen, was unable to change a tribesman into an empire builder, or an empire man into a Greek, or a Greek into a Jew, or a Jew into a Greek. At least not in large numbers. It was felony, it was high treason, it was desertion if you did go over. Individual cases have happened, and people were always very unhappy in such cases. If you go to Egypt, to this day there are 40,000 Bedouins, dwellers -- desert-dwellers, who have not taken on to the ways of the Egyptians, ever. And to this day they represent in the Valley of the Nile an element that is pre-Egyptian, that is pre-pharaonic, that have -- they have the same ways of life as the Arabian nomads have in the peninsula, you see, of Arabia, and they go back really to the first awakening of man's political urge, 7,000 years back; that is, considerable time before the first pharaoh of Egypt built his first pyramid.

If you are encased, imprisoned, but also molded and formed by one order of things only, gentlemen, then you are very much a whole man. There is nothing that yearns beyond it. In America, any man has enough received of Christianity to sympathize with something out of America. You sympathize with Raphael. You sympathize with the English Parliament, or English tennis playing, with Wimbledon. You sympathize -- any one in this country has some lasting interest either in the country from which he came, you see, or into the country to which he wants to get, you see, some connections for travel. We all are not simply Americans. It is the distinction of an American, to have the right to love non-Americans, to admire them and to know of them. This was not the case with the ancients. The ancient group is self-centered, and therefore it is intense.

Take a family relation between a son and his parents in antiquity, that is so total that parents had the right to slaughter their children as sacrifices, as Agamemnon did with Iphigeneia -- Iphigeneia -- with his daughter when he wanted to -- to show his Greeks that he meant business with the Trojan War. As you know, he was asked to give up the life of his daughter, and she thought that was quite all right. There was never a doubt in the daughter's mind that her father had this right over her, if it was necessary for the well- -- the commonwealth, then she -- the victim went to its death in great dignity, just as Isaac also did not object when his father first thought he had to do the same and slaughter his son. We today, gentlemen, every one of us lives in at least two orders, church and state. Even you have heard of the alleged freedom of the Church in this country from the state. Which means that you contain both, which most people never think of. Even the atheist in this country can occupy with his own ego this second realm of freedom which otherwise is given to you as member of a church. If the Church is free, it also means that every one has inside of him some province, some territory which is not state; that is, which is not worldly. He may make no use of it. You may say, "To me, this is a pipedream." But others are allowed to realize this pipedream, you see. So the man in this country who is in -- not interested in the -- in the Church is still benefiting from the Church by being given a tremendous amount of leeway about his thought, about his speech, about his reading, about his way of studies, because the Church and the state cut two different territories out of your heart, which you -- most of you never think of. When I hear here -- people today repeat this formula, Church and state, or free Church and a free state, or whatever you -- you have passed on as a slogan, I always find that you are completely dead to the great statement involved in this: that you are state and church when you say this. The whole sentence, "Church and state," you see, makes no sense whatsoever unless you recognize that you are at the same time in the Church and in the state, and that they are kept apart. Most of you -- you will admit, speak of state and church -- something here and there. But it isn't. There is you -- nowhere in America can you find any place that is only church, because even every building of the church stands within the territory of the United States of America, and is protected by the military might of this country, is it not? You can look everywhere, gentlemen. Church and state are not divided visibly. They are divided inside of every member of this great commonwealth of the United States of America. We'll see that is true of society, too. The society is another such thing of first magnitude, which is in every one of us as far as we must work. As far as we are unemployed. We don't care who gives us work. I work for a Cuban.

So gentlemen, these three seemingly superficial statements, Church fills the first thousand years, state fills the second thousand years, the world of states, and -- instead of empires, the replacement of empires, you can also call this second chapter -- by states, and society. These three things have been planted into you and me, and nowhere else. You look at the world occasionally as a world of states. You look occasionally at it as a world of souls, as a world of one people with a common destiny, that's the Church. And you look at it as a tremendous division of labor, and then you include the oil in Arabia, although we have -- very little to do with Ibn-Saud, and you include it, you see, the uranium mines in the mountains of the Eastern part of Germany where the Eastern Germans now are allowed to slave for the Russians. Because society is the whole order of men having to grow up from non-working to working, to non-working again. From earning a living, from changing their place, from finding occupation and activity from one day to another, in constant change.

If you see this, gentlemen, then our era is hampered and impaired by one simple factor: by pluralism. Every one of us is half a patriot, and half a Christian, and half a career-man, a worker, a job hunter -- one-third of it. So we are divided in our loyalties. And divided loyalty makes people weak. And the Christian era has accepted this weakness in honor, in humility for the power of growth. If you are very strong, you are fixed, you are in a rut, as we say today. Whenever when an American man says, "I'm getting in a -- into a rut," he blames himself, isn't that true? But that only means he's only one thing and not also another. So this -- this slogan, you see -- "He was getting into a rut -- high time for him to get out," means that he acknowledges that it is better to be pluralistic than to be one-sided. Now the ancients would have thought that was terrible. Once a baker, always a baker, you see. Once a president, always a president. Once anything, got you completely, and swallowed you up. And therefore, gentlemen, there is a very wonderful division of labor between the ancient pe- -- em- -- and our era. Any inhabitant of this great era of ours for the last 1954 years has had to be educated in the intensity, in the singleness of purpose by learning about the ancients. The Christians had to learn the Old Testament in order to get the full jealousy of the God of Israel into their bones. Because if the brotherhood of man is preached only, you would -- they would all have become already a hundred years ago so lackadaisical as you are. You don't care for any creed, you say everybody is all right. Gentlemen, that's nonsense. It's not true that all people are equally right. Therefore, China. Therefore is China -- went communistic, you see. That's the whole reason, because we were, you see, very willing to say we don't know. We are no better. We don't know -- no better. Christianity is not better than Confucianism. But the Chinese said, "It isn't true. Confucianism is not

as good as Christianity, because these Western devils come to us. They have done something, and we haven't." So now they go communistic. It's a competition between two Western offers of a future, which are now, you see, spreading out over China.

This is very serious for your understanding of the problem of China. The China -- Chinese don't care for Communism, but they care very much for the intensity with -- of belief into something real to come. And therefore they put up with the low standard of living and they laugh at us, who sell out the future for the high standard of living. This -- they say the Americans have no future. That's why they must have bathtubs. The bathtub has no future, gentlemen.

What is the future, gentlemen? That for which it is -- it is right to sacrifice the present. If a soldier in Korea dies, he does it for the future of the United States. And you know how hard it was for these people -- out there to understand this, because the people at home just don't understand. They don't believe in the future at home, how can these boys out there believe in it? This is the future, gentlemen. There is no other future, except that future which is able to make a man give up his present benefits. Any girl does it who gets engaged with you. She always gives up a nice life, you see, for a very uncertain future. Otherwise, she couldn't get married. But, you see, the word "sacrifice" has been eliminated out of your thinking, out of the teaching in this country, out of the public discussion. The word "sacrifice" has been tabooed. And gentlemen, that's why we have lost all sense of timing. Future and present are not connected automatically; they are only connected through sacrifice. Any one who -- takes at this moment less than he earns, than he could ask for, creates the future. Anybody who tries to get something for nothing thrusts the whole country into the past. Any thief who takes a gold watch, what does he do? He -- forces us to waste money on a police force. Decent people would do with the least police force, you see, because they wouldn't -- they wouldn't -- they have to think so much of restoring the order already in- -- installed in the past. But we, what do we do? All the interest centers around all these miserable juvenile delinquents. They are not interesting. They keep us back. They drain our resources. They chain us to things and orders which we already know, you see, as having been established. Every delinquent, every criminal is an accusation against our educational system, these children. They haven't been brought up right: into the order. Nobody else told them to obey. So they don't.

Why, yesterday I heard a tremendous case. Very interesting. The chief of police in a little midwestern town had this very successful father, and he had wanted to rebel, so he committed armed -- armed robbery. He got 15 years'

imprisonment. And a doctor -- psychiatrist in the prison saw this case and he got him out by pleading a neurosis, by saying this boy just had to enact this crime in order to get even with his father, you see. And since the father happened to be the chief of police, he had to be the chief of the gangsters, of the robbers. But what does it -- does this mean? That all this family, the prison, the law, the judiciary, the psychiatrist, who happened to be my own son, that they all were chained back to something, that everybody knew how it should be, you see, done. And they all plunged into dealing with the backwash of life. And that's the terrible thing about criminality, gentlemen, that it delays life. That it takes every one of you back into something settled 2,000 years ago. Because that you can't have armed robbery. That's really -- was settled 2,000 years ago, more or less, wasn't it? This is so uninteresting, all these deaths -- these are the headlines of your papers, gentlemen. This country is so afraid of the future, that the headlines are only dealing with the wantonly conjured-up past. This is the term, gentlemen, wantonly conjured-up past. It is wanton what these news -- Hearst press does to you -- to your brains and your hearts. Absolute unnecessary. You're filling yourself with the filth and the scum of the -- of life. Nobody knows for what purpose. Oh, I know, because the newspapers sell it.

Now gentlemen, because -- if there is in any time this lack of stamina, this lack of certainty of what is to do, that you say, "Oh, I don't know. How -- it's too difficult," as one of you, first course, I respected this very much. I understood this. It was in the other course, and he said, "Well," he just -- "it's too confusing." He just want to be left alone. So the individual in this world at this moment, gentlemen, is easily excused for not knowing what is the central thing to do. But you must understand that history -- if it means to include this continent, if we are not be -- to be left behind, which is still very possible, that it must make an appeal to you, so that you give your whole heart and soul. As the old saying is, "All your soul, all your heart, and all your power" to that which is necessary next. That's usually the voice of the divine life. That's why it is said, your neighbor you can love as yourself, that's good enough. But God you must love with all your power. Now give me one man in this country who knows what this sentence means. They always quote only the neighborly love. And since I don't love myself so very much, so I don't have to love my neighbor very much, at all. I don't have to love him more than myself, you see. I hate myself, so I hate my neighbor. There are many people who hate themselves. But this is not true with your relation to your maker. He wants to make the world, and if you do not do His bidding totally, it can't be done.

Creation, gentlemen, is not happening with hypocrisy, or with the split personality, or with schizophrenics. This country consists -- as they say, the

doctors must know it -- 90 percent of schizophrenics, so it -- creation doesn't happen. Creation is based on your total dedication. And here comes in the mystery of our relation to the ancient peoples, gentlemen. The Christians get their fervor from reading the Psalms of the Old Testament, and the history of the patriarchs of -- Abraham, who had faith when there was no pope in Rome. What's this today easy to believe in Christianity with all the cardinals, and the Vatican, and the Bible translations, and the theologians, and Mr. Tillich, and Mr. Niebuhr preaching the Gospel everywhere. But Abraham, he was utterly alone in his faith. If you read the story of Abraham, you know what faith really means. It doesn't mean to recite other people's creed.

So the Old Testament is today still necessary to shoot, to inject into Christianity this total dedication of the single member. The same is true about the empires, gentlemen. Why -- what have we done during the last hundreds of years? We have revived Rome. You have learned Cicero. Your an- -- at least you haven't, but your father read Caesar, and Cicero, and Horace. Why did they do it? Because this was still an empire with total dedication. When the emp- -- when Rome, you see, got -- went despotical and tyrannical, Cato took his life -- as you know, the great Cato of Utica -- because he would -- didn't want to survive the free citizenry of Rome. Well, that is total dedication. And we -- then -- then your forefathers for the last five, six hundred years have read avidly the story of the Greeks and the Romans, because they were undivided in their loyalty. And we are divided, and so it's like a refresher course. When you read, or go to the stage and see Coriolanus enacted -- as they do now in New York, as you know, by Shakespeare -- William Shakespeare, you know? -- and -- you see total dedication. And you see the consequences of a man even trying to break way from Rome, you see. Can't be done. He tries to go over to the enemy. There's no third meaning of pluralism. No church to which he can flee, you see. Cannot become a Quaker or Mennonite, Coriolanus. He just can go over to the enemy, which is just another city, you see, trying to swallow him up. Have you -- who has read Coriolanus? Is that all? Who has seen it? I'm sorry. How about Julius Caesar? Who has read it? Ah.

So gentlemen, what we call the Renaissance, the Renaissance is a permanent problem of our era. In any one moment, any member of our era has to refresh his oneness by being confronted with some ancient way of life. You see this very clearly when you today see how people no longer learn Greek and Latin, but instead they take to pre-history, to anthropology, to ethnology, and to primitive life all over the world. This means simply that it is just as I told you, that while this world of states were developed, people studied empires and the Greeks. But now, in preparation of the third millenium, in the preparation of the year 2000,

people begin to study avidly the tribes. If you read Margaret Meade or any one of these wise men, then you know that this is today the food of any number of -- of freshmen. I think it is done in a very slipshod manner. People don't know that they are playing there with dynamite. But one day we will wear these masks again of these wild tribes, just as Hamlet of Shakespeare re-enacted the Greek tragedy, after a thousand years of no tragedy in the West- -- Christian world, you see.

So we see today the rise of another chapter of antiquity, and what I'm then -- now am going to try to do in this first chapter of my story will be to conjure up, not wantonly, but necessarily, that which is past. So, you remember that I use this formula: just five minutes ago I told you the newspapers conjure up the past wantonly. Crime, and no punishment. And divorce, and sex, and drunkenness. That is everything that is prehistorical is conjured up there, but it is -- conjured up commercially, wantonly, for curiosity's sake, for obscenity's sake, for entertainment. Gentlemen, my task here is very simple. It's an antidote. I try to conjure up before you that which necessarily must be remembered in order to give you the intensity of living again, so that you know that this is -- nothing is done in the world even in the next thousand years, if you do not find some people of total devotion, of obsession, of dedication, however you call it. Most of these words are so terribly worn that one doesn't like to use them. But that doesn't matter. With regard to your own decision, you must find some point in your life where you are without reservation, where you are committed. This business of being non-committal, gentlemen, is very good for nine-tenths of your life, as long as you know where you have to be committal. If the nine-tenths of your life where you are non-committal, where you play, and fool around, and get the upper hand and you don't have the one -- tenth, you see, where it is worth living, you are the most miserable of creatures. You have lost everything. You haven't lost yourself. There is no such important thing about self. But you have lost your relation to the meaning of your own existence. You have lost the part -- participation in the march of the spirit through the ages, of God in history. That's nothing moral, gentlemen. The most ethical and moral man, who never steals, and never commits fornication, and never gets drunk can be just as imbecile, just as split, just as schizophrenic. The morally good people are not very interesting in history. The people are interesting who dare to to sh- -- exhibit themselves as they are, without hypocrisy. Because you cannot get going in this strange world without being there with all your deficiencies, you see, for all your worth.

Anybody who wants to be -- appear a little better than he is, is a misfit in --. I to- -- yesterday went, no -- two days days ago I went to the ordination of a minis-

ter near Bellow- -- a place nearby and this was the ideal man for the public speaker's bureau. He knew always ahead of time what he was going to say and he said nothing. And he entertained us with the story of his life for 20 minutes. Once in my life I still have listened to a man who put himself on his -- in his word totally. That was Al Smith, of Brooklyn. And when he opened his mouth, he flung himself upon his words so totally that you felt he was in it. And he was quite a different speaker from any other speaker I have heard of, you see, because he was in his word. And you could very -- well see the weaknesses of the man, that made him so strong. But he didn't, you see, didn't -- have no hypocrisy, no curtain, silky or iron, for that matter, behind which to hide. He wasn't any better than he was. And he took this daring risk that he says, "God sees me, anyway, so then since my maker sees me, the others can see me, too." But you always think God might just be absent, and so others should be protected against your real being.

You see, when Jesus on the cross said, "My God, why hast thou for -- forsaken me?" He knew that His maker looked into His heart, anyway. So why couldn't He also say it, that He was in despair? In His last act, He confessed His tremendous {pride} against hypocrisy, because He came all out. You wouldn't have said this. You would have enacted the role to -- perfectly to the end, you see, with a bow to the { } -- to the public and say it doesn't hurt. As you all do when something hurts. You are -- have been educated to say -- to keep smiling, and doesn't -- most people who in this country have kept smiling too long, they all end up in the lunatic asylum, where they must then weep for the rest of their lives. Because if you suppress your tears, you see, that's another way of escaping your -- your frankness. Weeping is a part of reality. You are told you must never weep. You end up with this chapter, with a story.

We had once a Russian movie here. It's long ago, 20 years ago. And it was on Peter the Great. And he was in love with Catherine, a very -- waiter -- waitress from a simple tavern, and she had -- he had married her. And he's very sick and she thinks that he's going to die, the man who has made her. She is, as you know, she became {empress then}. But at that time, that was not clear. And she throws herself in despair in the stage play, in this movie, over the body of this ailing czar, and begins to weep unendingly. Well, my eyes were moist certainly, but the boys in the Nugget laughed. So I was very angry, and next day I asked the -- the class, "Why did you laugh?" They, of course, were embarrassed. But they said they -- I said, "This is important to me. I must find out how in the highest moment of this play you could laugh." I said, "Think it over there. Please take this very seriously. I must know this." And they came back the next day after some consideration and they made a very fine statement, which I think was true.

They said, "We think we laugh because we felt at that very moment that this would never happen to us. We would never weep."

You see, if you, by your own will want to preclude certain potentialities in your own emphasis, you really play God, and so you deprive yourself of your creative faculties. Creation cannot take place as long as your own will enters anything you have to do. You see, it must be stronger than you, yourself. When Dante meets Beatrice in the {fay} world, in the -- on the new love is somebody stronger than I entered the scene. Vene aliquis fortior me. Somebody came upon me who was stronger than me. And only the things that are stronger than we are the things that deserve to be done.

Let us have a break here.

[tape interruption]

Will you do me the favor, then: to store away this explanation of this enterprise, or this explanation of why we have to have the Bible? That the past before our emancipated world of Church and state, that the past has to be conjured up to remind us of the intensity of living, of the singleness of purpose. Our era knows of unity of all men, but in order to have unity, the individual had to be given a share in various {ways of life}. The ancients had no such unity for all men, but they could keep everyone united on his specific way of life. As I said, once a baker always a baker. All professionalism has this great dignity that the man is this and nothing else. To give you a -- the Germans, who are very professional, and very special -- great specialists, excel in this dangerous habit of being one thing forever. And when I came to this country, a year later I was -- rang up at Harvard by a young man from Germany, who said he had also left the country, and could I help him to find a job. And I said, "You come over." He came, very young, 23, and he said what his interests were.

And I said, "Well, I think the obvious thing for you is to become a chemist." I don't know why -- what the circumstances were that I -- made me say that.

He said, "I can't do that. I can't become a chemist."

I said, "Why?"

"I already have studied two semesters -- two terms of biology." So he had to become a biologist, you see. And that all -- was all he could think of. He couldn't

give up the two -- the one year in which he had become a specialist.

This is very hard for you to understand, because you learn everything, French and German, so for one year and then you give it up. With a German, once he begins to learn a thing for one year, he thinks he has to go on for another 50 years with this. And that's the archaic type. But -- obviously your way of learning a language is very poor, too. That you learn every one language for two or three years, and then you ask -- when I ask you, "Do you know German, you said, "No, I learned this three years ago." And you imply that since you learned it three years ago, you no longer have any obligation to know one word of German. Isn't that true? I mean, that's what you call a language study. So the problem with you is to keep what you learn, and with the Germans, it's to learn a little more. Something different, at times.

In other words, this is what I want you to store away for all these chapters which we are now going to live through. You must know of these people not for curiosity's sake, not because they belong in the museum of pre-history, but because you and I will have to kindle our own flame of intensity of living. They develop one way of life. We, who have to go on various ways of life, must get some shot in the arm that, for example, you take these things which these people have established seriously. And now let's turn to the first chapter -- we'll see that with the empires it is very similar. We have lost much of the great faith and intensity of these people. We must stay out of their rut. We cannot go Egyptian, and we cannot go Sioux. But the Sioux, and the Egyptians, and the Chinese, and the Apaches have to offer us something terrific in the way of inspiration. Nothing of their individ -- specific way of life, you see, but everything in the power with which they have created this way of life.

Now what do we learn then in the first place from the old tribes, gentlemen? These tribes -- how do they reach us today? In two ways -- in three ways, perhaps. We speak in this country something that comes from the Anglo-Saxons. And the Angles and Saxons were tribesmen, long before they ever had a civilization and a city, they spoke. And we still speak their language. So they reach us today through the fact that they created a very wonderful language which we are very fast hacking to pieces. Which in a short time, if the Americans cling to basic English and other such nonsense, will no longer be a language, but just bricks, with which we have slogans, hitting each other over the head, in headlines and what-not. Really. You must feel, gentlemen, that language today is for the first time no longer handed over unimpoverished from father to son. You have not been taught English by your father. That's very serious. You are the first generation that has learned an impoverished English. Go to Pennsylvania

and see what the -- how the Pennsylvania Dutch to this day speak 17th-century English, and then you'll know that the children there have been taught English. You have not. Your father had no time for that. Mothers cannot see -- teach you really, they teach you the nursery rhymes. That's not English. That's the -- deteriora- -- that's the cheap English. That's for children. But the great language you may have learned in Sunday school. Or you may have learned, by learning by heart the Gettysburg Address. You haven't even read Coriolanus. So how much Shakespeare has gotten into your vocabulary? And your father hasn't read you -- to you The Constitution of the United States. He hasn't made political speeches. He hasn't conveyed to you his creed. He has no time for that. He's -- supposedly busy all the time, with making speeches. But by making speeches, you don't learn -- the children don't learn a language convincingly. When your father would have cried in agony to his creator, on his knees, you would have known why we speak, for example. Or if you had seen him contract with a friend on a serious deal, instead of just going to a lawyer's office and not taking you with it, then you would have -- know what -- know what the language of the law is, how dignified it is, how important, how rich. Do you know the language of the law? Of the common law? Do you know the language of religion? Do you know any of these words? As I said, when you say "state" and "Church" it never dawns on you that you are state and church. You think they're somewhere. So you haven't -- your father -- would have been his duty to tell you that you are state and you are Church. And that there is no other state and no other Church except in you. Now, who has been told this by his father, may I ask? By his father? So gentlemen, speech of the tribes will be one serious consideration, because we are going to lose it. The second thing is: what do we know of these prehistoric tribes, gentlemen? What do the excavators excavate, usually? Will you tell me? Where do they go to find traces of the caveman? What do they find? By which means do these people still make themselves known to us, that they have lived 7,000 years ago?

[unintelligible]

Wie?

(Things.)

Well, what -- where do we find these "things"?

(Habitation.)

Wie?

(Their habitation, buildings.)

Well, what kind of buildings? The tribesmen. They had no palaces, they had no pyramids. They had no settlements. They were nomads. Think how -- if you want to find anything, any trace of the Mongolian tribe who now sit in the center of Brazil and probably came across the Bering Strait, and went through all of Asia before they passed over -- how do we know anything of their ancestry?

Well, you all know it, of course. What do we excavate?

(Bones, burials.)

Tombs. Graves. Isn't that true? Now gentlemen, it's very strange. These poor people, as you think, who couldn't write or read, had one way of reaching us, over thousand of years, by burying the dead. Whether they thought of us or not, they certainly did not know who -- how we would look, and who would be -- they instinctively found one way of telling us who they were, by burying their dead, by writing into the earth the story of their lives. Because in this way, we find everything they used. Everything, you see. It's there. Horses, their bones, weapons, amulets, little babies' toys. So gentlemen, the graves of the tribes are something that must make us meditate why people bury the dead. Again, I'm very -- I mean it, gentlemen, with my whole heart. You may laugh when I say that speech is no longer reaching your generation in its full power, but only as a trickle. The same thing is true about funerals.

I have a friend who is a minister in this state. And he was out in Saipan, as a chaplain of the Army. And he and another chaplain, two good Christian gentlemen, stroll -- took a stroll. And they found three naked Japanese bodies lying there in the field, killed by us. And they stared at these bodies and went home again. And he told me the story. And I gave him a sleepless night, because I said, "You think you are a minister of the Gospel. You think you have the right to preach God's word, and you have not known that the first duty of any human being is to bury the dead?"

"Oh, but that was the Japanese."

So here he was his own judge. "But this was a Japanese." This could not have happened with any wild man in the past, because gentlemen, why these people felt that they entered history by graves is the thing we have to explore. Mr. Sartre -- you have heard of this interesting, preposterous writer called Sartre in -- in

France, the existentialist, have you? Who has not heard of him? The others know him because he allegedly is so obscene, you know. But that's not all. He has written a very serious play, "Les Mondes sans Sepulchre." Can you translate this? Wie? Les Mondes sans Sepulchre."

[unintelligible]

Ja. Ja. Now that coincides with my story of my friend the chaplain { }. And they -- he didn't bury the dead, and Mr. Sartre writes the play on the fact that this -- we live in a time in which the dead are not buried. That's not a mere coincidence. That's the truth. The dead die out of sight. Who has seen an older member of his family die? Well, I'm glad that it still exists. It's nothing to laugh, sir. That's very serious. These are the great experiences of life. If you haven't seen a child born or your father or your mother dying, you have missed something. If you allow your wife to bear a child without your being present, you desert her. That's not a business for doctors and midwives. That's for you, because there you reach the ultimate extreme opposite from your love for your wife, when you see her in agony. And if you can't stand that, you are a weakling, and she will always resent it, without knowing that she resents it, you see. You can do nothing more effectively to assure a woman of your real devotion as a -- as your -- her husband, and not as her lover, when you stay -- stand by at this very hour. But our doctors have -- prevent you from this. You have to force your way in. You have to be there. This is very serious, gentlemen, for your married life. Why do we have all these divorces? Because people only want to have fun together. When -- either one of them has a misfortune, the businessman doesn't tell his wife, and then has to shoot himself instead, and the wife is put in a coma. And that's life. Married life. That means that they are one body, doesn't it? For better, for worse. Always for better in this country. Never for worse.

These ancient people knew that life in history begins with -- when the living set eyes on the dying person and the dying person sets eye on the living. That is the strongest tie between the generations. As it is the strongest tie between you and your wife, when you see that she braves the great danger of dying -- death. Because any birth is -- entails this danger for this body that gives birth to the new life. You cannot have life without death, gentlemen, and you cannot have future without past. You receive your future when you are present, when your ancestors die. And you can't say, as the people here in this town now is -- usually say, "It is indecent for a person to die at home." I have heard people say this twice in my presence, "This man had the indecency to die in his own home. He didn't go to the {hospital}." And they meant it! They meant it! They are absolute, brutal barbarians today. Anybody who can say this is, of course, just as bad as my

chaplain friend who didn't bury the Japanese. No relation to the honor and the dignity of dying. You will have to cope with all this in your own family, you see. The old -- why do we the racket of the undertakers? Because you don't know what to do with death. You would save a thousand dollars at each funeral, if you would know how to behave yourself in this case. And you would have a wooden coffin of six boards, and not one of these elaborate, idiotic things which the undertaker tries to bribe you, to show your affection for the dead. Don't you think you show more affection when you prevent your people to die in a hospital, in a cold hospital bed, instead of dying at home, and then pay nothing for the funeral? But instead, you allow them to be shipped out into the hospital, which costs a lot of money anyway, you see, out of sight, and then comes the undertaker with an onion, and says, "Spend \$1200 on the coffin." And you pay it. Because you have -- that's conscience money. You have to do something for the dead, when it d- -- makes no sense anymore. This is going on in this country all the time. The minister gets 15 percent, and the undertaker gets the rest. And the debts are with the widow. Now who is equipped to say, "I saw my -- the soul of my father or my mother depart, therefore you, Undertaker, get out, Satan. I have my -- I have a clear conscience. Everything has been done between us in life. Therefore what happens to his body has to be done in the simplest terms. And six boards of oak or of pine are just right." Isn't that simple? But who has the authority, you see? Only a person who has been present at the beloved's death, because he's ahead of the undertaker.

Gentlemen, the ancients invented -- invented history by burying the dead. We shall see -- that will be another chapter. And the third thing, of course, they invented the family. They invented the fact that children must have parents, and parents must have children. And they must call each other mutually by their rank and title. So speech, language, has been created; funerals have been introduced; and the family has been instituted in the first thousand years of human history on this earth. And you will admit that the family, and that language, and that the relation between the past and the future are still our great topic of conversation today. That's why I think it's important, I think, to nourish one's own courage, to do these things right, by looking into their story.

There have been as many tribes as this tree of the languages in Dartmouth Hall hints at. As I said, we have reason to believe that there are at this moment 9,025 languages counted in Africa alone. There are in Europe, of course, only perhaps 40 or 50 languages spoken. In this country and in South America, if you do not in -- count in the -- the Indian languages, there is just Spanish, Portuguese, English, French, which is really dominant. I mean, then they are -- Yiddish, and Polish, and Italian, but they do not claim a literary existence, and they

are all, so to speak, on the way out. The second, -- third generation's probably not going to cling to it. So you see, we live today on this continent with four languages. Would you -- is there any other which you -- which I should mention? I may be wrong. Is there more than four? Wie?

(Well, the fact that the -- many of the radios and newspapers in the small -- bigger cities still carry many more languages I think, and so you have Italian spoken and --)

Well, I'm very -- I mean, I'm -- you see, I'm -- have no { } any number will go. I'm just interested to say that in Africa there are 9,000, because Africa is still a purely tribal continent, you see, of prehistoric character. Whereas we, who have passed through the church and state history, you see, and u- -- union of the world has already reduced this number to a tremendous extent, you see. This is quite interesting, the contrast, is it not? Forty languages in Europe, four languages in America, and 9,000 languages in Africa. It's quite important, just as a useful example, you see, what has been done.

If then -- I use now examples -- you must understand that all the tribes have a -- the same principle of formation, although they have many varieties and diversities. For example, you have ten tribes that are monogamous, and you have one tribe that is -- has a -- the superiority of the woman, and they are -- she is allowed to have more than one husband. This is an experiment which one tribe made. And you must understand that the main creation of the tribe is identical in all the cases, despite all the variations. This is important, because this explains why it is not necessary to tell you the story of all the hundred thousand tribes, you understand. The tribe is a group from 500 -- from 200 to 5,000 people. It's -- that is long -- largest size possible, because it must be able to get the warriors of the tribe together in one spot. Without the meeting -- we would say today the town meeting -- or without the meeting of the whole tribe at any one spot, no tribe. But it is an occasional meeting. That is, the tribe has to meet once upon a time, but not always. The tribe consists then of small families, drawing together at tribal meetings and then dispersing again. And the tribal meeting is the time and place where the families are created, where the people learn how to speak, and where the dead are treated as living.

In the tribal meeting, you have then the three approaches which we have to undertake: the creation of language, the relation to the dead, and the founding of families. These three acts, however, are sporadic. The tribe cannot eat, and fish, and live in one place. But these people, as soon as possible, already for fear of famine, disperse. And the little group created in the tribe -- the family, hus-

band, and wife, and children, and perhaps an unmarried sister or brother and so -- move off and try to make a living, as best as they can. So the tribe is in a constant polarity, gentlemen, between the small group and the total group. Without this you have no picture of the tribe, that there is a constant coming and going between the central meeting, you see, or the festivals you can also say, you see -- you know something of these dancing festivals. And these dispersals. The dispersal is the economy of the tribe. And the union is a policy of the tribe -- the politics of the tribe. And the economy and the politics are related in such a way that the politics is the large unit and the economics is the small unit. We'll see that this is different in the empires. We will see there that the economy is the big unit. But in the tribe, the economy is a house -- husbandry -- husband, and wife husband their resources together. As I said, they may have there their grownup children with them and the children may already have children again. Then it is the grandfather -- parents, you see, with all their children, and -- and the clan as you still find in The Philippines, for example, very decidedly so, and other many places, of course. But what I want -- you rarely read in the books is the dynamism of the tribe. They describe all these things in the books, but they never show you that there is a constant dynamism between the political meeting where speech, ancestors, marriage is celebrated, and the economic -- hunt, fish, et cetera, where small parties go. You may have a raiding party of more than one family, but then it would be just the addition of two, three, four families banding together. It would not interfere with the political decision of the total group which calls itself the Sioux. Or the Apaches, you see.

And only one occasion at which the whole group moves right from the central meeting into the world, that's the warpath. There is -- on the warpath the whole tribe sticks together. But that, as you can see, is something unnatural, because the warpath is the defense of the tribe against other tribes. That's not given in nature, that's in history. The warpath leads the people of one tribe into the exposure -- the competitive exposure to the forces, abilities of another tribe. Man is this strange animal, gentlemen, that has made war from the very beginning of time. And if you want to be cured from pacifism, study the tribes. It has been as much tragedy for the tribes to have to go to war as it is for us. And there have been many diversifications. There have been tribes, gentlemen, who have tried to become pacifists. For example, the Eskimos. That is, people who try to get out, you see, get into a place and -- forbear with everything, even with the igloo, in order not to have to bear arms and to fight their neighbors. We have in the tribal layer of history all the movements of our own time. We have anti-alcoholics, and we have pacifists, and we have vegetarians, and we have all -- Christian Scientists, and everything you want. That is, man has always tried all -- every way out of his misery, you see, of war, for example, or of famine. And I warn you, there-

fore, I have to say these things right ahead so that you do not think that I want to -- to make the area of their history smaller than it is. It is a very wide area. And there have been in the tribal history these special groups, which you can compare to the modern sect. The tribes also already had their sectarians, their people who didn't want to have speech to create, or families to found, or especially not to go on warpath, and who tried everything to get out of the whole problem of staying in history, and carrying the whole armor of life.

What makes therefore these -- this problem of the archeologists and the pre-historians rather complicated and which have confused men, because you find all kind of oddities in this tribal history. But the tribes which our anthropologists today describe for having, for example, peaceful ideas like the {procreandas}, you know, from Mr. Malinowski -- you may have heard of him -- people who allegedly thought that the pig begot the next children. They of course, just tease Mr. Malinowski.

But you find all kinds of such ways out of the pressure of the full life. But you will also find, gentlemen, that these people which the anthropologists today find because they were pacifists or vegetarians or had some sectarian attitude towards life, that they did not make history. We come from those tribes, obviously, you see. Every one in this room comes from tribesmen 7,000 years back, who did not go pacifist, who did not go vegetarian, who did not become Eskimos, but who stayed in some strange way in the central stream of life. And therefore what we discover now in these special forms are obviously the ramifications, the extremes, of one way another, who in one -- survive in their way, but they couldn't get on. They {got} -- any sect in any such special tribe, gentlemen, was unable to transcend his own form of life, to go on to anything further.

All of you have heard so much about anthropology that I thought I had to make this remark beforehand to set your mind at rest. I'm fully aware of all these specialties, but that's -- doesn't at all alter the fact that there is one and the same principle running through the whole -- this whole first layer of several thousand years of human history. Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Student introduction: Philosophy 58, February 25th, 1954)

[Opening remarks missing]

... report this one great fact, which is unknown to most people in this country and which is so miraculous, gentlemen, that mankind goes forward by heading backward. That is, while the heart is forward-looking into the future, our head is getting -- passion and focus by looking backward. This is very unnatural. If you try -- in this country of course, young people run in circles, because you don't know which -- know where you're going. You just go west, or you go south, or you go to Texas. And you come back, and that's moving in circles. You make no experiences. I have never seen an American boy able to make an experience, because he goes -- just go on -- goes onto the next experience. An experience -- make an experience means to base some action on an experience for which you usually have no time.

The direction of mankind has nothing to do with your way of life, gentlemen.

The way of life of the student generation for the last 2,000 years in the world -- be it Russia, or be it western world, or be it India or Chinese -- has been that young people were in their instruction emphasizing one phase of the past and then forced this into a revival, into a renaissance, into the future, and thereby found a shape for their future life. You are so naked, that you don't know what to revive. At this moment, as we know -- you know, there is one desperate need for us to revive the 18th and 17th century of America in this country, and to get out from under the scientific blatant-ness -- brazenness and impertinence of the last 90 years. On this nobody can live. You cannot bring up your children on pragmatism. And you can't bring up your children on glands or evolution. That's impossible. That's for the pre-competitive society of the robber barons of the '70s, such a Darwinian world, you see. It fits free enterprise. But since you and your children will be only employees, no free enterprise for you. You better look out for some decent ancestry into which you can steep your -- the tenets for your grandchildren. Now I warn you, -- I'm all participant on this revival of Jonathan Edwards and Cott- -- Increase Mather, as some of you who have taken 57 well know. It is highly necessary -- at those -- moment to reunderstand the past of this country. But it isn't -- it's too short-lived. I mean, in here, in 58 I must invite you to look backwards more deeply into the beginnings of our human story. But it is a law of human society, gentlemen, that we go forward, instructed by one special

chapter of the past. Now that is a twisted and tormented gait in which we are obviously of -- you see, pre-occupied. Think of a humanity which looks so very different from your idea of running. I mean, you think a man is a -- just like a runner on track, racing the mile.

This is not life, gentlemen. Life of humanity is a strange combination of looking backward. And there has been this since the New Testament. And Jesus said, "I have not come to change, but to fulfill." He put down this law that we would have to revive every form of antiquity, you see, but make it a part of one whole -- while these ancient forms all have been isolated, and separated. Can you see this -- what I'm driving at? This -- is hard to get, I think, for you. You have never been told anything like it. You know that there has been a renaissance. And that Raphael, and Michelangelo were people who looked to the ancients for their classical forms of their buildings, their columns, their pillars. You also know that Mr. {DeMeyer} has a course in classical civilization. That goes back to this urge of the last 400 years to have something to do with the Greeks and the Romans. Heaven knows why, you see, you may well ask. Yes, Heaven knows why. Heaven knows very well why, because it was necessary that the -- Christians of 1500, 1600, 1700, 1800, 1900 fell in love with their own past. The Renaissance is the story of Christian men for their past, you see, for their pre-Christian past. Very serious business. And you cannot live without this great respect for the red Indians. I foresee a future in 200 years: probably the president of the United States might have to prove he is a descendant of a red Indian tribe. Because I'm quite sure that within 200 years, we will develop a tremendous reverence and awe for these primitive tribesmen, you see. That, I hope it will never reach this superstitious stage, that he actually has to prove that he is a descendant. But that's what the Romans did -- even themselves, when they said they came from Troy, and were descendants of Aeneas, you know, and Hector. And I foresee such stuff, because man cannot live without wanting to be one with all the people who have ever lived. And the so-called "brotherhood of man," gentlemen, is a poor story, as you conceive it, because it has nothing to do with the people who live at the same time on this earth. They are connected by trade, by commerce, by egotism, by fear, by hunger, by all ki- -- by curiosity, you see. But your connection with the people who have ever lived, and ever -- are going to live is a much more frail and much more important thing, because they have only you and your conscience as the advocates of their existence, and therefore you -- they completely depend on your good will. And peace comes only to people of good will, as you know. And your good will must make peace with your ancestors and your posterity. And we are -- every -- the whole -- of history is put in to the frail hands of the living generation, at every moment. It depends on your good will how much room you are willing to give to these past generations and their con-

tribution, you see, and to the future generations and their freedom. But there it is.

It's very serious. And this strange arrangement, gentlemen, that the head looks backward by -- into history and -- revives, selects some things as most important, as most sacred, as most classical, as most model-like -- great examples, and that we have to march forward from the needs of our heart, from love of life into the future -- that is the great mystery of real existence. And that's, you see, why it is not right, for example, just to look back to your papa -- to Daddy and your mammy instinctively. Many people who don't have the conscious effort of reviving a great past, you see, have still to revive a past, but they don't know it. They imitate, then, you see, in their weakness, instinctively. And you should ennoble this, what everyone has to do, to depend on some past, by choosing your future ancestor and by -- thereby cutting the apron strings with which you are tied to your mother and your father of the flesh. It's the only way, you see, of -- recognizing this need of depending on the past will free you from the accidental dependency of some past.

I'll give you a secret, gentlemen. At the age of 40, or 45, every one of you will begin to embody his father. It just so happens. We all do this. That is, we suddenly get the features of our father or grandfather, whoever look -- we look most like. And people who are taken unawares, people who have only run, run, run for the first 40 years are then apes of life. Because in the second half, the superstitions, the ways, the forms, the decisions, the -- of their parents get almighty in them and over them. A man who has, however, from 15 to 45 known this secret connection of the generations, you see, will not fall into this trap of just being his father again physically, for example, you see, and instinctively and in his decisions, but he will have the -- himself recreated the elements of the past and his own contribution into something new, something third. He will not be haunted by the spectres of the past. And the old Greeks, gentlemen, have given us in The Odyssey a description of Odysseus' going down to the shadows, the world of the shadows, the world of the dead. You may have heard of any -- there are other such stories, of course, in our folklore. This isn't as arbitrary, and as fairytale-like as you may look at these things, you see. They had their Freud, They had their psychoanalysis just as well as we. Freud is just another way of putting the whole problem, you see, before you. And don't think that these people didn't know exactly that if a man did not fight for the place of his own generation between the past and the future, that the past would come and visit him against his will. That's the whole problem, you see.

So please take this down. The Renaissance, the concept of a renaissance, of a

rebirth -- Christians speak of rebirth, of a revival, of a resorgimento, as the Italians call the 19th century, the resurrection of the spirit of the nation of Italy -- all these terms are all in the same line: resurrection, rebirth, regeneration, renovation; the centuries have alternated in using these terms, gentlemen -- are sublimations of our being chained to the past anyway. They are conscious attacks on this problem. And they are only so dignified and so important because they fight something that happens anyway. You think that the Renaissance is just a question of taste, you see. It's not. It's a question of rising above accident, of our doing -- when we have to deal with the past, then let us at least know that we are dealing with the past. You can see this from Hitler. Hitler moved throughout 3,000 years of human history and said, "I -- the constellation of Judaism and Christianity is over, and I'm leading us back into the life of the blond beast, of the tribesman." The same people of which we speak now, you see. Exactly he did this, in politics. And he -- had to act immediately and enact the concentration camps. He had to take the name, and the family, and the speech from the people whom he put into -- herded into these concentration camps. He was radical enough to plunge wholesale into such a past, not knowing that it was only one element to go -- look into the past, and that we had to conquer a future.

And therefore, gentlemen, when people, as you, try to live so unconcerned and so in sports, you really prepare the world -- the rest of the world -- of society for tyranny, of this type, of these people. They -- the men like Hitler concentrate in his own talk, and slogans, and tenets the -- some urge that is in everybody and he could win over the -- your liberal mind, because the liberal says "I'm free. I am free, without having fought the ancestors." Gentlemen, no man is free by declaring himself to be free. That's not enough. He has to know where his temptations come from. One of your immediate temptations is to exhaust your youth in 30 years of blind racing, running; and then at 45 being tired; and then finding this ready-made pattern of habits, and tradition; and then becoming -- a daughter or son of the revolution. And you know the -- "I'm a son of the revolution, I have never -- I'm a daughter of the revolution, I'll never be the mother of another." That's the decadence of the daughters of the revolution, you see. I am the Daughter of the American Revolution. I'll never be the mother of another. That's terror. That's real degeneracy. The problem is the equilibrium between future and past. And therefore, gentlemen, the people who really have a future delight in the past, but they do it with this dancer's attitude that it is not a superstition, that it is not a drawing into an abyss, as it is with people like Hitler, who simply couldn't do anything but, so to speak, staring backwards, you see. But it is a great honor, gentlemen, of yours to love your neighbors in time, and not in

space. Your neighbor in time is just as much your great-grandfather as it is your great-grandchild. And Christianity has tried to express it in this simple expression by saying that Jesus was the second Adam, and Adam was the first Christ. That's a good formula for any one of us. We are exactly the same. The first man in us is there. Everything that went on before us, you see. And we have to be the answer to this first man, so to speak, shortcomings in ourselves, by beginning to create that which from today on will be able to reach out to the end of time. So you are the seed of the final man, and you are the fruit of the first man. It's all very simple, gentlemen, but it's very serious. If you miss out on this, and you think, "I am myself," you immediately are nobody. In the Kingdom of Heaven, there are no selves, you see. Everybody is fruit and seed. In this simple formula, you may be able -- to hold onto this reason why I'm now talking on the tribe. Now point 2, the tribe itself, gentlemen. I mentioned three elements: speech, burial, and marriage. And that may seem to you at first sight completely arbitrary. Why do I mention these things? They had warpaths. They had masks. They had tatoos. We'll speak of these things, too. They had swords. They had fire. They had initiation. They had circumcision. The young were under terrible tortures. They were introduced into society when they were of age. We'll talk of all these things. I only thought, gentlemen, that I should mention language, marriage, and burial to make it clear to you that history begins only with -- in at least three generations. You can't have anything that matters in history that deals with one man. A hero is only a hero if the -- greatchildren -- grandchildren still mention him. You cannot be a hero in your own generation. That's out. But you have such ideas, that life is interesting in your own time. It is not. It is -- it is maybe biologically interesting as with plants and animals.

In human history, the least that you and I are demanded to do because otherwise we are so frail, so incompetent, so little, natural -- what we have to do is to establish continuity between three generations. Before there is no politics. Before there is no government. Before there is no family. And now comes the miracle, gentlemen: and before there is no speech. The worst part of your equipment at this moment comes from your heresy, from your fallacy that speech is a means of communication between the living. That's not true. Speech is not necessary between people who live together. The animals don't use speech for this very reason. Why should they? They have a pross -- what do you call it, for the elephant? Prospo -- how do you call it? For the elephant?

(Proboscis {pronounced: pro BOSS kiss}?)

Probosci {pronounced: pro BOSS ki}? No. What is it? Pro- -- ?

(Proboscis.)

Proboscis, yes. And the -- they can -- they have their tails to wiggle with, the have snorted -- snorts, and whinnying, and all kinds of noises they can make. But why should they speak?

The difference, gentlemen, between speech and animal sounds is very simple. The animal sound is at the -- of the moment. The essence of speech is that it is the same after a lifetime. And can be recognized as such. Therefore the first event of articulated human speech has been to give a name to an ancestor who die -- has died, to the -- you may say the leading elephant or the leading -- lion of the -- of the group, I mean, the stallion who led them, or the chamois, or whatever animal you may compare man's horde, or drove, or flock, that when he died, the groups decided to stay put, to keep his memory awake among the whole group and say, "In the name of this dead ancestor, we are going to speak together and hold -- keep our peace." That's the simple origin of the human society as far as humanity goes: that they challenge death. And speech was necessary so that the ancestor could survive, gentlemen.

We speak in order to make the absent present. That's why we speak. You see, when you can go out and report, "He said," after I said, "I say," you have carried this moment into time. And there speech only begins. So you -- perhaps you say this explicitly. Articulate speech does not originate between mother and baby. Mother and baby would have no reason to do anything but to purr. You see, it's -- no speech needed. It's nonsense. All our modern books on language -- please would you put out your pipe right away -- all your speech between -- day -- to books on -- are all children's psychology, they try to place the invention of language to -- into baby's laps. This is nonsense, gentlemen. Don't make such a mistake. You just have to think once. The great achievement of the tribal age is the creation of a language which you and I still speak. Now you -- will perhaps admit that it's absolutely fantastic to assume that this came about by the accidental nibbling of a baby at her mo- -- his mother's breast. We can prove this gentlemen. There are many primitive groups in which children and women -- were not allowed to speak. They were not allowed to speak, and they never learned to speak. I can prove it secondly by the fact that all children's speech is informal. That is, it is the reduction of the great language into some smaller coin, into some cheapness. You say, "Daddy" instead of "Father," but "Daddy" doesn't make sense, except in comparison to "Father." "Mammy" comes from "Mother." "Mother" is the term of which the children make a reduction by saying "Daddy," or "Mam- -- Mommy," or whatever you choose to -- to say.

Gentlemen, what you have to understand is that what you are calling language -- speech -- is not language. You call speech informal noncommittal talk. Talk is not speech. Talk is playing with speech. Speech is language which is to last for more than one generation. That's why all language in the beginning is only vow. The first vow is the name of a person. They vow themselves to the name of the ancestor. You vow yourself to your husband and -- as husband and wife. You vow yourself to recognize children born as your children. So gentlemen, the first wavelengths of speech is something that is at least going to last backward 30 years and forward 30 years. Before there was no reason to create language. Language is the victory over death. It is the defiance of absence, disappearance, of sense -- nonsensuous -- of merely sensuous existence. Out of sight, out of mind, we say, don't we? And since this is so, names have been created to combat this proverb. You will admit that wherever you go, your family is with you, that has been conquered, your -- this proverb, "Out of sight, out of mind." As you well know, it's an experience of the psychologist, very rightly made, that many boys who have not cut the umbilical cord mentally and psychologically, that they are more dependent on their mothers -- their mothers' approval in college than when they are at home. That physical presence gives them a little more spontaneity, and independence, and rebellion than when they are away. So much is the name of "Mother" and the order she is given present in a weakling's heart. And it isn't true that by going away a man is already emancipated. Far from it.

I knew a college president who had been the assistant to the previous president. And whenever he made a speech, 20 or 30 years after this -- his boss's death, you could see while he talked, that he was feeling whether the -- his former boss was approving. This man's eyes were still on him.

So gentlemen, it is just as important that we use these explorations for your throwing out some of your worst dogmas. Because you are all, as you know, one of your dogmas is that you have no dogma. Throw that out. Your second dogma is that children speak creatively, so to speak, and then the grownups are stuck with language. That's the famous error of the 19th century, which you are, after all, America always is 50 years behind the times, and so you have still this psychology, although no other parts of the world still believes it. The third thing is that language is invented to express utilitarian views: "Give me this piece of meat," or "Keep quiet," or any such thing. Gentlemen, for these things, language is abused, can be done without language. A slap in the face does exactly the same with a brat.

Language is only indispensable when part of the human being's concerns are away, or dead, or not yet born. So language is by itself a bridge through time. Mr. {Korzybsky}, the Russian, has called it that man is a time-binding animal. I don't like the expression, but perhaps some of you have heard it. It may help you to think that it is simply true. But it is true even in a wider sense, because the smallest unit, for which the languages that today exist have been created in antiquity, are generations. The language connects generations. Otherwise no need for language. I talk to you with a real power, because I have the honor of being the last of the generations that have preceded you as your teacher, and you are the first of the generations that are taught and learn as a beginning of wisdom. You think that I -- you try to get something out of my course. So you can't learn. You can only learn anything in this course if you know that you are the opening wedge into the future. That through you, I try to reach the latest generations. I'm not interested in you especially. But I am terribly interested in keeping this channel going through time. And therefore you may believe me, because I'm not teaching what is in my head, but I try to put through my head what has been true for the last 7,000 years. And that's obviously worthwhile. But it isn't worthwhile for you privately, gentlemen. It isn't worthwhile for you as the last generation of men ever to live on this globe. That wouldn't -- would be worth the candle. Why should I make such an effort to teach you as you, as selves, you see? I can't only really interest you, and insofar as you feel that this must be known by every generation again. Why, gentlemen? Because by speaking, we create the times of history. There is no connection between the generations without it. Baker Library and the pavement of Hanover campus and so -- that's not good enough. That's nothing in time. That's just in space. All the meaning of this library depends on your accepting a certain share in the secrets of time. So that's why history has to be told. That's why you have to have your father's name. In -- in some tribes, they -- they were quite clever. You know what they did when a man married? They gave -- and the child was born -- the father got the name "Charlie's Father," instead of being called Johnson, then but, you see, as the son of John, he was called "John's Father."

You can do this, too. Perhaps that's a good solution for your problem of getting some contact with your children. Give them a chance to feel that you are proud to be their parents. And recall, I mean. We'll have these tribal revivals. I'm sure that some group in the western world will begin to call themselves -- the husband and wife, you see -- by the name of their children by adding "Parents of." Parents of John, you see; we are John's parents. In the P and T association, you already have some touching -- attempt, you see, to become the parents of the children in school. And for some parents, that's the only place where they get a spiritual kick. The parents-teacher association in this country is an attempt of

tribal restoration, by saying that the parents want to be these children's parents. That is, they want to be revived, regenerated by their connection with the next generation. Isn't that true? Don't you know such people?

That's very serious, gentlemen. You should -- you should glorify in this. It's a very wonderful attempt in a country without tradition, without history, without past, at least to reconquer, you see, some continuity through time. And you are so mechanized, that you always think time runs from the past into the future. No, gentlemen. From the very beginning time also runs only from the future into the past. Parents can be made over by knowing that they are the parents of these children, you see. Then they {may be able} -- to be able to tell their children about their grandparents, but always in the light of the future.

So names, gentlemen, are -- were created so that something would survive death. And names are created so that somebody would live into the future with some clear consciousness of who he was. You receive a name, so that you happen to have ten aliases. Formerly, if a man had no name, gentlemen, he would be called by some nickname in every city into which he went with a different name. And he would lose his identity, as many people try to do in this modern society. But you are ennobled by being asked to recognize your identity from the first day of your life to the last. That's a great thing, gentlemen. And you see that names create future and create past, connect the present with generations before and generations after. The Bible has expressed this in a very -- simple manner by calling the days of creation "generations." You learn, with the silliness of modern man, that evolution has proved that geology is right and the Bible is wrong by saying that the earth wasn't created in one day. Do you think that the Biblical people believe that the earth was created in one day? One day, as you know, before God like a thousand years. That is eternity. The Bible writer was never pretending that the -- that anything was created in one day, but was created in one epoch. And they called this toledot. Anybody who knows Hebrew must know that this word means "generation." That is, the mountains were created as one generation of God's generative power -- sun and moon. And the sea was created as one generation. We can't express it more vividly today. It's much more biological than the mechanics of modern astronomy, or astrophysics, or geology, you see. It is a -- living process and every one of these -- epochs, of course, has its own timespan, has its own life. But the problem for the Bible was to say that man should live with the six generations of living creation behind him, feeling the seventh.

There is a strange -- we will come to this later. The tribe was based on the pride to place men at least in the center of three generations back and three

generations forward, so that seven generations were the timespan of which a man could be conscious: great-grandfather, and great-grandson was the horizon of time for the tribesman. Of which -- this you find a remnant in the -- Genesis, in the creation of the seven-day week. And we'll talk about this. This is the reason why Moses put in it in this form. He had deep reasons, because he wanted to give this seven-generation principle into his timing. The Sabbath and everything has to do with it.

In -- the problem is neither one day nor a thousand years. It is not -- 500 million years, but it is a problem of the connection of these rings of time as ancestors and descendants, so that everyone is responsible for everything that went on before. By the story of Genesis, man is made responsible for the mountains, and for the sun, and for the fishes, and for the animals as their descendants. If this isn't good Darwinianism, I don't know what it is. It's called the generation, and nobody has -- tells you this. It's just incredible. I mean, the Bible sums up every -- the whole evolutionary theory of the last 100 years. I've never understood that -- I'm now after all quite old man, gentlemen -- I've never been able for the last 50 years of my life since I know of Mr. Darwin to understand why there should be a contradiction between the Bible and the findings of modern science. I just can't. I still don't understand it. It's only for silly asses who misunderstand both, science and the Bible. Of course, if you want this, you can misunderstand everything. But you misunderstand both. Doesn't evolution tell us that we cannot shun responsibility for what has gone on before? Here we have to limit in -- live in this limited environment, make the best of it. And doesn't the Bible say exactly the same -- that it is one stream of life poured out first in the animal and in the plant life and then in us that we mustn't boast too much of our special role in creation? We are a little higher than they. Exactly what this evolution theory says. So what's the contradiction?

But you will understand it better if you do -- forget the figures of the geologists with their 500 million years, and forget the day-simile, the metaphor of one day, you see, of creation in Genesis and cling to the Hebrew title of the first chapter of Genesis, Toledot, t-o-l-e-d-o-t, which means generations of creation. Because generations is the obsession of the tribe, to think in terms of generations. And this is the first thing I invite you to do again: begin to tell -- think in terms not of 1954, and of election campaigns in four -- within four years, and of plans for two or three years. Try not to think of yourself as a man of the class of '56, which is very diff- -- difficult for you to do, because you do think in these terms all the time. Try to think in terms of your generation between generations. This is enough. And it is a minimum.

So I say to you, gentlemen, to speak today in terms of thousands of years is foolish. You and I -- we are such little cogs on the wheel, that's beyond our understanding. To speak of the moment and of the year is too little. Gives us no direction. The middle course seems to me to speak of generations, and to modestly reclaim the territory of two, three, four, perhaps one day seven generations. If you can feel that you have connection with 1776 and 2100, you have achieved a tremendous security of living. And that's totally lacking in you. But you talk big about 50,000 years before Christ. Gentlemen, give that up. Don't talk about these geological figures. It leads you into insanity. It's absolutely insane to juggle with these figures. Nobody knows anything about them. Totally arbitrary. We don't know how radio or so worked, 50,000 years back. That's all fantasy. That's { }. If it has been so, maybe it has been so. But we can't do anything with these figures. They don't affect you and me. But it does affect you and me to raise your standards, and not always as you do: you speak of tomorrow, and today, and you speak of millions of years. Is this both equally undignified and silly? If you would to begin to speak of generations, you would get breadth and sincerity. You would get still -- realism enough, but you would gain time. There would be a connection between things to be done and things already happened. The reconquest, gentlemen, of the tribal horizon is the first thing suggested by our rediscovery what -- why people begin to talk. Seven generations is by and large the utmost of the tribal tradition. When you look into the traditions of the Navajo Indians, or the Sioux, or any one of the great tribes of our -- here, the American West, you will find that they have no assurance about events that go back more than 150 years. Then it becomes -- mythical and that is, they telescope the events of the last 150 years and events of the previous 150 years, and the previous, and the previous.

So gentlemen, will you kindly state the following interesting law: although the tribes that we find today obviously have a history of many thousand years, they -- they still survive sufficiently strong when their own conscious history is about 150 years long. So the -- what I call the "raft of time" on which they swim, you see, through the stream, the ocean of life, is by and large seven generations long. They can go up and down on this raft seven generations right, so to speak, you see, along on this stream of life which carries them down through the ages, and they already have a decent civilized behavior by having an outlook on life of seven generations' length. This is never mentioned, and yet, you see, we all feel that they are barbarians, that they are uncivilized, that they are primitive. But on the other hand, we all -- we all worship them, because they are so archaic; they are so old. Here this is dissolved, you see. These groups are primitive because their time horizon is no -- not longer than seven generations. And yet, with the

help of this much of an horizon, they have come down to us for many, many thousand years.

Thank you. Let's have a break here for five minutes.

[tape interruption]

(Student introduction: February 25th, after the break.)

Gentlemen, the content of generations is in our language nearly gone. Those of you who have taken 57 know that in America of the 17th century, there was this great concern with America becoming a matter of one age. The word "age" is -- comes nearest to this sequence of harmonious wholes of time. The other word is "period," and the third word is "epoch." Epochs and ages are then the old terms and they have spent their energy, and I invite you to go back to the simple term of "generation" because it -- makes time rhythmical. Time is not the sequence of moments in history. But time is incisive, i-n-c-i-s-i-v-e. The name-giving process, gentlemen, which tries to get hold of your ancestor and of your great-grandchild is incisive. There is no speech without holidays, without great events, without picking and choosing some moments of time to be lifted above the average run-of-the-mill time. Man's history does not consist of the natural time of the scientist. It is not a sequence of a thousand years, but it is the sequence of beginnings and ends, which is something quite different, of epochs, of ages, or of generations. That is, it is instituted time, and the people whom -- are become -- are made time-conscious in the tribe, of these seven generations, you see, have to be lifted into this ring of time, this rhythm of time, of these seven generations, by a stroke of violence, by some incision. That's the meaning of the tattoo. The tribe tattoos its people to -- write the constitution of the tribe on the bodies of the people. Tattooing is the first script. Long before people write on paper, or on papyrus, or on stone, they had to lift people into this special ring of generations, of this epoch, in -- inside of which they can get orientation beyond the moment. And so, if these -- Sioux have this consciousness of 150 years forward and 150 years backward, they owe this to the great moment of incisive initiation into this ring of time, into this epoch.

And therefore, gentlemen, the individual does not experience the historical time of -- cycle of its tribe -- in a stupid, accidental manner, but by the experience that it is allowed to enter upon some great creation by undergoing the pain, the entrance fee, as you undergo it when you are hazed for your fraternity. The hazing is the last remnant of the same ritual of initiation. And it has to be painful, because it is meant to lift you out of your rut. Something changes in your

consciousness.

And what is a change of consciousness, gentlemen? We learn from psychoanalysis not enough about this, although it's secreted into this -- you and I, every one as a human being, wants to penetrate before our birth and behind our death, every one of us wants to know what has happened before we have lived, and everyone wants to know what is going to happen after we have lived. This is done by initiation in the tribe. The name of the ancestor is the first beginning of revealing the past before my own birth and my own consciousness. The mistake of the modern analyst is, you know, that he thinks people want to be lifted up into their mother's womb as embryos. They analyze the traumatization that may have happened to the embryo. That is a complete superstition. You and I want to know what happened when father and mother met. That's what we want to know. And how their parents looked. We do not want to know anything physiological, or physical. That's all absolute, as stupid as any superstition of any wild and fancy tribe. It is terrible to say that modern, so-called scientific man is just as idiotically stupid and superstitious as any wild man has been in the past, by saying that we want to know our physical past. We don't want. We want to know how the people lived from whom we have to take orders today. We want to come behind their shortcomings, for example, or their greatneses, or their prowess. And therefore, gentlemen, every one of you, of human beings, wants to live before his own time, and after his own time, to some extent. We want to be connected with this.

Now the name of the ancestor was originally only known to the initiate. He had to join in the dirge for the ancestor. The -- the great -- the great complaint, the great dirge, the wailing was the first thing he had by which he recognized that this was his ancestor, that he re-enacted, so to speak, the event of this man's physical death. Here you get to the point of the connection of speech and universe. The importance of the burial was that here was, we may assume that at one time, one group of men really created this. There, this naming business, you see, that in repeating the name, the unborn could be made into contemporaries of the first generation that had buried the hero, or the ancestor, the leading -- leading human being.

So gentlemen, initiation is an attempt to overcome the time that has elapsed between the first moment of the creation of the tribe and my generation. The initiation tries to superimpose the first generation's attitude, you see, upon myself who otherwise would not be able to share in this great decision that the rules, or the behavior, or the attitude of the past ancestor is still valid for me. That this is literally true you can see from any totem post. What do you see on a totem

post? What do you see there, the totem pole?

[unintelligible]

Wie?

[unintelligible]

What's carved out there?

(The history of the tribe. The history of the tribe.)

Well, what do you see actually, on the totem pole?

(Animals.)

Wie?

(Animals, birds.)

Yes, but what's always -- the bird is only given there, because, that may be the totem of the tribe. But one thing is identical on all poles, regardless of the special bird or the special animal. The eyes. There are at least six or seven eyes of the preceding ancestral generations on these posts. Don't you remember? Sometimes it's just an eye. One eye above the other. It's not always an animal. They look at you. The ancestors in the tribe, gentlemen, speak to the living. The great secret of tribal religion is that the dead speaks to the living. The dead speak to the quick, as the Bible still mentions it in the Creed -- not the Bible, but in the Creed, you see. That God -- Christ is coming to judge the dead and the quick. In -- the tribe that isn't true. The dead there judge the quick. That is, the initiated young man puts himself under the eye of the father of the tribe. Of the originator of the tribal order. And in this sense, the tribal order is perpetuated. And this is the meaning of the totem pole. And the totem pole, gentlemen, then is the aspect of the funeral which makes it transportable, movable. Without the totem pole, the grave would have asked the tribe to stay there forever. You could have never left the place. So you must see the totem pole as the tomb made -- the coffin, the tomb, the grave, the funeral, the obituary made transportable.

In the totem pole we have no superstition, gentlemen. It is -- I think it is just as understandable as the Bible, or an history book or the Constitution of the United States, you see. The totem pole expresses the real constitution of any tribe. And

as you know, there are not many eyes, one above the other; it is the length of generations which in the totem pole speaks to the living generation. This is no contradiction to what I have said that consciously the tribe usually knows of the great-grandfather, and the great-grandchild, because the actions of these people whose eyes are carved out there, you see, are of more than a ring of seven, as this tribe may have had the same kind of totem pole for perhaps 500 years. It is only that what is suggested on this is seven generations. But it may be multiplied by more than seven -- by many times seven. I don't know what the archeologists here say about the antiquity of the totem pole still found here. Does anybody -- has anybody somebody in the family who collects totem poles? No? Does anybody know anything about their age, their antiquity? What I know of them makes them not very old. They don't seem to -- the ones we still find, they don't seem to be older than 2- or 300 years. But does anybody -- has anybody any information on this matter? Probably, by investigating -- examining the wood, we would be able to know if they -- we have in this country any totem pole actually carved out in 1200. This would show you, you see, that cyclical thinking in the tribe, in generations, repeats the process. Seven times, you see -- five times seven, you can have actually and still consciousness expressed is only seven generations in the number of these eyes. I mention this because somebody asked me in the intermission about the possibility of actually lengthening the timespan of consciousness in the tribe.

I give you a -- just a factual example. Some group of the Saxons in England in {1}790, one of these little kingdoms, wrote down -- a monk wrote down the genealogy that was then current about this kingdom. If it wasn't Kent, it was Northumbria. I've now at this moment forgotten the name of this special -- this special unit of -- of government in -- in England. Written down in 790 that carried the history of the tribe, by genealogy back to 340 of our era. That is, already under the impact of writing, you see, of -- the Bible, and of Christianity, very short. And in 4- -- the year of 330 A.D. it said that these kings at that time were born from Wodan, from -- Odin. You see the naïveté of this tribe. In 340 the divine spirit enters the scene and creates the first ancestor. This in the light of the -- of the era, the Christian era already, you see, from the creation of the world of the Jews, and the Christian era of the coming of Christ in 0. This man then, this Anglo-Saxon -- chronographer did -- made no attempt to embellish the tribal ancestry in competition with the Biblical story. It would have been easy for you and me to think this impossible. The man must have it -- the feeling, "I must go to -- back to the beginning of time," didn't feel like it. He just placed Wodan in the year 340 A.D. -- B.C. -- what is it? -- A.D., yes -- and he didn't see any contradiction in this. I thought it was a very important example to give you, you see. That has nothing to do with red Indians. But these are good Anglo-Saxons out of

which the modern English and American have come. And yet here you see a tribe whose consciousness is completely at rest when he has embroadened, enlarged the widths of consciousness to these -- what is it, 450 years, you see? Four hundred -- exactly 450 years. And that's three times, so to speak -- the usual length, and probably it took him already a great effort to travel the length of this consciousness.

And from this example you may see that there is no need for a tribe to have a greater extension of history. According to the special form of living, gentlemen, the form of memory is limited. If you want to keep a family sane and so, and without degeneracy, a child should know of its great-grandfather and think of its great-grandchildren. That's still valid today. And you go nuts if you become a genealogist who tries to prove that you are a descendant of David Bruce in Scotland, or some such nonsense, as here the people do when they falsify their pedigrees. You can buy it for \$10, any pedigree you want in this country. And I warn you, it is perfectly legitimate to be interested in your great-grandfather, still. Everything beyond it is very doubtful, because I tell you why. You know what the secret is of genealogy, why it is such a dangerous cult, and why the -- healthy tribes never wanted to go -- backwards? Does -- has anybody dabbled in genealogy -- by any chance? Who has? No? Well, that's very healthy on your part. I mean, you are really at an age where one does look forward.

But I once was the editor of a great -- of a big factory paper, for 15,000 -- 18,000 workers, and engineers, and merchants, and salesmen. And to me came one of these pedigree hunters and a -- a genealogist and said would it be good to advise all the workers in this factory to care for their pedigrees.

And I said, "Well, I myself am an historian by inclination and by deed, and I certainly -- I myself think nothing is more wonderful than history. But I'm not going to sell my work as your history. Because that is -- a history of vanity. Because, my dear man, I have always found the genealogists only mention the nice ancestors. They never mention the one in jail. The drunkard, the profligate, and so, he's left out of the picture. Now if you go behind, for three generations backward, the number of your ancestors multiplies in such a manner as you may see, 16, you see, 32, 64, that you then always will fall for Charlemagne as your ancestor, you see, and omit the less-famous people, and the negatives. And that's a complete forgery of the fact of life. And it's terribly dangerous. It blinds people to the fact that there are non-entities as much as there are entities.

In Switzerland, one-half of the nobility descends through the von {Meh} of Bern from Charlemagne. It's quite interesting. The -- you -- the country in which

the heirs of Charlemagne still really exist in the flesh is of all countries the republic of Switzerland. Neither in France nor in Germany do you find these people. But they are -- abound. There are several hundreds, families who can trace their ancestry back to this man, Adrian von Bubenberg in 1476 who married a Burgundian princess. The Burgundian princess hailed in direct line from Charlemagne, so all -- every one of these families tells you this. My wife's family, too. And -- but they always omit all the scoundrels, you see, that are also in the pedigree. And so you have always this one luminous ancestor, you see. But the 532 that -- better not are mentioned, you see, they aren't mentioned. And so if you tell your children that he hails from Charlemagne, it's a big lie, you see, because he hails from 532 people who were not Charlemagne. And Charlemagne is just the 533rd. That's too little to count.

So the ignorance of ourselves about our ancestry is better stressed, just as much as our knowledge. With regard to the three generations, we still have an open book there. We know what every one of these ancestors really, you see, was worth. But as soon as you come to the mythology of the genealogists, then -- the forging -- begin in the picking and choosing and the perfectly arbitrary invention of all racial prejudices and so on and so forth. And then every Jew comes directly from King David and Solomon and every -- every Nordic comes from Charlemagne, and on it goes. And then the rest is the world war. And the persecution of the Jews, and the gas chambers, and discrimination, and what not. Because if everybody can think his nice ancestor, you see, then he, of course, omits that one ancestor from which all the Negroes came. Because at one time obviously there were two brothers, Shem -- Ham and Japheth, some kind of such thing, and the one person who got stuck in Africa and the other in Sweden. So -- but that's never mentioned. That's the prodigal son.

Therefore I think there's great health and wisdom in the tribal principle. You must see there -- there, that with regard to ancestry, if you make ancestry, generation, you see, your way of looking into the past because you have no books, you have no buildings, you have no -- nothing else but just this frail, human body that it is much more reasonable not to go back ad infinitum.

I want to show you that these things have their great tact, they have great equilibrium of -- some delicacy which you always miss because you want more and more and think more and more is better. More and more can be worse in history. It is not true that we can -- must know everything. And it is -- since we cannot know everything, it leads then -- into a complete distortion, as these Mayflower descendants in this country, you see, who abound. But they never

mention all the harlots from which they hailed. But they do, because the harlots came bounding -- of course in -- en masse into this country, and the criminals. I mean, compared to one Pilgrim father, there were 5,000 harlots and 10,000 criminals, and 20,000 indented -- indentured servants. And nobody ever mentions this. And that's America. And not the -- not the Mayflower people. The -- America is the country in which the few Mayflower people were strong enough to prevail on the scum of the earth, and make a decent -- civilization out of it. Isn't that much better? Isn't that much more serious? It's a much greater achievement. It's never mentioned in any book what it took these Pilgrim fathers to prevail over these rowdies and these -- these terrible people.

Very strange. I don't know why it is not more -- more a great achievement. It would -- then -- for example, you would lose all respect before majorities. You would know that this country has always been created by minorities. It would make you feel that it is worthwhile to be the minority that is going to be the majority of tomorrow. Because the Pilgrim fathers have always been in the minority. Never did they have the majority. But they are so impressive that the majority could talk to them and come around. And as you -- forget this, you don't understand the Federalists. You don't understand the deep instincts of the leaders of this country in -- when the country was created, that they had to avoid mob rule, that the majority could not break the Constitution, that mass movement -- mob was worse than tyranny. You can't understand -- Hamilton. You can't understand Washington. You can't understand the division of powers. And you will then give in, like Mr. Stevens to Mr. McCarthy, because you won't -- don't understand that in any one moment the majority, you see, is wrong, that the minority has to convert the majority. That's the whole problem of government. Majority's always wrong, but there is a minority that finally wins out with the majority and then the majority, you see, that -- in itself would be wrong at least does the bidding of the minority of yesterday. That's the secret relation of history.

If the minority of yesterday has an important issue, gentlemen, then it will become the majority of tomorrow, but the majority will at the time, when the law is finally enacted, be already behind the times. Because the reformer will already look out for the next law, and not be surprised that now the majority finally comes around, you see, to something that the minority knew 30 years before. Don't you understand? This is the secret of governing. It is -- as long as you do not understand it, you do not understand, gentlemen, that government is always concerned with -- three generations. You have a minority who knows this should be done. Now it must gain time to get the majority to do it. So at this moment it

thinks already of one more generation, or one election campaign, or one period, it really has to work hard to get the people to do this, you see. But during this whole time, new abuses, new problems, of course, arise. The new invention comes up. New political clouds gather at the horizon, you see. So another minority must gather and -- you see, and become very concerned and finally have a platform on this. And while the majority, you see, is -- rampaging around, you see, with terrible noise that finally this law is enacted, the serious people no longer care for this. That's just natural that it should be done, you see. I'm thinking of the year 1960 in this country. Do you think I care what Congress meant at this moment? That's only normal that they have to do these things. That's not important. That's for children. For the mass, for the people who have no political concern. But I, who have political concern, I'm thinking at this moment of 1960. The only interest -- so I can say it snows. Mr. McCarthy is to me like hail or snow. Just let him pass, for example, I mean. That's not my business, that's the natural. People finally wake up against this intellectual shabbiness called -- I mean, fellow traveling, that has prevailed in this country for 20 years. I'm sorry. My time is up. It's just now becoming interesting. Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Student Introduction: Philosophy 58, March 2nd, 1954)

[Opening remarks missing]

{In order} to participate in the life of these people, and not merely. Gentlemen, when you look at this -- this pictures in the murals of the -- of the basement there, of Orozco, you'd see these primitive people marching to their -- it looks as though they were marching to their doom. Well, obviously, they are marching to their self-revelation. And they are unknowingly great. They are not merely marching into the future unknowingly, you see. But that they are marching at all, this is greatness. And they also march with something in back, with the dead, out of which -- from which they would like to flee. But the greatness, and the not merely, is that they do not flee.

We now come to the problem of the funeral, of the burial. I talked to you earlier about speech. We come back to speech after this. But I think the second thing I must explain to you is that these first people are very great, because they do face death. And they do thereby exactly the same as we do with any renaissance today. Now it {seems with may} -- it would seem to you a funny introduction, but -- so that you see that the facts and not my ideas are what you must learn to contemplate. Facts you know. I would like first once more repeat what was in {Follett's} report already hinted at, that for the last thousand years mankind has in a strange manner re-revealed the Greeks. We have this renaissance idea. Anybody who has taken Latin knows that he begins with reading Julius Caesar, who after all was murdered -- 44 B.C., and that is the first book read by the students to learn -- so this is the end of antiquity which was rediscovered first, and which anybody now today who learns anything about classical civilization is actually learning first. This is for you difficult to understand, because you think, of course, that in history, we march forward. And if Homer perhaps lived in 800, and the Trojan War was 1184, and to -- though you think you begin with Troy and go to Caesar. This is not true, gentlemen. The rediscovery of the renaissance -- of the renaissance of antiquity, which is now -- ended in this course of classical civilization in this college. Everything you know of politics -- this is a Greek word, as you know, for example -- of philosophy, another Greek word; of Plato, another Greek; of Aristotle; of idealism; everything Greek, which you use every day in your vocabulary has been discovered in a strange going-backward from Caesar to pre-Homeric man. The latest discovery which you are facing at this moment is, as you know, the excavations of Mycenae and

on Knossos on Crete. Some of you may have heard of these things; that we are, for the last 50 years trying to decipher the Minoan script of King Minos, or the Labyrinth. And you may have seen pictures of the Lion Gate in -- Mycenae near Argos. This all is pre-Homeric.

So gentlemen, the funny thing is if you read -- has anybody read Dante, or heard of Dante? Well, who is he? Well, it would be better if you hadn't heard of him, because then you might read him. Who is the companion of Dante?

(Virgil.)

Virgil. Now he is the contemporary -- even later -- earlier, as you know, than Caesar. So Virgil lives after Caesar. He -- I think he died in 17 of our era, isn't that right? Something like that. So he already attains to the Christian ages. Now, for Dante, Virgil, to us the last classic, is the first classic whom he meets in the revival of antiquity. So we get here Dante, or let's put it down here: Dante, led by Virgil, you see. Machiavelli is already led by Caesar. That's 1500. This is 1300. And by Aristotle, of course, the -- Thomas Aquinas is led. So that's also 1275 Thomas Aquinas, one of the other {stilted} names you carry in your bosom. Aristotle.

Now comes Plato. Plato lives, of course, as you well know, before Aristotle, but he is discovered afterwards. In 1442, for example, the pope allows a translation of Plato to be made, so that 250 years after Aristotle is discovered, they discover Plato. The Greek tragedy, as you well know, is not discovered by Shakespeare -- who takes Seneca, and Menanda, and Plautus, and Terentius -- but it is discovered by Corneille et Racine -- und Racine, and by Goethe, who writes Iphigenia. So by 1750, we have -- or by 1650, better take the Louis XIV date, we get the great revival of Greek tragedy, which again is 50 years before Plato. Or pardon me, I should write it the other way.

So you see the Roman antiquity with Seneca is still the model for Shakespeare as late as 1600, so that you can see the first half of the last thousand years, from 1100 to 1600 -- you can take this down -- the model is the first half of antiquity -- the later half of antiquity, from Virgil and Seneca, who lived under -- emperor Nero, and is a contemporary of Peter and Paul. You go back to -- just to 400, to Plato. Then comes the great inroad of -- taking on -- so here, by the way, Socrates. We have a special date for Socrates in the history of the Renaissance. In 1515, the famous Erasmus of -- Rotterdam, his name you also may have heard, Erasmus, made a speech in Basel, when he became professor there, in which he invoked "Saint Socrates." That's a famous speech. You may take this down. That

was the inthronization of Socrates instead of Aristotle, you see. St. Socrates, Sancta Socrates. {Adduta} nos, that was this man allowed himself to invoke Socrates, as you would invoke a saint. And put him in the vocative. That's the first time this happens. Before 1515, people wouldn't have understood why Socrates. They would have invoked Aristotle, or Virgil, you see. Can you see the point? You look at me in despair. Wie? Do you understand it?

(No, I don't.)

Well, were you here last time?

(No, I'm sorry.)

Well, then you can't understand it. That's your fault.

Now, we go back -- further back, here we come to 1800 as I said, and we come to the great Homeric question. Since 1800, people have debated whether the Homeric poems form a unity, or how they are composed. That is the great struggle from 1800, you may say, to 1929, when the great -- this last great defender of the com- -- why composition of Homer was given up. You know that is coincident with the great, the debate on the origin of the Gospels, too. The Gospels, the Old Testament, the New Testament, and Homer were -- how do you say? -- torn to shreds by the criticism of 1800 to 1930. Today nobody believes this anymore. People believe that Homer was one great poem. I certainly believe that every one of the Gospels was written by -- as it is by the evangelists. And I also believe that the five books of Moses formed the unity. But so the critis- -- the critics are rather obsolete today. But you still are obsolete. You still believe it.

And what does this mean, however? That all {brain} of the 19th century was given to the debate of the Homeric question, of the Biblical question besides. So that you get the strange parallel each time that one of these ancients is taken up by a century. Each time this has an immediate impact on something in the Church, and in -- in the Bible. When Dante discovers Virgil, he also opens Hell, because Virgil takes him through Hell. When we discover Homer, we also discover the composition of the Old Testament. It's very strange, you see. When Thomas debates Aristotle, he also debates the Apostle Paul, because the {apost- lus} is always the man who refutes Aristotle in the discussion of Thomas's, you see, Summa.

So the 19th century, gentlemen, compares Homer with the Bible. And today, gentlemen, we turn to pre-Homeric man. There is a very fine book by Robert

Graves. Has anybody heard of Robert Graves? His book is called *Hercules, My Shipmate*. I recommend it to you, if you want to penetrate before Homer and want to get prepared for that which will accompany you for the next 30 years in educated society. Because in the next 30 years, the debate will begin to start on the origins of Greece, on the pre-Homeric. And Mr. Robert Graves in his great genius -- he is a genius, a very wild genius, but genius, of course, as all poets, is a prophet. Poets in our days are the modern prophets. And he has thereby scented -- scented and -- you see, the future of our interest and in this book, *Hercules, My Shipmate*, you are in the midst of prehistory and Greece, so to speak. That is, he is trying to connect Greek genius and prehistoric man -- prehistoric in the sense of before Greece. With the empires of old and the tribes he connects us in this book, *Hercules, My Shipmate*. The other book is -- he has written, of course, a number of these books. What's his name, *The White Goddess*? Has anybody seen this? May -- he has really turned himself into a kind of tribesman as painted in the Orozco frescoes. It's quite an achievement, Mr. -- these modern poets have a hard time to steep themselves in the mentality of these old men. And Graves has so remarkably succeeded. Half the time he's crazy and half the time he's genius.

Here, gentlemen, only to see that beginning with the two world wars, or with the Russian Revolution, and with D. H. Lawrence, and with Robert Graves, we are marching into the origins of Greece. So if you here take the times, isn't that astonishing that we have here anything in Greece that exists 1000 B.C. or before? We get here anything that is in this in 700 B.C. We get here what is -- this in 500. Here what in 400. Here what in 300. And then here what would be in 100 B.C. And here what is coincident with Christ. Now, mankind's revival then begins and ends, just as I have told you. One step forward, one step backward. Two steps forward, two steps backward. If you take every century one step, it is obvious that today, 1954, we have to unfold 10 centuries before Christ, whereas in 1100, when we first find these, the stories of the wizard, Virgil, mentioned in Naples, it is only 100 Before Christ that people try to get {off}. This is after all very miraculous.

The Renaissance, which you take just as -- in a lump sum, you have heard of Renaissance not only, but you see the buildings in the Renaissance style in Washington and other places. All the rich citizens of New York have built Renaissance palaces in the last -- 19th century, have they not? This Renaissance -- renaissance to you is a frozen concept. You should see that the Renaissance itself is a constant avalanche -- a march, that every moment, the Renaissance is not something static, that you read the classics, as you think, you see. But the problem of every time is to discover something classic which has been forgotten and

which is needed again to intensify life.

Can you see my -- now my point, that it is today still that we are looking backward when we face forward, which is a contradiction in terms, but which explains to you that we will have to look for the same in most primitive -- so-called primitive man. If you understand this, gentlemen, you will never call the people on the Orozco fresco "primitive." You would call them "primordial." They are the first men who have lived like you and I, with the head backward and the heart forward.

This I have -- now have to prove, and I only wanted to stabilize this. Sir, have you now understood the Caesars? You see, I have propounded this last time, Sir, you see: that we go forward by looking back, or while looking backward. This is very important, gentlemen, because you are haunted by the idea that you have progressed from primitive man to I don't know what, to a Dartmouth student. As long as you think so, my whole course cannot make any sense to you. We are talking of this same human being through the last 10,000 years. Otherwise, why should I bother you with animals? A primitive man in your mind is another kind of an animal. That's nothing with whom we have to deal here. Then you go to the zoology department, please. If it is an animal, we have nothing to do with it. Man is the same at all times. If I didn't believe -- if we say we didn't believe this, we could not make any progress, gentlemen. Progress is only possible when all men are one man. Otherwise we would go in circles. You can only progress if the first man already wanted to do what you want to do. Then you can go him one better. If you want to do something else, there's no progress. This is your illusion, gentlemen. You think that your generation is not dependent on identity of purpose with all men. But of course it is. There's only hope for you if man has already endeavored to achieve that which you try to achieve. Otherwise you can't continue, you would have to begin from scratch. And that's -- for this you have no time, because before you can even begin to do it, you would be dead. So all this has just been the preparation, gentlemen, for telling you that the first people were identical in their relation to time. They already moved forward while looking backward, which is, after all, most mysterious, most unnatural. And it shows you that these people knew that God was pregnant with them, that they were embryos, that there was something to be achieved. All people in antiquity, gentlemen, have this strange look, which the people were given by Orozco on their faces. They -- they are half in the Greek, what you call "primitive" is in this sense true, that these people do not live in the Christian era, and they have a veil before their eyes. They look backward while driven forward.

Now gentlemen, what I have described as the renaissance, the rebirth, as our own fate, seems the same. These -- we do not know where we are going, if we are just natural beings, today. We revive the primitives, as Mr. Freud does with his term "Oedipus complex." Oedipus is a mythical figure of Greece by and large to be chronologically placed 1200 B.C., you see, as the founder of Thebes, the city of Thebes. So there you have a typical attempt of modern times to be pre-Homeric. Now Mr. Freud doesn't know what he does, because all the people who go instinctively in our time do this, what I have described. The Christian can play with this. If you are fully aware of the difference between our era and the pre-Christian era, you can play with renaissances, without being swallowed up by them. If you do not, you have to do like Mr. Freud, or Mr. Marx, or Mr. Darwin, and you just, so to speak, disappear in your revival of the past, totally, without having your head out of water, which is the -- then, gentlemen, the identical arrangement between primordial man and you and me. If you divide the head and the heart, and look backward with your head, then your hopes are pinned on the staying of something with you which has been -- most of you do not know that hopes are always based on pictures, on images, on concepts of the past. You cannot hope of which you have no idea. And ideas are always based on experience, on pictures, on images which you have seen. "Idea" is what I have seen, which you do not know.

The hope, gentlemen, which you entertain is always based on something you have seen before or you have been told that it has existed before, on some rumor of a golden age. All your ideas, gentlemen, are full of pious hopes. You call it "wishful thinking." But you cannot wishfully think without taking something out of the past as a treasure and saying, "That's good. I like to have that." Money or a car. You hope that you -- one day you will have them. Well, why? How? Because you know what a car, and a health, and a road, and money can buy and can perform. Anything that's dealing, gentlemen, with the real, brief future, would not be called "hope." It would be called "faith." The heart of these people marching there in the -- in the Orozco fresco are full of faith, which is the opposite of hope. Faith means that nothing is in your head, but you believe that you must live through the ordeal, or the future. You don't know what's coming. Something utterly new. And you can't -- hope for it, because you have also to dread it. The faith, you see, overcomes the dread of the future. That's all. We trust that it's God's will, but that's all you can say.

Now this country, as you know, has -- is in complete confusion. It is a country without faith and full of hope. And you call it "faith." Most ministers in this country call hope "faith," and you all confuse both hope and faith. That's why this distinction between the renaissance head and the new heart is for you of the

utmost importance. If you want to escape the heresies of modern churches in this country, and you don't escape it by going to church, you have to dis- -- learn again that the Lord distinguished between faith and hope. He made it very clear that He -- asked for faith and not for hope, because the -- His world was coming to an end, and I may give you a secret, gentlemen. The word "hope" does not appear in the first three Gospels at all. It's an unknown word there, because Christ was not coming to bring hope to the world. Because the people always hope for some sausage, or some frankfurters, or some hamburgers which they have eaten already. They want to have it again. And obviously Christ starts a new life with something nobody understands, yet, what it -- how it -- what it will be like. You cannot bring anything new on hope. When -- when Christoph Columbus was sent out to -- by Queen Isabel to this country, he had to sell her hopes, and he had to sail on faith. And the faith has finally prevailed because this is a new continent, but the hope equipped the -- paid the money for the ships. You see the difference? Because they thought it would be Asia where they would come. That was hope. But his holding out against hope, as we say, you see, is belief, his faith. And you don't know this, gentlemen. To you, in this country, you cannot understand that faith and hope are opposites. Faith is a future cleansed from your clutterings of mind, and opinion, and ideas, and programs. You can be sure that the real history of the world will look very different from your programs, and fortunately so. What a tiresome world it would be if the things would happen which you opionate. Fortunately God is much more imaginative than we are. And so even your wife is not boring after 30 years, whereas if you -- or she would be all you hoped for, you would have nothing to live with after 10 years. You would know it all ahead of time. But your idea is so much that your hopes are good enough. That you really think that if you get your hopes fulfilled, then you could live. Gentlemen, then you would die from exhaustion. From {inanition}, from anemia. The great thing is if you live on faith, then you know that life is given us. But you think you have to make it. And that's too poor.

Life is much bigger than what you -- than is in your little brain, or my little brain. I told you that history is the content of the unpredicted things, of the miraculous things, isn't it? Remember? The unbelievable things, which you can only, by real faith, accept as part of the story. You see the German {digna}, I know so much of it because we had to learn a lesson. Why I am in this country, gentlemen. Because I accepted the German defeat in 1918. As you well know, the rest of the -- Germany did not accept this, and it had to go to the world war the second time because of its disbelief, its unbelief, because of its pious hopes, which you probably would have done, too. Or take the South, who took 70 years

to forego its hopes, and is now, you see, finally in the Eisenhower fold. That is, the -- war, the Civil War waged by the Republicans has been forgiven by the South. They have accepted, you see. They now believe. Before, they only bowed to necessity. See the difference?

Hitler, gentlemen, is the -- the idealistic approach to life. There has been a war; we have not lost it. We don't believe it. We won't believe it. We don't accept it. We hope still, you see, against hope, that this can be changed into victory. It's the same in this country. You went -- committed yourself to the fates of the -- destiny of -- man, and then comes home after the first world war and say, "It hasn't happened." We hope that we -- the war, you see, will have no consequences. And here we are in it, you see, up to our necks because we have thought we could, by pious hope, forego, you see, an act of faith, an act of acceptance, an act of belief that something had happened which we had not hoped for, our commit- -- you see, of being in. Nobody had hoped for it in this country, of course. But you must accept it as an act of faith.

Now, gentlemen, what -- what mediates between hope and faith, then, in the life of man is the third virtue, the cardinal virtue, which stands between hope and faith. And I'm not going to talk to you about this, because that's only in our era that we know that love has to mediate between hope and faith. The ancients didn't know this. The ancients were torn by -- between hope and faith, but they had these two virtues to the utmost extent. Whereas you have only one -- you only have hope. You have no faith. Nobody in this country at this moment has faith in the year 2200, at least not officially. If you read the editorials, they all think -- by that time there has been a third world war and the whole world has gone out in -- up in flames. Funny thing is today, you see, formerly only Christians believed in the end of the world. But today Christians are the only people who think that the -- world may still have a future, whereas all agnostics believe in the end of the world. All the atheists believe that it is all over. They are all nihilists, you see, that nothing can prevent the self-destruction of the human race. Because you are all basing your whole life on hopes. You don't believe in -- you have no faith. Faith means that this -- that what happens happens meaningfully, although you haven't been told -- told beforehand what is going to happen. One hasn't asked for your consent, and it's just the same, and even moreso meaningfully to -- meaningful to you. When your wife dies, or your parents die, it isn't that you didn't hope that they would live on, but you have to accept their death, have you not?

I just get -- got the {faire partie} of a young woman. She has three children and is pregnant. Her husband was in Russian captivity as a German officer, a

doctor for the last seven years. He returned in 1952, began to practice medicine again, and after one year and-a-half, he fell dead: the excitement, 44 years of age. Well, I had to comfort this young woman. The only thing you can invite her to is to accept on faith, which is intolerable in terms of hope. If she looks back on what she has decided, to marry this man, to have children with him, to wait for his return, to re-establish himself in a common household, to go and study with him once more, from one city in Germany to the other, all I have to say is you must be dis- -- desperate, you see. Spero, hope, desperate, non spero: I do not hope anymore, you see. This woman has no hope. She has to live up on -- on faith. Ten years later, she may say, "Although I was desperate, my faith has borne fruit." She cannot say this now. I can only invite her. And you can support such a person to have faith, but there's no hope. Absolutely no hope.

And you cannot tolerate a hopeless life, gentlemen. Go to Italy. There's a nation without hope, but in deep faith. You can learn something from the Italians. Nothing -- the individual -- Italian, or the group of Italy to hope for. They'll be as poor as they are now for the next hundred years. There will be no standard of living in Italy, isn't that true? But they have faith, and they are very splendid people. And I think they are -- cannot be hurt less than we can. Hopes, gentlemen, are easily destroyed, and then the person who has the hopes commits suicide. Faith cannot be destroyed that easily by disappointments from the outside.

In this then, gentlemen, we are identical with the ancient peoples. And since this is never said, it is terrible, and since in our departments of religion, and philosophy, and history, we have atheism rampant, nihilism. The only religious departments I can see in this college are physics and economy. Because there they believe -- at least economists believe in the business cycle. That's a wrong religion, but it's a religion. And the physicists believe in progress of science. And that's only possible if you believe in God. Progress is something that outlasts my own mortal existence, does it not? But in sociology, and in history, and in philosophy, and religion, it's just blind nihilism that is taught.

Therefore I have to tell you in this course, gentlemen, that man is equipped with these two great forces, hope and faith, compared to which his intelligence is a very minor matter. It's just a harlot, it's just a tool. If you have faith, you will live forward, despite your disappointment. If you have hope, you will let nothing die that once has been proved worthwhile. Now that's exactly what I'm doing at this moment, gentlemen. I'm speaking English, and I'm therefore hopeful that the once-created English language is still good enough for you and me. Every mathematician defies this. He has no hope that the primitive man did a good

thing when he created the beautiful word "faith," or "love," or "hope," or "onetwo-three," you see. He tries to get out of this language. He's timeless, anhistorical, the mathematician. He -- he tries to tell you and me that our language isn't good enough. I always feel the language is much better than you and I, which I -- we are privileged to speak. It is still waiting for resuscitation. And to me, gentlemen, this whole process of revival is also a process of reviving the terms, the language, the speech of the first people. I just try to speak as energetically and passionately as they used to speak. And you should learn this. I hope that I succeed, you see. And succeed in this real sense that we succeed as a succession into their power. Just by talking of them, we may also be clad again into their righteous mind.

So gentlemen, hope and faith we share. And this is the common share of all men. With regard to the third passion, the third power, that has alternated. People have tried to do without love. They had courage in this place. They had justice in its place. They had reason in its place. The American businessman had hope and reason. And this he calls Christianity.

That's not, I mean, as an American missionary in Egypt, whom you also know, remember, Mr. {Bedau}. He gave once a talk here. He was a -- is a -- was the president of the American University in Cairo, Egypt. He once gave a talk here on this campus which was very impressive. He said the American businessman is a Moslem. That's all his religion. It's very identical with what the Arabs believe. It's -- all the rest is lip service. But what he really believes is in -- is Kismet. I mean, he hopes, you see, that God has mercy on him, and He is reasonable. { }. { }.

Well, that's -- gentlemen, if you don't know that faith and hope are in balance in every historical generation, then you cannot understand your relation to the -- to primitive man. This is therefore the first thing. And now we turn to the funeral, gentlemen. The institution of the funeral produces this split into hope and faith, because the animals run away when they are going to die. No animal wants to be seen when it dies. All animals disappear in a corner. If you have a cat, or a dog, or a horse, or a cow, it doesn't matter -- or a deer, it goes when it feels that it must die, in a corner. And it tries not to be seen. The great discovery of the tribesman is that the moment of death is a moment to be watched. We call this "observes." When a man, you see, is observant, of a strict observance, this doesn't mean just that he's -- an observatory, as you well know. The original meaning of "observance" is that he pays attention to something outside of him, which to the mere animal is quite impossible. A mere animal is self-centered. To be observant means, you see, to subdue self-interest to an act in the outer world

which is more important. It isn't service first, gentlemen, what you are lacking. You have no reverence, because you have no observance. There is nothing that seems to take you out of your life and make it important that you watch what happens in another man's life. You do it when a Catholic today prays for the pope's health. That's -- he's observant of -- because this man's health is more important to him than his own health. Now that's just one form of -- today, this prayer for the pope, which were mentioned yesterday in the paper, I read -- for his health and recovery is a pale form of taking care of older life.

This is unnatural, gentlemen. It is natural, as you know from Mowgli's Jungle Book -- you still know Mowgli and The Jungle Book? Well, that the old wolf is killed, is he -- is it not? It is the discovery of humanity, but not for any sentimental reason, that anything that man has done before us must be observed. Now death is that moment in which observ- -- this observance is preeminent. If you do not take over at the moment of death, you see, something is allowed to die, which is not purely physical, some achievement of the previous generation. Therefore, gentlemen, all tribes gather the people around a dead man's -- a dying man's deathbed and try to elicit from him his last breath. There's very often the symbol that he really breathes his last breath on the children, that he puts his hands on their heads, that he blesses them. And that is the meaning of -- "bless," gentlemen. Communication of one's own spirit to those who must receive it, lest they perish. The word "blessing" today has gone the way of all flesh. And you think it is something {fleshery}. But it isn't. The word "blessing" means victory over death. If you say to a person, "God bless you," he -- you mean to say, "May God extract you from the bottomless pit." May He provide that you do not die this -- at this mo- -- very probable under natural circumstances, but that you make evince, conquer, breathe again, and overstep the next danger of death, which is always around us, any moment.

To these people then, gentlemen, uphold the bless thing of God came in the form of the dying man's blessing of his progeny, of his offspring, of his henchmen, of his horde, of his flock, or however you call the people who had been impressed by his cunning, and his courage, and his leadership. We must then suppose, gentlemen, that leadership in the third, this is the animal equipment of the human race. That we were like the chamois, or like the deer, or like the wolves, or the elephants, living in groups. The discovery of men's special task, which may have happened the very moment he appeared, we don't -- I don't know this -- was the decision that this leadership must not be -- vacated. That what this -- the leading -- leader had achieved has to be passed on. There you have the institution of funerals, the break with nature. However you figure this

out, in details -- I have my own special ideas about it, you may -- must take this -- this fact, which is against everything you have believed so far, that you will not understand history if you don't follow this. The funeral is an institution that has been once instituted, that is -- has -- is not a general thing. It is -- has been instituted at one moment in history.

There is now a physicist in Europe who has written a famous book in which he says, "There has been one first molecule." The electrons, once gathered historically in one molecule. That is, he has the same insight for the -- even the so-called dead nature. I assure you, gentlemen, that the history of the tribes is the history of man in the singular, creating something first. And all the tribes on earth have imitated this. There is one origin of man, because there is one -- this one stroke of genius. Genius is not wanton, as you have been told by the evolutionists. There isn't -- the reasons are not as plentiful as blackberries, gentlemen. Even Falstaff knew this. You believe this, that you will learn in your own life that not -- there will be a dearth of presidential candidates, you see. The whole idiocy of your theory is that anybody can become president. That has to do with your idea that anybody can make history, and anybody can have created human history in the past. Very scanty. I doubt that we will be very -- will have a very happy time to find any candidate. The Republican Party had Mr. Landon, had Mr. Wilkie, and had Mr. Dewey. I think we may all say that the country will be very happy that they were not elected, because they just were not presidential timbre. I have nothing personally against any of these men, you see. They were no presidential timbre. And Mr. Truman wasn't. And so we have four presidential candidates in the last 20 years, because there was no better. Now we have a man of presidential timbre. But gentlemen, how difficult to find him. It took a world war to produce him. Otherwise he would be now a brigadier general. It's an expensive democracy in which you have -- have a world war before you can have a presidential candidate. That's all against your upbringing. You think that out of the 155 million Americans, anybody could become president, you see. And I tell you that the old tribes and we today again are faced with the terror of dearth of candidacies. There are very few people in any one moment who can do what is needed. In this college, too. In your class of '55 and '56, too. But you rely on everybody else, and you always say somebody else shall do it, so nobody does it. That's the result of a democracy in which everybody believes that everybody is as good as everybody else. So nobody is any good. That's the result. You must always assume, gentlemen, that this which has to be done, in a moment of vital significance, this equilibrium between faith and hope -- because that's what it is -- how much newness, how much memory, you see. This is so delicate that very few people can do it. You see it very clearly in a case like

Mayor Wagner, who is no man in his own right. But if you want to get the machine of New York, which is the past of New York, you see, the Democratic Party and the necessity of some town -- city government in the future at all, you had to elect the son of the old Senator Wagner, because there was otherwise no compromise possible, and so he was elected. Not on his personal merits, because in him the two lines of faith and hope could meet. Who is from New York? Don't you -- understand that this was the whole problem of the election this time? To find the enough of hope that the Democratic tradition could be, you see, preserved and enough of faith that there should be really a new start. And he did just exactly this and it's a very impersonal thing, you see. He didn't -- doesn't do it because he's personally important, you see. But because he lies in this middle between faith and hope. Can you see this?

You will understand politics, gentlemen, only when you see this -- the Republican Party couldn't elect Mr. Taft. That would have just been hope of a return to normalcy. It had to elect Eisenhower because there was a combination of faith and hope, you see. Something new, some real -- realism with regard to the last 20 years which after all had made this man, this -- man Eisenhower. Who was he before? And the Republicans? Nobody. So in making him the candidate, the Republican Party pledged itself to have -- to recognize the last 20 years, but since he had been a military man, they did not pledge -- themselves to recognize any one special form of the last 20 years, you see. And so they got out from under any identification with the faith of the New Deal, you see, and yet they gave some credit to the necessary faith in a free future, and promising all the Republican, you see, electorate the fulfillment of their pious hopes of 1913. And that's the problem of politics: the fitting, you see, of the past and the future.

Now you see "funeral" is just what it does. The funeral says the past is not the past. The bliss -- bliss has to be upon us. We have to look at the old man's achievements. It's very primitive, gentlemen, but that's how life has begun on this planet. It's this very primitive form that the living generation looks backward and says, "We won't fall behind the achievements of the old leader." Of course then comes something new, you see, and that's the discovery of the spirit, gentlemen. The spirit is the discovery that faith and hope have to be equated. That is, in looking backward, I look at certain specific things the old leader used to do. He used to put out watches at this corner of the pasture and this corner of the woodland, you see, for the hunting ground, and keep out others, or watch the animals. Well, this has to be repeated, you see. But they may have to migrate, and the weather may break, and this may be a very cold season, and they may have to establish fires where they never had established fire. Take a very primitive situation. You may go camping, you see. There's a blizzard. You would have

to do something unexpected, which is not in the rules. In this moment, you have to have faith, you see. You have to establish a new authority. Well, the spirit, gentlemen, is the unity between faith and hope. That is, that these people -- why do they have the blessing of the old man on their faces, you see -- still will -- are willing to agree -- to have come to an agreement in his name to the next -- for the next measure? And that the next measure, although never done by the old man, will still be acclaimed as being done in the same spirit, in his spirit. And here we discover the great meaning of the word "in the name."

When people in history speak in the name of Jesus Christ, or in the name of the American government, or in the name of philosophy, or in the name of science, or in the name of medical art, what do they say, gentlemen? They say that this, what they have to do now, and that which has been done before, are of the same vintage, of the same devotion, of the same righteousness, of the same authority. That therefore, gentlemen, the name of the old man and a funeral had to survive in order to allow these people to have faith in the future. The blessing of the old man and the turning of your face towards the past in the tribe, in the family today, in the clan, and your listening to the invocation of his name when somebody proposes something new is the same act of life, so to speak. It is -- one is done for the same purpose as the other. And this you may -- you see, the worst sentence spoken in church today is always "in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit." People don't understand that. They think that's one -- it is usually a formula.

Gentlemen, the most important part of the whole service -- the whole sermon you can do without. Sermons are quite unimportant. They are just elucidations of what's there already. If you would understand the liturgy, you wouldn't have to hear any sermon. In the Catholic church, the sermon is usually a very bastardized affair. But the worship, gentlemen, in the same spirit, is absolutely essential. Because you must be able to recognize what has done yesterday, what you are accustomed to do today, and what has to be newly introduced tomorrow as being in some form of unity, of having some relation to each other, you see. Before, you are not human beings. Most of you are not human beings. You are all playboys. You only are human beings when you understand the formula, "in the name." You are arrested in the name of the law. You know what that means? When you -- when the law was made, nobody knew you had to be arrested. But there is a new case. And the -- the representative of the law tells you that he's convinced that when the law was made, you see, and when he now stands there, there's no difference -- distinction of time. That this is one time, one age, one era, one and the same moment, one and the same situation. So he invokes "in the name of the law." You always hear, "This is a country under law," and not by

men, you see. "Government by law." What does this mean? That there is a way of keeping the past in front of us and still being ahead of the criminal. A law once passed is still valid when a new man commits a new murder, is it not? Well, that's very miraculous. The laws against murder were passed in the days of Cain and Abel. And this is still valid.

Yesterday in New York, you understand, there were three men shot in a Cadillac. Every one of them had a Cadillac. I wonder. And they all seemed to be very much deserving of being eliminated from human society -- from the -- according to what they said in the papers at least. But obviously the police went into action, because they were quite sure that in the name of the law, something had to be done.

So gentlemen, if you want to understand the greatness of names again, you will begin -- have to learn that the name is conqueror of death. In a political sense. Not the man who dies is saved, not the people who live today are saved by the name. The continuity is saved. The unity of purpose, the unity of intent, the plan of creation that the people who act today and yesterday and the day before yesterday are carrying out one great purpose. The name is nothing by name, gentlemen. It doesn't mean that we honor a hero in -- for -- vanity's sake as a -- build him a big monument. If you read Shakespeare's Sonnets, you will find that he said the only way in which -- in which we unify the earth is by speech, that brass and marble do not build continuity, you see. But by saying, "in the name of the old man" we can invoke in everybody else this willingness to continue, to carry on. "In the name" is therefore always said by the middle group, the middle generation, by trying to bring the past into the future.

We'll see that -- how in Christianity this has been very much complicated. In the tribe, it simply means the old man -- must be with us. It means the turning toward the past in an exaggerated manner. Everything in the future, gentlemen, which people have to do is declared to be the same as what has -- done before. Always the same, so to speak. Every exception therefore, gentlemen, in the -- in the old tribe is considered something to be redeemed. To be remedied. And that's the origin, as we shall see, after the -- after a short intermission, that is called -- the reason for the sacrifice of the ancients. You could -- had to pay for every exception from the rule, for every deviation from tradition.

Let's have a break.

[tape interruption]

Most people however begin with their little momentary will, and their opinions, and not with what they hope, and what they dread, or what they have faith in. And so you must understand that the story which we speak is very different from what you think your own story is. What is in the papers, gentlemen, is not the story of hope and fear. That's the story of intent, and of failure in the sense of the world. That's what they -- people call "worldly" or { }. The real story of mankind has always been a religious story between one's own hopes of that -- that which is ful- -- already done, can be preserved, can be expanded, perhaps, and that, something that is lacking will be created, despite our lack of creativity. In 1939, there was in the city of New York an exhibition called Futurama. Has anybody still -- no, you are too -- way too young. Did anybody go there? Well, that was sheer hope, you see. It was terrible. They tried to preserve everything, you see, that -- and extend everything that didn't deserve to be preserved. Only to show you that technical hope in itself, today, is a very mediocre hope. It is just hope in -- in standards of living and refrigerators. The final issue was, with the Futurama, that the cars would drive in three stories instead of one, you see. We were -- the streets -- cities all would live in three stories so that they could spit into your bed in the third floor, just as much as --.

[laughter]

You understand, that's hope, but not faith, because -- what of it? That's not very interesting that you think more cars. One highway is not enough. Three highways. Gentlemen, hope is always -- can always -- been expressed by quantity. You can say "more" of something. Faith can never be expressed by quantity, because it's a new quality that doesn't exist, yet.

So man is, from the very beginning then, gentlemen, united with this purpose. Nothing ever created, gentlemen, in the spirit of the Lord has been -- can be abandoned. Speech cannot be abandoned. Funerals cannot be abandoned. Christianity cannot be abandoned. There are -- Jews today as there were for -- 3,500 years ago. Isn't that very strange? We cannot abandon anything once really created. Because part of our humanity is connected with this by hope. Hope then, gentlemen, is the recognition that people before us must be kept alive in their achievement. Will you take down this definition? It's quite a good one. Hope is the recognition that an achievement, you see, already done can be kept alive, or can be revived, you see, because hope means we have a concept of something. We understand it, or we know what it is, you see. And we think it may come to pass again.

This good woman who lost her husband cannot have hope now to marry a

second husband. Thereby she would jettison her -- you see, her love for this husband. You cannot believe in second, third marriages the moment when a man dies. But she can have faith that her hope can be revived one day. That's a very different story, you see. She can overcome her despair by simply going on living, you see, and allowing this reservoir of hope to be filled again, which is now dried. That's faith. Life is much -- in a widow, you can study all problems of history -- catastrophes of humanity, because in a woman's life when her husband dies, you have the same as when a country is defeated. Something comes to an end, you see, at this moment there is nothing to hope for, but you can -- may have faith at one time there is a chance to revive. Think of the Poles. You saw in Life this article of this Polish man {Korovski}, perhaps. There is nothing to hope for in Poland now, you see. But you may have faith as a Pole that one day you may have hopes again. You can't have any hopes at this moment.

So gentlemen, now the practical question: the people believed in the old days that the children of the living generation could even better bring back the spirit of the ancestor. That's why the grandson always ca- -- received -- in many cases received the name of the grandfather. Also I told you already in some tribes in Africa the father becomes the name of the son, with the addition, "his father." Which also means, you see, that the son re-embodiment the spirit of the bygone past, you see, gives the living generation the certainty of being in the right order. And I told you at the end of the -- moment before, that anything that really deviates from the -- hopes of the past in the tribe has to be redeemed, has to be bought off by sacrifice. Sacrifice is the necessity for the tribe, and we find therefore no human group -- which for you is hard to understand -- because sacrifice is abolished in America officially. There are no sacrifices. Everybody does as he pleases. And everybody is to be made happy. Sacrifice is just not a part of reality here. Is this -- foolishness to you, sacrifice.

Gentlemen, in the tribe, it is the constitution. The constitution reads: "Anything that is not identical with the spirit of the ancestor has to be expiated by sacrifice." You know the word "piety." That means to be at peace with the spirit of the old man. "Pious" always means to be reconciled to your father, and your ancestors. "To expiate" means to restore this piety when it has been violated. Now "to expiate" is perhaps the best word to describe to you the relation of the tribe to -- into the future. They have the desperate hope that anything that does deviate -- if you have here the run of tradition -- that anything on which the eyes from the totem pole set, and of which they would disapprove, that this by expiation can be straightened out. And there comes -- is the origin of the word "right." "To righten the path of my people," as the Bible says, to straighten again the crooked path, from the past into the future, that is the essence of expiation.

"Straighten" and "right" means, you see, continuation. This is right, and is better for you to speak of right and wrong, instead of speaking of law. Law is a very difficult for -- thing for you to understand. But it's simpler if you really actually see that these very primitive people knew what to -- mean by "right." It means a visible continuation of the past so far traveled. Expiation must straighten out the wrong.

Now gentlemen, we get a very interesting figure. The past is designed or -- consecrated by the tomb, the grave of the hero, of the ancestor, and it is -- distinguished when the totem -- the tomb cannot be carried with you when you have to move, migrating -- by the totem pole. The totem pole, as we said, is the list of tombs made available. You remember? At the front every tribe has an altar, an altar, because that is the means of keeping the road straight. On the altar, the sacrifices are sent up so that the spirits may be reconciled and may accept this as a payoff for any deviation from their rule, from their way of life. The word "way of life" is very, very strict connection -- contact with -- of course with "right." You see, a way of life can be crooked, or can be right.

So gentlemen, we have two things for the tribe which we now de- -- still find in every tribe. The problem of the grave is the problem of hope towards the past, the recognition that something of the past has to be remembered. And that is the name of the ancestor, because you can only have peace among the living in his name. The second thing, opposing the tomb, is the altar. Because at the altar, all crooked things have to be straightened out again.

So we can say, gentlemen, that in the tribes, the future is only reached through sacrifice. Because it is the way of reconciling the inevitable change, you see, with the past. The tribe has great difficulty of recognizing change as legitimate. By sacrifice, the tribe pays the penalty for having to change. Because there is no way out. People have to change as time goes on.

Gentlemen, there are two other things -- two other situations in which every tribe is steeped. One we have already mentioned. That is the warpath. Against the world outside, the tribe keeps its unity by arming to the teeth. By holding off any deviation, any -- any group that says, "We have a better ancestor. We have our own history." It keeps its own history straight. It keeps to itself. It keeps its identity. War, gentlemen, is something never concerned with individuals. War is not killing. The fifth commandment in the Bible, "Thou shall not kill," has nothing to say about war. That's one of your mistakes. War is the sacrifice of my own life in order to keep the way of life straight. Because the way of life is bigger than you and me. Everybody knows this, gentlemen, who dons a uniform, that he

doesn't murder a northern -- China -- Korean when he shoots him. He's willing to fight for his country. That's something very different. And this country is a set of rules, is a set of traditions, from time immemorial, in which he has received the revelation of the spirit. And when you don the uniform, you are not interesting, and your enemy is not interesting. But it interesting is that one is fighting for the United States and the other is fighting for North Korea. That's very interesting. Because that's why you are there. And the two represent a set of revealed ways of life. And the ways of life, gentlemen, are bigger than any one generation. Because every generation has to enter upon this way of life to continue what has been started. You can't get away from it. Because otherwise we can't con- -- do anything human. And this is then the warpath, gentlemen. On the warpath, the living generation is willing to keep its own path so straight that it itself is sacrificed. That it is the living victim of this conflict of his tradition with inimical traditions.

Inside the tribe, gentlemen, we said already there is only one way of producing unity and cohesion: the meeting in one place. The tribal meeting place. You can also call it the dancing green. Because in this tribal -- at this tribal meeting, the spirit of the ancestor has to be imparted to a frenzied chorus. The tribal meeting is at a high pitch. The festivals, gentlemen, and the tribal meeting are identical. Political life in any community, gentlemen, must distinguish between weekday and holy day. Take this down, gentlemen. You don't know this again. The meeting is extra-ordinary. The weekday is ordinary. Everyday life, gentlemen, is inept politically. You are very nice in your -- on your weekdays, but you have to have an election campaign to get a little bit intoxicated, to get anything done at all. In these three months of an election campaign, you can get a little of the air -- that was inspiring the tribal meeting. Or at the religious revival, you can get the same spirit. It's extra-ordinary. What is extra-ordinary, gentlemen? What is so extra-ordinary about any tribal meeting? Well, you know people danced. People had their hashish, their soma, their beer, their ale. Every tribe had its own way of getting drunk. Wine, beer, vodka. All -- every political community we know of had its own special {spirited} liquor, spirits, you see, to impart to the tribal members the right spirit. That's not accidental, gentlemen. In the liquor business, you have the imitation of political necessity. That's why it is so immoral to drink alone, and why it is so moral to drink together. Any other country except America knows this and has to be told. But you are -- perhaps have to be told that it is immoral to get drunk by yourself, whereas it is highly fashionable to get drunk together, and rightly so. Because drinking is only supporting, strengthening the sublimation which comes from the fact, gentlemen, that in the tribe, the spirit makes the -- in every member participate in {spirit}. In the tribe, no living man speaks himself, but they all sing together.

On this we have to stop. A little more the next time. Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Student introduction: Philosophy 58, March 4, 1954)

I have been asked a question about faith the other day. Who was -- they asked the question? I asked him to bring it up now. Is he not here? What was the question?

(I don't think I can remember.)

Well, obviously it's not very important then to ask. But you know, I thought it was an important question. You see how little a man owns one -- his own spirit. You see, at that moment, you had some inspiration, but you expired.

I want to -- before going back to the tribe, I want to bring in two things. One is the question of faith and hope. As I told you, it's the most difficult for you to understand. And the other one is the relation to history. You are very impatient. Anybody who has no -- not faith is impatient. History gives you endless time. Gentlemen, you should at -- not rush now and say, "Now I want to have the whole history in this course." If you really had understanding of what history can do to you, you would say, "Go on." Any good narrator is asked to procrastinate and to make the story longer. If I only would win you over to this great experience, gentlemen, that a story can never be long enough. That's its essence. Has anybody been in 9? You remember the epic, as the way of life in which we try to make it longer? That's why all words of the past in many languages are reduplicated, to express this longing for being longer. Memory, instead of "mory," you see, "memory" is the duplication of the root of m-r. And does anybody know Latin? Well, you may then remember memini, you see, from {reminiscere}, and pepuli, from pellere, that is the formation of the -- of the past tense in the ancient languages is very clever. They simply -- reduplication. Because we express the past by saying it is longer. We express the future by saying it is a second -- a split-second. Because the future comes in by one act of decision. And the past stretches out endlessly. Now gentlemen, if you can feel that in the whole -- past the story is exactly your own life story, then you begin to get that benefit from history on which I am going to read you now a strange quotation.

It's strange, because you -- we certainly do not turn for authority to a Muslim of the year 1000. In the midst of the Dark Ages, as you like to call these times -- those time -- days, which were very bright indeed, an old Muslim, {Al-Masoudi}, born in Baghdad and lived in Spain -- living in Spain, wrote this on history:

"History captures the ear of the wise and of the ignorant of this. The simple and the intelligent are enchanted by its reports, and ask for them. History brings together all classes of themes. Its superiority over any other type of knowledge is evident. And all the minds concede their supremacy -- its supremacy ..."

... except American minds. You believe that physics is superior to history. Gentlemen, physics is dust, dealing with dirt. It's the most indifferent thing. History: it makes us into human beings. We'll come to this, I mean.

"... with reason. The wise say that the -- most secure friend is a book of history. It offers you at the same time the beginning and the end, little and much. It unites the foreign -- the far- distant one and that which is right around us. It joins the past to the present. It combines the most diverse forms and the most distinct species. It is the dead who speaks to you in the name of the dead, and it is accessible to you in the language of the living. It is a person that -- it is intimate with that -- intimate friend which gets gay when you are gay, and which sleeps with your dreams, and which only tells you that which you taste -- like to taste."

This was the relation of all people, you see, to history. You are spoiled because you read historical novels instead. All the King's Men, and Gone With the Wind. Gentlemen, you ruin your taste for history by these books. They are scandalous. And yet you are such rhinoceroses to read books which are made for money, written for money, as the author even is impertinent enough to tell you -- that is the limit. I have never understood how a man can sell a copy of a book of which he is boasting that it is a best-seller. Because he tells you that he did it for money. How can anything be good -- of the spirit -- what is done for money? It must corrupt you. It must lie to you, because it wants to flatter you. You want -- you are made to buy it now. Of course, everything goes. If you are meant to buy it, you know what they play on Broadway. All the silly stuff for which you are willing to pay money. You are willing to pay money when you see a -- a girl décolleté, so they have the girl décolleté. Et cetera, et cetera. But that you should not feel, gentlemen, that anything in -- of the printed word which brings in money is thereby condemned. It's worthless. Later on, Shakespeare today may make money in the theater, but not in his own day. Most of his plays couldn't even be played in the theaters, as you know. He didn't -- he was -- seven years dead when the Folio appeared. All his Quartos were printed without any copyright. He didn't get a -- get a cent for it. That's why he's the greatest poet of his age.

Your idea that poetry, writing, history, anything worthwhile in knowledge is something that can pay, condemns you, you see. That's why in this country there is no spiritual life, because you have degraded the spiritual life to a paying proposition. So what you get is what pays. That's not -- nothing worthwhile. That's the shabby situation of the modern literature in this country. There is no literature, because it is commercialized. But you, gentlemen, in this college, in this time of your life -- you should develop a strong sense of the incorruptible. You should never buy anything because it is a best-seller, because thereby it stands condemned. Does Homer make money? Five thousand years or 3,000 years after he wrote his poem, we now, you see -- other people make the money. That's always the proof of {genius}, when somebody else makes the money. I mean, you know this in the family. What is -- what is important? Their volunteering. What's it mat- -- true in marriage? When you make a sacrifice for the person you love. And you don't think that's the same in -- with genius? That must be given for nothing, freely. And you have a church in which the people get 15 percent from the undertaker -- the ministers -- and you have a literature in which people -- the author boasts that he can make people buy all his stuff. And that's accordingly what you -- and gentlemen, every historical novel you should be ashamed of touching. Because this man says that he abuses history for his commercial purposes. It's bad enough that the romanticists, like Walter Scott, transfigured history, you see, and they discovered the historical novel as you see. But there was an excuse, he really was in love. By the way, Mr. Scott, as you know, wanted also to get very, very rich, so he lost it all in the process. And that's the limit, even of Walter Scott's novels. But you read genuine history { } history. You don't read real history. There are great historical books, in every language, in every literature, about every period. But when you read Mr. Parkman's Oregon Trail, you know that's an historical book. Or Prescott. That's -- or Bancroft. These are real people who -- stuck their neck out, and wanted to achieve something, wanted to restore the memory of the human race. So out go these fiction stories. Anybody, gentlemen, who in this time and age reads fiction and -- then says he's reading, gentlemen, I tell him he's drugging himself. It's a drug, these books which you read. Has nothing to do with food. It should come under the -- how do you call it, the law -- the bill -- the food? [unintelligible]

Yes. They should write on the outside, you see, "90 percent chaff and 10

percent drug."

This is the importance, gentlemen, of this course, that you develop a taste for the really stunning truth. The truth is much more -- obviously much more imaginative, much more interesting than every -- anything these ladies can -- can write on the obscenities of the ages.

This is the question, then, gentlemen. Faith in history: what does it to you? And why is faith in history, in the truth of the historian necessary to develop our own faith? There is a relation, I think, between the illness of your faith and the lack of your writing -- reading either the Bible or any historical book and instead of having these cheap, historical trash pieces. They cannot give you faith, you see. They are written to flatter your hopes. They are projecting your hope for some obscene off-color story or your hope for getting something tricky, or something detective-like, or some mystery story into history. They don't -- exalt your faith, because they flatter your hopes. What then is faith? It is something very simple, gentlemen, but you don't know it. It's something in your -- our physical construction. The difference between hope, faith, and love is localized in different organs of our body. And I'm going to speak on this for a few minutes, before going on with the story itself, because I think you should know that this is nothing abstract, as you are accustomed to think, but is something very -- material.

The spirit is material, gentlemen. It is that which connects you and me with the dead and with the future generations. And that's just as material as -- that we are here connected by the same amount of air we can inhale and take out of this room. Aren't we together physically? You wouldn't deny this. This is the material form of existence. That's why history has to be told to convince you people that I believe that I'm physically united with the people of the past. I'm breathing the same spirit still which they breathed. How is this done? Gentlemen, when you hope, you fix your eyes -- either the externals or the internals -- on something. If you -- go into a river and you swim, you want to see where you -- try to come out. Or when you go on a road, you wish to have some signpost; that makes you feel hopeful. You can't miss it. Hope is always the result of our being able to see something. To see something. Therefore hope is given us by sight. Ideas are such inner sights. Always hope is our pinning our hopes on something to be seen. Very soon, we'll see the light of the city, so we come out of the woods. That's hope.

Gentlemen, faith is located not in the eye. Faith is located as you -- everyone knows when you ask what happens to you when you have no faith, in quite

another organ. What happens when you have no faith? What do you feel? What's now the prevalent notion of the American psyche, in psychoanalysis, and psychology? What does everybody feel?

[unintelligible]

Wie?

[unintelligible]

Nausea? No. Why do you go to the psychoanalyst? Because you feel here, what?

[unintelligible]

Anguish. Anguish. Anguish. Gentlemen, when you have nothing to see, you have -- you have no hope. You have fear. Fear is always that a certain object is objectionable. That is, hope and fear are related, and they both are related to what we think we see, or what we fear to see. But faith is connected with anxiety. So we live in the age of anxiety. Didn't Mr. Auden say that? Well, he could also have said we live in the age of faithlessness. "Anxiety," and "anxious" and "anguish" comes from "narrow." The throat cannot expand. We don't get air. Anybody who feels anguish cannot breathe. He cannot breathe. He who has fear closes his eyes, because he is afraid. But he who has anguish cannot breathe. He has no spirit. Faith makes the throat -- what? Very simple, very physical. Nothing philosophical, gentlemen. Nothing abstract, nor religious. Christianity is a very material belief in the incarnation of the spirit. And the spirit incarnates in you and me when you can take a deep breath. When you are -- have anguish, you can't. You're so tight, as you know, that you have to -- the first thing you have to say to a faithless person: "relax," because he can't breathe.

So let's put in here "fear" and "anxiety." That's the question of the throat. If you go down into the system, you come to the heart. Obviously you get love and hate. The heart loves or hates.

For all these movements, from heart, throat, and eye, or the senses and the pulmonary system, and the { } -- aspirational system, you receive -- we receive our directive forces from our desires: from our stomach, from our kidneys, and from our genital system. And that's a very profound secret; the harmony between the upper parts and the lower parts of our body. And you can -- also say, gentlemen, that when any one -- faith, hope, and love -- of the upper parts are in

harmony with the dictates of hunger, of love, and of thirst, that in those three cases -- this is perhaps not everything, but the passions tell us -- there is an equilibrium -- an equilibrium between our being in need of food, or needing of thirst, or needing of sexual satisfaction, and our willingness to offer the necessary price for this -- for the peace of the race. It has been said, gentlemen, that love is desire and sacrifice in equilibrium. Perhaps you take this down. It's a very important statement by a great Italian. Love is always desire and sacrifice in equilibrium. That's why I do not believe in platonic love. That's nonsense. Love is always desire. And platonic love says, "I don't desire." That's why I don't believe in platonism. Anybody who loves -- if he is a full-blooded animal, he wants -- he desires, but he also is willing, you see, to compensate by sacrifice. Otherwise he's a brute. If you only try to love with your lower part, you can't love. That's just desire. That's not very interesting. That's the Kinsey Report. And that is not -- only half of the story. It is the lower part. It must be there. For heaven's sake. It's very encouraging to hear from Mr. Kinsey how -- how potent we all are. But that's an endowment. You see, it's nothing of the execution.

The same is true about our faith and anguish, gentlemen. Faith is inspiration and expiration in equilibrium. Whereas mere anxiety is expiration. You expire from fear, from cowardice, from depression, from melancholia. You won't breathe anymore.

What we call "inspired," gentlemen, is always a victory of inspiration over expiration. And what the word suffers today from is the idea that, with regard to the life of the whole race, the spirit is always one of "exhale." Look at all these books -- Spengler and Toynbee -- and what you -- are made to admire today as having something to do with history. Gentlemen, they just spit out the vomit, the history of the past. They are all on the dunghill, the dungheap, the histories of the past: 23 civilizations, or six or seven. I don't know why -- why they have such numbers -- it makes no difference, they're all dead. Of course, they aren't dead. But the people who have written them up, have written them down. That is, they have expired -- made them expire. They are have no länger -- no longer made them breathe, what we -- what I told Collins here last time, you see, that he said "merely." "Merely" is expiration. And admiration is inspiration. Whenever you can admire something, you see, it makes you take a deep breath. And whenever you say "Hmph! Hmph! I don't care. The {end}," you allow it to die. We all at every moment, gentlemen, kill and call into life. Have you ever thought how strange it is that we say, "Something is called into life -- called back into life"? We call it back into life, because to use our throat means to form something, a deep breath by which this is again within the wind, within the

waves of the air that shake the rafters of the theater, or fill the lines of the editorials, or the pulpits, and the echoes, and the resounding walls of a church. Do you -- know how Christ is kept alive? By the foolishness of preaching. Do you think He lives on Mars, or on Mercury, or on Venus? You know He doesn't. You know very well that He does not live except on -- in the mouth of His followers. That's how He lives. And that's why He has been resuscitated from the dead. Because we have, and we should resuscitate Him all the time, and as much as you do, you are in the universal history of the human race. And in no other. You can kill Him. Christ is killed not by the Jews once, but by all of you every day, because you don't carry -- you make Him the name above all names. Do you? I've never heard you say that, except in some organized church service. If you would say it to someone else in your life at a -- dangerous moment, you would bring Him to life. Who -- who of you can say that? You go to these dead church services, where it's just repetition, but if you would bring Him into play where it matters, you could cure men from anguish. It never dawns on you that you should. That's why all the atheists today are better Christians than the Christians. Because you have { } Him somewhere where it doesn't -- doesn't -- He doesn't make your throat {large}. If He doesn't do this, gentlemen, He is not alive. I accuse you all that you repeat dead words to -- to protest that Christus -- Christ has risen. He has not risen with you, as long as you haven't once dilated your throat in such a way that He could come through with it, as an act of faith. Before He -- there is no experience of faith in you. All your ancestors knew this. You couldn't join a church in New England or in America, if you didn't give proof of such -- such experience, as you know. That people called "to get religion." Today "to get religion" means to pay the taxes for the church. Because you have commercialized the Church just as much as you have -- commercialized history. And that's always the same thing, gentlemen. People who lead -- read church fiction -- fiction they must read The Robe instead of praying to God. And these scandalous books, -- The Apostle, by -- what's the man's name? -- and all this stuff which you read. The Robe is just the greatest accusation against a living congregation -- I know of. It's a fiction, but poor fiction, instead of an act of faith. You know The Robe? Who has read it? Repent! Such {sick stuff}.

It's the only way people can sell you religion today. That's why The Robe is written. It's sugar-coating. It has nothing to do with the -- with the problem that Christ is alive today and waits for the universal history of mankind to come true. So gentlemen, the heart, the throat, and the eye in our own existence are very real. But they can be made subservient to something that is not concerned with

the short life of 70 years. These same organs, why shouldn't they be made subservient to the tree of life, and its life? The heart, gentlemen, is a branch of the one great tree of life. Your heart is given you here into this body as a -- how would you call it? A scion? Or I don't know -- a part of the whole tree of life. You cannot come to life unless you have a heart. And this heart isn't yours. This heart is simply a branch office of the big tree of life. If you look into the embryonic history of how you are born, the heart is a branch of the great tree of life. Very carnal, very much in the flesh. But yet not yours. Not yours. The heart tells you -- that's why you have the tremor of the heart when the connection of your heart with the rest of the universe is not in order.

So the same is true about throat -- the throat, gentlemen, the throat is that pump which allows you to take air. Well, isn't the air common to all? The fishes, and the birds, and the animals, and man? And do you really think that your pump is only there to feed you? No. It's installed in you, yes, like the heart, but only so that you produce the necessary transmission of these floods of air, of spirit from generation to generation.

That is, gentlemen, every one of us carries a much heavier load than he -- cares to admit. The eye is not given you for what you see. The throat is not given you for what you breathe. The heart is not give you for what you like. But obviously, these three organs, because we are human beings, are given us to be -- to serve to the fulfillment of the existence of the race. We are all, gentlemen, specimens, and not individuals. If you analyze the word "specimen," it means "representative of the species." You are representing the whole species at this very moment. That is, your life expectation expands from the first human being to the last. Every one of you carries life everlasting inside himself. And in order to prove it, the Church came along and said -- and the Buddhist monks came along, and the Aztec, and said, "You don't have to propagate physically by the lower organs only, have children. The spirit connects you just as much with the very first moment of creation, and the very last moment of history," you see. That's a great act of faith of the -- of the Christian spirit to say, "The spirit can also -- finally make people marry and beget children, but you have thought that you only reach posterity when you have children, of the flesh." That's not true. By breathing, by loving, and by hoping, we comprehend all times. Now, gentlemen, therefore, history makes -- gives you the great pleasure to become a cell of the great man. History combats that which you think is very spirited, and which is the greatest, I think, evil in thought which has befallen this country, to call man a microcosmos. Man is not a microcosmos. That's utter

nonsense. { }. But you are a microanthropos. And the only real man is the macroanthropos, the whole human race. Humanity certainly is more real than you and I. The partner of the creator is the creature man. And that comprises you and me and ev- -- all the generations of all times.

And the whole problem of history, gentlemen, is to make you understand that the whole race has a life story. And when I tell you a story about the tribes it doesn't make sense if you think somebody else experienced it. You must come to experience the story as though you would have done the same at that moment. That's history. History makes us feel that we would have done this, or we would have wished we could have done it in their place. Or we would say to them, you talk of a devil, "No, I would not have done this, in this moment." This is a story. And it is not history, gentlemen, that -- the difference between a story and a history. History is only that of which you can realize and experience that it was your problem at the time, and that obviously you were present when this happened. When the first tribesmen buried their dead, you must feel that this was a question -- is a question put to you. Would you have done it? Would you have entered this whole march of history? Well, every isolationist in America is asked this today. Do you stick to the dead of the two world wars, or don't you? Do you bury your dead? If you do, you cannot go isolationist, you see. If you don't bury the dead, but say they -- they just died in a corner, you go on from there as though nothing had happened. That's what the people did after the first world war. They did not bury their dead. That is, they didn't stay -- stand by their achievements. Isn't that true?

So perhaps you see now, gentlemen, this very act of a funeral, of the first day of creation, is your question today with regard to the two world wars. And obviously there's a great inclination on your part not to bury your dead, as I told you about these two -- chaplains who didn't bury their dead. Called themselves ministers of the Gospel. They were neither ministers, nor did they know what the Gospel was. They were paid chaplains by the United States Army. For ice cream and soda.

So in every one minute, gentlemen, history asks this question: would you have done the same? Or why wouldn't you? And therefore you become one man through all times. There is no history unless you believe that all men are one. Instead you believe, however, in this cheap "brotherhood of man." I recommend to you to believe in the father- and sonhood of men. Because in the experience of father and son being one, you can experience that ancestors and great-grand-children are one. Every one of us has an instinctive inclination to speak of the founding fathers. Because if you say honorably, "The founding fathers did this

and this" in the Constitution, at that very moment you bring together your little generation and the other generation and make them into one. By founding fathers, you bow to them as their son, as their heir, as their promoter, as their continuator, you see. As their successor. And they become your predecessors. And that's history. If you can't call George Washington your founding father, you haven't yet been able to understand history. When Mr. Charles Beard wrote the debunking history of America, he tried to abolish American history. Because he said we have a better history than the American history. The American history is just a capitalistic hoax. Have you seen the book? Who has read Charles Beard? Very strange man, he is. I think it's all Mrs. Beard. I think she resented the term "founding fathers." Most American women do.

And so if you want to beat down the women of America, flatter them by writing a book on the founding mothers.

Now I'm quite serious. That's why this whole problem I think is very practical. Let's go back now to our ancestral spirits, gentlemen. I've tried to tell you two different things to enlighten the problem of the spirit of old. The ancients, who -- for the first time spoke of spirit, never mind -- meant anything more intricate than breathing together. To have spirit means to breathe together with other people. It is something absolutely physical, material. But it is, of course, something bigger than you and I left alone, you see. When you are inspired, or when the spirit moves you, then the dead are present, and the future generations are present. And your throat is moving as a pump for bringing air into the chambers of life of this great tree of life, which certainly has many seasons, and which must have its sap pulsating in the generation of ours, which is our spring, and the next generation, when another spring must re-live in the same tree. And since we are only seasonable creatures, the problem that our pumpwork must expedite the sap through the whole tree is nothing extraordinary. Every branch on every tree does exactly this. It feeds itself. But it also keeps the whole tree alive, doesn't it? And even if -- when one of these branches dies, the whole tree -- the tree sends out the next branch, and the next branch. But while these branches, which we can see are there, they must serve the whole tree. They must send -- receive sunshine and rain for the whole tree, not just for themselves.

It's all so simple, gentlemen. But you live in such an abstract world, and the terrible thing is that you think you are realistic. You are the most unrealistic, misinformed, and malformed people, completely corrupt by your own science. This is all incredibly stupid and incredibly unobservant of the real facts of life. Isn't it a real fact of life which bothers you now for the last nine years already that you have a sex, that you have -- genitals, that you have great passions, that

your reason never is any good for anything, because you always do things for another reason than for reason? Isn't this true that therefore the whole problem is how to make this -- mighty and powerful body of yours subservient to tasks that are worth of these tremendous potencies? Well, all the tasks of the human race are such. That's why you get married finally, so that this potency of yours may be made subservient to the procreation of the race. And that's why we have meals together so that this great hunger of ours and thirst of ours may serve to enliven the community. That's why it is more moral to eat together than to eat alone. When I have to eat in the coffee shop, I always eat by myself, but that's an act of defiance against Dartmouth College. And I'm very wicked when I do that. It's immoral to eat alone. Because all these great acts, gentlemen, of our body are given us to create a greater body. In the family, everybody admits it. Very strange. But in politics you don't. And in history you don't. Well, what's politics and what's history, except the enlarged family of yours?

So let's have a break here and then go back to the tribe.

[tape interruption]

The attempt of the tribe is to re-present the past. If you know what representative government is, you would understand perhaps that to re-present is a tremendous undertaking. We have representative government, allegedly, but as you know you treat your representatives today more or less as mail carriers. You -- they can't count the letters that come from home. That, of course, is not representative government. But that is just mob rule. Because re-presentative government would say, "This man in Washington now knows better. I send him there to make me present -- it's in my stead, because I can't be there." The form in which the ancients wanted to make the spirit of the dead dominate the living was the mask. The word "person" means somebody who speaks through a mask. Person-are means to personate, to make a sound through some foreign face, through some strange face. And as you know we had this week Carnival, and Ash Wednesday was yesterday. And that on Carnival, you wear these masks, because it is originally the day of the dead. The day in which the dead come to life. And that was -- is now a joke in Christianity, but of course at one time it was terribly serious. It was the time at which you danced under the inspiration of the medicine man. And what is a medicine man in the tribe, gentlemen? The man who wears the mask. The man who wears the mask of the ancestor. Therefore, every tribe had to have at least one mask, just as it had totem poles. The mask is the impersonation of the founder of the tribe, of the first in whose name everything has to {happen} and it gives you the experience, gentlemen, in -- as a tribesman,

that you are spoken to.

Now you are such philosophers, such rationalists, that you really think that the life of the spirit begins with "Me" saying something. But "Poor Me" is very differently organized. You only live because somebody speaks to you. If nobody would call you by your name, you would be panicky. You rely on the fact that when I step on your toe, I say, "Excuse me, Sir," or "Excuse me, Friend." That is, that I call you -- speak to you. If you think for one moment that you were quite sure that nobody ever would speak to you, you would probably commit suicide or go crazy. To be spoken to is much more important than to speak yourself, as you know, Mr. {Davidson}. Why is that so, gentlemen? Because by being spoken to, we get direction. By our speaking ourselves, we get no direction whatsoever. You can't speak yourself into any direction. The great thing about the medicine man is that he, even after seven generations, can redirect the living generation into the proper paths. The narrow paths of antiquity. That is the -- the ambition of the medicine man, that the next generation will get direction from him. As you well -- you have all read the descriptions of the medicine man, and you now understand the difference between a chieftain and the medicine man. The chieftain is at this moment the guide and leader of the living group. He's purely physical. That is, you can see him in the flesh. The medicine man has to bring on the tribe the great blessing that somebody of the past speaks to him -- speaks to them, I should say, you see, including the chief. That these poor people remain under the direction of this greater spirit. That's why you always {hear these} people speak of "the great spirit."

Gentlemen, the whole story of the great spirit in American folklore is a great hoax. These people all had spirits, and when they came in touch with the missionaries of the white race in this country, the white -- the missionary, of course, wanted to persuade them that they always had believed in God and something like it, and so the whole abbreviated talk about the Great Spirit came into usage. I don't think it's older than 1700 that any great Indian spoke of the Great Spirit. That's not original in this country. It's all nonsense. But that is -- are the 18th century Christians in this country. Just as little as the Indians had horses. And yet all your boys think that wild Western stories must give the Indian man horses. But -- as you well know, the Spaniards and the -- and the -- Englishmen brought the first horses into this country. There just was -- were no horses and that's why it's this great ambition at this moment of the -- of the, as you know, paleontologists, to prove that America had the older horse than the rest of the world. Of course, it hadn't. It's one of these patriotic hoaxes. You can read it every few years. Some other bi- -- zoologist gets up the notion that the American had horses. It's a wonderful story. It's like the Greenland hoax, you see: of course,

America must have been discovered before it was discovered. And the similar way with the Great Spirit.

Gentlemen, the story is great enough. The greatness of the spiritual life of the tribe lies in this: that the living were not left without orientation, as you are, your poor -- you poor nonentities. You are left without direction, but they were not, because the story was told. It wasn't fiction. It was a real story. And it was told through the mask that provided for them the certainty that the dead were living to the quick. As you know, gentlemen, the Creed of our -- of the Christian tradition contains these strange words, that He will come back to judge the living and the -- dead and the quick, the quick and the dead. The living, that is, and the dead.

We'll see, gentlemen, why Christianity has these two fronts against the empires, and against the tribesman. And let me throw out to make the whole thing more pointed, at this moment. In the tribe, the dead men speak to the living and give them direction. In an empire, the living men speak to the dead and give them direction. It's very strange. And in Christianity, which has risen above the two superstitions, the -- Christ speaks to the living and the dead. That is, nothing past is already final in its righteousness, and nothing living is. But in the old -- ancient order, it's different, gentlemen. In the tribe, the dead are always right. The living are always wrong. Or in danger of going wrong. They have always to be coerced. They always have to be kept in the narrow path. And therefore, gentlemen, the fiction, the -- really the fiction at that time -- in this respect, the legal fiction is that everything new has to follow precedent. The modern judges in America are that part of the modern order which is tribal, because they go by precedent. And you can't -- one branch of life has to go by precedent in order that we have life at all. To live by precedent is today the legal fiction, isn't it? And the same legal fiction is in a greater score embodied in the medicine man who makes sure that the dead man speaks to the living.

Gentlemen, this is terribly important, because there is one task before your generation: to limit the power of corporations. Now corporations are masks. Take that down: corporations, legal persons are masks. They are legal fictions. They don't exist, unless some living people give them their living blood, their lifeblood. You have no General Motors without Mr. Wilson. Today it seems that we only have Wilsons, because we have General Motors, and that's why he is in the Cabinet. But it is the other way around, too. That is, the relation of the real life of the -- of living people, gentlemen, and the existence of corporations, is the great problem of America. It's much more important than the problem of capitalism or socialism. Obviously the problem today is not between any such branch

like socialism or Communism on the one-hand side and free enterprise on the other. But the whole problem is, is there still a free entrepreneur, or are there only corporations? That is, are there physical people in this country, or are these big institutions, these abstractions? That's the real question, gentlemen. And it is the question before the whole world.

If you read Mr. Priestley, who wrote this wonderful story, the -- So Green Is My Valley -- do you know him? Charming man, this Englishman. He wrote once a wonderful essay in which he said, "I'm now asked to choose between America and Russia. I don't see why I should choose. There's nothing for me on either side. They both live by corporations. And I just wish to live myself, in my green valley." There are no people in the United States, he said, and there are no people in Russia -- who are allowed to exist. It's all corporations. It's all five-year plan, or it's General Motors, or General Electric. All so big. You know, our bread isn't bread, it's General Mills. Well, it is. And why? Because it's so general, there's no bread in the bread. Anything the corporation makes has lost its vitality. That's literally true.

Take anything. If you bake it on such a big scale, it loses its vitality because, gentlemen, take this down: vitality and frailty go together. The more frail something is, the more life -- alive it is. A vitamin, a violet, a baby are the most lively things, and thereby they are the most easily crushed. A man of war, or a tank, are very hard to crush, and they have no life. And they make their inmates stupid. And very little alive. That's so strange.

Gentlemen, the degree of vitality and the degree of frailty go together. And the degree of immunity, of invulnerability, is in inverse ratio to the aliveness of anything. Life is life only because it is delicate. And the fear of man, his hopelessness, his faithlessness, drives him on to make himself strong and stronger, and in making himself stronger, he loses his life. Power corrupts. Because the -- life is life only as long as it is delicate. The corporations are attempts to what? To escape mortality. The curse of the tribe is that it will not say that the ancestor died, that's {it}. And that's wrong. That's the great lie of the tribe. He has died. You must see the equilibrium. The achievement of history is based on an attempt to keep the spirit alive. And the first tribesmen go to the extent to say, "Nothing has died," you see. They have this -- they overdo it. They project the -- the life of the ancestor so much into the present and the future that they, so to speak, say, "Hear, you can hear him speak." And the medicine man is the enthusiastic representative of this man who actually has died. So the masks every -- you and I know it between ourselves, you see, that they are unreal. Yet they are there. And you see, since nothing that has ever been created must -- may ever disappear. We

do still bury people, and we still wear masks. And it isn't so easy. At this moment, we cannot finish the whole story, but you must know that mankind is wrestling all the time with the right degree to be given to representation. We need the Fuller Brush representative in our house. But how much? You know when he comes in, he tells the woman, you see, "Will you buy some brushes?" She says, "No, but I would like somebody to play the piano." He sits down and plays the piano. That's big { }. He represents everything she wants. If -- he does it sufficiently, she will buy also what she doesn't want.

That is, gentlemen, by masks, we do impress people. We do. And you -- we -- you must begin to fathom, gentlemen, that we cannot at random found corporations. It depends on the degree of our vitality. You and I can feed our spirit into the mask. The medicine man in a tribe is very often a really enthusiastic man who does revive the spirit of the ancestor when he wears his mask. You know these people smoke endlessly. They drink. They get intoxicated. But on the whole, when you read descriptions of the medicine man in the tribes, you will see that this a very wholesome influence. That they really do, you see, keep the people in the straight line of tradition. And that if the medicine man went, something terrible would happen to the tribe. They would lose direction. They would lose direction. So we learn here for the first time, gentlemen, that much is forgiven people who do some -- who save life. The great book by Selma Lagerlöf, the Swedish writer, is -- it's a novel called the -- *The Miracle of the Antichrist*. It plays -- it's laid out in Sicily. And there the miraculous Jesus bambino, the baby in the church, the -- that does miracles is stolen. And the socialist agitator puts in his own edition of the miraculous Jesus. And it, of course, the new bambino does the trick, too, and the miracles continue to happen. And finally the socialists, the atheistic agitator is found out. That's why she calls the book, *The Miracles of the Antichrist*.

Well, this book has made much -- much in my life. I once converted a faithless Jew to believe in the living God by this book, because it ends on this note: It said, "Nobody can redeem men from their sufferings, but he shall be forgiven much who again encourages them to carry their load, to carry their burden." And this is what the medicine man does. A tremendous encouragement to carry their burden, and what I try to do at this moment, gentlemen, is to prevent you from being romantic about the tribesmen, and also from being snobbish. They are admirable, and yet they're wrong. Can you see the double -- the double? They had no other way than their primitive way, of keeping a direction unless they did not undergo this tremendous pressure from the first generation all the time. This is tremendous story, but I think I would -- equally easy to look down on these people and say they were ridiculous and barbarians, and it is equally

wrong to exalt them and say they were right. But in their place, they found the one point of attack, you see. By representing an absent time to the living, they made these people much greater than they otherwise could have ever become. They really added to their stature. Can you see this? Because you all know that all the tribesmen became under the impact of the -- impersonation of the ancestor -- what do they -- did they become? Hopeful and fearless. Faithful and without anguish. You all know that the tribesmen at the martyr -- how do you call it, the post to which he is tied? His post of martyrdom, of torment by his enemies? -- would go on singing the songs of his own tribe, with utter fearlessness and without any anxiety. And he proved his lack of anxiety by singing, because you cannot thing -- sing when your voice is extinguished in anguish. And you never, I think, appreciate sufficiently the tradition that the prisoner of war had to sing while he is tormented. Because you do not appreciate the problem of the spirit that comes out of your throat. You only know of hope and fear. And you -- say faith is the invention of the clergyman. Gentlemen, the prisoner who sings in the moment of agony, this prisoner has overcome, you see, through faith his physical individual anguish. Because what does he sing? The honor of his tribe. The survival of the -- not of the fittest, gentlemen, you see, but he is the fit one who makes the tribe survive his own pain. That's the story of mankind. Ridiculous: survival of the fittest. Who is the fittest? He who makes life survive himself. It's the other way around. All these slogans, gentlemen, dismiss them! They are all done without any real self-knowledge of the people who make -- throw out these slogans. Darwin, I mean, sick man. Had migraine all the time because he didn't get married in time. He never loved. He never had any faith in anything, so he throws out such a suggestion, "survival of the fittest." Gentlemen, man's problem is: how do I make myself fit enough so that the race can survive? That's the man's -- only problem. And by singing, he does. The prisoner who sings at the stake convinces the enemy that his tribe is unbeatable. Impresses these people, you see. Because if the voice of the ancestor, impersonated by the medicine man, elicits this echo of the war song in the prisoner of war, then the spirit of this tribe is invincible.

And gentlemen, may I say that it is? That these tribes are still with us after 6,000 years, 7,000 years proves that they are invincible. We, the white man, finally have crushed them, but not before.

So if anything, we haven't proven our worth with white man's Western civilization certainly, in these few hundred years since the discovery of America. But these people have. They have survived 7 hundred -- thousand years by filling everybody -- now, mark this well -- the living echoing the sound of the dead. The

war song of the tribesman is an answer, a reply to the inspiration coming to him from his ancestral spirit. They could not sing it under their own steam. It is a reaction, a response, a responsory, you may even call it, you see. The tribesmen, gentlemen, form the choir. The spirit of the ancestor forms the single speaker. In the tribe, the only "I," is ego, is the ancestor. All the tribesmen are answering these.

You go to India and the rest of the world, there's no such notion that man can be -- living man can identify himself with ego. They all -- as you know in Hinduism call themselves "thous." "These { } -- thou" is the great saying of the Hindu, you see, because everybody knows that as far as he is in the flesh, he is "Poor Me," to be addressed by somebody else. "Poor Me" is the accusative, for anybody who knows a foreign language. That is, it is not "I." In the tribe or in the family, gentlemen, nobody is "ego," except the dead.

The -- egos speak with authority, as the only authority is vested in the people who have preceded us. And we have to go by precedent. Therefore we never say, "I did it." But we always say, "I'm sorry, we have to do this, because it is already ruled by precedent." Therefore nobody in the tribe who is alive is an "I." The only person who says "I," the medicine man, wears a mask. So take this down, gentlemen: persons in the tribe, the person is an impersonator of somebody dead, of some body dead, of some dead body. Some, who only lends his living body to the spirit of the dead somebody. The word "somebody" -- "somebody" is a very profound word, you see. The living medicine man embodies somebody who has died and therefore is pure spirit. And you little cats, or -- and dogs all think you are persons, because you are born. Gentlemen, this way you are not persons. You are highly impersonal, I assure you. To be a person always means to speak in the name of at least two generations. Nobody -- you are a -- as a doctor, you speak in the name of the whole medical profession. Of course, we'll say, you are a personality. But gentlemen, you are not persons if you do not identify yourself with something right, and if you do not stand up against something wrong. And we know already right is that which has come down to us as a straight way and wrong is that which is crooked, a deviation from the old way. Right and wrong, gentlemen, are ways from the past into the future. You don't know this. You think it's just something in a course of ethics, logically disputed. It's all nonsense. It is simply something which has reached us in the straight way and we can go against it, or we can continue it. That's how we become a person. When a man says, "I want to do right," he identifies himself with a thing that has reached him from the past, with a way of life. {Once} you enter upon this way and say, "Yes, I affirm it," you become a person. Nobody can a person -- be a person just because he is a living tadpole. That's what you are.

This is terrible. Everything in this country has been wasted. The sacred word "person" has been bestowed on every brat, without any obligation to continue the life of the race. But the word "person," gentlemen, is only available to those who want to do right, and who will fight wrong, because in this very moment, they enter upon a beaten path of life which they have to continue. Can you begin to see this problem? Gentlemen, ethics is nothing for the merely living generation, because it means that we hand over and continue that which man has found out to have -- we have to do. A person is always pluri-aged, if I may introduce this term. Pluri-aged, more -- of more than one age, of more than one generation. "Pluri-generation" would be too complicated. Let us use this poor term, "pluri-aged," because we need something to fight the philistines. And the philistines tell you that man, by looking at his own -- navel, decides what is right and wrong. Nonsense! You wouldn't know anything. We have -- must have heard what is right before we can decide whether we can go on with it or have to change it. You want to alter a law, you first must understand the law. So in the word "person" we still have inherited from the tribe the being vested with masks, any judge with his -- any sermonizer, any minister with his garment -- in England, the wig of the judge -- in the priest, with his -- with his -- in the Catholic Church, with his Roman dress, because he wears just the same dress as a Roman would in 300 A.D., that's after all you call the clerical garb, you see. It's very secular dress. The pope still wears the dress of the Caesars, of the senator of Rome. Today. Because they are their masks. They try to speak from former generations, and to keep us in line with these former generations. That's why every person of dignity wants to wear something that's a little older than the present fashion. That's why you crown the -- Queen Elizabeth, you see. For her crown is older, so when she speaks, she doesn't speak, you see, with the authority of the living, but with the authority from the dead. And take this down, gentlemen: the crown is an attempt to break out from the fic- -- the wrong fiction of the mask, as though the dead man was still in any way present. In the crown, the face of the living, he's allowed to shine. That's a very great beauty between crown and mask, you see. We'll come to that point very soon. To be crowned means to keep this connection with the past, but to lift the -- the mask from the face, you see, and to say, "We will not exaggerate, we will not overdo it." These are very great stories. I can't go into details of all these slow clarifications. The first idea is: the dead speak, and the living listen. The dead speak, the -- living listen. You must -- cannot realize any tribal organization if you do not understand that the living generation in the tribe is meant to obey. That's their honor. You see, the living is meant to obey. The dead speak.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Opening remarks missing]

... be indifferent and on a quotation waste a whole page. This quotation I only brought you because I thought you might be interested that a thousand years ago, a man in the Muslim world in -- world in Spain already was able to say everything good on history which we could still subscribe to today. But the -- the constitution, gentlemen, of the tribe to us must be understood for us as it was important, because at this moment we are lacking in the one rudiment, or in the rudiments on which the claim of the tribe is based, to be revived today, to be regenerated. We enter, certainly, a thousand years in which tribalism will be of -- so to speak, a necessary refresher course for us because the family is destroyed today and speech is destroyed today. And therefore speech and the family, being the creations of the tribe, must be found there where they -- were most intensified.

And this is what I try -- shall try to do now, to once more show you that the tribe needed marriage. A tribe can be defined as an institution to create marriage. Everything around the tribe can be summed up in this one function: the tribe is a family-making institution. Now hark well. The tribe is then the couche, as the French say, the source, the machinery to produce families. What you read in your textbooks is totally misleading, because it says that in the -- in -- primitive man lived in families. Primitive man created institutions out of which every day or every year families could be produced. Mark this well, gentlemen: families are transient. Tribe is eternal. The tribe is a lasting form. One of the greatest mischiefs done at this moment in your own thinking is that the family in which you have been born is there, meant to be eternal. And all families must dissolve. It can only make havoc and lead to fascism, or Hitlerism, or racism, or some kind of superstition when you are told that the family is an aim, a purpose in itself. It is not!

When you get of age, the family must become second-rate. And when you have children, you must give your parents the privilege of becoming the grandparents of your children. And that's how they reconquer then their family status. But it is very unhappy when you have two parties in this country. One of rugged individualism, destroying the family and escaping to the West Coast; and the other, the mother party, the mothers of America, going with their boys to Korea and arguing with the corporal about their diet. Neither has a mother anything to do with the dean of this college, but unfortunately they have, because you are

unable to stand on your own legs. So they come here where they don't belong. And on the other hand, you don't know where they belong. They belong to your children. You -- don't give your parents any chance that they become the revered authority who redeem your idiotic family life by bringing some spirit of longer history into it. So your wife is jealous of her mother-in-law and you are usually jealous of your father-in-law, and that's what is an unpurified family history. But on the other hand, you have a bad conscience when you leave off your own family at a certain age, which you have to do. You have to cut your -- the apron strings of your mother.

Let me repeat, gentlemen. It is a heresy to say that a family is for eternity. The Church may be for eternity, and -- but not the family. However, we need permanent institutions to create families, just as you obviously cannot take any one part of a water -- elem- -- and say this water will stay forever -- and you want to have a spring out of which water can gargle up in spouts and spurts.

This is a complete confusion today and as it always is with revivals, gentlemen. For the last 50 years, people have begun to revive clans and tribes. And so their first primitive attempt was to praise the family. So we have courses here on the family in this college, too. And everywhere you find today eugenics. And you find racism. And you find attempts to say that the physical family is so wonderful that your race must be eternalized. And you know what it does in South Africa. And you know what it does in Asia, in Malaya, where the Dutch lost out -- and the Eurasians, because people tried to eternalize the physical product of the old tribal world. If you once more would remember that the tribe, we said, was the first historical achievement of historical man, then it isn't breeding, it isn't the animal production, procreation which has to be revived today, but those thousands of years during which people learn to marry. That is, the act of marriage, of belong -- one man and one -- wife belonging so close together that their children can greet them as one, that is the historic creation of the first thousand years of our race. But not the animal breeding, which we find in the whole animal kingdom and in which, as we do with all animals, since we can reject or adopt. That has nothing to do with tribal achievements.

So the first thing, gentlemen, tribalism is not biological. It is not breeding. It is not racism. The confusion today is total. You can read any book on eugenics, on family. They always mistake the fact that marriage has been given us a certain way of procreating, with the process of pure animal procreation in itself. Now if you come to this, then you must worship your mother. Then you get matriarchy. Then you must have ancestor worship, in the most primitive sense. But in the ancient tribe, gentlemen, the ancestor worship was subservient to the great

mission of man to be one through all times. And therefore ancestor worship and marriage was only a first step into the same life we have to lead, which cannot worship any flesh, any purely transient group like relations between parents and children.

So I have to do a difficult task at the same time. I have to try to show you the greatness of the tribe that produced families, but I have to warn you against your superstition that the product of that historically is the family in itself is, you see, something to be worshiped 100 percent. Can you see the difference?

The problem of the tribe was to enlighten the act of mating with the word.

Gentlemen, when husband and wife meet, and when the husband stays with his wife to her hour of birth, as -- Joseph did with Mary and thereby ac- -- acquires the right of a spiritual authority in this history of Mary. When you see what we tried already to say before, that marriage means to go from your blind passion of the moment to the -- through the whole life cycle, even to its most opposite point, to the childbirth, then you see that the problem of marriage was to alter the course of nature. In nature, the husband and the mating animals mate in spring, and perhaps the male stays building the nest, as in the birds' case, for the young. And then the young forget who their parents were. In the animal kingdom, gentlemen, the children forget who has begotten them. They forget it. After a year, no horse knows who the mare -- brood mare has been from which -- from when -- out of which it came. No chicken knows who was the hen, let alone the cock, the rooster.

Animals cannot go beyond their individual life cycle. They do not know what happened before their birth, and they do not know what's going to happen after their death. It is the essence of history that we know this. I told you this in various terms. Now let's investigate this with regard to the family.

To marry means to create a body of time. A body of time. That's a Shakespear-ean expression which is very wonderful, you know, a "body of time." This is found in Shakespeare. And he has created there something -- we must appropriate in so- -- in the social sciences. A body of time, that is the problem of marriage. Which is not natural. Which is based on being named, in the name of the ancestors. Marriages were concluded therefore, and on the bowling -- dancing green of the tribe. Marriages must be public. Marriages must be entered upon not clandestinely, not between you and me -- as free lovers think -- but it must be entered under invocation of the whole group. Marriage is public business.

Because marriage means to force the rest of the tribe to recognize the existence of this special tribe -- body of time.

You remember our triangle -- no, it isn't. I didn't give it to you, here. But we talked enough about this recognition, I think, that you'll understand that all history depends on this problem that others should know who we are, and we should know who others are. Without this mutual experience, the whole problem of the tribe wouldn't exist. You think if you do right, you haven't to ask anybody else for his permission. You're absolutely wrong. Your parents had to force the rest of the community to call your mother "Mrs. Smith." If they would call her -- called here enduringly "Miss Brown," you wouldn't be here. Dartmouth wouldn't have accepted you, because you would have been out of -- born out of wedlock. The whole problem is not when people marry that they love each other. That's not interesting to anybody. But it is very interesting whether they have forced the community to say that these people are married. You never see this. You see for the last 50 years people have weakened all these rules of the game so completely that they think if two people have -- are in agreement, and they go to some sheriff somewhere, that's okay. So you get these children's marriages, which are no marriages, because they cannot force upon the community the esteem and the dignity that two people -- we who are -- shall be given a -- a house of their own, and shall be allowed to bring up their children of their own, and shall be allowed to bestow on these children their own name, and shall be allowed to make, for example, the religion of their children their own decision. Gentlemen, as you know, we hold still to the fiction that parents decide over the religious upbringing of their children. In this country, it means that the Roman Catholic -- parents allow their church to take care of the education of their children, and that the others send their children to Sunday school. In other words, they force their children to believe in something they -- don't believe themselves.

So we have a wonderful arrangement, which all comes under the heading that parents have the right to determine the religion of their children. Gentlemen, when marriages were created, it was, of course, in a very different sense. The first authority that go with parents is that they have the right to influence, and to educate, and to direct their children under one condition: that they impart their -- to their children their own beliefs. Now in 90 percent of the cases of education today, parents do not impart today their beliefs to their children. But they allow other institutions, like churches, or the cultural ethics school, to give their children a religion which they themselves do not even know that they have. Because most people in this country don't know what they believe. They are just all gamblers on the horse race. They know more about horses than they know about God. Who in this country knows anything what he believes? He has one philosophy one day and the next philosophy another day. He has opinions.

The people who have opinions, gentlemen, are not -- have nothing to do with the power to ask the community that they be given the authority to bring up the next generation.

So I can foresee, gentlemen, that it's -- this authority will be taken away from you. The great powers -- Church, and especially state, and the American Legion, and some other similar organizations will take care of that, that it will be just fictitious that you are allowed to bring up your children in your own religion. Because you have -- you have relinquished this right already to the nursery school, to the psychologist, to the psychoanalyst, and all these people. They give you your religion, so what has your right to teach your children your religion? You have given that up for the last hundred years in this country more and more. I don't see how you want to take it in again, bring it back -- take it back again.

The other day a group of people in New York -- young mothers got together in the suburbs, just to give you -- show you where we have gotten. And they had -- were all -- women who had -- hard-working women, and they had not much -- not much money. And they decided to run a nursery between themselves for these 15 or 16 children they had to take care of. And the mothers said that always three mothers or two mothers would take care of them within a fortnight -- cycle of a fortnight. Two days, and the others would come and so they would, you see, be able to cope with this educational problem. They did very well, but one of these mothers had the typical philo- -- scientific urge and they said, "We don't" -- she said to them, "Perhaps you do everything wrong. We must ask the psychoanalyst."

And so they invited the psychoanalyst to give them a talk about the problem of taking care of their own and the other people's children. And the psychoanalyst needed some money, so she went -- stood there and said, "It's impossible for you to do this, to take care of your children, because you either prefer your own children, and that will be an injustice to the other children; or you will lean over backward and mistreat your own children in favor of the other children. So the only way out is to give me those children and to pay me for it." Which they proceeded to do.

That's by and large the state of America, that they actually believe this professional -- this professional criminal, you see, who said that indifference was better than love. And that's called science.

And that happens every day in this country, that parents abdicate their sacred

duty, to love their children in favor of people whose -- frankly have declared that love is damaging. And you pay people for this. That's why you go to the psychoanalyst. Who -- I have a young friend who went to the psychoanalyst. She had a love affair. She was this desperate. So she wanted to be -- to comfort it, so she went there, and he comforted her there by saying that she never was in love, but just has a repression from her second year in life. So now she's rid -- even of her one experience that might have made her a woman. Unhappy love is a very serious affair, you see. But she lost that to the psychoanalyst.

But that's what you -- what I call the abdication of your -- rights certified to you in marriage. Gentlemen, marriage is priesthood. You cannot understand marriage when you do not understand that what we today call the universal priesthood, which is the old, as you know, war cry of the Protestants against the Romans, and which the Romans have never, by the way, denied: that all men are meant to be priests. Well, the -- they are part of the Christian Creed that one element comes from the tribe. The first priests instituted in the tribe their fathers and mothers. They were put in authority to represent to the newborn children the whole past world of the tribe, by teaching them the sacred names of the tribe, by making these children in their youth, already, form their lips to the invocation to the ancestral spirits. And to know that whenever these names were formed, the children had to stand in reverence and awe, and that -- that was the greatest authority under which a human being could be placed. That's priesthood, gentlemen, to be allowed to teach others these sacred names of invocation, of prayer, of authority, of law.

To teach children to speak, gentlemen, means to make a terrific decision whether I teach my boy German first, my own native country, or English first, is a decision over my orthodoxy, obviously. You know very well this problem of the minorities. When in Buffalo the 300,000 Poles teach their children -- Polish first, whatever the decision is, but let's take it to be Polish first -- they have made a religious decision. Because to learn Polish first means to keep this generation still in the position between two worlds. To keep them, so to speak, first-generation people. Which perhaps is a good thing. But it is a decision.

Gentlemen, you say -- I just let -- let these children learn English. But you make a decision if you let it go. You have just made a negative decision. You have not evaluated at all the problem whether it would be a good thing to make your child bilingual. I don't say that you should. But it is a decision. And don't fancy that by -- because most Americans make no decisions, but -- leave it to the public schools to make the decision for them that you haven't made the decision.

By making the decision, for example, that your own native tongue, or your parents' native tongue shall not be kept, you of course escape or run from the real problem that God must be worshiped in many languages. And that you -- certainly it is easier for America to keep its civil liberties and to keep out the dictatorship of the government if there are many languages still spoken in the home, because that would remind people of the real facts of American history, that people came here for freedom of conviction, and freedom of speech. But the way you live, gentlemen, you have forgotten this. You think everybody must be standardized. Everybody must put on his -- off his straw hat on Labor Day. Everybody must eat ice cream. And everybody must go to the football games. Why must he? As long as you would know that it is the great privilege of America that people could speak, you see, their native language, plus American, you would stand for liberty. Because then it would be natural that people are not conformists, you see. But as soon as you think that conformity is not a desire, but must be an accomplished fact, then nobody has the right to say anything. And then you have yet this -- this strange situation today that nobody wants to stick his neck out and say anything, from fear that he may be different from the most stupid and most cowardice-fellow next to him. And what you really find out is that everybody dislikes the situation, but everybody thinks all the others are a scoundrel, so I must be a scoundrel, too. That what it amounts to, you see, this -- just state of fear. When you are afraid to tell the truth, you really of- -- insult all your neighbors, because you assume that they all are cowards, you see. And you are the only man who would like to -- not to be a coward, but then you say, "I better am a coward, too." Funny {morale}, you see. If you really have respect for your neighbors, you would say, "They are all heroes, so I must be a hero, too." But no -- not one of them does this. Think of all the off-color stories which you allow to be told in the fraternity without ever pouncing the desk and saying, "You swine! Be quiet!" Has ever -- body -- any spoke- -- spoken up in a fraternity and said, "Don't go on with this"? Before, I won't talk to you, gentlemen. Before, I won't admit that you are parents. Before, I won't admit that you know what it means to get married. Because a married man, gentlemen, is a man who can say "No" to any desecration.

Gentlemen, parents are there to consecrate their children. I -- I mean this very literally. If you can't consecrate your children, you can't christen them. That's the same word. "Consecrate" means to give your children direction. Once you teach them English, you have already separated them from the stem of the human race and made them into Americans, which is very dangerous, because it is a limitation. It is one way among many. And you -- that's why this whole problem of Christianity is -- has been, you see, to warn the parents later on that by making

them speak Egyptian, or Roman, or French, or English, they have to instill into this a warning by the Christian term, you see, in the Christian first name they give the child, to tell this child, "Yes you may speak English. But that's not the whole story. You remain, you see, a part -- creature of the whole creation, despite the fact that we allow you now to march on this narrow road of Americanism." You can see that Christianity to this day simply purified the old tribal system. The first tribal man, when they allowed people to consecrate their children, only saw the benefits of giving the children some consecration. When Christianity came onto the world, the divisions between the races, and divisions between the tribes had reached a point that it now seemed important to consecrate the parents back again, and to ask the parents, "Now when you now teach these children Latin, English, or French, please inject a note of warning. Give them a Biblical name, so that they may know that they do not have to be nationalists," you see. The whole problem of Christianity is then, in this sense, nothing but the true meaning of the old tribal marriage. Christ has not come to change anything, but just to fulfill it. And you must take this together, gentlemen: modern christening, and first marriage system have very much to do with each other. The tribesman wanted to do exactly that which today people try to do when they christen their child, to consecrate this child. They only missed out in identifying the special family group, you see, the clan, with the permanent problem of this child: direction. And the -- Christianity today says, "Inject into this family bond some corrective," you see, "so that this child knows the limitations of this one tribal connection."

But what we have to do, gentlemen, is to understand that the first man on this earth was as good a Christian as you and I. And as little a Christian as you and I. It's an old saying, which you have forgotten: Christianity is as old as Adam. The church has existed since the beginning of the world. This is old, good, patristic Roman Catholic teaching, gentlemen. You don't know this. Your idea is so silly that you think we could have a world in which all of a sudden everything was changed. No, gentlemen. The first step in history, that parents must bring up their children in this knowledge of what has gone before -- this consecration of the child -- is the oldest problem of mankind. It's always with us. It is so much so, gentlemen, that -- we come to a very practical problem of our days in this. Marriage means that father and mother must cooperate before the child is born. In some tribes, that goes so far that the father goes to bed and shares the wife's suffering -- symbolically. You may have heard of the man's "coubade," c-o-u-b-a-d-e, coubade. The man's childbed. Now don't laugh. I think it's one of the sublime rituals of the human race. It's an attempt to convey the fact to the world outside that the father feels as much responsible for the birth of this child as his

wife.

In order to show you the full impact of this, take the fact of a malformed child, of an embryo that is idiotic, or so. In ancient times, there was no question that a child was the carrier of the spirit, to be consecrated, to receive a name, to be understood, and to be recognizable, as a potent member of the group. Therefore, gentlemen, it wasn't done as today, when a nurse is asked to let a baby, a malformed, stillborn baby die. Because somebody has to take the responsibility. You don't know what's going on in our hospitals, fortunately still. That not every child is allowed to live. It would be terrible if we allowed every child to live, it isn't meant to live. Somebody has to care -- have the responsibility today. It's a doctor, or the nurse, and the parents never know anything, because they are treated like children in our hospitals. It's all over when they come. The wife is in a coma, and the husband is -- having whiskey. And that's how the child is born today. So somebody, of course, has to say, "This -- can this child, you see, be figured to be a real child, or do we not, you see, make it cry?" If you don't beat the child, you see, it cannot live.

I was asked here by Mr. {Keats} the other day how this is done today. And I told him the story of the tribe, gentlemen, that the father had, of course, to look at the child and to take it in his arms and to say, "This is my child," as God did when Jesus was born, in the river -- baptized in Jordan. "He is my child in which I take pleasure."

Gentlemen, this formula is very ancient. Because it is necessary that in the spiritual ancestry of man a child should be received, just as it is necessary that it would receive out of the mother's womb into the physical world. You have all forgotten this. You -- we live simply by nature, by motherhood, by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and by Benjamin Franklin, and by all these semi- -- these half-baked people who think that life is natural. But your life is not natural, otherwise you wouldn't sit here. Otherwise you wouldn't wear pants and a sweater. Otherwise you wouldn't be in Dartmouth College. Nothing in your life is natural. Everything is spiritual, which if -- you really {treasure}. And what is spiritual, gentlemen? That you can speak. And that by speaking, you enter into the great life stream of humanity from beginning to end. And somebody has to impart this life stream to you, just as your mother imparts life to your body, so your father imparts life to you by naming you. And this is -- would be the first rediscovery of tribalism, gentlemen, in our age: that the father would again have the responsibility by saying "Yes" or "No" to the child.

You may think that's very cruel, because you think every child born should

live. Of course it should, gentlemen. But don't miss -- mistake the situation. Somebody has to say, "This is a full-fledged human being," you see. When a child is born with three heads and -- four legs, the -- it should not live. They make people -- these people live today, artificially, I'm told. Didn't you tell me? It's a scandal. Nothing but brutality. Make it in -- into an object for a circus. But you think that has to be. Because you have completely kowtowed what you call nature.

You see, your whole picture of humanity has been completely falsified because you -- think that people should be one with nature. It would be much better if they would be one with the human race, which is still very natural. But humanity has the great purpose of staying one through all times. The human animal, gentlemen, is that animal which is ubiquitous and always, and of which any member can acquire the consciousness of man's ubiquitousness -- that is everywhere-ness, you see -- and all the time-ness. No elephant knows what went on before him, and what will come after him. And no animal can know what happens next door, around the corner. We can.

Man is extending all the time his space and his time, gentlemen. That is, he is creating supersensuous periods and supersensuous spaces, or localities, or boundaries -- if that is better. Man wants to be where he is not physically, in time as well as in space. And marriage allows him this, because it allows the child to know of ancestors. Fathers and mothers -- will you take this down, gentlemen? -- represent to the child in the absence of the tribal meeting, in the first 20 years of his youth, the existence of this big entity, the tribe. The child is not taken to the assemblies of the grownups. But just as education tells you that there are united nations and there is a republic of America, and there's private property, that it's the law, although you don't see it; you live in your home, you see, innocently -- the fam- -- the father and the mother are the local priests who testify to the child of the existence of a wider world, of a wider reality. How is this done?

If you take the little group, the family group, you would find that there are always several youngsters under the care of the parents, growing up and receiving from their parents, as the first thing, the knowledge that they share their -- their mother tongue, their parents' -- father's tongue. In the tribe, of course, it's the father tongue. You should again mark this down, gentlemen. What we call "mother tongue" is sentimental. The -- all in -- all through antiquity, down through 1100 of our own era, the native tongue was called the "father tongue," the paternal tongue, because it was still well known that were the males, the warriors of the tribe that spoke, formally, you see. "Mother tongue" is an expression after the full victory of Christianity, and can only be understood because

there was the physical mother and the Mother Church. And the -- Latin was the mother -- the tongue which the Mother Church spoke. Therefore the native tongue was, you see, the mother tongue which the physical mother spoke. Very important for you to notice. "Mother tongue" is something romantic, sentimental. The real fact is that the -- in the law of the jungle, the males speak, and a child must learn his father's tongue. The father and, in his absence, the mother, represent to the children the tribe.

Now, all the families therefore must have access to the source of their existence, to the center of the tribe, to the meeting ground. At this tribal meeting, gentlemen, the decision is made for the funeral of the hero -- ancestor, for the warpath against the enemy, for the expiation of deviations from the behavior laid down in the tribe, and for marriages. We call this today "the orgies," because it had to be danced at this tribe. Gentlemen, the whole -- all the mature members of the tribe were married in the tribe -- and sealed, so to speak, as father -- future fathers and mothers, by these so-called orgies, or dances, these wild dances in public of the marriageable people. In this tremendous upheaval of a wedding, the parents become the carriers of the tribal law. So to speak, they are endowed with this spirit which has led to the use of the word "Ehe" or "legitimate" for children -- for marriage and children, gentlemen, which shows that the marriage is the carrier of the law, is this priesthood by which the parents represent the law of the tribe.

Who knows German? Anybody? Well, you know the word "Ehe," for marriage? You know that?

(No Sir, I didn't know.)

Which just means "law." That is, gentlemen, what I mean to say is that in the ancient language, "law" and "marriage," very often it's the same word. It means the same thing to get married and to become the legislator, or the representative of the law. In any marriage, the whole tribal law becomes, so to speak, documented. The law is written on the skin of the marriage people, in the tattoo. Tattoo is the first writing of the tribe. The constitution of the tribe that the authorities which it invokes are painted, depicted in the tattoo. You must come to think, gentlemen, tattoo is not a superstition, or not something funny. But in the tattoo of the modern sailor, you have the last remnants of the first layer of script. It is simply not true that writing was invented by the Egyptians, or that the Greeks inherited the script from the Phoenicians, or so on. It is much more complicated. The tribe writes, too, but he writes on living bodies. He has nothing more permanent, because the tribe moves. So the most permanent a tribe can do

is to write the law of the tribe on the skin of the people who are ready to marry. Then they bring the tribal law, the totem pole, or whatever the symbol of the tribe is, everywhere, on their skins. They are one document, one edition of the constitution.

So gentlemen, in these orgies, there are very painful operations. In order to get married, these people have to undergo circumcision, incision; their noses are perhaps made to stand out in some -- you have {japanation}. They make holes in here -- into the skull, which is a superstition. We may -- we may talk later about the -- very interesting because it was -- went on -- down to the days of Faust. It has been said of -- of the modern Faust that he also had still this tribal thing performed in him -- a perforation of the skullbones, something we do now again, you see, to get rid of blood clots in the brain. These perforations are now found to be very useful. When children fall, you see, a blood clot, you perforate the brain -- the skull you can save the child's life.

The tribal man had all kind of such ways of making pain the great memorizer. As you know, tattoos are not easy. They have to burn -- be burned into the skin, or painted, or whatever the method is by which these tattoos are inflicted on these poor people. But the tattoo is only one form. If you have earrings {set} -- long so that they pull down your -- here, how do you call the -- the lobe of the ear, you see, as you have in some African tribes, you these kind of extreme hardships which are connected with the moment of making the child of nature into a bearer of the law of history. The tattoo and the circumcision, gentlemen, are the most outstanding rituals of this type.

The ring is one. It { }, of course. Especially when you can't pull off the ring again. I can't mine, because my finger has become too thick in the meantime. So here I am linked with this {taboo}, you see.

But this is very serious, gentlemen. In the orgies of the meeting ground, the acc- -- people of accidental origin are made into members of one group. They are all identified by the same tattoo. They recognize each -- then by the same constitution. And there is an order in this constitution, gentlemen, because by the tattoo it is said whom you can marry and whom you can't marry.

The tattoo is also a taboo. Your tattoo shows you that you can't marry those who have exactly the same tattoo. The great thing of the tribe is that it creates orderly marriage. It excludes inbreeding. The tribe invents incest. What is incest, gentlemen? Incest is the destruction of a sacred space inside which the passions of sex shall not rage. All modern people show the weakening of the tradition of

the tribe by de- -- writing now poetry on incest, on homosexuality, but specially also on the love between brother and sister, or the Oedipus complex: love between parents and children. Gentlemen, that shows that it is high time to study the tribe again, because the tribe is the institution that has outlawed incest. In -- in nature, there is no such law. Animals do inbreed, if you leave them to themselves. We have found -- out to our own great dismay this fact that we have now today the father and the brother among our horses being the same individual, and it happened against our will, certainly.

Gentlemen, chastity has nothing to do with morality, in your sense of evil thinking. Chastity is the creation of a spare room inside which man is unafraid of the other sex. What you call a home today is of -- first of course not a home, but a relationship of the children of the same family. The members of the same -- family cannot intermarry, of the small group. Parents and children to each other, you see, form one body of time. And the consecration of the children makes it necessary that the father and the mother remain to these children father and mother.

Now you may think that's a small matter. But if you think that for the last 8,000 years, parents have not slept with their children, that is not a small matter. It's quite unnatural. A father would love to sleep with his daughter, because she is very young and beautiful. It just isn't done, because he loves her too much; because his love outweighs his desire. You think nothing of this, gentlemen. I must wake you up to the fact that with all your sneering of history, and all your ridiculing of religion, you all simply believe that your daughter is sacred to yourself. And in doing so, you are part of the greatest historical tradition. I advise you to stick to it, but to be proud of it, and not to concede it to yourself that this is quite unnatural, quite supernatural. You recognize in your daughter somebody who must reach the future in freedom.

So chastity, gentlemen, is the creation, or the division of the world of man into two spaces. One, for sex, and the other for non-sex. That is, the orgies and the meeting ground, and the -- the brotherhood, or sisterhood of the home are correlated. You can say that the tribe increases the frenzy, while they meet, and allow all kind of sexual libertinage, licentiousness, in these tribal meetings in order to sanctify all the better -- to consecrate all the better these private groups, these small groups inside of which this must be completely excluded, never happen, never be thought of. A brother does not think of his sister as a sexual being. And a sister shouldn't think of her brother as a sexual being. Mothers should not think of their sons as being good to sleep with, and parents -- fathers should not of their daughters.

Now, gentlemen, you will see we have to learn this again, because that is the root of all human purity. All these things in the abstract -- virginity, chastity -- make no appeal to a grownup man. He knows that. He is free. But wherever you have a nurse, or a nun, or a sister, you voluntarily carry this creative power into their lives, and your relation to them so that you recognize here is home. Here is family. And whenever you meet somebody, you see, in the moonlight, you feel free to -- to court, and to woo, and to worship, and to propose, and what-not. But it is each time your free decision whom you treat, you see, as under the law of the jungle, and -- whom you treat as being in the same house with you. And you have to know this. You have to know that man has in himself this tremendous starting point of orientation that there have to be with human beings two worlds. One in which the consecrations, the sanctuary of the spirit, of speech, of naming each other, you see, is so strong that the physical has no right. And the other, where the spirit is not there, where the physical -- your pleasure in another man -- human being -- the physical appearance prevails. If you cannot make this distinction, gentlemen, the girl to whom you are going to propose will find out. If you only run after her for her fair looks, or for her impertinence, or for her sensuousness, or for her lipstick, or for whatnot, if she is any good, she'll know that -- what you're doing, that you have not this other power in yourself to create at random the second step into the sanctuary. You have to have a sister and a bride inside your heart before you can get married. If you only expelling the sister or your mother by now the -- the strumpet, you can get a strumpet, but you can't get a wife. And the names do not -- have nothing to do with it. You can get a strumpet and think you are -- married. It's up to you, gentlemen, to -- to let your sweetheart know that she -- you know this other world too, of non-sex. If you don't have both, gentlemen, you can't get married. That's the difference, gentlemen, between puberty and an erection of your penis, and the power to get married. Your physical part is one thing, and your power to consecrate is the opposite. And the tribe has introduced this balance of power inside yourself, that you can re-create the sanctuary inside of which there is chastity. As I said, chastity has nothing to do with your physical being, but it is your power of the spirit in favor of the whole human race to abdicate for the time being from your physical urges. And you will admit everybody can that -- do this. You may say, "I can't vow chastity as a monk. Oh, that's too much." I've heard many people declaim that priesthood -- celibacy is unnatural. And there should be no celibacy. Gentlemen, as long as you live as you do at Dartmouth, there have to be monks and nuns to remind you that you too have the power of celibacy at random. You can honor women, easily. At home you do. Only now

you repress it. All these special institutions of the monk and the nun today, that is, of the eternal virgin, you see, are only reminders to the normal being that he has this power of priesthood inside himself. What's a priest, gentlemen? A man who can throw the switch between his physical wavelengths -- which goes from 20 to 60, in which you want to procreate, you see -- and his historical role in which he stands for the direction of the whole human race through hundreds and thousands of years.

It's nothing abstract, gentlemen, this -- what I call "the spirit." It is -- when you say to somebody, "Sister," you place her in a time stream of thousands of years. When you say to somebody, "Sweetheart," you want to have her and kiss her right now. And therefore in your sister, you face eternity. And in your sweetheart, you face the moment. Now, your sweetheart can demand from you that you give to this moment that much perpetuity, you see, that she can save her sisterhood, her power to be a mother within the sequence of the family story, that she fills a whole range on the totem pole between one generation and the next generation, she must come into her own, which takes 30 years. If you only go behind the bush with her, and make a child, she is of the moment. She has no -- she is not introduced by you into the history of the whole group. She has no way of becoming a grandmother, or an ancestress, you see. She cannot rise to the proper time lengths. That's only, so to speak, put into you by your learning to treat a sister. With her it's the same -- with the brother.

Everybody knows these great secrets, gentlemen. What I try to add is only consciousness and some respect for them. I don't -- really today it is so im- -- unimportant whether people go to church, gentlemen, because you misunderstand the Church, anyway. But it is terribly important that you should rediscover your divinity in this power to be alternating a brother and a lover. And I assure you, you all are. It is the sovereignty of man that by the simple word "Sister" you can suddenly see in your sweetheart this human being which is not dependent on your lust, is not waiting to go to bed with you, but is this child, for example, as Joseph when he went to -- and took the baby and put it in the cradle, you see, in -- in Bethlehem. That's the great story of -- of the birth of -- of Jesus, that there, the whole question of the marriage in the tribe is put just on the opposite pole, where there is no lust, no relation of sensuousness, you see. The child is born and the father has to act out the midwife, because Mary has become Joseph's sister. And that's the idea of the virgin birth, by the way. It plagues so many people. The problem of the virgin birth is that in this case, it only mattered that Joseph and Mary are -- were sister and brother. That's the only part that's interesting in this story.

So that goes through -- all of humanity, gentlemen. And today, with these psychoanalysts and so, it's nearly lost, because people are told that even the mother is an object of lust. That is, the son wants to go to bed with his mother. I don't know where they found this. But you see, they have really gone back to prehistoric animal life. You see, these people. They are radicals. Now, don't -- we have to look into this -- steps. It is perfectly true that among the animals, mothers and fathers for a short while do not exist. Once the child -- the colt, or the chicken, or whoever it is -- the bitch has reached a certain stage, there's no memory. All the relations of sex are concentrated so totally, you see, on the consciousness of any dog, or any bitch that there is nothing else. There is no horizon. Perhaps we may use this word with -- to some lasting effect, gentlemen. The tribes established horizons of time and space over the members of the tribe. The horizon places even the greatest passion, the passion of lust, of sex, you see, in the -- under the horizon of permanency, of its opposite. On a horizon, the sun rises and it sets. Now, if you take the story of Joseph and Mary, and the story of your mating, you see that when the sun rises on your passion, you only try to -- be in this. It is very hard for you to see the sunset, too. The sunset would be the -- mother giving birth to the child, you see. Then your passion completely has died down. You even look in the other direction. You don't want to know it. It's too distasteful to you. It's dirty. This is not very agreeable to see a -- to see a pregnancy, or to see a birth. It's travail. You sweat, you -- you run away, as you say. Now the horizon of the tribe establishes, you see, the identity between the sunrise and the sunset of your passion, and it teaches you that after the sunset, there is a sunrise again. It's the first calendar of human life, gentlemen. Very interesting. The first calendar of human life tries to identify passion and non-passion. Difference and indifference. Ecstasy and -- yes, ecstasy and indifference, I should say. The problem of humanity is to find the sameness between the ecstatic, the passionate, you see, and the cold. You try to be objective, gentlemen, cold only. Your ancestors tried to be in their revivals ecstatic. But the problem is only to be the same person in ecstasy and in indifference. You cannot be objective, you see, as long as you do not know that to be objective and to be passionate are just two sides of your life. If -- you want to be objective instead of living. This you cannot do, gentlemen. I'm all for being objective at times, and passionate at other times. You understand? The problem of man is always the horizon on which the sun of objectivity can set and the sun of subjectivity can rise. Before, you have not been able to see that your sister and your bride are, as in the Song of Songs, one, you are not human. You're just little apes. That's what you try to do by your claim that you want to be objective. You -- nobody can be either objective or passionate. Life only begins -- historical life -- when you can

remind yourself in the moment of passion that there will be a sunset of this passion. And when you can remember, in your moment of indifference that there has been a consecration of your passion, which has allowed you now, you see, to stick, despite your indifference to the wife of your choosing. If you leave your ch- -- mo- -- your wife in the moment when she gives birth, you are a scoundrel. Why? It's very objective to say at that moment "I've nothing to do there," you see. Isn't it very objective? You really have as a male nothing to do there. As a male, you haven't. But because you have been consecrated into the priest of the tribe, there is now your place. It's purely inspired. It has nothing to do with the physical -- any physical reason. Objectively, you should be on the other end of the globe. Otherwise you would -- now you will have to support this brat. You don't want that. Why should your money go for the support of this brat? Physically, naturally, you can never explain that.

Let's take a break. Wie?

[tape interruption]

[Opening remarks missing]

... very simple rule of thumb for this problem of incest. I think it is pertinent.

The -- as you know, there has been much talk about inbreeding, or exogamy and what is better in eugenics. It's all talked on on a biological level. Long ago, St. Augustine, the bishop of Hippo, the saint of the Church, the father of the Church, was asked this question: "Why not incest? Isn't it very handy?" And he said, "It is not, for a simple reason. Wherever a word -- a name of love has been already been given to a sister or a mother," or in those days even the aunt or the cousin, "you can't approach this person with a new name. Love needs a name given to this sweetheart or your bride for the first time. Incest is everything -- every situation in which somebody has first been called by a dispassionate term, sis- -- like Sister. You cannot rearrange this, because love must give this person a name as though you see her for the first time. And since, between mothers, sisters, brothers, and fathers, there is already a first name of love, the second name would be deteriorated, would be impaired."

And therefore, I think that's the best explanation of the incest rule of man in history. That wherever you have given first already a name, you see, of no passion, like "Sister," you can never approach the situation in the way it should be approached. That's why in these orgies, there is this ecstasy that you meet this woman for really as though you had never seen her before. And that leaves the

idea of the totems of the tribe. A group that has met before dispassionately should -- cannot enter marriage. As you know, the old tribes in their arrangement of marriages, were very careful to split the tribe into marriage groups. You may have heard in anthropology, or sociology, or in prehistory, or wherever you have met with these problems, with the fact that the tribe had subdivisions. And that -- one had perhaps the fish as a totem, and the other has the eagle, and the third the raven, and the fourth the bull. These totems have the -- this profound reason that if you have met these people on -- in -- without ecstasy, they are already sacred. They are out of the running. They are not the people, you see, to choose. Today the incest problem, as you know, is not a physical problem in the family. Nobody thinks really of marrying his sister. But if you marry your coed, you may already make this mistake that you have met this girl first, you see, in a dispassionate way. And you have to think twice whether this coed is really so new to you, so unknown, you see, that you can discover a new relationship. A good marriage must try to see -- give a new name to the mother of your children, and not something already hereditary. I feel the problem of intermarriage and of inbreeding today is very much a problem not so much of the family as of the schools. You can inbreed by marrying the girl with whom you went to school from your eighth to the 13th year. You understand this? Because you have called this girl first, just as a -- as a fellow child, you see, as your fellow classmate, and as your playmate, and that is not the true origin of marriage. In marriage, the sequence is: first, you see this girl for the first time as somebody whom you desire; and the second step is that you add to her all the horizon of her becoming your sister and the mother of your children and the daughter of your parents. If you pervert this sequence, gentlemen, you put things -- stand the things on their head, because passion is the founding energy. And indifference, or -- not indifference, but objectivity, or realism, as you like to call it, or factualism -- is always that which then comes out of us.

So I think St. Augustine's answer is very beautiful. He simply said, "Wherever a name of love has already been borrowed by the younger generation, from the parents, where you have called somebody your sister, or your mother because you were taught to use these terms, the -- the -- you are lukewarm. You have inherited this." Inherited love, gentlemen, is the reason for the incest rules, because you have already lived with these -- these people, you see, in affection, but without passion. They cannot become the -- the object of your passion. Can you see this? And this solves many riddles. And it is the only explanation I've ever found in the literature on this subject which holds water, which is really completely correct. You can test it. All the biological explanations will never work because, as you know in breeding, you can have at times the necessity for

inbreeding, the feeling that you should stay to your race, like the princess, or here, the white man who doesn't want his daughter to marry a colored man. And in other cases, we have the great feeling of embracing the whole world and going out. Physically, you can never decide these things, really. But you can very well when you ask your tongue. Where your tongue has already applied a name within the family relation, you can hardly then be allowed to use the name for the beloved, as though this was for the first time.

The subdivisions of the tribe then tried to pay attention to this problem of keeping the woman whom you meet on the -- at the meeting ground for marriage unknown to you. You have never spoken to her before. You speak to her for the first time. It is this great experience of the power of giving somebody your name so totally that there is nothing, you see, you have to obliterate, which is really new to you. That she can become old and familiar to you, but she is somebody entering your horizon like the sun for the first time.

Now, gentlemen, the -- on these totems, let me say something which is -- may also show you how this is really the spiritual or the inspiring part of human biography, of human living. When I was out in British Columbia, I was struck with something I had never found in any books: that I had to walk there through the underbrush on the paths made out by the great animals: the elk, or the moose. All people who go on expeditions in unexplored countries -- without maps we went, we didn't know where we were going -- have to -- or are very grateful when they then find these paths made by the big animals, to their watering place, for example. The meeting grounds of the weak, frail, primitive man were the paths created by the animals. And the animal totem is, I'm quite convinced of this, never only the -- the superstition that man came from an eagle, or from a lion, or from a bear, as you can read in most textbooks. But it is the simple acknowledgement of the gratitude, the spiritual gratitude owed to these animals for the organization of this incredibly weak man, who has -- had at that time no eis- -- no iron axe, no steel, you see, weapons. He had perhaps stone weapons. He could not possibly fell those trees, which he had to in order to find the place of union inside the jungle.

And so man, in not only giving name to his ancestor, whom he buries, but also in naming himself after those animals, recognized a dependency on the existing universe, on the existing cosmic order. We have, for thousands of years, and as you see, even modern man, we still follow the paths of the created world. The first five days of creation, gentlemen, are much more with modern man than you care to admit when you live here in these urbanized cities. You don't see that we still to this day follow the water courses and the animal courses. And even the

birds direct us. The otters do. The beavers do. All these animals, which you find used in the totems of the tribe, in some way or other have actually directed the paths of man on this earth.

And the word "path" therefore, gentlemen, you should make the foundation of the political understanding of tribalism. The tribes try to find paths in the jungle. Paths in time, paths in the thicket. And that's why, going upstream, following there the water courses, or following the paths of the wild animals was the first power -- political power that allowed these groups to become a little larger than the -- the small group of husband and wife and children. That's the one thing, gentlemen. The relation of the tribesman to the animals is one of spiritual gratitude, of gratification by their directing powers, by their -- the work they have done for them. Because an elephant, and a lion, you see, and a fox, were more -- were superior to man. This explains to you all these strange ideas of dragons, and lions, and sphinxes, and cherubs, in the Old Testament and in antiquity. People felt that man should base his existence by bringing together all the achievements of the animal kingdom and making use -- put them to use. This has nothing to do with man's pedigree in a physical sense, but it has very much to do with man's devotion to what existed already, to the organization of the world which he could inherit. It's his inheritance.

The boy scouts, of course, still try to do some such thing, again -- it's a very -- the beginning of such revival. But I think most people today -- all the textbooks I know never mention this confrontation of primitive man with the achievements of the animals. They think that man develops, or evolves, you see, by evolution out of the animal. I think that's of no interest to any one of us. There we are. Whether we came from these animals, from the apes or not, is a very minor matter compared to the great question these first men had to solve: how much use can they make of what these animals already, you see, did. You see, this is a very different relation: one of working together, and one of owing them something -- some gratitude. This explains to you the sacredness in which the animal world was held. These people did -- these animals, these beings, these creatures did something for man. You may sum it all up in the one sentence: man without the large animals -- and the small animals, by the way -- couldn't have survived. The -- the political organization of the first thousand years of man depended on his following the paths, the trails of the animals.

So it is very different from what you think that man was threatened by the animals, or that they were -- he was superior to them. At the first beginning, man certainly was weaker than the animals. I think we still are. The whale, if you think of Herman Melville, he's -- still has this symbol of the white whale, you see.

As he, the white whale, knows what he is doing and has all the powers in the world and this little crew on the -- on the boat has to try to -- to match his energy. So from the very first, gentlemen, man's grouping was trying to imitate the achievements of the animal, in a very permissible way.

Let's just list what we did today. I tried to show you that the creation of marriage, the consecration of a room of chastity, the organization of the tribal meeting as being able to draw people together who otherwise did not see each other, and tried -- attempt -- tried to allow them to mate passionately with newly seen, newly invoked, newly named people of the other sex, that is the great center of production of tribalism. The center -- the tribe produces marriages. And all the things which you know of the tribe -- taboo, tattoo, incest rules, totem -- all go back to this one, simple central problem: how do people so fall in love that their marriage means more than the satisfaction of their momentary lust?

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Opening remarks missing]

... want to stress one point, gentlemen: that the power of a name given for the first time is the deepest reason for the incest rules. That the way we live is from the high moments of first seeing something to the commonplace, to seeing people repeatedly. The honeymoon is an expression of this fact that the routines of life must not come without some passion, some high day. In the German language, the word for wedding is "high time," which means that the time is exceptionally sub- -- sublimated, and it's like a water tank put up with pressure. From there -- the -- the life can then run down, as a clock would. Well, this means, gentlemen, that it is not only that "Sister" cannot precede "Sweetheart" because it is a different name. That wouldn't make -- wouldn't be important. But that the name given for the first time must be experienced by the lovers. The great thing is that somebody who had no name, you see, now receives a name. This is the -- like the discovery of America. Obviously any first-generation man who lands at the Statue of Liberty loves this country much more emphatically than a man whose fourth generation -- goes to Dartmouth College. He's lukewarm. He's accustomed to this. It's routine. He knows all {-- gone} soft.

So this first-generation spirit, gentlemen, of the pioneer, of which we talk here so much in this country -- pioneer spirit -- is exactly what was introduced into the marriage of the tribe. It was a pioneering experience. And as you well know, to pioneer is to have -- twice the intensity of the man who does something from routine. This is the general concept of the pioneer, which you must keep. In this country, it is easy to discover the pioneer spirit -- at the frontier. But you rarely know that anything in life has to pass through these two phases of being first called, for the first time, and then because of the greatness of the discovery, being made permanent and stabilizing gratitude for the greatness and the high point of this experience. This is the deepest reason why the girl cannot come from a too-familiar group.

If you want to understand the tribe, compared to modern industry, modern industry produces factories. You believe that factories constitute together modern industry. That's your fiction, your illusion. Fifty factories do not make industry. Because, as you well know, every day factories must go out of business and others must come in when the ways of production change. You learn in Tuck School that factories, to get -- statistically comprehended, build up industry. Not a word of truth in that. Industry is that principle which creates factories and

dismisses and dismantles factories. Boom, bust. Ghost towns. How do you explain ghost towns? They have been factories. They are -- all gone out of existence. That doesn't change the fact that we live by industry. Because the industry, when it is worthwhile, there creates a factory, brings down a factory. And -- you see, it must withdraw its support and out goes the factory. You can never explain modern production by thinking, as you are accustomed to think, from the atom. When Mr. {Debohr} wanted to explain the atom, he had to go to the solar system, and had to -- to design, as you may have heard, a system of planets circulating, rotating inside the atom. So it -- is it quite impossible ever to explain the whole out of its parts, gentlemen. You can never understand the tribe if you start from marriage, simply, and say, "All the married couples together form the tribe." And the same way, if you have a thousand factories -- General Motors, and Ford, and General Electric -- you still haven't industry, because industry is production of the basis of science. And wherever science leads you to a new discovery of electricity, or of oil, there industry goes. And accordingly older pla- -- centers of production go out of business. And new sprang up.

Now that's exactly what the tribe does with families. It is giving up decadent families and it is founding new families. And it is mending families. How does it do this, gentlemen? The superiority of the tribe over the family, as the principle of the life of primitive man, of primordial man, I should say, is found in the law of adoption. From the very first day of life -- as we have surgery, as people try to mend wounds of the body, of a single person wounded in battle, as you find that the earliest tribes, of course, tried to save a valiant warrior, so that he shouldn't bleed to death -- in the same sense, a marriage is cured by adoption. Adoption is as old as the spirit of the tribe, and that means, as old as marriage. That's very strange. It isn't that the Hollywood stars have invented adoption because of their waistline. That's an old story. Kings, and nobility, and rich men have always needed heirs to continue. To find somebody who would continue the family was something that should -- had to be done artificially in cases when it hadn't happened physically.

So it is very strange to behold, gentlemen, that the possibility of adoption shows you how the power of the tribe to name somebody as the child of somebody else reveals the stupendous capacity of the tribal organization. It could fill lacunae in the physical world. It could say of somebody that he now was to be recognized as the son of somebody else -- though there was no physical tie. And why -- how could he do it? By initiating this one in the same form as -- in -- at the tribal meeting other such things were done, in the great ecstatic dance on the tribal green. I think that from this rule of adoption, you may be able to think out for yourself the -- my right to claim that the tribe explains the families. The fami-

lies do not explain the tribe. The factory does not explain the -- the industry, but industry explains every one workshop of -- that exists, or that gives up the spirit. This is very important for you because the modern man is so -- so completely particularized that he really thinks you can -- you can create the world out of sun and moon. But you can only understand sun and moon if there is a sky and a world and at -- at large. You cannot build up the universe by putting it together. This is however the fantastic undertaking of most modern men. So they never get anywhere.

You see this is very interesting by an industry -- from the point of view of the unemployed. As long as you try to understand industry as the sum of factories, you have no interest in the unemployed. And that was the case in this country down through the Depression, as you know. But if you understand industry, then you understand that unemployment is a part of the industrial process. And it is the most important part in which you recognize it's the functioning of the industrial process. The unemployed belong to the whole of industry, although they do not belong into any one part of industry.

Now the same is true, gentlemen, of the overpopulation in the tribe. They are also unemployed. They are also people who can't get married. The tribe suffers either from no children -- that's cured by adoption -- or a {tribe -- it } suffers from overcrowding. The problem of unemployment, gentlemen, is as old as the tribe -- as mankind on this earth. It isn't an invention of our days. Only the stupidity, the folly, with which the 19th century has dealt with unemployment -- the economic theory which you learn, which omits the problem of unemployment, the so-called capitalistic theory which you learn -- that is fantastically stupid. Now the tribe wasn't that stupid. But it was tragically hit by an -- the unemployment problem. It saw it, but it couldn't solve it, as little as the single nation can solve it. Luxembourg cannot solve its unemployment problem. Guatemala cannot solve its unemployment problem. Unemployment forces a change of the frontiers of the world, all the time. If you have 10 million people unemployed in Italy, then the United States must write the Marshall Plan. It's a very poor way of {dealing} the unemployment problem, but we should let these 10 million Italians come in here. We don't do this. But we have to do something, so at least we pay them some money. The dole. Because the unemployment is that motor, gentlemen, that transcends the existing political organization on the globe. Now the tribe is an organization of people who actually can meet. And we said that the numbers of the tribe move between 500 and 5,000. When you get to higher units, you get the United Nations, as you know. The five tribes here in this -- in upper New York state. That was an attempt to go beyond the physical measure of supporting for three days and three nights, or for a week, and the

orgies of the tribe, 5,000 people. Well, you can't feed more, you see, within primitive times. Therefore you can't have a tribal organization that exceeds these 5,000 people. So you get to this -- this theory of five -- five united tribes. As you know, at this country that has been the biggest entity ever created without the white man's interference. Deep reason, because the tribe is stymied when the people cannot be locally vaccinated with the ecstatic experience of having one ancestor in the spirit, of worshiping one -- dead hero, of looking up to the same totem poles, of receiving the same tattoos on their body, you see. All these things have to be performed physically, there in the presence of the ancestral spirit. So that's the limit.

Now what did the tribe with -- do with the su- -- with the -- with the surplus?

Gentlemen, the history of mankind is that of an eternal stream of people creating new tribes, and new tribes. These people, who had to leave the tribe in various ways in many times -- regions were called "wolves," -- wolves. You have perhaps read in the paper that the -- Nazis tried to -- or are said to have tried to organize werewolves. The werewolf. Who has heard this -- this term in 1945? Well, this is an interesting word, {betwe-} -- because the word be- -- because the word -- the term "wer," -- w-e-r is the same as Latin, tir. And it means "man." A wolf is -- the werewolf is a man turned wolf. That is, a man -- an unemployed. And by and large, we have treated in this country, in -- during the 19th century, in the capitalistic countries in Europe the same way, the unemployed as werewolves. They had no place to go. They had no -- and when they were poor, as you know. They didn't even the vote, in England, for example. Because they were poor. So they couldn't even express their economic needs by the political machinery. You see, so were -- they were not members of the tribe, of the country, of the state.

So you see this is all present-day history. The way you treat today the unemployed of the world, not just of the Americans, but the unemployed, shows whether you have a vision of the -- of that one world. All these people who sign up for One World, {Mr. Stride} or something to me are utterly foolish. If they are -- but if I see an American boy bring in one foreigner, he does more for the organization of one world than with all the subscriptions to these fantastic abstract newspapers on One World. Because he accepts the fact that one unemployed is stateless, is asocial. He's not integrated into society. It's a very serious problem -- proposition, gentlemen, produced every day.

Now in the ancient days, we shall see that this changed later, these people set out to found another tribe. And that's why we get these perhaps hundred thousand or more tribes, poured out. If you come to think that from the Bering Strait, the people who tran- -- who came over from Asia, have spread out through the

whole of this American continent. And that we have here several thousand languages spoken. You can -- must begin to think not of the individual tribe, but of the eternal stream by which tribes were produced. Tribes were produced by this surplus so that every tribe is again the matrix of other tribes, through the werewolves, through those who were cut off.

That's the real story, gentlemen, the history of the tribes. It's a great story, because it didn't come to an end until the whole world was filled with people. You never think how this was done. Well, it is one story. These tribal languages, gentlemen, have been invented by human genius. Usually in a dialectical fashion, because the Indo-Europeans say "pater" and "mater." The Semites say "abu." That is, they put the vowel before the "b" and the Romans and the Germans put the word in "father" and "pater" the vowel after the "p." But it is the same word. You must think that the tribes couldn't have invented these languages without the constant irritation and stimulation from do -- going one better, for distinguishing themselves from each other. I know where found this even mentioned in the literature. That's why the literature always strikes -- strikes me as being so unmodern, so static. People describe primitive man: here's one, and there's one. That's not the story of mankind. Mankind was perfectly aware of the unity of the human race, from the very beginning. Marriage proves it. Memory proves it. What we have seen, they were unable with the help of tattoos to reach a greater perspective than seven generations. You remember what we said about this time { }.

Now the full stream of historical life was, of course, more than seven generations. It goes now on for 6,000 years, 7,000 years. By and large, that's my guess. That perhaps all this started 7000 B.C. or 6000 B.C. The history of mankind is very short, gentlemen. All what you hear is all nonsense. There is no million years, or 500,000 years of human history. It's a very short story. People who don't believe in the spirit always replace the spirit by millions of years. That's { } -- would escape -- they say, "It came to pass in 500 million of years, which -- that shows more probable." Gentlemen, it's even more improbable that anything reasonable should happen in 500 million years than in 7,000. But all this is mythology. It's just childish. The ancients -- the Egyptians did the same. They had -- also had -- had for their Egypt 500,000 years back. But we know when it started. It started exactly the year 2782. And the tribal history then, before the empires settled down in a different manner, may be traced, I would say to 6000 B.C. -- 7000 B.C. But we have no proof of anything older, as what human-speaking, human-organized mankind goes. That's, of course, in contradiction to all these cheap evolutionary schemes, which have never applied the first experiences about human speech, how we see languages develop. After all, we have these lan-

guages to this day. We can -- we can poke into them. There are 4,927 languages spoken in Africa to this day. There they are. They are not from eternity. And they all are mutually dependent. They all have been developed by something which you must know is very important: by contrast imitation. Imitation by contrast. When you get black shirts in Italy, gentlemen, that was fascism, as you may have heard. Mr. Mussolini introduced black shirts, because he had no soap. Then you get silver shirts in America and brown shirts in Germany. Now what is a brown shirt and a silver shirt? That is an imitation by contrast. You understand what that is? You have to have the shirt, but it has to have another color. This is one of the most frequent political recipes for multiplication. The -- political order, gentlemen, at any one time demands from everybody to do exactly the same. So the -- we have the FBI, and the counterintelligence, and other people have the secret police. And we boast that we have not the G- -- the GPU in -- of Russia. Well, we have something similar, gentlemen: an imitation by contrast. And if Mr. McCarthy had his way, we would have exactly the same. But it would, of course, be called, you see, the defense of liberty. That's imitation by contrast. You can call it DOL, you see, and it's still the GPU. DOL meaning "defense of liberty," you see.

So gentlemen -- this is one of the first things the political departments -- science -- the departments of political science should begin to teach you: how the -- in any one era you get 50 different nations, and they all do exactly the same. But they cannot confess that do exactly the same. So you see, what is brown for one is black for the other. But the black and the brown is absolutely indifferent, compared to the problem of the shirt.

Now that's what the tribes did. You find identity of purpose in the -- every tribal system in the world. But you find nuances. You find in some tribes, as I told you, that the man has to go to bed when the ch- -- his son is born so that he suffers with the others. In other tribes, people say, "We won't do this," just as the Germans will not eat an omelet-soufflé, because it's French, you see. And vice versa. But they eat the same. They live on eggs and chicken, both nations. So all -- all tribalism, nationalism, I mean all over the globe, is always beset of course by vanity and jealousy, and by the great fear of becoming superfluous. So every tribe had to prove its own inevitability that you couldn't dispense with, you see. And that, of course, is for any group leader a great insurance against unemployment, that he proves that he -- people can't do without {him}. So imitation by contrast, gentlemen, is the nerve of tribalism. There are two

limitations to the individual tribe. Size, 5,000 is of course an arbitrary number, but not quite. You find it still in Plato's laws. The citizens- -- -ry of Plato's best state is exactly 5,040 citizens. Very strange. But obviously he caught on to my class.

And the second is the limitation in the time. If you have only tattoos and migrating groups, and you have no written -- you see, therefore you can't have a library carried with you, and no stones of inscriptions, because you move on -- then you cannot have a memory that extends over seven generations. So gentlemen, you get between the various tribes, as the growing point of mankind in those primordial days, the so-called hero. The hero is a man who starts a new tribe. That's, I think, the simplest definition of a hero. Very important.

You hear much of heroism today, and -- and heroes are revived today in many ways, strange ways. But the founding fathers, they come nearest. What did -- had -- did George Washington have to do compared to Samuel Hancock? Who was the bankrupt man? Not Samuel Hancock, it was the other -- Samuel Adams, in -- Massachusetts. You had a rich man, George Washington, a gentlemen, who had served in the British Army with great distinction, under Sir Pepperell. And here was George Washington. He didn't need to become an American. He had all the honors he could wish for from George III. And here you get Samuel Adams, I think it's Samuel Adams -- is it Sam Adams? -- who was bankrupt and had to try to keep out of -- of jail for his debts. George Washington is the hero in the ancient sense of the tribe and Samuel Adams is not, because he has nothing to translate from the old society into the new, except something minus, except some shipwreck. He is a, you see, the { } of the old order { } Samuel Adams.

The riffraff, the rabble of the Revolution, gentlemen, in this country could never have built up the United States. That's why the Federalists had to do it. The founding fathers of this country are people who had something to lose.

A hero is a man -- now, would you bear with me for a very strange word which I use for good reason. Because it's a theological term which has lost its strength in your imagination. I want to give it this strength again. It's a simple secular process of transubstantiation. You may know that we say at the Communion supper of the Lord that bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and the blood of Christ. This is nothing superstitious, but Christ had, of course, to do something which every tribesman could understand. I mean, Christianity is -- Christ didn't come into the world through His contemporaries. He came into the world to all the people who had lived from 7000 B.C. to His own day, you must understand. That is His mission. That is -- means to be the Messiah. Jesus was not interested in His contemporaries. He treated them very super-

ciliously and contemptuously. But He was interested in all the tribes, all the cities, all the empires over the whole world. Since you do not understand it, you do not understand Christianity, and you do not understand transubstantiation. But every hero had to transubstantiate his former allegiance to an old tribe into the founding qualities of the beginner of a new tribe. He is -- how would you call such a -- what's the term for such link that is at the same time, you see, the heir of one group and the ancestor of another group? That is a hero. You see, this is a very strange situation, because any -- you can understand it more than any European, because your ancestors have come in the same way to this country. They had to transubstantiate their marrow, the marrow of their existence as Germans, as Britishers, as Irish, into this existence here as Americans, whether you know it or not. And whether they knew it or not. Having lived 20 years, 30 years in another world, they come here, you see, and here they are only known for what they are here. Nobody asks any questions what they have been elsewhere. But they have been elsewhere. You see. And that has made America. This constant transubstantiation of heredity into ancestry: this is what America is. You are this, gentlemen. You must understand the old tribal world better than anybody else. Because this is transubstantiation. A substance is transformed from an end into a beginning. We all -- you always speak of your heritage. There is no American heritage. There is only this heritage of transubstantiation, which is between the old and the new world, which is not American, properly speaking, but is this secret of bringing into this country, you see, something that is not of this country. A Nisei in this country is not simply an American, but somebody who has transubstantiated his virtues of a samurai, or whatever it is at home, into an American. And this is much more, gentlemen. You should never fall for this cheap Americanism. Your heritage is the -- again this great factory of Americans called the pioneer spirit, called the melting pot, however you call it. It is a process. Melting pot makes it very clear: a crucible into which forms are thrown and the substance is transubstantiated. Can you see this? That is the heroic phase of the creating of a new order of society. It is heroic. Gentlemen, the word "hero" I must try to free from all sentimentality, from all pep talk. It is a very sober, scientific statement, just as in chemistry when you define any compound. A hero is somebody who binds together two generations without showing one generation in evidence, without mentioning the other generation. The beginner of a group cannot mention the past without the weakening the future. And this is the hero. A hero is a two-generation man forced to act as though he was a one-generation man. This is a very important

definition, gentlemen. This makes you understand that heroism is with us all the time, wherever a man is forced to be silent about his former allegiance, because his associates know nothing about it, you see. They don't care. If the president of the Dante Society of Florence, when he comes to this country, he cannot talk here to Americans about the, you see, his {Dante -- being} the president of the Dante Society in Florence, you see. Doesn't help him. He has to start from scratch. And -- the deep feeling about this in this country that you have -- should have sold shoelaces on the curbstone at -- Brooklyn Bridge before you can become an American, which only says, "Don't mention anything that has gone on before."

But gentlemen, that doesn't mean that it hasn't gone on before. We -- you must learn to be free in two ways. You must be free not to mention the past of your family in -- out of America. And yet to be proud of it. This is the combination. Your people -- the people here are not interested in what the family did at home -- that you were an illegitimate child of David Bruce, king of Scotland. But you must have this power of using all this heritage, and throw it into this melting pot here. Can you see this point of a hero? The heroes, gentlemen, of the different tribes are the dynamism of the history of primordial man. The wolves in the eyes of the old tribe are the heroes in the eyes of the new tribe. For the old tribe, the story is, they go into the jungle and they disappear. And for the new tribe, they come from nowhere and there they begin. That's what all the fairy tales are talking about. All the fairy tales, as you know, speak of the prince who comes out of the jungle. He's a bear, he's a -- he's a wolf, he's something, you see, some animal. And suddenly he's a prince. Well, there are many rivulets, and brooks, and tributaries who have formed these fairy tales. But the main point of the fairy tale is that the hero begins from scratch. Nobody knows where he comes from.

But he is somebody already when he comes. He's full of power, full of pep, and he knows exactly what he has to do. He has to found a new tribe. And how does he know it? Because he has to create a counter-language, a new language. All this is so obvious to anybody who looks on -- { } that you -- I always wonder that it is never mentioned. As I said, it's all today a description of differences. But it is never the story of this -- what I like to call, gentlemen, the one great stream of the tribes. The tribes formed one great stream pouring out over this globe exactly like the great rivers. In exactly the same manner. You can only explain it as a tremendous surge. We know of the birds who go to Florida, as you know, nesting and then come -- go back north incredible distances. The North -- the eels traveling in the ocean, from the North Sea down to the Med- -- Caribbean. Well, man is -- is strange, certainly very strange. From the very first day we

find him moving from one corner of the earth to the opposite. You'll find the Australians now to be living in Patagonia. Incredible! They separated as the -- Firelanders south of Argentina -- separated at a time from the Australian primitives when they had no words, no demonstratives, no pronouns. We can see this in the language. The language is identical in its roots with regard to nouns and with regard to numerals. But the word for "this" and "that" hadn't yet been created in the maternal language, so the Patagonians, you see, didn't. Well, there was a peaceful emigration. No new -- completely new tribe had to be created because it was so far away. This same group in Fireland, which today still can be recognized as Australian would had -- had to create a totally new language in Australia itself, because they would have been too close, you see. They couldn't have had the passion, the ecstasy, the emphasis without your own {marks}, and without your own totems, and without your own terms, so to speak.

The closer by, the more had the tribes to be differentiated. You find today in this country tribes very close -- neighborly tribes speaking a totally different language. And you find on the other hand relationships between languages over long distances. Because the more far away the werewolf could get, the founder of the next tribe, the less it was, you see, vital to change the equipment of the tribe. You had to be -- you always had to be more original at home, you see. All -- every family cramps one's style, as you know.

There was a nice article the other day, "My family cramps my style." It does. It's very easy to represent your family when nobody else, no other member of the family is present, you see. Then you are all for the Millers. But when all the Millers are together, you try to get out. I hope you do. You seem -- look rather uncertain. Wie? He travels so much he never sees the Millers anyway. Isn't that true?

(Not quite.)

So I think we have here found the secret of thousands of years of human life. And of course you can understand this tribal life in some corners of the globe is even at this moment going on, although it's ebbing. We have no other example, and that the -- the number of languages spoken in Europe has doubled -- over the last 50 years. The literary languages of Europe have doubled. That is, the tendency to revive life through tribalism is coming back with a vengeance. The Brit- -- in Brittany they speak Breton, in Welsh they -- Wales they speak -- Welshian again, and all -- Gaelic, and on it goes. It's fantastic. And the oldest civilizations of the globe, the Europeans, try to regain the power of creating languages.

They may not succeed, but I mention it to show you how serious this desire is to go tribal today, to revive the or- -- most original power of man to speak. In this country, it's all in the opposite direction. We still are here in a -- in a melting pot where a man can get away with murder and he calls it basic English. Well, you believe in Esperanto, and all this nonsense, gentlemen. If you want to live, destroy Esperanto. If you want to make money, then have Esperanto. It's good for commerce, but it's not good for the soul. Because language makes you speak with conviction, and Esperanto makes you speak without conviction.

Why is that so, gentlemen? Let me now come back to one more feature of the tribe. The tribe organizes existence in this hierarchy: names given to each other. The character of a name in a language is that it is given mutually. The hero is suffering, and that makes him heroic. That he calls, and he isn't called back. I mean, a hero is a man who can stand the solitude, you see, of the lack of mutuality, because he begins. That is the -- the -- that is why the hero is always a tragic hero, because the hero has not yet a group that calls him by his name. He makes a name for himself, you see. He's the first name. The namer, you may -- call him. A hero is somebody who can name others, but they have not known, you see, anything before he comes -- in the picture. He has lost those people who named him -- his parents, his friends, his relatives, you see. He is the unnamed.

This is important, gentlemen, that names are mutual. Then you get words. They are from mouth to mouth. They are between the dead and the living, as we have seen in the tribe. That is, the chorus of the living who dance at the burying green and the mask of the medicine man, who represents the dead, speak to each other: certain songs, certain magical songs. They are words. I mean, there you must mention the sun and the moon, and the stars, and the earth, and the feed, and the hens. That is, you get words for all the things which express your actions. And finally you get the priest and the lawyer. You get a -- case. You get a murder. You get a crime in the tribe. You have to go to the altar, as we said, and expiate an act of impiety. Whenever you get -- go to court, gentlemen, for wrong -- righting a wrong, you have to define your terms. And this is, therefore, the world of concepts, of definitions, definitions or concepts. That is, gentlemen, the world of the wrong-doing, the world when we step -- step -- stop living is the world of concepts, the world when we doubt that we know what is right. Then we have to try to define our terms, when we suspect each other. When we are confident in each other, we can speak words, because we understand each other. We don't have to define our terms. And when we are in love with each other, and in great passion, and give orders to each other, then we call each other and the spirit that moves us by their proper names mutually.

Names are above your heads, gentlemen. In the -- I could put your name here -- here, up here. That would be the right place. Not here, where you always wear it. It should be up here. Any man has his halo on top of him, and that is the meaning of the halo of the saint. That it is surrounding him, you see, that he appears in this name as the spirit -- as a body embodying the spirit that is -- contained in this name. When a grandchild has the name of his ancestor -- of his grandfather, this name is his halo, originally.

We'll see in Greece that this played a great part in the whole myth of Greece -- that comes later. The names then, gentlemen, are mutual. They are the currents of force that regulate our behavior as sister and brother, as husband and wife. I talked to you about this division of the sanctuary inside the home, you see, and the warpath and the free paths of the orgies of the tribe there. Where boy meets girl. This is done by names, by calling out.

You have learned the opposite. When I talk to you, you come from a world of schools -- scholastic upbringing. You are all medieval minds of 1100 to me. Very dark ages you belong to. You don't believe in scholasticism, you think, and in medievalism; but you define your terms. Now, a man who defines his terms is a very poor scholastic. He's a -- he's a man who has not the spirit anymore to move mutually by invocation of a name. And he has lost the power of immediate talk. And he must define his terms. And he's a lame duck. If a man gets up in a lecture and says, "Let me define my terms," I leave the room. I'm not interested. Why should -- he can -- I can define my terms. He can define his terms. We have nothing to say to each other. That's good for lawyers, in court. But you believe this. You -- you are impressed by this man's logic, and cleverness, and smartness, because he defines his terms. A man who defines his terms in your -- in your presence says that he suspects you, and that you have nothing to say to each other. It's ridiculous. But that is the alpha and omega of a -- of Dartmouth student, to ask another person to define his terms. Can I do it? I have to use words for the definition. Well, I may have to -- this is one term which I have to define, but all the other words by which I define the terms, gentlemen, that is again just the confidential treasure of the English language on which you have to rely. If it comes -- all comes down that you can define one term, you may -- be able to define two terms. You can never possibly define all your terms without depending on your -- my being the professor, and you being the student; or one being the classmate of the other fellow. That is, by calling each other, you see, names, either host- -- in a hostile sense, or in a friendly sense. And by first being able to speak to each other. This precedes everything.

So throw this out, this business of plea- -- playing the smart one and then

getting up on a -- before these innocent voters and saying, "Let me define my terms." There is a famous book in the -- literature of the last 30 years written by a Mr. Alfred Whitehead. Alfred Whitehead was a charming English gentleman who happened to be a mathematician down to his 65th year. In the 65th year, he was called to Harvard, because the spirit was dying there, or was already dead. And he was -- I -- he was a great soul and a very inspiring man. And so he came there. But he wrote a terrible book, which begins with 28 definitions. Because he was a mathematician, he -- that was what he had learned to do. He was a great man despite the 28 definitions, but never believe that he was a great man because of the 28 definitions, because nobody in the -- whole, wide world can keep in mind the 28 definitions. He cannot. Nobody can -- can, you see, understand after having read five pages of 28 definitions. Show me the man who can keep in mind 28 -- first-time definitions, of which you have never heard before. He pleased himself with this fiction. It didn't matter. As I said, he was a very great man despite this fact. But if you open this book of Whitehead, you can study the tomfoolery of the academic world. It is utter foolishness to believe that a man can define 28 terms.

You can define this in mathematics, because that is the science were you want to get away from words and names, you see, because you do not wish to talk to people in mathematics. So don't take mathematics, as you all do, as the argument, or as the -- the right direction for the polit- -- politics of society. The social sciences in this country are so im- -- immeasurably childish, because they all have as their ideal the want -- they want to determine their terms. You cannot determine their terms as long as you speak to -- of people who can talk back, because then they have to speak your language and you have to speak their language. Like the social worker who came to a woman and said, "I understand your -- your husband is a drunkard. And we have made him a case in our study. And I -- let me then ask you how he behaves when he's drunk."

And so the woman gave the only sensible answer. She said, "My husband is not a drunkard. Is yours? Is yours?" And by -- thereby she had the social scientist -- worker, you see, completely baffled.

So this lady had defined a drunkard, but she had never looked at her own husband in the light of this definition. She called him "Charlie," and so did this woman her -- think of her own little -- of her own husband as a -- as "Johnny," who would perhaps drink sometimes, but he wasn't a drunkard. And if only all the cases in this country would talk back to the social workers, we would get rid of all the social workers.

They are all defining their terms, and all killing people. Because anybody who is defined by your terms, you see, is no longer -- has no longer the right to his -- the name in which he wants to be spoken to in his own right. When a man is a drunkard, he has -- cease to be John Smith. Don't you see this? All these case workers kill! They decline to use that name by which this man is known among his friends. They label him. This is very serious, gentlemen. That's how you destroy democracy at this moment. The psychologists destroy the society, by taking upon themselves the impertinence of describing this man as a case. The man has the right to be called by his name, and by no other thing. Come to know him and find out what his -- what -- how he is, how he behaves. But don't label him. But -- what do you do? You label them all: "feeble-minded," "idiots." The social workers are the feeble-minded.

This is very serious, gentlemen. And you must understand that in a primordial society, this cruelty might be applied to the prisoner of war. He was a case, you see, the man who had no name in the tribe. And you -- we produce in this modern society again these nameless people, which led finally to the concentration camp. The modern concentration camp is the triumph of the case-worker, of the man or the woman who takes it upon himself to label a man with a name which they do not dare to speak to him in his presence. That's the -- when you define your terms. That's the result.

So this is very serious business, gentlemen. You can define your terms at the altar, in a law-court. When a man is a murderer, you have to prove it. And finally, you see, that sticks, and he is a murderer. But that's serious business before you can call a man a thief. He has to be -- stand condemned. There is all the rigamarole of justice, and law, and defense, and complaint before you are allowed to label a man a thief. Isn't that true?

But we are today in our modern social sciences imitating the law courts, because you have learned that a concept is better -- and a definition -- than a word. And you have also learned names are shadows, powerless. To give you an example of the modern power of a name, gentlemen, let me give you one simple example. When a worker is called by his employer for a readjustment of his wages, he simply has today to say that he is a member of the CIO. The name CIO is a magic which forbids the employer to talk to him directly. That is the whole problem of collective bargaining. The whole problem of collective bargaining is: this man, William Ryan, is still William Ryan for his play -- playmates, and for his wife. But he is not William Ryan to Mr. Wilson when he directs General Motors.

Then he has to be treated as a unionized worker. And Mr. Ryan -- Wilson can a hundred times call him "William Ryan." With regard to leave, and wages, and benefits, he, William Ryan, says, "I'm sorry, I'm organized." And that means that the workers have a different name when they speak with their employer. And they demand from the employer that he speak to them through the union. This is the power of a name. But then we are told that names are just -- what is in a name? That names are just fictions. It is incredible. Names are the greatest powers in the world today. Think of McCarthy, or Malenkov, or Stalin. These are the real powers that govern the world. And then you are told in this college that names are superstitions.

Names are the only political powers we have. There are no others. Lincoln and Washington -- what else do we have in this country? Racetracks. We have very few names by which we can direct our steps. Don't destroy them by your superciliousness. As -- as students you are superior to names. You are not superior to names at all. Only when you destroy the sacred names you will fall for the diabolical names. Then you will worship Mr. Freud, as you all do. But isn't that a name? What do you understand of psychoanalysis? But you say, "Freud's a great man." Because you must have a great name. So you put the -- the anti-names, instead of the sacred names -- or Marx, or whatever it is, whom you choose. I don't care which debunker you take. All these debunkers are only taken up by you in the power of their names. You don't understand them. You can't define their terms. You believe it. Because you need names. All -- we all do. If you could only see, gentlemen: the tribal language creates three levels of speech. One is names, and they are always mutual. You can only be a son because somebody else is a father. And the greatness of this relation is that, you see, when you say "Sister," she calls you "Brother," you see. This is tremendous because it means, gentlemen, names have a compelling force. Compelling. They are compulsory. You cannot enter this re- -- magic relation, you see, without putting yourself inside of it. You yourself are named as you name. Do you see it -- when -- once you begin to see this, you know that all this talk against magic, or sorcery, or witchcraft is all nonsense. We all live by sorcery. Only we live by white witchcraft, by genuine witchcraft. Your mother uses witchcraft when she calls you "Johnny." And she receives back her -- your name, "Mother." That's witchcraft in the sense that it is compulsory. Can you deny -- can you withhold the term -- the name "Mother" from your mother? You cannot. You have to use it. How does she produce it? Just because she acts as your mother and treats you as her son. Very simple.

Gentlemen, life is compelling. But it is mutually compelled. White witchcraft means that the person who uses it puts himself under the magic, too. It means the difference between, gentlemen, the propagation of the faith by a missionary who dies in Japan like Saba- -- what was his name? The gro- -- great missionary to the Japanese? The Jesuit?

(Francis Xavier?)

Wie?

(St. Francis Xavier?)

Francis Kavi -- Kavia, wasn't it?

(Xavier?)

How do you spell it?

(X-a-v-i-e-r.)

Yes. How do you pronounce that?

(Ex-savior.)

Yes, quite. Or you are an advertising man who laughs at his own advertising, who uses magic for the other people, but says, "I would never buy this product," you see. The difference in life is only, gentlemen, between black sorcery and white sorcery. The black sorcerer says the others must believe. I don't. The white sorcerer says, "I believe, too. And I {act accordingly}."

You don't believe that you are under the spell, gentlemen. But the old tribes believed in spells. They were -- had spellbinders. We still have this word "spellbinder," which reminds you, gentlemen, that in this term "spellbinder," you reach to the first layer of human history. The whole tribe lived by spells. These spells were spoken in plainchant. That is, in a language which had not yet distinguished between singing and speaking. When you go to a m- -- Catholic mass or when you go to the synagogue and hear -- how do you call the -- the man who leads the prayer in the synagogue?

(Cantor.)

Wie?

(Cantor.)

The cantor. They speak like primitive men. The Church, as you know, is an institution that exists since the beginning of time, so obviously the Catholic priest must speak in the tone of the first man. And so he has this half-song, what we call plainchant. And there you have still the power of the spell; because as he speaks, he wants to be spoken to.

So we have, to this day, gentlemen, a much more normal relation to this problem of primitive man, as you admit. When this was purified in Christianity, in the Church, when the priest took over plainchant from the tribal sorcerer, or medicine man, as we call him, and when the masks could disappear, these tremendous masks -- I have here -- I want to { } some picture of it. Who hasn't -- has not seen tribals masks? Is there anybody? Well, it's known to you. They are very elaborate as you know, and they are the -- the great technique of the tribe. Well, when this disappeared, gentlemen, the orgies of the tribe still were kept, as you all know, in the May celebrations, around the Maypole. To this day, gentlemen, everything connected to the first of May in Europe, for example, in the Walpurgis Nacht in the Faust by Goethe, is tribal ritual. The same is true of the witchcraft here of the Indians, of course, you see. It is tribal ritual of the orgies still there, the masks at Carnival, that is, the ludicrous aspect, you see, of the tribe, in this sense, preserved. Because mankind always preserves the serious life of a former phase as a plaything. When our children play, you usually can be sure that it is an old ritual that is observed. All children's plays -- Hide and Seek, and Heaven and Hell, and how all these names -- these games go contain usually very old rituals. Legal ritual, or -- or others. Well, the dances around the Maypole were in England, for example, the remnants of the pre-Christian order of the tribes. And this has to be understood, gentlemen, that the positive character of tribalism is -- is really retained in the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Mass and in the plainchant of the priest. And that the byproducts of the old tribal life went into the modern carnival with its masks, and its {lauras}, and its dances. One last thing, gentlemen. Where a person has his heart, he has also his genius. The great artistic achievements of the tribes were the masks. They are insuperable. They are of a beauty. They can compete with any Madonna of Michelangelo, or Raphael. They are masks. They are animals. They are wasps or butterflies, or lions, or dragons. But they are insuperable. Every group of society, gentlemen, has as much genius as any other. And the greatness of the art of the tribe is there. The topic -- the topics do not interest us so much. We do not find

that people should express their highest aspirations by going beaver. But the mask of the beaver, there is no greater artist today than there was in those days when they made masks, you see, showing eagles or -- or beavers. That is, what you must recover, recuperate, gentlemen, in your -- inside yourself is the reverence for the genius of these primordial men. They had just as much genius as we have, or perhaps more, because they have after all created us, and we have still to give proof that we can create anything. Here we are, thanks to them. Now who is going to say to you, "Thanks to you, I'm here."

So that has -- remains to be seen what we are going to perform. But these people have performed. Therefore they had great genius. And they show it in the incredible beauty and perfection of their masks. Would you kindly take this, gentlemen, as a great clue to the history of art? What has to be artistically given changes according to the period. But the way it is mastered has exactly the same fortissimo, the same excellency then as today. Otherwise, these people would be of no interest to us. But what they have done, they have done to perfection. The -- the order of any one tribe, gentlemen, and the order of the eternal stream can then be shown in a kind of figure. If you get the tomb, or the totem pole, then the whole tribe would try to direct itself towards this past. The eyes of the tribe are directed backward. Anything that is a disturbance has to be expiated on the altar. That is, the future of the tribe -- look at the -- at the eyes of the Mexicans marching there to their doom, so to speak, in the, you see -- to their -- on the mural. The eyes are, as the Bible calls it, they are held, as though they had a veil for their -- around their eyes. They cannot see into the future. They look away from the future. It is too much. They need protection. They need the ancestral spirit to direct them. Therefore anything, gentlemen, that has to do with future leads into the jungle outside the -- tribe and begins the next tribe. This is the story of the hero. That is, the tribe has as its future: inside expiation, making up by sacrifice -- what has been changed, or if the change is too much, expulsion. Excommunication. What the Church does -- when it excommunicates, gentlemen -- it has inherited from the tribe. The excommunication, the saying, "You do not belong to the community." We said that the -- on the altar you can expiate. You can adopt. That is, you can create by a spiritual act some deficiency inside. But adoption would be backward into the ancestral tradition, wouldn't it? Excommunication is its very opposite. It leads beyond the tribe. So the beyond of the tribe, gentlemen, is really beyond its knowledge. The tribe does not look into a future. And it cannot look beyond its own boundaries. So we can't either, by the way.

This is the horizon of the tribe, as we call it, and we said that the horizon is

here determined by the warpath against the enemy. And it is here on the dancing-green defined by the power to unite for initiation and marriage. Now those of you who have taken Philosophy 9 -- who has taken Philosophy 9? Is there anybody? You'll remember the cross of reality. It is exactly the problem of any political group, of course, as the family, you see, to have a past and a future, and an inner sanctuary, you see, an inner body and -- of time, and an outer -- opponent, an outer defense organism. And so, you see, the warpath is the form of the fortress of life ...

[tape interruption]

... you see, by inroads made by impure spirits, so to speak. The flame on the altar is the symbol of the light this tribe tries to in -- entertain in its midst, as an eternal flame. And here comes, of course, the old ritual which you still find in the -- in any cathedral church of an eternal lamp burning. There has to be some fire that burns all the time and devours the impurities of this -- that may, you see, extinguish the spirit. And on the dancing green, you have the center meeting ground of the tribe.

This much then is the relation, gentlemen, of a tribe to the land, to the earth as created by {God's} { }. In the main, a tribe is an organization, gentlemen, which is purely personal, purely human, which has no relation to -- Heaven on earth. In the Church, today, everything that has to do with ancestry and offspring has been taken over from the tribe. And has been purified there, as I told you, the plainchant, you see, adoption, initiation -- all these things you find in the ordination of the priest, and so on. But what there is not existing in the tribe is the decent relation to the territory on which these tribes move. The earth is an enemy. The earth is an enemy, and you also find in the tribes no interest whatsoever in astronomy. It is not true that any primordial man looked up to the stars. They did not. They looked individually, but it was not a part of their political organization. The politics of a tribe, gentlemen, are this side of astrology or astronomy. The typical tribe, gentlemen, makes people move through the darkness of the night. And neither the heaven nor the earth have more to say to them than that there are other living beings. What speaks to the tribesman is the river, the sea, the leaves, or the trees when they shake in the wind, the otter, the beaver, the lion, the eagle, the birds, the fishes -- that is, people have called the tribal organization "animistic" because man looked into the universe: life as his own. But he did not see that which did not live: stone, diamonds, gold -- all these things had no meaning for tribesmen. They despised them. Because they do not make the nature around them akin to them. What they feel brotherhood with is the -- is the animal, the moving thing, the breathing thing, the procreating thing:

the fox, and the dog, and the chicken. And all these things that -- the primitive man had already.

So gentlemen, what is called animism in anthropology -- who has heard of this term "animism"? Well, it's very common. You must think through -- it's very important. Primitive man has a -- a preference for that which is alive, like himself. And he neglects, or he can't do much with the things that are dead. This is terribly important, gentlemen, for us, the living, because as you know we today are exposed to a terrible problem. We have to dig into the earth several thousand feet to get oil. That's very dead. The stench in our cities proves to you that -- how dead it is. It's completely dead. We have coal, which is partly dead. We have stone and steel, uranium. That is, we have for the first time embarked on a venture of living really with dead material to an extent no {one} in other generations has ever dared to commit themselves to dealing with dead things that grows on surface of the earth. It's such an -- extent that even the question of its being alive doesn't exist. We shoot our pilots up into the air where they can't breathe. And we torture these people so that they are able to fly beyond sound. Gentlemen, we are people without any relation to animism, because our main materials are inanimate. This is very important, gentlemen, because most of your heresies, most what poisons the air in -- America is this mechanization, as you call it, this idea that -- the world consists of not-living material, or that you can neglect the living element, and that you can be called "very good material" for Dartmouth College. Gentlemen, you should rise in arms and say, "I'm not material. I'm a human creature." You are not material, {as -- unless} you're cannon fodder. You aren't expendable. All these are terms that come from the inanimate character given -- by our statistics and by our techniques, you see, to the world at large. And finally we begin ourselves to believe that we are nothing but electrons. Gentlemen, you are alive, you see. Dead things cannot die. Would you take this down? We talked about it before, did we? I'm sorry to have to repeat it, because it remains true. Dead things cannot die. The greatness of the tribes {dealt} -- that they exclusively dealt with such parts of the created universe which could die. Because it is the great honor of the living that they can die. And it is the great dishonor of the dead things that they cannot die. Material cannot die. Marble doesn't die. Dust doesn't die. Sand doesn't die. You see the deader a thing, the less it can die.

The breath of the spirit, gentlemen, to use this term in its full sense, which filled these tribes with immortality for the last 9,000 years -- 7000 B.C. to 1954 A.D. -- this breath of life comes from their tremendous reverence for anything that might die. You have -- don't have this. You think life is just a quantity. Now the tribe knew that it could be extinguished any minute. The frailty of the tribe

has made these people save every ounce of inspiration, of spirit, of spell, of magic, of invocation, of religion, you see. Because they needed to fan the flame of life any one minute. If you take this -- it's more than a simile. It's a fact, gentlemen. The tribe is an institution we said to -- institute marriages. But you can also say that the tribe is an institution to fan life, to a burning flame, and to find anything living under the sun -- lions, and panthers, and leopards, and snakes, and bees, and ants, you see, and to gather them with the tribe together in one big pyre of burning fire against the powers of death, the powers of darkness. And the powers of darkness were the soil, were the sky, were all these things later worshiped, but not in the tribe. All the dead things. All the things you couldn't speak to, you couldn't charm. That's why any tribesman can charm a snake. She's alive. He will not give in before he has not, you see, dealt with a -- with a serpent. He can do this.

As you know, the rattlesnake is a very favorite in -- in Harlem County, Kentucky, for the white miners there. They show their innocence by allowing the snake to bite them. When they die, their -- their own wife can say, "Well, he was just guilty. It's -- justice be done." That's very strange, gentlemen. Why is that so? Because the -- the tribe does not draw any frontier between man and other life. All life is on the side of the tribe. All non-life is outside the tribe. The jungle is outside, the animals are inside.

So gentlemen, the -- the boundaries of the science, of the philosophy, of the theology of the tribe just run differently from yours. You distinguish between men and the world. That is not the idea of the primordial man. Primordial man says, "Where there's life, it's part of my existence." That's why he could see in these totems, you see, something utterly natural, utterly normal -- these totems, these --. And when there is no life, I run away, I move on. Corpses, and so on, of the enemy, you see, have to be gotten out of the way and this probably also explains this tremendous zest of the tribes to fill the whole globe, to find new sources of life, and not to worship any wall, or any Statue of Liberty, or any place. They could not sanctify space as we do, gentlemen, with your stratospheric nonsense, as your younger brothers do. That would have been too dead for them. If I listen to these stratospheric talks over the radio I'm frightened, because that's the generation that prefers dead things to living things. That's terrible. It's completely dead, everything I -- I gather in the -- I always buy off and on some magazine on stratospheric nonsense. I'm always frightened by the complete deadness for what's going on there. It's nothing, you see. Perhaps some crime, somebody is -- doing -- going to be murdered. That's the only thing that makes the blood coil.

But in the tribe gentlemen, it is very different. Anything alive is revered.
Anything dead is feared.
Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Student introduction: Philosophy 58, March 16th, 1954)

[Opening remarks missing]

... you understand --

[tape interruption]

... now I'm listening. During the next four meetings, we have four meetings to finish the empires. What leads to a different approach to life where the line is not drawn between the living and the dead? Where the hero disappears? Where the masks disappear? Let me say two things of the tribes that will explain the permanent, eternal value, and the permanent handicap of the tribe. The one is the saying by Zarathustra -- Zoroaster. You may have heard that Nietzsche, when he tried to go back before the Greeks, he wrote this book Thus Spake Zarathustra. And you may have heard that Zarathustra was a Persian who -- under the influence, as I think, of the Jewish prophets, under the Persian -- rulers at the -- in the 6th century B.C. gave to his tribesmen a religious book, the Gathas -- as they are called -- the books of Zoroaster. You read in the textbooks, which are mostly anti-Semitic that the Jews learned it from Mr. Zoroaster. I don't believe that. The dates are all against it. What matters, however, is that he summarized into one short sentence the whole problem of the tribe, the divine or the religious problem of the tribe, the political problem. He said very simply, in one of these songs: "Tell me," and he speaks to his great spirit, Ahura-Mazda, "tell me, Ormazd, who -- who made the son staying with his father when his father was absent." It's a very beautiful saying, you see. Very simple. Most people overread it today as unimportant. That is, Zarathustra became, in looking back, aware of this great mystery of the tribe, of this vow that the son should stay with the father. And there you have men going beyond the animals. That the -- son should stay with the father makes a father stay with him, you can also say, after the old man is dead. This is your decision, gentlemen. The first step of humanity is to stay with your father. It is not human to stay with your mother. That's just animal. Most of you stay with your mothers, and already think you deserve having to celebrate Mother Day. Mother Day's -- is a date that doesn't deserve to be in the calendar, because motherly love has no time, no day in the calendar. But gentlemen, in the great days of the tribe, the day on which you stay with your father has to be celebrated, because otherwise it doesn't exist. This is all mixed up today. You don't know the difference between mother and father

anymore in this country. You have no fathers. The -- relation of the father is that he is allowed to push the perambulator. That is, he is just the -- the assistant to the mother. That's all he is in this country. He assists the mother with her chores. He is allowed to wash the dishes and to nurse the baby. That's not the father's role, gentlemen. The father is your entering gate into history. By him, the whole past opens and you know that at one time you become like a man who has posterity, who has offspring, who is an ancestor. In your father you have all the founding fathers of this country. And you have all the founding fathers of humanity. Your father stands for the patriarchs, for Abraham, and for Isaac, and for Jacob, whether he knows it or not, whether he wants to be a Jew influenced by Judaism, or not. Because the father exists only as an institution as long as you believe that you need him to belong to the ages, so that he is there while he is absent -- although he is absent. This is all in this very small sentence, compressed very beautifully into the Gatha of Zarathustra. Or the sacred man is also called Zoroaster, when you read him -- of him in the books. A Persian of the -- probably written this -- this was written in 570 B.C.

The second thing -- that's the positive. Mankind has never lost this { } after that. The second thing is connected with this. In order to stay connected with your ancestors and with your fathers, people believe that they had to go to war. The vendetta is the name for the warpath in Italian. But the word "vendetta" is necessary to replenish your notion of the word "warpath." In your Western movies, you too easily see only the glories of the warpath, of the red man. But it is also the tragedy of those tribesmen, or the sadness that life cannot be had without death, without killing; that in order to defend the totems of your -- of your ancestry, your history, you have to allow this history to remain uncontaminated. Wars, gentlemen, are all of a spiritual nature. They have nothing to do with killing. We said this already before. But they tried to save that which makes man man. That is, that he doesn't live by his five senses, but lives in a larger continuum of seven generations, of paths hewn out in the fogginess of existence. That he has a consciousness, that he has speech, that he has beloved ones -- to -- people who trust him and belong to him. This is war, gentlemen. All this pacifism in this country -- we talked about this, I think, before -- is so terrible, because it individualizes the problem of war, as if this was your choice. Anybody who cares because he wants to murder somebody is certainly not a warrior. A warrior is a man who defends his having become a man. Before, you aren't a man. A -- a man is as little a man who can't go to war for a great purpose as a woman is a woman who declines to bear children. Both have to pay with their lives. If they won't, out goes the race. And as long as you don't know this, gentlemen, and it's a hard lesson for any American boy, he will not { }. So you will have to -- serve in the Army, and you won't admit it. And so these people come, as you know,

back from Korea as spiritual -- how should I say it -- destroyed -- spiritual -- destroyed because they have this bad conscience that they did something they shouldn't have done. I know, you all probably know people who have come back from Korea in -- absolutely ruined, wanting to murder their mother. I had one case where the man calls for the first six weeks in this country, always ran around and said, "I have to kill my mother."

"Why?" we asked.

"Because she is the one I love most." That was his way of taking revenge, you see, in his tribalism, the other side, since he wasn't -- hadn't been brought up right, and didn't know what war is. He thought he had killed. So it's a very strange logic, but perhaps you can fathom it a little bit. That I know another case where the wo- -- the man left his beloved wo- -- wife, because he loved her so much that he had to revenge himself for the disaster that he had been a jet flyer in Korea, by taking it out on the very person he loved most. That's how the human soul works. And why is that so? Because all these boys went to the little red schoolhouse in America and all were told that "Thou shall not kill" was an application of -- to war, and to the army, and to the uniform. Very simple. The sooner you -- you investigate this in your own { }, gentlemen, the better it is, because this country will be destroyed by this identity. You can't have -- that's why all this country here always talks about atom war, because it's the great hope that somebody else is going to throw the atom, and you may not have to be drafted then. All this new look -- is just a surrender to these damn mothers of America and their damn sons who do not know that they have fathers to defend, and their Constitution. It's not the business between the animal cub and the animal mare, or the animal cow. But that's an affair between fathers and sons. And that's historical. That's artificial. That's spiritual. Has nothing to do with anything you find in nature. But you won't have it. You must be natural. So your poor father becomes a daddy. And all -- we become just facilities. Teachers in this college have been called "facilities." Gentlemen, I'm the author of your thought. That's a little more than you know. Any teacher is, for that matter. I represent to you the whole past of the human race, and I'm not a facility, where you can put -- earn 45 bucks and then get what you can, as one of you told me, that he wanted to get something out of this course. Gentlemen, be glad that I put you into something here. I hope you'll never get out of what I tell you here. I put you here inside of something, in which -- to which you have not belonged, yet. But that's the frustration of American education, that we are not meant to do this. But you really think you sit here and get something out of what I say. Nothing do you get out of this! You just get out sweat, toil, and tears, responsibilities,

duties, doubts, misgivings, hardships. That's all what an education gives a decent man. A burden is put on your shoulders. That's all. But you don't want -- you {won't pay}. I can't give it to you, gentlemen.

So the vendetta of the tribe, gentlemen, is the dark cloud which hangs over these tribes. In their small groups, they judge themselves, they condemn themselves to frustration, because anything outside the 5,000 is too much for them to organize, to integrate with. And therefore you have the vendetta, and you have the fear that when you meet, a man of another tribe, you -- you run or he runs, or you have to kill each other. That's why -- I tried to explain to you that's why we have pacifistic tribes like the Eskimos, who obviously just went out of the -- of their way never to be inside this stream of life, you see, in which they would -- run into opponents. But gentlemen, you and I do not -- have not sprung from the Eskimos. We send our doctors, and our missions, and our stores and supplies to the Eskimos at this moment. And therefore, gentlemen, all this -- this wonderful enchantment by primitive man -- you must learn to look through it. You and I come from hardier tribes who remained in the middle of things and who said that their tradition was so great that they had to win over the others. That they had to spread the gospel. That the -- the -- they were carriers of a spirit that promised finally the unity of the human race.

Now the -- I could go on, of course, with many examples of individual tribes, but as I said, if we want to reach a certain completion here -- this is, of course, a course that should go -- and did go originally over a whole year. I have to compress things.

What is the next step, gentlemen? The next step is the disappearance of the mask, the lifting of the mask from the face of the sorcerer. In this sense then, gentlemen, the medicine man of the tribe is replaced by the priest. And the ruler, the first ruler wears instead of a mask before his face a crown. The crown is the lifting up of a man's role from his headgear, so to speak, before his face, from his masquerade, to his dependency on the sky. The crown are the rays of the sun that land on the head of the ruler. The spirits of the tribe are replaced by the stars in the sky. The tattoos on the bodies of the tribesmen, of the warriors are replaced by the hieroglyphs, the cuneiform script on the walls of the temples. The temples replace the tomb of the hero, and the altar in front of the tomb and the dancing green, and even the warpath, as we shall see in an extreme case, because all the buildings that now go up on this earth are in the image of the order in the heavens. They are a sky-world. They are Heaven come down to earth.

The whole revolution, gentlemen, of the year 3000 B.C. is in every way as

dialectical as Marx could wish for. That is, in every way the new order of things which now combats the vendetta of the tribe and their -- the heroes of the many tribes, and the pluralism of the tribes, is dialectically sharpened; that every one feature of the tribe has to be outdone by its exact opposite. To give you a further list: the line between the humanity and the outer world, the created world, is now suddenly drawn quite differently. Gold and jewels, stars, sun and moon, marble, granite become the exponents of the life of these new -- these new people. The people suddenly introduce that very gold that, as you know, still poisons the veins of this country. The gold in Fort Knox comes exactly from this strange idea of the peoples of -- who founded the empires of old: to have something everlasting, something that was so eternal that it could not die, even though it was never born. The whole problem of the new order of things is to find material which did not enter the tragic process of birth and death at all. And the more permanent a pearl, or the cyanite quartz, a granite stone prove, the better. Limestone wasn't good enough, so the first builders, gentlemen, of temples carried their stones 2,000 miles -- 3,000 kilometers -- from where they found them to build the pyramids of Egypt. That's just unbelievable, that the oldest stone temples around Cairo to this day can be investigated for their material; and we find that the people of the first dynasty went to the expense, and to the lengths of shipping the -- their material from the Nubian desert, where they quarrel now about the Sudan. Two -- two hundred miles to the river. No road, nothing. Blocks of four, five, to 40 tons, which we today could not lift on any truck -- truck, you see, of a building concern.

Again, you will see, gentlemen, that the buildings and the -- the jewelry of Egypt, of Babylon, of China, and of the Aztecs is un- -- insuperable. What these tribes did with their masks these people did with their buildings. When Napoleon sat at the foot of the Great Pyramid and -- had his more alert generals climb the top, he used the time while they were climbing the tip -- the peak of the pyramid to figure out its contents. And when they came down, the -- he was a commander of the French army in Egypt when he was still, you see, just military man, just before his great career as emperor, 1798 -- he was seated there and he said, "Do you know how many steins -- stones are to be found in the Great Pyramid?" And they laughed and said no, they didn't. "To make a wall 6 feet high around all of France." That's one pyramid. You can imagine what this means in organization. To build a wall around France of 6 foot height, around the whole country of France.

The -- we talked -- already about the walls around all the empires. This word "wall" is the right term perhaps to introduce you to the main principle of the empire: to interdict, to defend, to prohibit humanity from migration, to abolish

that which has brought together humanity all over the globe in these hundred thousand tribes. China is called the union of the hundred tribes. That's a very good description of see -- telling you what the empires undertook to do. The empires undertook to settle. The idea of the empire is better translated by "settlement."

Gentlemen, in the rest of the world except America, human settlements have lasted in the same place for several thousand years. It's unknown, the boom- -- ghost town -- the boom-bust town idea, you don't have towns that have been relinquished as in this country by the thousands after several decades. Here, you know in Vermont, you go from cellar hole to cellar hole. In Europe, you go from settlement to settlement. Why is that so, gentlemen? Because the religion of thousands of years, from the years, as I told you, 3000 B.C. to the year 1800, has been all over Europe the religion of agriculture. And the best -- translation of the word "agriculture" so you can understand what it means is settlement, permanent settlement. Nothing to do with agriculture in itself, because in these settlements, you had jewelry made, and you had buildings going up, and you had tailors, and you had tanners, and you had scribes. That is, these settlements, very little interest in a special economy. They had of course to eat, and to live, but the economic view of life is a very poor one, and it is -- mutilated as you do it here in this country so often, as though it meant bread and butter. Gentlemen, it meant the bread of life. Now the same bread is eaten in the Communion supper; the same bread is eaten at a -- as a -- in a wedding cake, the flour at least, the same flour; the same bread has to be distributed in -- in an army, because an army walks on its sto- -- army marches on its stomachs. And you can also offer it as a libation -- bread and wine poured out as a sacrifice -- or give it as a charity to beggars, to give -- show that you're sacrificing it as a surplus. That is, gentlemen, economy of bread is a very varied thing. The Egyptians certainly, the Chinese certainly cast bread on the waters. But as -- if you think bread and butter is what is meant as what you have to eat every day, that's never what these people -- first agriculturalists considered by -- by being economists of the land. They wanted to settle.

And how do you do this, gentlemen? I had an old lady friend in Germany. She was 87 when I came to know her. I was 30. So it spans quite a distance of time, now. In her youth, she told me, in her little village in which she grew up, there were cherry trees and apple trees. It's a very fruitful region. But it was quite impossible for any man who had an orchard to harvest all the cherries from the tree. One twig always had to be left in piety so that there might be cherries the next year, too. You do -- you laugh at this and you think you wouldn't do this, gentlemen. Yet this is the reason that there have been cherry trees around Karls-

ruhe in {Badinia} for the last 3,000 years. And because you don't do this, you have soil erosion in this country. You destroy what you have. Every -- thing is destroyed in America by exploitation. Your souls are eroded, the soil is eroded, everything is eroded, because you want to get everything at this moment. These people were settlers, gentlemen, and a settler is a man who, just as a tribesman, wants to have eternity. The idea of settlement, gentlemen, is the application of the totem, of the warpath, of the humanity, of the presence of the ancestor with the son, even though he is absent, written into the soil and the sky. It is the eternal sky on top, or above an eternal earth. This you must connect with this new great step. That's why China has lasted 4,000 years. That's why the Roman Empire has lasted at least 2,000. And that is why Egypt has lasted 3,000 years. In -- settlement is the eternity brought from Heaven to earth. It is not just Heaven to -- coming down to earth. But the great problem is: how do I eternalize the soil? How do I make the earth as permanent as the heavens, as stable as the heavens, as repetitive? The problem of these empires is the eternal recurrence. You may have heard that the modern -- philosophical problem Mr. Nietzsche -- Frederick Nietzsche has brought up this idea of eternal recurrence. Well, we don't have to bother with the -- with the philosophical argument here, at all. The main point is that a whole group of the human race, all of the people who tried to divide the earth into non-migratory fractions, where there would be no migration, but settlement, had exactly the idea that they wanted to bring to earth the eternal recurrence of the sky.

So if you could, for one moment, gentlemen, see that the word "settlement" should in your mind attract this adjective "eternal," then we would begin to understand what I'm talking about. There is no word in the English language, except perhaps "property," which has for you the ring of permanency. Property at least with the Republican Party used to have that. I'm afraid even this is lost today, because people don't believe that they can, against the tax collector, hold onto their property very long. But eternal settlement. Do you know any ex- -- appropriate expression of this analogy? You have the hard time, gentlemen. Even the tribe is more accessible to you than this idea of a recurrent order in which people are so safe that they can abdicate their birthright of migration. We talked in the tribe about the tragedy of vendetta. Let me call in the -- in the empires, gentlemen, in this new chapter, of the tragedy, or the loss, or the sacrifice every member of these new groups had to make. He could not migrate. He could not leave the country. He was inside.

Today the only group of the Arab world that doesn't migrate are the Egyptians. There is no pan-Arabian movement. That's all a hoax, because any Syrian

is a trader, and you find many of them in the United States. He's allegedly an Arab. And the nomads can migrate, gentlemen, but the Egyptians cannot. They have lost it to the pharaohs of Egypt. There are perhaps 67 Egyptians living in America. You compare this with the numbers of people of every other nationality, you see, that have come to this country, you see that the Nile still holds its spell over the people who surround it now for the last 4,000 years. That's very strange. Or it is 5,000 years, as a matter of fact.

We know -- this is -- I gave you the -- some principles. You see immediately that since people cannot migrate, the ideal principle of imperialism, as you call it, would be that the whole globe is covered with eternal settlements, one bordering on the other, as on a chessboard, the checker, the fields. That is, you must understand that beginning 3000 B.C. man took a different view from his task on this earth. More and more people started in trying to collect humanity in such frames, such mazes or reservoirs, of empires around temples, reflecting in their climate and place the eternal order of the sky. This is a principle, as you can see, and not before the Russian czar was dethroned, and the emperor of Austria-Hungary went, and the Aztecs were removed, and the Incas, did this whole era end. So you can say that by 1918 only, did the attempt end to define the man's mission on earth by the task of eternal settlement. And most of you -- of you in this country still have naïvely the idea that everybody else should be settled, except the Americans. Then you would have been -- it would be able -- easy to keep order. You have quite a naïve idea that the Irish would be in Ireland, the Albanese in Albania; but the Irish are in New York and the Albanese are in Massachusetts. Because they just defy your idea of people.

This is very serious, gentlemen. We are today faced with a new consideration of these first principles of human establishment on this earth. And it is absolutely open to doubt what the solution ought to be. Certainly it cannot be that 155 million Americans deny immigration to the rest of humanity. That is the new imperial principle of the McCarran Act. It's very naïve, you see. The new sky -- eternal sky which you have established here is your standard of living. That's the sun and the moon and the gold in Fort Knox bears it out. And so you say, "We live here 155 million people. It is true that we came here into a void. But now we lock the gates, and the rest of the world has to stay put, in their place. And that's justice." And most people think it is justice. You know that I sometimes think it is justice, too, because I -- also would like to keep my refrigerator.

So we all at this moment, gentlemen, are the last imperialists of the world, the Americans with their McCarran Act. I mean it. I don't say this in persiflage, gentlemen. I ask from you to understand that we have here a tremendous princi-

ple, that for the last 5,000 years has worked. You ad- -- will admit that the Japanese after the loss of the war just had to do something to get rid of their 30 or 40 million Japanese. Heaven knows where they are, you see, apt to go. But they cannot be imperialists in the old sense. You abuse the word "imperialists," because you think that it is conquest. I'm speaking of the empire principle, gentlemen. Just drop the word "imperialism," you see. What imperialism is an attempt to find a sky-world in which there could be an eternal recurrence as in Heaven, be it on earth, as we say in our "Our Father in Heaven": Thy will be done, as in Heaven, you see, so on this earth. This is -- if you call this imperialism, imperialism is the quest for empire. But empire is limited, or determined, or confined, or defined by the idea that when you find a realm big enough, that there can be summer and winter, harvest and seed, you see, day and night, as the Bible says, in -- incessant recurrence, that -- that there can be peace. Because these people then don't have to migrate. They can receive their livelihood, and their mutual understanding, and their peace inside the Chinese wall, inside the limes of the American -- of the Roman empire, this side of the 54th degree of latitude, or wherever the Canadian border goes. And you see, it is typical imperialism, when we drew the line at the 38th degree of latitude for these poor Koreans, and shoved them into two sky-worlds -- one Bolshevik, and one democratic. So, begin to believe, gentlemen, the problem of eternal settlement is the question of eternal peace. If you cannot look through this problem more clearly, you see, all your dreams of peace in your time are scattered, are nonsense. Because it is always a decision of how much migration, how much new conquest, you see, how big the land to be so that the people inside there can see that God is in France, so to speak, as they used to say, you see, and that the spirits inside a certain fraction of the earth can move gaily in their chorus and dances without ever paying attention to the outside world. The first date of which we know, gentlemen, that it started, this whole im- -- empire business on earth, is the year 2780. There may be a doubt between 2784 and 2778, but this is close enough to make you understand that we have here reached a point where history becomes eternal. Because with this year writing starts, and the writing in the most imperishable material, in granite. We can still read what has been written there. We have from the ancestors -- from the tribes no writing, but we tombs, we have graves, we have mounds. From the Egyptian and Babylonian times, we have script. And we have therefore an unbroken sequence of communications in speech, in so many -- not words, I shouldn't say this -- in so many sacred signs. The body of the earth is the new tattooed body. The Egyptians and the Babylonians, when they put these signs on the walls of their temples, gentlemen, felt that this was the skin of the sacred bull in the sky,

of the sky-world. They used material so imperishable, that as the stars, the sun and the moon look alike, so the gold in the temples, and the inscriptions in the temples would always look alike, rain or shine. This is a tremendous imagination. And you see it's quite a new imagination. And you will learn here at this moment a great law of history. Where was this done, gentlemen? This was done in two countries: Mesopotamia and Egypt, first. Later in India, later in China, and finally in America.

What were these countries like? They were the countries in which it seemed quite impossible to live. They were countries of inundation. They were the pariahs. They were the sinners of the old order. As you know, there's always more joy in Heaven over one sinner than over 99 just. Now that's true of all history, gentlemen, that the bearer, the carrier, the cornerstone of the next order is always the outcast of the previous order. Why is that so? Well, you just look at the Americans. They were the outcasts of Europe. That's why we are still going strong here. This is not a moral principle as in the New Testament. Gentlemen, Jesus has never preached any ethics or any morality. He's perfectly amoral. He's not interested in ethics. But He has described laws of creation, because He is the second creator of the universe. So when He says there is more joy in Heaven over one sinner who repents than over 80 -- 99 other people, He describes the process of new power, how new power is created. And He -- it is created, as you already know, with the new name of love, when this man, who has been called names in the old order, as a minus, suddenly feels that he is entitled to great honor, that brings out all his best.

And in this sense, gentlemen, the valleys of the great rivers were avoided by the tribesmen as dangerous. There was fever; there were the crocodiles, and the lions; and there was swamp. You got lost. So gentlemen, the non- -- bush, that which did not fit the migrating people, was the new center of the empires, the negative bush, that which was not fit to be treated as bush. When you go -- study the history of New Hampshire and Vermont, gentlemen, here -- while you are here perhaps you do this -- and you go and consider where the first settlement -- settlers worked in 1769, when this college was founded -- you will to your surprise -- find that Lewiston then was completely empty, that the -- the level of Norwich Village was completely unused, that the people over there in Norwich settled where now the old meeting house -- the first cemetery is, on top of the whole wall of hills that rise above the river, because there were no red Indians. There were no bears and wolves, and there was no fever. There was not the pest, the plague, you see. You didn't fall sick. In 1768, Norwich has been founded, a year before Hanover, '67, as a matter of fact. The meeting house was established on top of the hill there in -- at that time. In 1817, the people of Norwich moved to

the second level, where they are now, where the grocery store is, and where the city -- or town hall is, and the bandstand, and the common. And in 1850, when the railroad was built, and the bridge was renewed, Lewiston came into being, where you now -- it is said that the Dartmouth boys who don't want to pay their bills have their bills sent to, because it's in Vermont and so you can't be arrested when you don't pay them. Is that true?

That's why there is a post office in Lewiston, you see. I shouldn't tell you.

So you see in this moment, in this country here, and at this place, you can follow the story of man's settlement, how he first just perches on the -- nests on the hills, high hills. And the old tribesmen, of course, moved on then, from one hill to another, and always avoided the depths. And how it was only the railroad that forced the origin of this terrible town called White River Junction, in Hartford, which as you know, was never meant to be a place to be lived in, but just to get drunk in.

So late, gentlemen, is the conquest of the valley -- I have to tell you this so that you do -- feel that you can understand the miracle of Egypt, and the miracle of the Euphrates and Tigris. That it took a tremendous change of aspect, of point of view, before the second man took up his life on this -- no longer on the earth as a bush, but on the earth as a soil. If you put to the tribe as a label the treatment of the earth, you must call it "bush." Be bushwhacked. That's why we call paths, and trails, everything of a movement, he imposed on this earth. Warpath. But within the empires, gentlemen, the same earth is now treated as a gift of Heaven, as soil. It would be very important -- it hasn't been done yet, to follow into all languages this dualism of terms for the same thing, for the good earth.

What is soil? Soil is the earth given for a second time out of nothing, out of a flood. Soil is the watered earth, the watered bush, the -- the earth made fertile by the inundation. The whole story is reflected in the -- our testament, or in Noah. Noah is pharaoh purified. Noah is, so to speak, the gist of the Egyptian story without the superstitions. The Bible, you see, had to give a universal history of mankind, minus the terrors of the vendetta, that is, minus Cain. And you see in the first -- in the first chapters a thousand year of Adam. And Adam lives 924 years, so you see the old writer had a very clear conception that this was to cover a whole age, one millenium. The tribal life is given in the first chapters of Genesis. It is absolutely, simply true to form. The story of Cain is the story of the eternal vendetta, the man driven out, and the story of the altar on which Abel {burnses}, and the story of the incest rules, and everything is in this -- in the story. Adam lives a thousand years. That is -- wasn't superstition, gentlemen. It

meant that his eye, his spirit was worshiped in the totems of the tribes for that time. Noah was the first man who lives after the death of Adam. That's very peculiar. If you figure out. He comes -- he is born when Adam is dead. All the other people between Noah and -- Adam and Noah are born still in the lifetime of the tribal age of Adam.

Noah -- the whole Bible is -- set against Egypt. The exodus of Egypt has, of course, made history for the Jews. Israel owes its existence, that it supersedes the order of the empires. That's his story. There are Jews in order to protest against this checkerboard business of Heaven coming to earth, place after place. It's a protest against the idolatry of Egypt, as we shall see. The temples and the priests of Egypt, the sorcerers of Egypt, the hieroglyphs of Egypt.

But so next time, you will kindly bring your old -- your Bible, and we'll go through a number of items in which the Bible opposes the Egyptians. And by taking this a little more serious than usually you do, you'll come to understand the glories of Egypt also a little better, because it is not for nothing that Professor Moses turned against the -- his Egyptian university, which was going strong in his days, you see, and said this is all nonsense. We have to start from scratch { }. Let's have a break.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Student introduction: 58, March 18th, 1954)

[Opening remarks missing]

... have a better memory. The more you -- you have to retain in memory, there's -- less is room for the individual fact to juggle around. You have no memory, because you know nothing. It's a scandal how you ruin your memories. You haven't learned anything by heart in your youth, and now you know nothing and you haven't even -- know -- got a memory, which is -- you can build anything on. Gentlemen, you will rue -- be very rueful about this, because nobody can be of any proficiency in any field without an excellent memory. And this is you -- you have wasted. You have destroyed it with your football games. And that's why you -- you simply say, you see, about everything that is told you. It doesn't matter whether you retain it. I told you, "Bring a Bible," and I -- I'm sure two-thirds of you never gave it a thought afterwards. Isn't that true? But these are -- you are not -- this is not a human being, you see. That's a young dog. Formerly this was called S-O-B.

(We got --)

No. That's -- that doesn't work. I have to have 30 Bibles in this room or the people can't look at it. And they don't know it, so what should I do? Oh -- where's my report today? Take it. Now, {Blascal}.

[tape interruption]

[unintelligible]

Total confusion. Total confusion.

But gentlemen, this is very serious to waste it on you, so you must really understand it right. Obviously the Jews had to leave Egypt before they could institute the Sabbath, you see. So that one day the {Sabbath} wasn't introduced by a smiling pharaoh, you see, or the smiling { } to have the Egyptians {rest}. But it took 40 years in the desert before Moses got his Egyptian friends, the Jews, to give up the Egyptian idolatry of the ever-rolling calendar. That's a very serious business. Gentlemen, the Sabbath is one of the greatest creations of the

human race. It's the first independence from astrology, from the overpowering of the stars. You just belittle everything in these papers. These are great things. And you can't just write them down. You have to write them up.

So I resent this. The Sabbath was not introduced in -- Egypt, you see, because Israel had to leave Egypt in order to create the Sabbath. We'll talk -- about this later. What I have tried to do, however, I have wanted to put you into the Egyptian situation as between the Old Testament -- that comes later -- and after the tribes, that the pharaoh leaves behind. And this was all I tried to say, when I mentioned the Sabbath, to explain you that the Egyptians did not have the Sabbath, and couldn't have, because they -- they { } -- hitched their wagon to a star. If you hitch your wagon to a star, you are in a juggernaut of eternal movement, because the stars move. They have no Sabbath. You see, the -- the seven-day week of the Jews emancipates man from the stars, and from the sky. The Jew does not look to the sky. He looks to God. And God is invisible. He's beyond the Heaven. God is the creator of Heaven and earth. To give you a very simple -- the whole Bible, you see, is written against Egypt. So the first sentence of the Bible is written against the dogma of Egypt, that Heaven creates earth. That's the first sentence of the Bible. It's one of the greatest polemics ever written, as violent as the famous Communist Manifesto: proletarians of all countries, unite; you have nothing to lose but your chains. You may have heard this. The great document in -- of 1847, with which Marx invoked a new era. And here we have it today.

So in the same -- exactly the same sense -- you do -- cannot read the Bible, that's why you don't have even a Bible, because it bores you stiff. If you could read it, you would read it as the greatest political pronouncement that has ever been made, against the chambers of commerce of our days and their mechanical calendar against the idea that it only matters to -- to figure 365 days a year or 365 and-a-quarter days, and to belittle the whole problem of our -- of life -- living, gentlemen, in putting you into -- in mechanical boxes of 24 hours a day, you see. You think that's life? That's how you try to live.

Life is at any moment the whole spirit of the whole human race is present. Everything created can come to life through you, if you live it fully. If you don't understand it -- don't understand me, why the Church, whenever it has a great holiday, transgresses the 24-hour day. It has two days. You have abolished Easter Monday. You have abolished Pentecost; you don't even know what it means. You have no idea of -- of Christmas Eve and the second holiday, on December 26. Whenever man felt he is free, you still have the Thanksgiving hol- -- weekend -- that's all you have. Where you learn to celebrate means to change the astrology

of the stars, to break away. That's what we call freedom, you see. The Egyptians were not free. They chained -- hitched literally their wagon to a star and so I -- perhaps you take down this sentence. The Egyptians were the enemies against which the Bible has written the sentence, "In the beginning God created Heaven and earth." For the Egyptians, the sentence would run: "Always the heavens create the earth. There's no beginning. There's no end. Then there is a domination of the sky over the earth."

Now we have to do -- take the opposite step. We have first to do justice to the Egyptians, because, gentlemen, you all, with Washington as an artificial capital of the United States, with 48 states, and with the 36 square miles per township here in New England, as you know, 6 times 6, and with the 38th degree of latitude, or the 54th, we all live partly by Egyptian law. It isn't that this has disappeared. We'll see when you read the "Eternal Jerusalem" in -- in the Apocalypse; that's written against Egypt, but it is written and can only be understood if you understand what Egypt means. If you speak of the throne today, {or if} the chairman takes a chair, or if the Speaker presides over the House, that's all Egyptian law, because it means eternal settlement. A chairman is only possible when there is a high chair. And when there is no chair, you have no stabilized order.

So all these things, gentlemen, which have to do with man's marriage with space, exist. And that's why the "Our Father" -- has to -- had to say, "Thy will be done, as it is in -- is in Heaven," you see, "so on earth," because that's the compromise of the synthesis of the reconciliation of Israel and Egypt. Only in this form could the first sentence of the Old Testament, "In the beginning, God created Heaven and earth," could it become acceptable to the pagans. We'll see this, you see.

So -- take down these three sentences, and you will know even better. The Egyptians say, "Eternally the heavens create the earth." Judaism says, "In the beginning created -- God created Heaven and earth." And Jesus makes us say, "Thy will be done in the heavens as it is on earth."

These are three different stages of the human spirit, gentlemen. And you can't escape from them. You like to. You don't think you must know these things, but they are the dogmatic foundations of your own thinking. When you speak of a capital, and of a state, and of a village, you all use Egyptian -- Egyptian dogma, especially when you speak of your beloved private property. And of surveying. All we {do here, that's just -- } the Egyptians were able to survey the Nile Valley to an exactitude of less than five seconds' mistake, 3,000 years before Christ. They

were able to measure from the peaks of the desert mountains, which go across the Nile -- that's a winding river, full of meandering, you see -- to such degree of exactitude, because they had to. The existence of their country did depend on the idea of cutting out on earth something as precise as in the sky, what we call a temple -- I tried to tell you last time, you see -- was something cut out with this amazing exactitude. They -- we have nothing to excel. There was a committee appointed by the English survey -- geographical survey 50 years ago for Egypt. And they tried to remeasure certain parts of Egypt. And they -- and the, for example, the site of the Great Pyramid. And the lengths of the pyramids, and their height, and their relation. Well, they found that their reckoning, although showing a slight deviation from the Egyptians' -- the ancient Egyptians', was not any more reliable. And they could not find out who made the mistake. Because it was so minor, and they had -- were aware of the fact that anybody in figuring in nature something, you see, it doesn't make a certain -- there is a -- how do you call it? -- how do you call this margin of ...?

(Error.)

The margin of error, you see. So this margin of error is as large today as it was after all -- 3000 B.C. That's some achievement. We have nothing added to our -- to our precision. We have nothing added to our weight-lifting capacities. As I told you, there are stones in the -- in the existing temple near Gizeh, across from Cairo, on the Nile River, which weigh 40 tons apiece. They are lying horizontally up in the air on pillars. Nobody knows how they ever were lifted up, or put down. And they are so put together that you can't put a needle between two stones. They are absolutely precise. It has never been excelled and will never be excelled. I mean, the Empire State Building is a {monkey} against that. Nothing. I have put -- down here -- to you -- on this -- the -- the map. This would be Thebes. That is, the Nile River would go for another 300 miles, up to the First Cataract. This is the First -- would be the First Cataract, the place where the Nile enters Egypt, where the water in a -- in a kind of Niagara Fall, as they would between Canada and the United States, begin to flow without further cataracts, so that you can treat the -- the Nile Valley from the so-called First Cataract to the Mediterranean as one valley. You cannot before, because you cannot get up above the cataract without a large detour, you see. And so beyond the First Cataract is Nubia. There are six -- seven cataracts, they go up the whole Sudan. We call it now the Sudan. The Sudan is marked out by the cataracts of the Nile. The Nile Valley of Egypt is that which is north of the last cataract, but it's called the first. Why? Because from the Egyptian point of view, of course, the desert far behind, you see, it had to be explored from the First Cataract, southward. But we,

who always begin every counting with the source of a river, gentlemen, we always would say it is the last cataract. They say it's the first.

Gentlemen, it's very important. The old people -- in antiquity, in general, tribes, and empires and Is- -- Jews really were -- living in real -- were realists. They lived with the facts. You don't. You think it is logical to count from the -- from the source, because you are a geographer. You have an M.A. in geography. When you go up, and you begin -- to count only after you have reached the peak and come down again. That's an -- completely abstract and scholarly reasoning. Scientific. The ordinary man goes up the White River from this damn White River Junction and what does he do? He -- finds three branches of the White River. Does anybody know how they are counted? Who has been up the White River Valley? Well, then you don't know that there are three branches of the White River, and how are they counted? You know -- you see, you have even -- you always say that you believe in facts. You do not believe in facts. You are not even able to observe a fact. You are absolutely living in the abstract. You do, gentlemen. You th- -- what you call nature is an abstract invention of scholars. It has never been experienced by your five senses. You don't have -- you have lost the faculty of living in reality. And that's what -- why you always speak of "factual," because you have no respect for reality, as it is really impugning your own senses. You have it all from books, from schools. Well, of course, not for nothing that we include you -- enclose you into these institutions for mental health.

Well, gentlemen, this is very important. America in 150 years, now mark you this, especially New England, has run through the history of the human race of 5,000 years, and it -- in its first decades, it still has all the marks of the original settlers of 5,000 years back. Man was forced here back into the primitive decisions. And there -- I mentioned it the last time, but now take this very seriously. I told you that the town of Vermont -- of Norwich was first founded on the hilltop. Then it came down halfway to the side slopes and finally, with the railroad only, did it dare itself to go down into the valley of the White River, into Lewiston. In the same way, gentlemen, the three branches of the White River were named before fortunately there was any Dartmouth College to speak of. And therefore they got still the normal names of people who are acquainted with the facts of life, and not with your abstract idea of nature, the Devil's invention. Because in the normal life of a human society, you name the things in the sequence in which you discover them, and in which you settle in them. Now the first valley -- branch of the White River is therefore the branch first settled. That's the -- the valley that goes up from Royalton into Tunbridge and Chelsea. That's the first branch of the White River. Then you go up from Bethel to Randolph. And that's

the second branch of the White River. And then you go up to Stockbridge, and -- where you come out and -- on the left-hand of the road 100 on Sherburne Pass, the end of the White River; that is then the last branch of the White River. Now that's a very important discovery you can make here, gentlemen. That's the opposite from what a geographer would perceive, because the man who for the first time discovers a country -- he has no time to be a scholar, and to abstract, and to generalize, and to wait till he's on top. He doesn't know if he will ever make the mountain ridge. First he's -- meets one tributary of the White River. He says, "That's the first branch." You understand? He lives really empirically, and he has not the time to put up a laboratory in nature, an exploration, an expedition of a geography. What you call, gentlemen, "experience" is all experimentation, is all abstract. You treat nature as a laboratory. But what normal men, who have to fight for their lives, have to do, is to count always the other way around. What comes first has to be named first. You cannot wait until you correctly come down the river, because when Royalton and Tunbridge were settled, they -- nobody had yet gone up. Nobody knew how many branches were there to be seen in the future. Can you see this?

This is the Egyptian way of counting the First Cataract. And I only want to explain to you that this is how the world in antiquity presented itself, full of undiscovered paths, and therefore everything numbered in the opposite direction. Now it wouldn't ever happen to a Korean, you see, because he's still a normal human being, to have a line drawn at the 38th degree of latitude, as the Americans did and thereby destroyed Korea. That can only come into the head of a geograph- -- a man who has learned geography. And we have ruined great parts of the world, gentlemen, by this abstraction. Modern man is very cruel. He doesn't -- he doesn't live by empiricism, by experience; but he lives by experiment. That's the opposite. He lives by thinking about things, and not by having the things affect him. Do you think that any ancient man could have ever had the fantastic, the really diabolical idea of splitting Korea by an abstract line of thought which doesn't exist in reality, which we couldn't even respect now, because in the armistice, we had to have some hills that went beyond it, and had to give to the Russians some place where it went southern -- that was the minimum concession we had to make to reality. But you have no idea, gentlemen, that you live in an abstraction, in an absolutely abstract world. You do. Do you think otherwise there would be a million Puerto Ricans flooding New York at this moment? Abstract reasoning. We annexed Puerto Rico in 18- -- {89}. Now we can't do anything. A normal human being wouldn't behave that way. You have this abstract idea. You can't do anything. It's all settled.

Wherever you look, gentlemen, all our foreign policy troubles come from your ineptitude of looking -- not at looking at things, but letting things impress you. But the Egyptians, of course, and all ancient people, had to found their religions on impressions -- really, actually made on them, not on thoughts about the things. Now this is very important, when we now come to the impression made on man by the sky.

Gentlemen, this -- since I don't have the Bible, I will devote this meeting today to the birth of the gods. The tribes have no gods. They have spirits. They have the dead speaking to the living. You remember. And that's why the medicine man had to impersonate the dead, and thereby impressing on the -- living the presence of the dead, that the -- the dead still had claims on the behavior of the living. Now I said to you { } that the masks could give way to the crown, because the relation of man was completely changed. It was changed from Heaven down to earth. In the empire, gentlemen, perhaps that's the formula you may write down again. You don't find this in any book, gentlemen. That's my whole life work -- 50 years. So don't waste it. I don't like to waste it on you. Try -- write this down, Sir, the gentlemen with the ring. Yes. That in the tribe, the ancestors of the dead speak to the living. But gentlemen, in the empires, the heavens speak to the earth. And we have this literally. In the hymns of the ancients, heavens speak to earth. There's still in the Bible some wonderful Psalm, "Heavens" -- {how does it run}? -- "Give your due to the just," which is a counter-hymn against the Egyptian idea that the stars shall speak to men. Now the crown are the rays that come down from the heavens and single out the ruler, and the counts and the dukes. As you know, the counts in Europe are still distinguished by the number of -- of -- what do you call it? Peaks? No, what would be the -- the crown has single -- how do you call the single wedge?

(Point. Point.)

Point, the single point. As you know, they have nine points, seven points, or five points, according to the dignity of the wearer of the crown. And you see, the more points a crown has, the more fully does he represent the celestial influence of the whole sky on earth.

I asked you, under promise of five dollars, to tell me what man could do to the universe of the stars -- do, not think about -- which the stars as seen could not perform. Has anybody a bright idea of this?

[unintelligible]

Ja?

(Man observes the stars?)

Wie?

(Man observes the stars, and the stars don't observe him?)

Well, I said "doing." Observing would -- to be just abstract -- meditation. It would be contemplation. You see it, by the way, our word "contemplation" comes from this, sitting down in a temple, you see, in a {cutting down} and looking up to the stars. Contemplation. But this I do not mean, because that makes the star into an object of our thought. I want to say, "How can a man act better than a star?"

(Man measures his relation to the star.)

But that doesn't mean he proceeds like a star. I say he can do something in the procession of the star. The word "procession" by the way is an Egyptian discovery, you see. Progress and procession, the queen's progress, Elizabeth's progress in Kenilworth, by Scott. Who has read Kenilworth? You remember the king -- queen's progress through -- her country? That's still the Egyptian idea of moving on earth like a star. No, gentlemen. Ja?

(Uh, could you say that a man acts through his will, whereas the star acts through the -- the laws and the --)

Well, the Egyptians certainly thought that the stars acted by their will and that man had to learn their will. I told you they thought that the stars spoke clearly their will, and we had to follow it. A good law is something that speaks.

(Man is free to go backward or forward and move around, whereas the stars were in a set motion.)

You're very near the truth. Very near the truth. Very near the truth. Wonderful, wonderful. Well, to the Egyptians, this discovery that man could turn dialwise, or go against, you see, clockwise, or against the clock, whereas the sun always has to rise in the east, go south and then west was not important, because they wanted to obey the order of the stars. And therefore you could then say, "Well, pharaoh should always turn on his -- go clockwise, as we still do. And you could then just say that the other thing was tabooed. People had such ta-

boos, you see. If you want to observe the stars, why is it better to turn the other way? But one movement had to be done, which the stars cannot perform. And I'm quite close on your track. But even less abstract than your idea. {It altered the Heaven.} Gentlemen, the symbol of the pharaoh of Egypt is a sunball, or a sun-disk, carried by two wings. You call this winged sun today, you see it with the -- in the railroad still kept as a symbol. There they have the wheel, with two wings. You must have seen this symbol of the railroad. This is only an imitation of the old Egyptian -- empire ensign, or symbol, or banner, and it is of tremendous significance, gentlemen. The two wings are the wings of the pharaoh with which he is able to go and carry the south -- sun from the south to the north. The movement of -- from the south to the north is essential to this geographic -- geography of -- of Egypt, because from the First Cataract to the Mediterranean, it is 1500 kilometers, over 1,000 miles long. To unite such a country without any other preparation, without any technical means, was the greatest miracle mankind has ever achieved. That's why it has never been lost again. People have all kneeled before the miracles of Egypt. Plato has. Archimedes has. Pythagoras has. And Thales of Miletus, all the Greek philosophers. It couldn't be matched. How was it done, gentlemen? The symbol of Egypt is the sun-disk with the two wings, conveying to every subject in Egypt the idea that although -- although on earth you could not see further than the next corner of the Nile, the next bend of the Nile -- and you cannot, you can only see perhaps for three or four miles, it just goes always winding, you see -- that the sky was the same over Egypt all along. And pharaoh, the emperor, the god-king, the priest was able to ride out the Nile flood from the First Cataract to the Mediterranean and thereby progress, like a star, in the order in which no other star could proceed from south to north. To unite what in -- in the heavens forever separated. You see, the sun can only go into three visible directions. It can never reach north. The north is hidden. One sees the sun attack in summertime. It's -- finally arrives in the northeast and it sets in the southwest. To the ancients, this was an attempt of the sun to conquer, to enlarge its scope, its -- its power. But {funny} enough, on June 21st, when the läng- -- longest day is reached, the sun breaks down in her attack, as we were -- had to go back in our Tenth Corps, in Northern Korea at the Yalu River where we had it already, and we didn't reach the Russian frontier at -- near Vladivostock, as you know, and Mr. {Allman} had to turn back and he never came back again. It's all winter now. So this is, you know, the winter of our displeasure -- in Shakespeare?

(Winter of our discontent.)

Yes, our discontent was -- ? Turned in summer by the sun of York, isn't that?

Now the Egyptians, for the whole idea of exploiting the flood of this dangerous river, which drove every cat and mouse into the desert, because it is completely flooded, the Nile, between these two hills in the summer, had to promise these people some stabilities. We always speak -- speak today in sociology of security, that everybody wants security. How could they persuade Bedouin, tribesmen, migratory people who were swift of foot, and were accustomed to carry themselves away from any pestilence, feverish region, any region in the swamps, simply by leaving it alone, when it got wet there, as we try to leave mud at mudtime this part of the world and go to Florida? How could they persuade them to settle? They had to show them that the sky was {here}. Man, if you can't understand this { }, you want to understand all that you read in books about thrones, settlements, towns, states, constitutions, we'll write something stable in the sky. What's the constitution? The Constitution of the United States links the principles of life to something eternal; come Democratic Party or Republican Party, or the Whigs, we have the Constitution. That's written in our sky. We have some -- some such sky, too. It's an abstract sky. But the Constitution has survived for 180 years because with the various parties coming in and going out, man needs something he could look up to all the time. The Constitution, gentlemen, is the substitute for the security gained by the stability, not only of the sky, but -- perhaps you mark this very much out, too -- by its unity.

For primitive man, who has no telephone, who has no railroad, nothing what you take for granted, what only the Egyptians prepared in their creation -- they invented the telegraph in the sense that they made it sure that one day we would invent the telegraph, because they yearned for it. Their telegraph was the universal visibility of the stars and the sun. You could see the sun in the Mediterranean, and you could see them at the First Cataract. The priests and the temples, gentlemen, in every part of Egypt expressed this belief in the identity of the sky everywhere. Egypt was divided into districts of 36 -- of course, for good reason, because 36 has to do with the -- with the cyc- -- circle, the 360 degrees of the circle, and the 12 months and the 360 days of the year, as we shall hear -- and in every temple, the priest would invoke with great solemnity the movements of the stars as being just the ones in the -- at the other part of Egypt. The great satisfaction from the subjects of this new pharaoh was that they could be sure that at the same moment the same movements were to be seen in the heaven, although the whole valley was flooded, or it was parched with heat, or it had to be now har- -- you see, seeded down, or it had to be harvested.

This is the importance of the calendar, gentlemen, of a -- of the primitive settlers of China, for example, of the Incas, or of the Egyptians, which has never

been understood. Why did the Incas worship the sun? They never worshiped the sun, gentlemen. They bowed to the movements of the sun. This is very different. And that's why the sun is not the god of Egypt, but the carrier of this sun on his two disks. That is, the name of this -- of this divine power of the human spirit was Horus. Horus. Horus is pharaoh, as being able to go from south to north. And this is the birth of a god, the gods, gentlemen, of the ancient men, against which the -- Israel and Christianity have placed their -- their recognition of God. The gods of the -- of the empires are all celestial gods. God -- our god is supercelestial, as St. Augustine said -- calls Him. Our god is supercelestial. If you believe in a -- that God is in Heaven, you are pagan. It's not so simple. The meaning of the Fa- -- "Our Father" bends over backward to allow the pagan to become a Christian, but "Our Father who art in Heaven," means that He is in -- on earth, too. And through us, we -- His will enters the earthly life. It is always the unity of the first sentence of the Old Testament -- "In the beginning God created Heaven and earth -- which you must hear through everything said in the New Testament. But there are many people today who are Egyptians again and call themselves Christians, you see, because many -- superstitious people today would like to have God identified with Heaven.

God is higher than the Heavens and lower than the earth. As long as you do not understand this, gentlemen, you are in the darkness of Egypt, and at the fleshpots of Egypt, too. That all these expressions, gentlemen, are very real. The great temptation, because what could pharaoh promise his people? He could promise them that all -- if they only stayed with him, over the three months of the flood, beginning July 19th of the year 2778, as I have told you, and ending in the celebration -- last great celebration of the down- -- the fall of Christianity in 395 of our era -- that's the length of the Egyptian story, perhaps you take down these dates -- they're quite interesting -- that beginning 2778 and ending in 395 of our era when the great temple of Serapis of the Egyptian -- one of the Egyptian gods in Alexandria was closed and destroyed, 395. This is so important because it was closed, when the Egyptian priests boasted that this man, God Jesus Christ could only last 365 years, that was one year of their religion, one day, one year. Now from 30 to 300- -- to 395 there would be -- have lapsed 365 years, and the Egyptian priests said, "This madman Christ, we give him a chance of 365 of our celestial days, where every day is one whole year, and in 395, He will be at an end." So the emperors took this very amiss and the bishops, and -- in order to show that the Egyptians had wrong- -- guessed wrongly, they abolished the last services of the Egyptian priest, as late as that. The Egyptian religion has lasted as long as the first 400 years of our own era.

I think this -- this reckoning may interest you: that Christianity was attacked

on astrological grounds, that they wanted to find some explanation for the great spread of Christianity, and so they said, "Well, let's -- let us have them -- let them have one constellation," you see, one 365 turning {-- turn-around}. Mr Hitler, who was an Egyptian, if any -- there ever was one -- and who believed in astrology, spoke of it, that Christian- -- that the solar constellation of Christianity was over. He used exactly the same ideology as the Egyptian priests, you see. Very interesting that he should accept this. He said the solar constellation of Christianity was over. Most of you believe this, too.

Now, the gods are born because one man is God. The pharaoh has two crowns. The sun has only one, because, gentlemen, Horus can do what the star of the night, and the sun and day can only do together. Because if you wait till it gets dark, what do you see in the sky? What do you see in the north? You see something very impressive, that impressed early men. You see the Arcturus. You see the Polar Star. You see the Great Child's Wain. Because you see the ineluctable, not-moving, permanent northern stars. They cannot move, they don't want to move, they are invincible, however, because whenever you look up, any question?

(Yeah. They had a different polar star than we do.)

Pardon me?

(They had a different polar star than we do now.)

Yes. Quite right. Well. Well, if you want me to go into this in detail?

(No.)

There was, however, in their -- in their firmament a star. I know all about this, Sir. But I -- this is -- is not very important at this moment, is it? It's not very important -- of course, if you see that the whole firmament finally moves, you have to take another polar star. This was nothing in their political problem -- problematic. If they had north, they had north. That's all they need.

All our stars have been renamed 20 times, I mean. The Arabs gave us part of the name Betelgeuse, and Orion is, of course, the replacement for the {Sahu}, the Egyptian name, you see. Sirius was not -- the Egyptians did not call Sirius "Sirius," although it was the most important star in their lives. So what of it? Just -- I mean, I don't see of what -- what relevance it is. I admire your knowledge.

But gentlemen, Horus is a double god, because what he does is unite day and night. He -- when he goes from the First Cataract to the northern shore, to the north -- northern end of Egypt into the delta -- here, I tried to put the delta in, not to exaggerate it, but it is really much more impressive, because -- this would be Cairo. Here would be the great pyramids, Gizeh. Here is Memphis. Now, it is so narrow here, it is only 30 miles wide at the widest place, in the whole valley of the Nile, a thousand miles' length through the First Cataract. It's nowhere more land. Perhaps you take this figure down. The whole fruitland of Egypt is as large as Belgium, yet the distances are as large as in America. You travel 1200 miles from the First Cataract to the outposts at the Mediterranean, you see, which is as far as New York-Florida. But the arable, tillable soil, which you can really have -- use for production is not more than the area of Belgium. And the area of Belgium is, by and large, little -- as much -- I have forgotten the figures. I wouldn't be surprised if it was as much as New Hampshire and Vermont taken together. So it is a fantastic hose, or tube, this whole of Egypt. And here, I have to exaggerate this now, as it really is -- the delta's certainly spreading out in this -- compared to the center here, in tremendous {ways}. The Horus of Egypt is then able to do something that he borrows from the stars in the -- at night, who stand to the north. The symbol of the Horus is a falcon, a falcon spearing, which is very strange, this combination -- or a bull sometimes -- spearing the northern star, throwing it from the south against his large thigh, his upper thigh, the thigh of the -- of the star of this constellation inside which -- that is really my anger with you -- you. They never thought of single stars. They had always constellations. And Child's Wain was also not in the center then. But it is a small polar -- what we call -- what we -- how do you call this -- the small wagon? And the large one and the -- I don't know the English expression.

(Bear.)

Wie? You say "bear" too, probably.

(Dipper. Dipper.)

Dipper. Pardon me. Dipper. That's the word.

So this -- this movement that Horus can throw the -- the spear against the constantly inflexible, not-moving north: that's the symbol of uniting Egypt. And he spears whom? His hostile brother Set, who is called his enemy. Horus and Set are this strange couple, this strange pair which cannot be one without the other. There is no Horus without taking aim toward the north. And there is no Set if he

isn't overcome time and again by Horus. Horus and Set are the two hostile brothers. And at the moment when the pharaoh arrives in the north at the shore of the sea, he is Horus and Set. The title of the emperors of Egypt, gentlemen, is very stringent. It is he who can look at Horus and Set. It's one of the divine things, gentlemen, which is nearly impossible for you and me to understand. The ancient gods in antiquity are all at the same time saviors and demons. Calamities and blessings. And the ancient man did not think ever of his god as merciful, or good, or friendly, but as a power that at times go wild and de- -- and be destroyer, "savior and destroyer" is perhaps the best expression, gentlemen. All ancient prayers, all the statues which you see in the Peabody Museum in -- in Boston, for example, about the -- the Mexican gods, show you in alternation the face of a human and the face of a dragon. All the length -- long side of the pillar. Some of you must have seen such columns, have you? Who has seen such columns? That's always the two faces of the same god. Because it is the same god who can withhold his support and destroy us. If he's on our side, he suddenly can support us.

Gentlemen, ancient men, before Christ is born, feel that creation at every one moment threatens us with death and gives us life. And in no moment are we sure which is coming. You have forgotten that, because you live so deeply in the -- in the cradle of an all-merciful god. But it is still true. If you come to think of it, you would no -- not live in the story of our own era, you would all feel like an ancient man that at any one moment, death and life are in the scales. In a time, with this infant mortality, you see, and women in childbirth dying, and people of the warpath being killed, and nobody growing up to a ripe old age actually, except some very exceptional beings, most people dying at 25 or 30, you can imagine that these people were much nearer to the really wild, natural process; and nature is absolutely ineluctable. It is -- you never know. You breathe. Well, if it is monoxide gas, you die. If it is -- happens to be oxygen or {nozone}, you live. But you can't, if you are primitive man, guarantee that the air isn't poisoned. You cannot guarantee that the hailstorm is not throwing you down. We live so -- safe, you see, so hidden away from the ways of providence, that you do not understand how mi- -- miraculous it is that one day you are drafted, and the other day you are sent to Korea, and the next day you have peace, and the fourth -- over next day you can play football, and then the fifth day there is a war again. And nothing is of your making. You live in such a fool's paradise that you really think man makes his own destiny. You even say that man is the captain of his soul, or he's self-made.

Well, such a man, of course, cannot understand man's relation to the ancient gods. The ancient gods are destroyers as well as saviors. Horus and Set are the

first god { } in history. And that's why it's worth looking into their meaning, gentlemen. Horus and Set are two aspects of the divine spirit. As long as Horus is in the South, and Set resists him, and the country is not united, and there is no one temple service, no one priesthood functioning, whenever there is danger that the country disintegrates, there's Horus and Set. Whenever the pro- -- triumph -- triumphant Horus carries the sun and the moon, for that matter -- that's why the symbol is so -- we will see -- has been duplicated -- carries it from the First Cataract out into the sea, he is Horus and Set, both. This is his triumph. That's why he has -- as I said, he has two crowns on his head. He is a double monarch. The first great exper- -- experience of the Egyptians was that one man becomes immortal and divine because he can break the jinx of the eternal separation of day constellation and night constellation. He can do what the sun and the northern star do in combination. He can bring them together. He can, so to speak, be the alchemist of the sky, if you like the expression, you see, because he can mix the order of day and night and force them together. It's this fusion which has dictated the whole -- law, the whole constitution, the -- all the texts of which we find in the Egyptian graves, thousands and thousands of spells, the so-called texts of the pyramids. The texts of the pyramids tell you the story of this union of the lands, as it is called; how Horus must spear Set and, so to speak, drink him in; but how every year, when the Nile falls and becomes a trickle, then Set rises again in his threat, because if Horus is victorious, then he rides the crest of the wave, as we say today. That's an Egyptian expression. The flood, you see -- rushes down and takes this water of the Nile -- by the way, in order to make you -- known the whole problem of Egypt, to think of this as a unity, in a time when Rhode Island would have been a large country, next to impossible to unite, well, and such days to unite this Egyptian country was, of course, such an incredible conception that at any one moment, people trembled to see it disappear again. It would disappear if the Nile did not -- did not live. Egypt was ruined if the flood didn't reach 16 yards. That was the minimum, 16 half-meters, what -- how do you call it? 20 inches. I don't know what the measure there would be. It's a little more than half a yard, by which the Egyptians measured.

(A rod. Rod.)

It is this length, from elbow -- from elbow to -- to finger.

(Cubit.)

What?

(It's a cubit.)

Cubit. Is that the word? Thank you. So the Egyptian fate was decided by measuring the altitude of the flood of the Nile every year. They had a special marker in Cairo, from time immemorial, the meter of the Nile. And they built it into the ground, as a kind of a water temple. And you may go down the steps, and when it is dry nine months of the year, you can go to -- down quite deep. And then there is figured out, and of course, in the opposite direction again as with the First Cataract, the first cubit is not on top, where you would begin, you see, with the -- with the plumbing line, to figure. You would -- we would go down to the plumbing line from the top down in to the water -- wouldn't we? -- and then count to 16. But the Egyptians of course counted in the dry time. They built into -- as deep as they could, and then if the Nile rose, the highest would be 16, you see, and a flood that was still tolerable was 12.

Now you find this all in the Old Testament very carefully described, with the 17 years and the seven fat years of Egypt. This simply true, that the Egyptians trembled every year that Horus might not reach Set, that the whole country might not allow him to ride victor- -- ride out the flood, that would be a flood that would be too meager really for force Set down. Of course they had to try. The pharaoh made this procession in the first years of the -- of the Egyptian history, every year. Later he made it every two years. Later he made it when he come -- come on the throne. But this was the pharaoh's progress. And if you read the Elizabethan poetry, you will still find that the word, "the king's progress," plays a great part in the imagination of the time. That's the Egyptian institution: the ruler does not rule before he hasn't progressed through his kingdom. Do you understand? He has to take possession. In Egypt, or in China for that matter, originally meant that you had to out-ride the flood in order to bring the same sky-world, the same order to every inhabitant so that pharaoh actually could say to every villager, "Be quiet. We have one order." And of course, this villager otherwise would never hear of him or see of him. He had to be known, and he had to make himself known as the carrier of the good tidings. In this sense, gentlemen, the Egyptians had their gospel, too. The gospel was that man was divine -- divine who, in -- together with the -- all the priests together serving him, observing the sky was able, you see, to be supermortal.

Gentlemen, the idea of the divine right of kings comes, of course, from Egypt. It wasn't so fantastic as it sounds to you. You had to have a knowing class. The man who does -- tills the soil, or is the fisherman, and hunts crocodiles just doesn't -- cannot know. He has not been set aside to live in the heavens. So you see, gentlemen, a stargazer, or an astrologer, for that matter, or a priest

in Egypt is not what you call a priest or I. The word "priest" is -- would be quite wrong-chosen, because priest is just older. But it is a chosen clergy. The word "clergy" is better, because it is the clergy through whom the ruler knows. It is the bodyguard of the -- Horus for the sky-world, just as the soldiers are the bodyguard against the enemy. And the tillers of the soil are his bodyguards against the -- the soil, against the earth. So pharaoh always shifts, so to speak, in his uniform. As we have a chief executive, you see, and the Chief Justice, and commander-in-chief, and then the Speaker in the Congress, the Vice President, you see, you would think at first that the first ruler of man-pharaoh had all these four qualifications. But he had the clergy to tell him the hours of the sky-world. And he had the soldiers only to protect him on earth.

Can we go on? Is this all right? Pardon me for not having interrupted this in time. Now, let's -- let's finish. I'll break off five minutes earlier.

This is then, gentlemen, the insight which we gain from the gods of nature.

The world is split. Not one moment does man know what is disaster, or what is astra; what is constellation, and what is discontent. It has to be restated every year. In China -- and all the countries, by the way, exactly the same in Mexico, where emperors ruled -- the new year has to be proclaimed by the emperor. And you perhaps know all -- the symbol which has survived to our own days in which this victory over the separation of day and night, of north and south, has been expressed. Every emperor has to swing his sword into the four directions -- south, north, east, and west -- in order to proclaim that he's a god. That is, he can do something that is not found without him. That's why all the houses in Egypt are oriented, the whole country, because the -- wherever you have the orientation in the four directions, you have the divine power -- you can say the manner of the emperor -- at work. You have this great art to follow out the dealings of sun and moon on earth.

The Horus who carries the sun was complemented, or supplemented by the idea of the mother moon-goddess, who would carry the moon on her horns. This is very interesting, I think, to you to make you these goddesses and gods a little more understandable. The moon has not the same exact movements as the sun, but in -- generally, also moves -- she also moves, as you know, from east to south to west. Only that she moves in a much shorter while. So the mother of Horus was called {Athor}, which means the house of Horus. The house, the womb, you can also translate it -- it's very difficult to make the distinction between womb and house in the ancient language -- and she is also given as a -- as a cow, the sacred cow. And you still speak of the sacred cow when you say, "There are no sacred cows in Boston." In the Ganges River, the Hindus still have the sacred

cow. That is, the divine power of the mother of the pharaoh, who can carry the moon in the same liberty, so to speak, in the same way as he can carry the sun. But as you say, she's given as a cow, and so Horus is -- is called with the rather eminent name as his mother's bull, or his mother's husband.

The strange myths which you hear of Zeus begetting children with Europa, the cow, or others in which he himself appears as a bull, come all from Egypt. They are all attempts of the -- the Greeks to make the best of this, which only made sense in the Nile River -- Valley. It makes -- made no sense, as we shall see, in -- in Greece. And the whole mythology of Greece is a kind of compromise with the Egyptian great facts of life. The cow went to India. The Chinese took over the whole idea of orientation. To make it easy for you to compare these things, I -- let me -- make one -- say one little thing about this. The problem of China was to give to a region with two large rivers the same constitution as a city with one river -- a country with one river. You know they have the Yellow and the Green River. And the achievement of China, by which it pro- -- for which it probably has outlasted Egypt by only -- by the way -- 1500 years, is that China had this -- to solve these two- -- two-river problems. That's why the emperor's progress in China did not play the same role as in Egypt, that the Peking Center, the central residence, was -- took the place of this. The Egyptians made the same attempt. They tried to become Chinese. It became very clumsy, very inconvenient to have the -- pharaoh spend all his time on this formal progress after they had built all the temples, after they had organized the priesthood in these 36 districts, after they had counts and gardeners, and superintendents of the ditches and the canals right and left of the Nile, you see, after -- over centuries, the {Kopka} said to pharaoh, "Stay at home." And he proceeded and tried to do this and he lived then in a new residence, gentlemen, up here, higher up in Thebes, where most Americans go. It's called Luxor now, with an Arabian name. You may have heard of Luxor, or Thebes. That's already a decline of the Egyptian idea, because it is no longer based on Horus and Set, but on the possibility of watching the movements.

Now you come to contemplation, you see, on your power. That's the second-rate power, to be able to contemplate the stars. First you have to outdo them, in order to get obedience; because as long as every human being can look at the stars, you see, nothing of unity is achieved. You had to have one who, based on his clergy, and his military might, you see, could race and unite the skies. You see, that the individual cannot do. Because if you embark with -- as -- as yourself on the day on the First Cataract, you could be stopped by one crocodile in your little sailboat, you see, the next corner. And the myth is full of the stories, you see, how around every bend of the Nile River, pharaoh is attacked by Set's men,

how they try to block his progress, how it takes all the followers of Horus to carry him through.

Now, I only meant to say, gentlemen, you may have heard of King Ikhnaton -- Ikhnaton, Amenhotep IV and his famous city Tel-el-Amarna. Most people only hear of this declining year of Egypt's might.

If I can explain to you that failure of Tel-el-Amarna, and why Egypt rejected Amenhotep IV or Ikhnaton, then you have understood the Egyptian problem. And then you have understood why Moses left Egypt. Because the two events that are -- three -- there are three events connected. The exodus of the Jews, the reign of Amenhotep IV, Echna- -- called Echnaton in our sources, E-c-h-n-a-t-o-n, and the calendar of Egypt.

The emperor brought the rule of one agriculture, the rule that after three months of flood, people would be able to settle and therewith he brought the idea of a plan for the whole country of storehouses which would feed 2 million people very soon. There must have been as many, very early, in three months without their getting anything out of the ground, because there was noth- -- is nothing. You can even say for five months. In the drought season and in the flood season, there is nothing to eat in Egypt. Absolutely nothing. Imagine. Not even fish, because of the rapidity of the flood. You cannot afford to go on these canoes then and try to fish.

So the great conception of the Egyptian year was to have stored away during one half-year what you have to need the other half-year. So General Mills was invented.

Pardon me?

This is the calendar of Egypt, gentlemen, a storehouse calendar, which tells you exactly how much you have to lay in, store, in order to reach the next flood. That's why these 16 cubits were God himself. They were the god Osiris. The flood in Egypt is Osiris. The man who allows Egypt to become the seat of one land, he's written with an eye and the throne. It's a maker of the throne. The throne alone needs {Isis and he} ...

[Tape interruption]

... unity of his body. And then he can fertilize his land and if you -- now, please don't laugh, because it is very serious, although it is something that has to

do with sex. The Egyptians felt that this god was rising to his power, that his living rod, his phallus, his member virile, was in this flood able to fertilize the land, and Isis, the mother of Horus -- {Athor}, was at the receiving side, and the Egyptians have introduced this sacred rite which goes -- is at the bottom of all the mysteries, of all the later mysteries, of the Athenian mysteries, and all the later rituals of the Middle Ages, that the woman received into her womb, being in the upper position as the sky, as the heaven, and the man lying down, and fertilizing her, because the flood had to come and lift him up. This most unnatural, and you may say, perverse conception was the great secret preserved in all the Egyptian temples. Osiris is lying on his back. His -- his living rod, as I like to call this our -- the pride of man is rising and Isis is receiving into her womb the living waters. You cannot understand Egypt- -- Greek mythology later and nothing of the mysteries of later time if you do not -- are -- are not initiated into this strange conception that Heaven is the woman, and earth is the man. But not the dead earth, not the earth of the jungle, not the earth, you see, as is. But this miraculous, living earth which -- in which the flood unites the particles of the desert, of the dark land, which is lying separated, you see, ly- -- as -- if you have the members of a body quartered. Now this is exactly what the {Biblical} texts tell us. Osiris for nine months is quartered. He's divided -- all his limbs are separated and his central limb, the limb of -- the member of regeneration, of generation cannot be found. And at the moment in which the flood comes, he is rising, in all his might, and he's able to fertilize the whole of Egypt. Hovering over him is the form of the moon-goddess of {Athor}. That is a very strange conception, but I had to introduce you into it. I am very grateful to you that you have listened seriously, because we have to respect these old conceptions. You can see that the life of men served to explain the cosmic processes. Gentlemen, for the Egyptians, birth and generation are what for the Greeks and for your little mind, and for the physicists' mind is causation. The ancients conceived of causation as generation and birth. It's not a bad idea. They say -- from which this has come -- cop- -- you get, for example, an alloy metal -- they say, "Gold is his father." You see. "Copper is its -- is its mother." That's still alchemistic language. So much did the Egyptians try to describe causation by birth and generation. They say when -- what does this come from? You say, "Why -- how -- where does this come?" you see, you give a cause. This no Egyptian, or no primitive man would have understood. They say, "It is born from this -- and such-and-such as his father." This they could understand. I must say I'm a little deaf on the ear of causation myself. When modern man always gives causes, I do not understand much. It doesn't explain much to me, these so-called causes. As a matter of fact, you know, many natural scientists

have given up this whole reasoning, terms of causation. The whole problem with modern physics is to get rid of causation.

But the Egyptians had this first urge. And therefore the cause of the unity of Egypt is that the corpse of Osiris is unified. It becomes one body to be compared to the human body and inspires the mother of Horus, and Horus, the son then follows suit, and he is the revenger of Osiris. That is, Osiris obviously has been killed by Set, by the man who resists the unity, by this northern district which holds out against any power in the heavens, {to come near him} who repels the sun when she moves -- he moves into him -- upon him, you see, even at the solstices. The next -- last moment Set is able to tell the sun, "Turn back, you can't come near me." The revenger of his father, that's the official title of "pharaoh," the revenger of his father, Osiris -- here you see the idea of the vendetta of the tribe suddenly translated into a completely new situation. The revenge is between the powers of Heaven and earth. Set is this power in the sky, you see. And earth is revenged by the superhuman, celestial -- falcon-god, Horus, who can tell the celestial powers against Osiris, { }. "I ride the flood and I thereby tell you Osiris lives again. He's there."

In this sense, gentlemen, ancient religion is -- believes in resurrection. This is not an invention of Christianity. The -- Osiris rises again every new year. And you must understand Christianity, because you cannot understand the Easter story if you do not understand -- this is a fact -- that the coffin of Osiris had to be found by his mother -- by his wife, Isis -- Isis, when he receded -- the flood receded again and the country went back into -- into dryness after the harvest, then Isis says, "Oh, where is his coffin?" And tries to find the coffin of Osiris. The Easter search in the -- in the Gospels, gentlemen, for the corpse of Christ, is in sublimation, or in superemana- -- or how would you say, in overcoming the Egyptian story of the search for the coffin of Osiris and his corpse. That was a ritual which was just as much done every half-year as the begetting. In summertime, Isis received the seed from the flooded Nile into her womb. Six years later, she went mourning with her sister Nephthys to try to find where Osiris was buried.

I'm sorry, my time is up. Next time I'll tell you more.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Opening remarks missing]

... settled parts of the world -- this week so that the Easter vacations do not break -- give much of a break. So that's why I asked Mr. {Dickson} and Mr. {Roger} to hold out with their reports until I am quite sure that they can make it, and ask you {guys} to read this next time together with the other reports.

(Next time?)

Pardon me?

(You said "next time"? You said we will read it the next time?)

What? Are you going to have a nervous breakdown?

(No. {I'm reading it.})

Good.

[various unintelligible comments]

Gentlemen, I was stopped last time by one of you with a typical {fit} of disbelief, of not understanding anything about that which we are trying to do. We are not trying to do the history of 23 civilizations. This is not a philosophy of history, as Mr. Toynbee has given. But this is telling you from the sources a story, as we said in the beginning, which has to be told, in order to be believed. And therefore, I could have just as well told the story of the pre-Columbian America, or of China. It would still be a story to be told. And the man who came to me didn't understand the economy of history, that what has been done in great emergency in one country spreads everywhere, just as it -- you have now the secret police in this country after it has been invented in Russia. We are also imitating by contrast, at this moment, as you well know. And later on -- later historians, of course, won't mention this. You always read the story of the Civil War -- those in 57 will remember my great example that the emancipation of the Negroes, of the colored people here in this country is deemed an American event. It wasn't, of course, at all, because in the same year when the slaves were emancipated in this country, the czar of Russia emancipated his serfs in Russia. So you see, it's very shortsighted to call this an American event. It's just our shortsightedness that wants --

wants to have it all this way.

In the same sense, gentlemen, at this moment I cannot tell you the story of the Chinese civ- -- civilization which carried over to a problem of two rivers, as I tried to tell you, the solution found in Egypt for one river. And, of course, the -- the modern brain is completely destroyed by pluralism. I'm telling you the story of how an empire was discovered as a possibility, as a way of life. But you are all so geographically minded that you look at some point of the map and say, "There's a civilization." That is idolatry of the golden calf, of materialism, gentlemen, if you cannot see that the spirit has created the -- all these civilizations, one after another, in solving this great possibility of covering the earth with at least part gardenland, cultivated land, soil, as we call it, after the inundation.

And to come now to the Egyptian problem, as an example of the solution, because I -- it so happens that I know Egyptian, and I don't know Chinese, and it would be foolish of me to give you a second-rate story when I give -- can give you a first-hand story. The misunderstanding of the Egyptian civilization is, of course, perhaps a lesson by which I may relieve this gentlemen's distrust -- mistrust. We find in the books is written modern man's viewpoint, who does not understand that it was difficult to settle. I tried to prove to you that it was the discovery of a new human attitude. And we are interested in men's castrating himself and getting over his fear that he might be a shut-in person for the rest of his life and if he remained within the four directions of the compass within one country behind the Chinese Wall, or behind the mountains of Egypt. This is the problem. Nothing local, but a spiritual problem. How can you -- gods, tribesmen, a Bedouin, remake so that he says, like a monk today who is wedded to his monastery, that he is wedded to a country, wedded to the Valley of the Nile, that he has to live there day in, day out, year in, year out, that his ancestors had to be buried there in the certain place in the ground in order to have peace after, for thousands of years, the people have roamed the earth and have been this eternal great stream, that -- as we tried -- I try to tell you -- runs down all over the globe, of which this country -- this continent, America, is an especially great example; because except for Spaniards, Portuguese, and Anglo-Saxons, this continent is still occupied by the first layer of the human history by tribal people who have migrated.

In the books which you read on Egypt, or on Greece, you find very often the startling statement that there is an Athene of Athens, and an Athene of let's say, Sikyon, or Corinth, or -- or Sparta. And there is a Zeus of Otricoli in the famous Vatican Museum, and there is a Juno Ludovisi in the palace of the Ludovisi family in Rome. And people begin to believe that the gods are local. That there is

a different Zeus in one city, and a different Zeus in another. There are 20 Zeuses and 36 Junos -- or Heras, as they called, you see -- or Jupiters, or Poseidons. And so people also -- you can also read in these books of modern philology that the gods of Egypt -- that the Horus, for example -- exists in Buto, in the delta, and exists in {Etphu}. There are many Horuses, there are many Osirises. There are many Isises. Gentlemen, don't believe this for a minute. This is the modern man's hopeless misunderstanding of the creation of the settlement. The problem of the god is from the very beginning what divine -- what the divinity always is. Divinity is always the power to overcome our five senses, the world of our five senses. What Shakespeare, or what even you mostly at least, still when you are not quite corrupt by study call "nature" is that which the five senses offer you, that's your own space and time. What we call God is the -- those powers that force us beyond what we see. The spirit of the ancestor is divine, is the first de- -- declaration of divinity, because the old man is dead. But through the eye- -- mask of the medicine man, he's not dead. He's still here, you see. So we reach through anything what we call divine, or spirit, something that is beyond our five senses. For the very beginning, Horus is that power which makes people see in the sky of Egypt more than they can see on earth. The great temptation of the Egyptian idolatry of the golden calf is that you could see Taurus, the bull, in the sky, as I tried to tell you. His sky was speared by Horus when he ra- -- raced down the river and came always nearer and nearer the Northern Star, and the Dipper. So if he aimed at this constellation near the dipper, which here in this country you do not even see, he could spear the thigh of his enemy Set, of the hostile brother who kept the country in fragment -- in fragments. He kept it apart, because he was the god of the desert, the god of the heat, the god of the dryness, the god where it resisted the flood that kept Egypt in -- just earthly, and didn't allow its union from the sky. Now your -- it is obvious, gentlemen, that Jupiter for the Romans was the power that lifted Rome up into eternity and allowed Rome to meet the requirements of world domination. Under Jupiter, the Romans conquered the world. To think that -- Jupiter had a temple in Rome does not mean that we say that Jupiter was of Rome, by Rome, out of Rome. But it was the place in which the Romans, or through which the Romans could reach a power that was not of Rome only. Therefore the same name everywhere where people tried to get hold of this mighty power of the sky called Jupiter, where they invoked him. Zeus, too.

So nearly all the books of the last 50 years, gentlemen, in all the fields of religion, are marred, are tainted by what is called positivism, by the idea that we must reduce everything to our five senses. That's positivism. Because the five senses mean that you can weigh it, that you can see it, that you can measure it.

Now gentlemen, you cannot reach the gods in this -- by this system because man has all the time desired to be beyond the realm of his five senses. The space and the time allotted to a human mortal is too short to appreciate it very much, or to base any actions of the body politic on it. I have tried to tell you before that politics only begin when something is true for three generations. And on the other hand, we -- you know of the tribe that he wanted -- the tribe was forced, so to speak, spiritually to migrate, because it had to find out what was true everywhere. And -- so they migrate all over the earth to find confirmation for their -- for their great task that man is that strange being that is one through all ages and in all places. That's the strange animal we are. A ubiquitous animal, and a { }. Not eternal, because you don't understand eternity, but a perpetual animal. The problem of history is, as -- we have talked of this before, that man must feel that he and his great-, great-, great-, great-, great-, great-grandchild will pull in the same direction. Nothing you do today makes sense if you have no guarantee that your grandchildren are not going to curse you, to turn against you, to uproot your tombstone, and to say these were terrible beasts, our grandparents. If you have to expect from your grandchildren that they curse you, you better be not born. You have to do something lest this happen. But nobody in this country, of course, cares because he doesn't think he will have grandchildren. Birth control will take care of that.

You see, you live in an era, gentlemen, in which the most serious problem of man is procreation, is propagation -- has become a social game, through the pessars, and the condoms, and the birth control. And if these -- the act, gentlemen, which can only be done in ecstasy, in despair, and in sublimation, if that is reduced to a -- game, like Whist or Bridge, or Poker, as it is in your fraternities, with your high school girls there -- then man is no longer potent, because he plays with his potency. The real, potent man, gentlemen, is created, because he has to speak to his sweetheart, and he has to convince her that she's taken care of for eternity, that her offspring, in the act of his embrace, will be sacred to the man to whom she gives herself. That is not the case with the -- your girls who gives themselves to you in your automobiles. It has no consequences. And therefore, you deprive yourself of your real, creative potency; you are castrated when you think you are most potent, because you are divided body and soul, body and spirit. You do something with your body and you have nothing to say about it into eternity. When -- anybody who is really is love says something that is valid for all generations to come, even in a tragic case, as in Romeo and Juliet. Every word spoken in Romeo and Juliet is still there, although these lovers never got married. And here in modern marriages, even if they live together for 50 years, they aren't married. Just organized prostitution.

Since you do not understand this, you have no gods. This is an era of complete atheism. Even the people who go to church don't know what God is. They really think it's a private devotion, not the power that goes through the ages. You have no idea what -- of what God is, because you do not want to join other generations in your worship. You really think it's your private affair when you join a church. You are all sectarians. That is, you think it's a private invention. Your -- you have nice feelings about God. God doesn't care for our -- nice feelings. He's not interested in any sentiment. He's very much against sentimentality. Religion is never a sentimental affair. It's a very brutish, very serious, very incisive affair. It's just as exact, the divine law as the natural law, gentlemen. It isn't -- the races that are rejected; look at Spain, that are dead countries, that goes by law. It isn't arbitrary.

So if you play with sex, gentlemen, for example, you are out of the divine order of things. When you play with the mind and have ideas and you sell your ideas to the highest bidder, when your mind is commercialized, out you go. God is not interested in commercialized ideas. If you live by bestsellers and -- and commentators, and so on, you become absolutely nobodies. And you just go around in America. Who is still serious? The women. So they run this country. Who makes McCarthy, and who breaks him? The women will. You can't -- can only run after them. The women's clubs do it, because at least these people, they are very often terrible, they are fanatic, like the Daughters of the Revolution, but at least they are serious. Sterile and serious. You are sterile and are not serious. The gods, gentlemen, in Egypt were the powers that united the world. Please take this very seriously. The quality which was discovered in Egypt for gods was that they had to be ubiquitous. Ubiquitous, everywhere. Therefore, everywhere for the same god a temple had to be built. You cannot understand later the Greek religion to which we will turn after Easter right away, if you -- I do not first sharpen your understanding, gentlemen, that in Egypt, the ubiquitous character of God was discovered. The Old Testament has two places where this is still taken up for -- as an attribute of -- of the living God. It's -- He is called {Shadai} in two places of the Old Testament. This word {Shadai} has been debated very much because it is a strange title. The most -- probable -- explication is that it means "a god here and there," everywhere. In the true Jewish name, as you know, is for God "He shall be who He shall be." This is the god the Egyptians could not have, because they have no future. Everything is only the eternal present of the cosmic order, the stars circling -- rotating. What they discovered, and that's why we here are present at the birth of the gods, is that they are everywhere, although on earth they are not -- man is not able to see around the next corner. Man can embark on this tremendous discovery of the divine order of the

universe by looking into Heaven and finding gods there who really are everywhere. And therefore, gentlemen, a temple is an attempt to make the god present on earth where he otherwise could not be seen. The temples on earth -- I said this before -- but now it make perhaps special sense to you -- is an attempt to repeat the everywhere-ness of the sky.

And here now comes the paradox, gentlemen. The sky offers the possibility of reconnoitering an order that is valid ubiquitously, everywhere. The only difficulty for the sky is that it is constantly revolving, and constantly rotating and therefore is never the same at any one time. The sky-world, established for all the -- over all these countries, has this great encouragement: everywhere the same stars, but not all the time.

Now I have to tell you how human -- the human relation to these stars, that is, God is everywhere. The gods are everywhere. The human partner of the divine family, the deified pharaoh and his court, the great house on earth can help these gods to be there all the time. That's quite funny. But they -- I tried to tell you last time that the de- -- the divine right of kings, the idea of caesarism, the idea of the pharaoh, the idea of an emperor of China, or the idea of Montezuma, the man without fear, the emperor of Mexico, whom then, as you know, Cortez can kill, because he just cannot be fazed, he cannot be frightened. He is himself a star. This life of the ruler of a country as one more star offers the opportunity to the gods in the sky to be made omnipresent through time.

So the crucial situation, gentlemen, of the Egyptian religion is: the gods are there everywhere. If this is the Nile Valley, over 1500 miles, the inhabitants can be told, "We live on one economy, under one division of labor. The granite will be brought over 2,000 miles. You will be fed during the three months of the inundation out of the storehouses of pharaoh, from wherever you come alongside the Nile." You must think that these people had to be concentrated for their -- the work on the pyramids over a thousand miles of land on their canoes. We know that one obelisk was carried down the Nile on 972 ships. Now 9- -- the crews of 972 boats have to be fed, you see. This had to be somewhere. And it is this great assurance which came from the sky that there was one order which would allow these people to live during these three months of hard work in the quarries, or at the pyramids, or in the -- on the boats, which offered all this great promise. You could establish a lasting order which would dovetail, bring together people from various places, although they couldn't see each other. You must think that these people who were invited to settle eternally in this Nalley -- Valley of the Nile were terrified, terror-stricken. You had to offer them something by which they could go and get orientation and believe that there could be

such a budget, you see. We believe today of -- in the budget through the printing press, the newspaper, and the commentators that there will be provision. If you are employed, you actually believe that the salary will be paid, year after year. Gentlemen, there is a first time that people have to rely on other people for their food, for their livelihood, for their wherewithal. The Egyptians are, so to speak, the first people in a civil service, or in employment. And they have to believe that the rulers do dispose of such divine powers that, instead of hunting yourself, you see, the whale -- or hunting yourself the -- the deer, or earning yourself the living, you can indirectly -- can indirectly be fed by some other people's governmental resources. It's like the dry milk now shipped to Korea. The Koreans, I'm told, just can't understand what that is, dried milk. They won't take it, you see. And the service committees have a very hard time to persuade them that dried milk still can be made into liquid milk. This -- this retranslation is a miracle to the Koreans, you see. They don't believe in it, quite.

Now gentlemen, the other problem is for pharaoh to say, "The stars in the sky are moving constantly, but by my special provisions, I can make you see the stars that you only see once a year, or that you only see at noontime, at night, or in the opposite time of the year." This is the divine right of kings, gentlemen, or that is that which Caesar, or the great -- the great leader, the Huey Long, always has to offer the people. Tyr- -- tyrants, gentlemen, are not invented. Hitler is not an accident, or Stalin. You too expect from Mr. Eisenhower good crops and prosperity. And you don't elect him again if there is unemployment. So we are all superstitious in this respect. Why? What did a pharaoh, how was he able to say that the stars are the same, although they do shift? The greatest example of this is that the pharaoh looked up to that star which is the brightest in Heaven, which is rated by the astronomers as minus-60, because the classes of -- of luminosity in the star divides the star in ten classes. Who has taken a course in astronomy? You may remember that they are divided by their brilliancy into classes. But there is one brilliant star -- star that is -- outclasses them, outranks them. Do you know which this is?

(Sirius.)

Sirius. Now that's the greatest star of the night sky for this reason. And therefore Sirius is called the "daughter of the sun." In Egyptian, her name is usually today what the books call {Sotis}. Her real name in Egyptian is a little different. It's {Soptid}. We find the book {Sotis} for Sirius. And she's a feminine; she's a lady. She's a daughter of the sun. She is the most eminent star in the -- sky, and she has today the luminosity of minus-60, which shows you that she outranks every other star in the sky. And the Egyptians made quite a good choice in

saying the most important star for them in the night was -- would be this brightest of all stars to go by, to get orientation, when the sun is absent. When the father has gone to bed, his daughter is out, so to speak. And so you see they did not think the -- moon could do anything but imitate the -- as I told you, the being carried from -- by the sacred cow from south to north, but they had this other problem with all the changes of the moon: it's waxing is -- how waxing and waning, to find something in the heavens that would be more permanent. This seemed to be the brightest star, Sirius. It's a fixed star, at least.

So they had to find some rule of thumb by which it -- the identity of night sky and day sky became impressed on people. And modern man, you see, since he no longer lives under the stars at all, thinks that moon and sun together make sense. But do they? The -- moon behaves so absolutely, you see, erratic in the day -- in the night sky, that to say that -- that at the -- in the day -- in the day by the sun and at night by the moon is a very poor recipe, because then you live in two opposite worlds. The moon-world is really one of -- of a month's duration, and the -- the sun -- the solar-world is one of a -- of a year's duration. And where are you? You are confused. You have two different calendars. As you know, the world today still spits -- split into the Islamic world, which has a moon calendar of 354 days, and we have a solar calendar. And there's no way of really unifying them, really, in any order. They don't make sense together. You are very glib about all these things, and most of our positivistic textbooks take real people's troubles not seriously anymore, because we live behind glass and brick. We no longer observe the stars. We have electric light. But these people had to live with these -- phenomenon of the cosmic, created order and they asked themselves, "Do they speak to us and tell us their laws? How do we comply with the seasons? Whom do we follow, the moon or the sun?" Certainly you can't follow both with complete identity. That's why Sirius, you see, is called only the first of the stars. The great book of star-lore, which today still, as you know, used by the astrologers in all our newspapers to give you the silly horoscope, all comes from Egypt, not from Babylon. And what does it say, gentlemen? That the night sky, in difference from the day sky, allows us to under- -- be -- to understand the order if we elect Sirius as the commander-in-chief, as the queen of the stars, as she is called, or the queen of the deacons. Queen of the deacons. And if we consider any change -- any change in the sky during the year as simply the coming-up of lieutenants, who wait for her return and while she is retired, so to speak, and takes a rest, take her place. The word "{locum tenens}," "lieu-tenants," "locotenenti" in Italian, is still in our military title, lieu- -- lieutenant. As you know, lieutenant is a man who holds the place of somebody else, for the captain. The real McCoy is the captain. A lieutenant, or two lieutenants, or three lieutenants, you see, in the company are his stattholders, the people -- you may call them -- like to

call them "substitutes," but that's not a good term. The real term is "people who take his place." That's the literal translation of the Latin term, "{locum tenens}," of which your word "lieutenant" is the modern American idiomatic chain. So the official terminology of the Egyptians, there is one queen in Heaven. And all the other deacons, constellations, stars which you see in other months of the year when Sirius is not in the middle of the sky, are called her lieutenants. So man in a breathless curiosity waits through the whole year for the Great Day of days, high great days on which Sirius will again be in command, and this is what pharaoh does, and what the gods themselves cannot do. He has his priesthood, his own vicars in every temple. A priest in Egypt is the vicar of the pharaoh, of the ruler. And the stars which are seen every 10 days, the so-called deacons, you think today of the zodiac, that has replaced the -- the original idea of -- every 10 days, 36 times 10 days, there is another constellation in the sky. And because they come up every 10 days, they are called "{dekanus}," or "deacon." Our word "dean," the dean of the college has the same name. He is the -- the head of a unit of 10. A dekanus, 36 deacons have given us the 360 days of the year, and the 360 degrees of the cycle in mathematics. As you know, we still count the 360 degrees. They are older than the month, than the division of the year into -- into 30 days. The first division of the Egyptian year was in 36 watches which, over 365 days, would guarantee the return of the queen into the center of the sky.

Now the fabulous, miraculous story of Egypt is this: that Sirius not only was the brightest star, but that Sirius is the star which the sun spits out. See she seems to spit out of her womb at sunrise on the day of the great flood, on July 19, 2778, and again in the year -- 1321. And again in the year of our era 139, it was actually observed, that the sun, one hour before she came out of the mountains, allowed Sirius to be at the same place in the so-called heliacal rising of Sirius. That is, the star at that moment, when there is such a heliacal rising, is to be seen right before sunrise. That's the great marriage, the sacred marriage of father and daughter in Egypt. Sun, Ra, and Sirius are both visible within one hour on July 19th, as I said, of the first year in which the -- the Egyptians find ways and means of uniting their country.

The pyramids, gentlemen, are called places on whose top Sirius, {Sotis}, and her father Ra can unite. You have heard of the -- of the sacred wedding of Zeus and Hera. All this in late Greek -- very late Greek adaptation of this great problem of -- bring together night sky and day sky in a complete harmony.

Now you see the importance of the priests, of the temples, of the pharaoh. Without their appointing the vicars, the lieutenants, without their explaining to

everybody that the 36 constellations only were the subordinates, the lieutenants of the main queen, the gods themselves had no consciousness. The pharaoh becomes an important member of the divine family of stars. He has something to tell them. As he goes north and moves the heavens, moves the sun and moon along the sky, he also can make sure that the stars are, so to speak, introduced to each other -- speak to -- with each other. This is the deepest reason, gentlemen, of polytheism. As you know, the many gods are puzzling. Isn't it much simpler to believe in one god? Why has Judaism had such a terrible time to establish itself in a pagan world in which there are many gods? The polytheism is a -- is a wrong expression of the problem of the divinity in those days, gentlemen. Just as you have seven ancestors on your pedigree, on your totem, and they are fathers and sons, and wives and husbands who have preceded the living generation, so gentlemen, pharaoh has to be a member of a family. The gods are many so that the king of -- later -- of Mycenae, of Isis, like {Thesus}, can be one of them. You have a divine family. The problem of polytheism is not that you have 12 gods or 75 gods, but that you have a family within which man can speak and be spoken to by the divine powers. The greatness of this principle of polytheism is, gentlemen, that here within a social group, of gods and men, the ruler and his queen both crowned, can speak with the powers in Heaven, and therefore also can be spoken to. Pharaoh does something for these people in the sky, and so he is one of them. The Olympic gods in Greece are only interesting because Agamemnon is Zeus-born. If the kings were not Zeus-born, or Hera-born, there would be no need for believing in many gods, because, gentlemen, many is there, as I said, not the poly- -- but it means a family, a group, an organized whole inside the house of the Olympus, later, in Greece, the -- the king can find his equals, his family, his aunts, and cousins, and brothers. And he can talk to them. Otherwise it wouldn't be important that man has relations to the divine. We need instructions. We need guidance. We want to know. And we want to be told. And we also want to do something for the gods. We want to put the world in order. We want to complete -- man is, after all, this still holds good, gentlemen -- you and I are in the world to complete it. Some very wise man has -- one very wise man has formulated it this way: man is the being that leads all things to their destination. That's the minimum you have to admit as being true. Well, if man is the being that leads all things to their destination, you are in between and betwixt the things -- already created and their creator, you see, and their destiny, for which we all hope that God at the end shall say, "Thank you" to us. Because we praise God and thank Him with the sacred under- -- sacred understanding that if we do right, He in the end will say, "Well done. Here is a good servant, and Dear Son," and He'll thank us. That's never mentioned in church, but it's the obvious reason why people act at all. Of course we want to be found not wanting, but having done well. It -- anybody who wants acceptance or recognition thinks that other

people are -- have a -- have a reason to thank Him. And if you take the highest point of view, since your local neighbors never thank you, but only gossip about you, you'll have to think of some power in the earth that is satisfied with your doings and at the end, you see, sanctifies your action and says, "Well done." That probably is the creator for whom you have acted as a lieutenant on this earth. So this idea of lieutenancy, gentlemen, is a very far-reaching one. Anybody who has -- received a calling is a lieutenant for the power that makes you a doctor, or an architect, or an engineer, or an inventor. You are lieutenants. This is still today a valid idea. Nobody has -- owns anything thing on this earth, gentlemen. As Card- -- Admiral Mehan -- Mahan said -- who was in 57? You remember? That man is -- there are no self-made men in the kingdom of Heaven, which amounts to the same thing, you see.

Now this lieutenancy, gentlemen, of the star-lore, this explains all the later astrology. That's why I bring this all up. The first idea of man -- of the Egyptians has been to divide and observe the stars as to 36 different constellations. The 36 constellations were painted on every sarcophagus, on every coffin in Egypt over thousands of years. And man passed then in -- on his way into eternity through these -- he passed by these 36 constellations during the great year of the migration of his soul. And Sirius was waiting for him as a fulfillment. If he landed in the constellation on New Year's Day where the sun of the day and the Sirius of the night could see each other, you had complete bliss. You had the beatitudes, because there darkness and night were reconciled. And the opposites met. And always man has believed in this great harmony of the coincidentia oppositorum, as the medieval people called it, the coincidence of the very opposites. For more you cannot ask. When your understanding -- your spirit is able to understand that opposites mean the same, and are at peace with each other, you have reached the zenith of understanding.

All this was discovered in Egypt. The problem to understand that behind things in opposition, things at day and at night, there was a secret harmony. There was understanding, mutual understanding, that Sirius did not rise on its own, or on her own, and Ra did not rise on his own, but that they moved in a secret understanding. And you could see this because once a year, this -- understanding was revealed. The first revelation, gentlemen, of the Egyptian calendar was that at one time the secret comes out into the open. Sirius and the sun can be seen on one day together. So from this -- this -- the Egyptians got their great bliss, their great blessing, so to speak, their satisfaction. We know the secret because the gods are good enough to let us see it one -- day in the year. If we only apply this solution of the riddle of the eternal order to all days in the year, we'll be

saved. And how will we be saved? We'll know when the flood comes again, so we will not lose lives in the flood -- in the inundation. We'll be able to predict to everybody in good time when to flee from his gardenland in the middle of the valley and to go up and join the columns of workers for the pyramids, you will have a predictable, workable calendar for the whole year, if you rest your confidence on the relation of that which is secret and that which is publicized, revealed. You believe, gentlemen, that you can live without revelation. You cannot, gentlemen. The relation of secrecy and revelation changes in every generation. But as soon as you have no secrets, you have nothing to live for. And as soon as you have no revelation, you have no orientation and no direction. So the thing is in life always, gentlemen, that part of us must be unknown and secret. And part of us must already know and also be publicly known. You are, at this moment known insofar you have been routine products of American civilization. Fortunately you are not yet known for what you will do yourself. If you hadn't this balance between the known and the unknown, gentlemen, you wouldn't be alive. If I knew everything about you at this moment, you would be as dead as a dodo. But you don't know this. You think that everything must be known. No. Only one-half must be known. The other half must not be known. The Egyptians had, therefore, gentlemen, this tremendous devotion to the re- -- make a hyphen -- re-velation of the stars. They were not discouraged by the fact that the secret only leaks out once. And so you come to the understanding why all the ancients had mysteries. And they had all initiation into temple services, because they were perfectly satisfied that the secret could not be known all the time, that it was only visible once, and that the tradition that it could be revealed had to be given to the people even though at this moment, the sky did not give it -- its secret away. This explains to you, gentlemen, that the Egyptians over two -- twice 1460 years believed in the propri- -- appropriate return of {Sotis} and sun at the same day on the calendar, on the -- in the same hour. They had a year of 365 days. That was -- came from observation. But as you know, that doesn't work because of the leap-year problem, because the real rotation of the earth around the sun is 365 days and 6 hours minus, I think, 4 minutes. Isn't that true? So it's not quite 6 hours, plus 365 days. And you now -- know how the people have labored under the reforms of the calendar, Julian Calendar, under Julius Caesar; and Gregorian calendar under Pope John -- George -- Gregory XIII in 1583. And you know that the English only introduced our modern calendar as late as 1752. Being anti-pape- -- popish, they could not accept the pope's reform of the calendar for 2- -- 170 years. So the problem has been now left sight of. You all think there is no calendaric secret anymore. We know when the years will return. But all the more, you may

appreciate the attitude of an empire, in which against visibility, against the evidence of every year, the eternal order in the sky was believed in.

Where is a piece of chalk, to make my own copy -- you see any?

Perhaps it's worth your while, gentlemen, to take down these dates. This is B.C., B.C., and this is A.D. Twice in their own religious unbroken tradition, the founding day of the Egyptian unity was relived. One is in the days of Moses in 1321, and the other is in the days of the emperor Antoninus Pius, of Rome, 135 of our own era. Both years, gentlemen, are very important. The Jews came into existence because of the return of the eternal year. Moses, who was very learned in the wisdom of the Egyptians, broke away, so to speak, from Egypt obviously under the impression that this was now hopeless. The iron ring of the -- the stars had come full cycle, and there was nothing to wait for in Egypt to unite the world. Egypt would always just remain Egypt. Mankind would never become one. If every empire had found its own law, then it is separated from the rest of the human race forever.

The second event I mentioned to you, because the emperors of Rome had coined, minted in 139 of our era, when Christianity already was breaking forward -- coming forward into the empire, at full strength. All the Gospels were written by that time. And the popes already were found in Rome; the great sects of the {Mationites} had already split the Church, so at that moment there was a coin minted in Alexandria with the title "aion," aion -- a-i-o-n, which we, in our unfathomable author- -- spelling right now, e-o-n. Hard to understand this word, "eon." It's a very important word, gentlemen. It has to do with "eternal." The same root. The e in "eon" and the e in "eternal" means exactly the same. And you ought to penetrate this word, because we are dead -- dying today with the wrong understanding of eternity. You think eternity is that which has no time. But no living soul in antiquity had such idiotic conceptions of a thought-out eternity. Eternity meant the mastery over time. It meant the eternal recurrence of eons. So in 139, there ends one eon and the next begins. And therefore, the god of the eons, Aion himself, was put on this coin, to be worshiped. The order of the sky, that is eon. One eon, gentlemen, and eternity are therefore related as one expression, or one member of the family to the whole family of eons who come out of the divine potency in constant flow. Time is organic, for an ancient man it is rhythmical, it's alive. The days are 24 hours. But the Great Year is 1460 years in reproduction. One cycle begets the next cycle.

On Sunday, I read a paper here to my colleagues in which I proved to them that the translation of the King James Version is all wrong, "world without end,"

as you -- there know. The Latin and Greek expression is "eons of eons." For eon -- God, our God, the living God is -- governs the world eons over eons, or into the eons of eons. Now, we have to go today to school to the Egyptians to recover your right belief in Christianity. The James -- King James version is a Newtonian translation and has to do with space, and with your misconception of time, as less than space. If you say, "world without end," you assume that -- men can assume that the world is without end. That's nonsense. The world always comes to a very definite end. Any one world comes. If you don't believe this, you cannot understand any faith of any era outside the last 70 years. It's only in the last 70 years that's -- as I said, the so-called positivism has men put on his fannies in space and has not allowed him any longer to believe that God speaks through His epochs to man. Gentlemen, space doesn't tell you what to do. But time does. Youth and old age tell you exactly what to do. For example, your -- only time tells you when to get married. It is the ripeness of your nature which demands you to marry. That's an event in your time cycle. It has nothing to do with where you are. You have to get married whether you live in San Francisco or New York. But you believe that by going west, you get orientation, gentlemen. You are all lost in space. And if you translate "world without end," you'll -- will always defend -- depend on {Mrs. Desoko} of the Dartmouth Travel Bureau for your place, because you always have to find that a place { }. But you -- your explanation of your life is only in time, never in space. This place of Hanover can just as well be wrong or right for you. Perhaps you have to take a ticket and leave it right away. Space is -- doesn't speak in itself.

I tried to tell you that the Egyptians worshiped nothing in space in itself, but the recurrence of the phenomena, everywhere and all the time. The Great Year of the Egyptians then supplies the ubiquitousness of the sky-world. What the pharaoh did to the Egyptians was to tell them, "Not only do you see one sky all over Egypt, but you also live in one era, all your ancestors, and all people to come." The Great Year, as this is called, the annus magnus in Latin, the Great Year has then been imitated by our own era, by the Great Year of the Persians, by all kind of cycles. The last application are the Olympic Games in Greece, and the business cycle of the modern economists, saying that this is written in the stars that certain events follow each other in constant order: boom-bust, prosperity-depression. That's a simple star-lore, in shorthand. The Greek Olympic Year, gentlemen, as you know, is four years long. That was a kind of shorthand for the 4 times 365 years out of which the cycle of 1460 years consists.

Heavens! My relation to chalk is certainly not eternal!

If you have 6 hours -- go {around} -- plus -- 300 plus, you see, 6 hours and 365

days, you can see that four years make one day. Therefore 4 times 365 years make the sun again back at the same position, if you have no leap day. And the Egyptians had no leap day. They had no 29th of February. Therefore, they had a year of 365 days, so the sun could only rise together with {Sotis} on the 19th of July, 1321, 1460 years after the first constellation -- { } {date or whether they celebrated in} 1319 or 1321. For four years, we are not quite sure, because four years together give one day. It's only 6 hours, you see, that every year we are behind the rotation of the earth around the sun in our calendar of 365 days.

Can you get this? One day is the result of four years. Is made circles, you see. Therefore it takes 1460 years before you get 4 times 6 times 365.

In this -- the priesthood of Egypt, the temples and the pharaoh made the Egyptians believe. In this security they rested their faith. And so men, this divine class of the scribes, of the priests, of the stargazers, the court of the pharaoh had immediate conversation, talked with the gods. This is so naïve you find it in every painting depicted in the pyramids. The gods speak to men, and man speaks to the gods. The same is on the -- on your cylinders of your -- the seals of the old Babylonian kings, and still in the Bible, you -- God speaks with Abraham. I hope sometime He also speaks to you. But all this today to most modern men seems childish. But gentlemen, is it? Is it not an incredible discovery of the ancients that they were able to penetrate an order for the first time in human history which would return in 1460 years? Can you perhaps feel the great exhilaration which had -- did befall men when they shouted with joy that they could figure out what they called eternity, 1460 years?

So let us be satisfied, gentlemen, with this first meaning of eternity, that you master the deviations in the sky. The first hieroglyph, probably, which the Egyptians invented, was far away from their five senses. You always think that writing is something practical, and speech is something practical. I want to tell you that this door should be shut, so I invent the word "door" and the word "shut." The origin of speech, gentlemen, is the conquest of eternity with the ancestors. You remember the names, that the dead could be named, and that the living could be named after the dead. Now we come to a second order of -- in script, the first hieroglyph -- you know what it means and we find it already in the oldest pyramid: "millions of years," or "infinite number of years." That is, the greatest emphasis in the script of the -- of the Egyptian civilization, the invention of script, was the -- not to tell you, "Bring my handkerchief. I forgot it at home." You didn't write such ridiculous things at first. But on the walls of the temples you wrote with great joy that you knew the secret of the millions of years. This is the first hieroglyph of importance for our understanding of the Egyptian mentality is

a hieroglyph which even you cannot have today. We have no word for it in our language. Millions of years. And it is a man who rejoices, who lifts his arm and bursts forth in jubilation, "Millions of years." That is, "I know the secret of the heavens," you see. "I'm in the know of the divine secret. The gods have revealed to me their greatest secret which no living being can ever hope to live, to experience. But we know it. In 1460 years, Egypt will be restored to the order of its beginning. And if we only comply, you humbly and faithfully with all the stations -- the service at the stations in between, when every generation is lieutenant, the priests of every generation, in this great return of the Great Year, then the general will be satisfied with our service, and the army of the republic will do its -- do right."

Gentlemen, you get here the other idea of lieutenancy. The priests in the temples, and the faithful who come to these temples act -- enact in their generation a lieutenancy of an eternal watch, so to speak, of a nightwatch, waiting for the gods to come full cycle. Our term "come full cycle" still implies perfection, that there is something to wait for.

I have to tell you this, gentlemen, because the Egyptians have quite a different relation to time as you and I have. You believe in the future. This the Egyptians could not. The Egyptians wanted -- waited for return. They believed therefore in an eternal presence. The conquest of the -- eternal settlements, gentlemen, is a new dimension of time, the presence. The gods are made omnipresent. What you say today still that God is omnipresent, is usually very meaningless, because you are quite sure that he -- you are accepted, that you can do something which He might kindly overlook in His absence. Especially the theologians always seem to me to be wonderfully sure that God does not listen in to their discussions of Himself. He is totally absent from all the theological schools in this country. And also from your -- bull sessions. You discuss the existence of God; obviously, He's not present. So that's a very strange thing. The Egyptians didn't believe that. They believed, gentlemen, that the gods were omnipresent. They did not believe in any separation from past, future, or present. They didn't have our three dimensions of time, because their hieroglyph, "millions of years," meant that you could live in the visible presence of one star anticipating already the next. The cycle was their existence. Just as a businessman who actually thinks the government can't do anything against the -- the Depression, you see, would believe in the eternal presence of the cycle. But that's only -- seven or 12 years long, so the Egyptians were made -- and the higher up the more, and the pharaoh totally -- that the world was transparent in an eternal presence. That's why all the Egyptians, or the Aztecs look very much look alike, like eternal children living the day of the god without a dark future, and without a hidden past. The pharaoh never

mentions his predecessors. Ancestor-worship is abolished in Egypt. Every pharaoh has to build his own pyramid. If it isn't finished, his son begins immediately his own pyramid ...

[tape interruption]

... from their living son. You know the totem means that the dead speak to the living. I try to tell you that in the -- in the Egyptian order, the heavens speak to the earth. But that has a greater application, still. The living there have to empower the dead to survive. Instead of the eyes on the totem pole, in Egypt you get the strange mummification, as you know, of the dead. The emperor is taken apart; his intestines are taken out, and then he is mummified. And now comes the great moment in which you can study the complete change of the notion of time in these empires, you see. This idea of -- it's very hard for you to understand because you live it too much. You live it a little bit yourself, the eternal presence, a deathless present of cycles. The son, the ruler of Egypt at this moment, when he -- buries his father, must take his own eye, the eye of Horus, and lend it to the old man, in a complete dialectical opposition to the eyes that look upon the ruler from the totem pole, you see. His eye now must look upon the dead man. That's the famous eye of Horus. Who has heard still of the eye of Horus? You can buy it in the streets of Cairo, in Egypt everywhere, a little carved thing. Have you never heard of the eye of Horus? It's a -- it's used for brooches and rings for ladies and -- even in this country. The eye of Horus. Horus is a living pharaoh. Horus is the power that at this moment unites Heaven and earth. Horus is the power that can go north, and that can set the temples down and make the priests worship and, so to speak, organize the soldiers of all the lieutenants on this earth. But Horus therefore is the only power that can allow the dead to see, to participate in this bliss of the eternal heavens. The eye of Horus must be borrowed by the dead king, so that he can see again after he has been mummified. The mummies in the pyramids, in the sacred texts which are written there, receive the eye from their son, and the son graciously says, "I bestow my eye on you, Father," which is -- would be a complete perversion if you wouldn't think that they had to do something to eradicate the faith of the tribe.

If you did not break down the totem poles, you see, hierarchy and rule, the ruler of Egypt could not have risen above the 100 tribes of the Nile Valley. The family of the gods, gentlemen, replaces the ancestor-worship. And the fullest expression of this family of the gods is that the earthly member, the pharaoh, can use his eye to give life to the dead. If you can see this, gentlemen, you will make a great discovery. The division of ancient man in family relations, right between the small family that lives together in one home, and the large clan, where

people were blood-related, through ramifications -- cousins, and aunts, et cetera, and uncles -- you all today think that's all the same family. For ancient man, down to 1100 you may say, or even to 1500, the greatest division of the human race was between the home of the people actually living together and the people related, because in every tribe everybody was in some way related to everybody else, you see, that was one clan. But the group, of the small family, was a different matter. They lived together. Now in Egypt, gentlemen, the problem for the pharaoh was to exalt his family as a small-home family, as a family actually feasting together in a temple, eating with the gods, speaking to the gods, conversing with the gods -- of his own generation, so to speak -- to exalt this little family over his ancestors. Because otherwise the tribesman of old could not change their religion. We have here the first great conversion, the first abolition of an ancient creed. And so the incredible story is that all the rules of marriage in the tribe are abolished for the ruler. The ruler of Egypt must marry either his mother, or his daughter, or his sister. Here you have the full {insonization} of this fantastic fight against the marriage rules of the tribe. I told you that the tribe had abolished incest. And Egypt reintroduces it for the ruler. Not probably at first for the other people, but in the long run, this too was done. The kings of Egypt must stay in the divine little circle of the family, because it is as members of the household of the gods that they got their reputation. Since daughter and father, Sirius and sun, meet in the sky, what should be more natural than pharaoh also should prefer to marry his sister or his daughter, or both? And we have even one case where a man actually married his mother, which is really revolting to us. If you look into Homer, you may have heard of the -- in The Odyssey, to whom does Odysseus there come in his migrations, to which king?

(Phaecians?)

Wie?

(The King of the Phaecians?)

Yes, who -- what's his name?

[unintelligible]

Does anybody know? What's the name of the King of the Phaecians? Wie?

(Alcinoös.)

Alcinoös. Or Alkinoös, yes, the Greek pronunciation. Now gentlemen, if you

look that up in the sixth and seventh book of The Odyssey, and I recommend it to you -- well, it's very important -- you'll find there still the Egyptian order prevailing in -- in -- { } non-Greek, that which has been condemned by history, this endogamy of the people marrying their own sister and daughter against which the Bible then turns again, and which the Greeks and Romans did not accept from Egypt. There are 24, I think, daughters and sons of Alcinoüs, and they are all married to each other. Twelve sons and twelve daughters, I think. Which -- what -- who has an Odyssey? Who owns an Odyssey? Would you bring it to class next time, {Leslie}? We'll look it up. But you find there still the vestige of the pre-Greek order of things, when he goes to the Phaecians, Odysseus meets with an order in which the king's family intermarries. The sons marry their sisters.

Now, you must understand the profound religious reason. This is not arbitrary. That's not a joke. It's also not sensuousness. It's asceticism. This divine family must remain among the gods. And it must defy by every one point of its ritual anything that the tribes stand for. Now the tribes stand for exogamy, you see, for these marriage classes, because their own ecstatic experience is on the dancing green. Where has Egypt its corollary, its corresponding area, experience? On the New Year's Day, in the temple, you see. Now this New Year's Day on the temple unites the ruler and his family to the gods. So at that moment, he must get married. There's nobody with him except his wife and his children, you see, dignified, exempt from the rules of the tribe. And since, in order to unite the tribes, he has -- like today Mr. Malenkov -- to rise above the partisans. In any -- country, the ruler has to be more than a partisan, you see, than one-half of it. You have this necessity for the rulers to defy the taboos, to defy all the rules of a previous order. Before, it is not done, so to speak. Before, this ruler is not sovereign.

This is the tragedy, gentlemen, the tragic law of any new rule, that in some form or other, you have to defy it. George Washington, you see, at first thought he should have his -- his birthday celebrated like a royalty. That wouldn't have made a republic. So Jefferson saw immediately the point, and fought it tooth and nail, and said, "If the living president," you see, "is allowed to celebrate his own birthday ceremoniously, like the King of England, we won't have a republic." That was a real debate of the -- in the first years of government in Washington, of -- in Philadelphia, for that matter, that George Washington, in his -- in his complete -- ignorance of -- of -- of the new situation -- it was as bad with the new administrations then as it is this year here, in Washington again -- they know nothing what government is. They have to learn day by day. And so there was this debate: "Can we simply imitate the English?" But then Jefferson said, "Then

you'll have a king, because if the king's birthday is celebrated, you see, as much as a president's birthday, then this president is more than a common man elected by the voters and he cannot be voted out of office, because we have made his birthday an -- too -- an important event in the life of the nation."

This you must, for example, compare in order to understand this strange problem of polytheism, gentlemen. Animism, we said, was the problem of the tribe. Everything is alive. And everything that is alive belongs with man. And everything that is dead belongs to the other side. In the Egyptian universe, gentlemen, everything that is of the sky is divine. And everything that is not of the sky must be ruled by these divine powers. Pharaoh is on the side of the divine powers, and his clergy allows him to say so with confidence. Therefore kings and priests rise above the crowd and belong to this -- to this domestic order of the court of the gods. The eye of Horus, the abolition of the tattoo, the jewelry and the gold worn by the people -- by these kings, everything else points to you -- to the same thing that the -- there arises a power on earth that knows more than common man. When you speak of common man, that is, of course, a revulsion against the non-common man. But you first must admit that in order to discover common man, you probably -- mankind probably had to go through a phase in which there were uncommon men. We had the hero in the tribe, as the man who belonged as heir to one group, and as ancestor to another group, you remember? You get here -- you get there the superiority of the hero over all the other people. The founding fathers in our case would be the same. In Egypt, you don't have the hero. There are no heroes in Egypt. No heroes whatsoever, because you are in the same country all the time. But you have the exaltation, you have have this funny order here in this country, exalted ruler, who is -- has this funny ritual?

(The Elks.)

Wie?

(The Elks.)

The Elks have the exalted ruler. Well, this word "exalted ruler" expresses best what it takes to create an eternal presence. If you wish to be independent from the prejudices of the past, if you wish to fulfill your day's task, as it comes today, you have to have somebody who sets it in motion. And that is in this order of the Egyptian what our president is today with his message to Congress. The New Year's message of the emperor of Egypt, or the emperor of Mexico orients the people and tells them what and when to act, under the rule of the stars, and for

this, all former order had to be destroyed.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Student introduction: (Philosophy 58, March 25th, 1954)

[Opening remarks missing]

... don't know how long I have to {spend} now giving you the movement of the divine family in the face of the Egyptians, that is, what we -- you would call the history of religion, the history of the Egyptian religion. Today most people write histories of topics which they do not understand. It's very easy to write the history of France or of America. You begin somewhere, and you add some wars, and then you come -- go on from year to year. That's what most people today call history. But they never give you a budget of the elements that constitute, for example, America. And only as long as they are these funda- -- fundamental elements can you have a history of these elements.

Most historians today have their politics, and their own religion, and their concept of art from the newspapers. And that makes modern historians so absolutely incompetent. If you read Mr. Toynbee, he doesn't know what religion is; he doesn't know what politics is; but he knows all about the history of all the civilizations. But he has never asked himself, "What is the elementary budget, what are the inescapable minimum requirements of a going civilization?" Most historians just study some period and think they know all about humanity, and about the laws of a body politic. But they have never learned the grammar or the law, or the dictionary, the cookbook out of which you can only dish out life. I tried to show you some such household in the animistic organization of the grave, and the altar, and the warpath, and the dancing ground. And I -- tried to show you that there can be no tribe without marriage rules, without memory of the dead, without sacrifice for misdeeds, and without resistance against outer interference. And I tried to show you that such a tribe has therefore to have four directions and four places, or four meeting -- grounds, against which this group can -- must be considered as a going concern.

We come now to the economy of the Egyptian religion. Quite unknown to all the books on Egypt. Most -- books on Egypt are picture books. They are utterly ridiculous. But the same is true, gentlemen, of Rome or Greece. When you read these people who give you a history of Greece, they don't tell you what Greece is. But how can you give the history of something which you first doesn't -- do not understand its operations? The greatest Rom- -- historian of Rome said, "Nobody can study the history of a country who has not studied, for example, its

laws." Now ask any man today in this college who -- speaks of European history how much he knows of the laws of these various countries. Nothing. Absolutely nothing. And he thinks he can give the history of such a country. It's absurd. Today history has become a ghost, you see, a specter. You -- you tell the -- one event after another, but you don't -- cannot refer this event to an order. Now, my problem tonight is -- today is -- well, in Egypt, day and night, as you know, have to be united, so -- is to show you that history means the shifting emphasis from one of the existing elements to another. If you get the history of Christianity, gentlemen, you can see that the last century has shifted the emphasis in the Christian faith on the life of Jesus. There is such emphatic interest in His life -- there is very little interest in His death, because this country doesn't want to hear of death, so they have even managed to bring the man who made death understandable and fruitful under the heading of "biography." Well, Jesus Christ, of course, has no biography. He has only a thanatography, He has a thanatos, meaning "death." We write the story of His death in order to understand our live. But the last century has perverted, or has changed, you may say -- you -- as you please: the history of the Christian religion ends in a life of Jesus. Gentlemen, it begins, as you well know, with an apostolic age. And then it comes to a patristic age. And then it comes to a -- you could call "marienological" age, or I don't know what the best term is; the mother of God enters the picture, and there -- is grave interest in the Mother of God, as you still see in the dogma proclaimed by the pope two y- -- last year, you see, about the bodily assumption of the Mother Virgin.

So obviously, gentlemen, Mary is the mother of Christ from the very beginning. The apostles are there when He begins His mission. John and Peter, as you know, are called out right after His baptism in the Jordan, to leave John the Baptist and to follow Him. Apostolic, yet it is perfectly true that there is one age in the history of the Church when the age becomes the apostolic, because the whole interest centers on the Apostles. You understand now perhaps that history is one great firmament, slowly moving like the Great Egyptian Year of 1460 years. There is, for example, in Christianity, Christ the Star, the morning star. But you can look at other parts of the pyramid. And history is the slow movement of all the possible constellations or emphases you can put on other parts of the Christian pyramid. But today, as Mr. -- Mr. Hitler has said, Christianity may be over if you think that the life of Jesus is the last emphatic interest on Christianity. It began with an interest in His resurrection and it -- you see, then came the story of the Apostles, who had been the children, the fruits of this resurrection, who said that they had now the soul of Christ, vivid in themselves through His resurrection, that resurrection meant that they were apostles, before they had been

disciples.

So the Resurrection is the first light in this historical cycle; the second are the Apostles, the fruits of this resurrection. The third is the going-back to Mother Mary, and the whole -- Old Testament, the bringing in of the liturgy, of the Psalms and everything that the Church holds to this day. Then you, as you -- I told you, can get another interest. You can stress the Roman centralization from -- for 500 years you may say the Church history is the Church -- history of Rome. Then you get Protestantism, and you get the interest in the Evangelists, in the four Evangelists. That's another side, you see, because the Gospel is translated. And you can also say, as I said, the last 200 years people have concentrated on the life of Jesus. And everything else was just -- went overboard. If it goes totally overboard, if Jesus -- the story of Christianity ends in this way, that you are interested only how to put Him into the American Encyclopedia of Biography, then out He goes as a religious power. And that would be the end of the history of Christianity.

Now in a similar way, I'm sorry to say, as such a cycle of shifting interest, the elements of Egyptian religion have passed before the eyes of the Egyptians, one after another. And the economy of Egypt, gentlemen, had four necessary elements. It had to have the court of the pharaoh as a movable thing. You remember the south-north direction. You had to have the movement of Horus against Set. And you had naturally in this valley of the Nile, which goes from s- -- north -- south to north, it had the problem of the stars from the east to the west, exemplified by two great stars at n- -- day -- at day, the sun; and at night, Sirius or {Sotis}, {Soptid}. So here we have the fundamentals. We have the court. We have the temple. We have towards the environment the fortifications, the fortresses instead, you remember, of the warpath, so that this Heaven on earth may not be -- may not be threatened. And so we can write here the four elements of Egyptian religion down also in such a -- in such a way that which is expected to return in eternal recurrence is not the grave, but the temple. The temple will guarantee the Great Year, the 1460 years, and the action of all the servant-stars, as they were officially called, of the deacons, as bringing back the loot, you see, as their lieutenants, the chief of the stars, Isis. Then you have, as defending the outer world, the fortress. You have the farm-, or the garden-, or the storehouse-economy inside and I'd like to use the Greek word for this Egyptian institution of the oekos. Oekos is the same as in "economy." It's the Greek word which you have in "economy" and "ecology." And it's an important word, because it means the household with servants, and farmland, run- -- going on what we today would call a "business." The going concern on land, in land. It isn't quite right to call it a farm, because the owner of a farm nowadays may go to Florida during

the winter. This an Egyptian oikos owner could not do. The economist of Egypt was a man who really had to be in the place, you see, and run. A husband-man, as we say, which also comes from "house." Husband -- "husbandry" is a very good word and it's simply the English word for "economy."

So, but the word oikos, gentlemen, is deprived of religious connotations. It's not a temple, although the temple had economists to run their -- their own -- their land, you see, their property. And it isn't in a fortress with the military considerations -- prevail. You have, of course, foodstores. You have to have bread, and meat, and wine as -- in supplies in the fortress, but you don't consider the fortress to be just an oikos. It has its first, as we say, a fort. I mean, all the -- forts against the Indians you see, were -- they had storehouses, as you know, and they had -- they had traders in all these Western forts. It was very important that you could buy stuff there, at Fort Sumter, et cetera. But that isn't the -- the main point, of course. It was the strong point for military purposes.

Now gentlemen, the weakness of the Egyptian society, by which it led to its downfall, is exactly the weakness of the Egypt- -- of the tribal society. You remember the tomb, the warpath, the dancing ground. They in themselves are innocuous. But the altar led to all the werewolves, to all the vendettas, because that was expiation. That needed sacrifice, it needed victims. It was -- needed the shedding of blood all the time to correct the ways of old, which had been co- -- seemed to be corrupted by any innovation.

So the altar, with the human sacrifices, as you see them in the Orozco frescoes, who is the end, or is the limitation, or is the corruption of the tribe, is its incapacity of changing anything, is we -- weighed down by precedent. The Egyptian eternal present, as I tried to show -- shall -- show you, is a little different. To the Egyptian the eternal present means not that an altar has to expiate change so much, but that anything that happened new could only, since they were not moving, but staying put, would come from -- in from the outside. Egypt has been dominated by foreign rulers from 900 B.C. to this day. The last king, Monsieur Farouk, was an Albanese horse thief. He came from a family of thieves of -- from Albania. And as you know, most Albanese now live in Lynn, Massachusetts. But some went to Egypt and became kings of Egypt. And -- and that is Farouk. And that is his dynasty. They were not Egyptians. The Egyptians have not had kings of their own descent for the last 3,000 years. And that you have to take into consideration if you understand the weak-willed -- wish to understand the weakness of eternal settlement. That which comes and moves around you from the outside, you can do very little about it. You have -- can stay put and stay in the fortresses, at the frontier, if you are lucky. You can fight -- defend your

country against the enemy. But you know this mentality of modern man, also. He says, he'll only fight defensive wars. Well, if you only fight defensive wars, the time comes very soon that you can't fight any war obviously, because if you allow all the rest of the world to prepare for the war, and you finally say, "Now I have to fight for my life; they attack me," that's too late.

Now that's exactly what happened to the Egyptians. They had only one way, gentlemen, of knowing what was going on in the external world. You had to take this very seriously, this being stymied, the -- Chinese exactly the same, by the outer world, which was forbidden, which was barbaric, which was foreign. It's the marketplace, gentlemen, the trader alone who can set foot into such a country in a peaceful way without destroying it, without conquering it, he can bring it commodities. This country has, as its great marketplace, New York. Here all the foreign ideas of the -- are traded. Greenwich Village acts as then -- as some such vaccination center of America. Otherwise this country, as a big country, as just an empire -- state, you know -- as a geographical unit, would have no connection with the rest of the world to speak of. Because simply even by reporting what happens elsewhere, you are not connected without the outer world.

Something has to -- really to go on between you and the rest of the world.

Americans are very glib about this connection. Everybody coming to this country and running away from another country, the people here didn't give much time to the thought how they would stay connected with the rest of the world. And they turned their back on Italy, or Poland, for that matter, and they lived here, happily hereafter. But in the long run, gentlemen, if everybody would only come to this country, you see, looking into Missouri, they would very soon be as stupid as a man from Missouri. He would only believe his five senses because the people of Missouri say, you see, "I have to be shown." Now that's a very poor education, because educated man believes what he is not shown. If you can't do this, you are not -- certainly have no spirit and you can't live. The Missouri people however, as you know, boast of this stupidity. Who is from Missouri in this class?

Well, I have always wondered that the people thought it was -- this low-brow expression was good. It is an -- expression of desperation if you say you have to be shown. You cannot live with a person who always has to be shown. No faith, no hope, no love lost on such a person. Love means, and faith means, and hope means that you can live with people without being shown. I mean, who could marry you, gentlemen, if you had to show -- that would take you 70 years before you could prove that you make enough money to support a family? In the process of living with your wife, you prove it. But she has to marry you beforehand, just on faith. So never take a wife from Missouri.

But gentlemen, that's the empire problem. So we put here, into the Egyptians { } the marketplace. Can you -- can you see it here? So we will say the cross of reality of any empire -- be it Mexico, or China, or Egypt -- will always be the relation of the powers of the ecos, where the wherewithal is earned; of the oriented economy; the temple, which establishes the eternal recurrence, the certainties of the era, of the eon of eons; the fortresses which defend in space the inroads of the enemy; and that accidental loophole into the created future in which, in disregard of the eternal recurrence of the temple service, in disregard of the calendar, the Jesuits come into China and are allowed in by the emperor. From the point of view of the Chinese, the Jesuits, who in the 17th century, as you may have heard, went to China and nearly converted the whole empire in a magnificent campaign, from the point of view of the Chinese, they came -- didn't come as missionaries -- that was out of the question, because they didn't know what missions were. They were after all Chinese. They were not Christians, you must understand. To them it was a new commodity, something interesting from the outside, something that had nothing to do with their rules of life, something you had to weigh and to look at from all sides and -- like you look at a foreign gem, at a jewelry, at a nice, interesting foreign thing. That's how you travel in Europe. I mean, you look at these people as objects of your curiosity. You can say, the American way of life is not so much the marketplace only of New York, but every businessman travels outside and buys some interesting human beings in Europe, whom he thinks are funny. An Austrian prince, you see, or an English -- Lady Astor or some such commodity, and brings it home and says, "You can go to the natural museum -- the Museum of Natural History now, and I'll pay for you for the rest of your life, because you are so funny." When you say of a person he is funny, you mean he is a commodity. He is something to look at, to stare at. He's interesting. Jennie Lind came to this country on this commercial basis. The first great artist, as you may have heard, who brought music to this, at that time terribly anti-musical, country a hundred years ago. And do you know who her agent was? Very typical. Under what class Jennie Lind came? Have you never heard of Jennie Lind? The Swedish Nightingale?

(Barnum. Barnum. Barnum.)

Well, that's a typical American solution of the -- relation to a foreign empire -- to foreign empires, you see. This country, being so much a world by itself, said Jennie Lind comes under the heading "Barnum." That's the circus. Apes, elephants, and Jennie Lind.

Now, I'm not joking, gentlemen. We have a picture of Egyptian old rule,

where monkeys from Nubia and Negro dwarves are shown around at the temple -- at the open place in front of the temple -- exactly like Barnum today, or Ringling Brothers. That is, the circus, the fair was in the old kingdom already the way in which the Egyptians deigned to take cognizance of the existence of other countries. It's literally true. I don't -- think there is one picture even there, in -- in this little pamphlet, I'm quite sure -- in which dwarves and animals -- foreign animals are shown. So in this way, as a curiosity, the empires take cognizance of the outer world. Very much as you do. That's why curiosity in this country has this strange ring of something good. By curiosity, you come to know things that are otherwise outside the system of your own life, you see. Curiosity is the admission of foreign things that are not systematized. An omelet-soufflé is -- you look at it with curiosity when you go to the French restaurant, because here, you see, you don't have it. Or pumpernickel, with your white -- terrible white bread and these damn crackers which you get here, which I really always want to -- would like to throw at -- at the waiter -- in the waiter's face, but then it wouldn't even hit him, it's so ridiculous. So pumpernickel would be a curiosity.

You live very much on -- in such an empire-island, gentlemen, because most things are curious -- you look at with curiosity. Anything you are not accustomed to, the only way you will be reconciled to my thing is if he's funny, this is a curiosity. I am a curiosity. That's why you tolerate me. Curiosities one doesn't take seriously.

Now we have discovered here something quite different from the tribal life. If you look at the faces of the marching tribesmen on the Orozco fresco, the future to them is to be redeemed. It is sad. They are melancholic. The Egyptians are very cheerful, because what they expect from the outside world are curiosities. Elephants, as I said, and dwarves, and Jennie Linds. Is no danger they really fear. The cheerfulness of the Egyptian scene has to do with their living in space, only, in an enlarged space, a space of 1460 years' duration and a new beginning after that. But still, the brightness of the Egyptian scene strikes you when you see their pictures on the temple walls; they're gay. They are -- keep -- they keep smiling, like the Chinese and like -- as you do. All the underneath sadness is denied. There is no dying. Pharaoh lives forever in his pyramid, as a star. The -- the living declare that there are no dead. If this all is true, gentlemen, if every empire for the last 5,000 years has made an attempt, as you see it today in America, to cope with one's own life -- here we have, instead of the temple, we have the stock exchange, and the marketplace we have, the telegraph, and the news, and the travel agencies, and your trips through Europe -- 26 countries in 6 weeks and ...

[laughter]

Don't laugh, gentlemen. I once tried to persuade a class that they shouldn't go to Europe to more than one country, and they should not take a return ticket. They should expose themselves to the danger of getting stuck there and finding it so beautiful that they could live there really, and make a real experience. I said, if you get a return ticket, you can't go to anyplace. A return ticket makes it impossible for you to experience anything there. So the result of my sermon was that after class, a boy came to me right away and said he was off to Europe and he would see 26 countries, and would I help him to see them all. I couldn't, of course. I said I didn't even know there were 26 countries.

So you see, gentlemen, the soul of man in an empire, or in a -- in a land, in a -- under a state-rule as you live in the United States of America, this -- the capacities of the soul that are developed, they are of a very special nature. The future is left to accident, to the latest news, to curiosity. The past is as you live, the academic year, the 365 days, the business cycle, the football matches in October, the baseball that goes on -- who remembers that football didn't exist in 1860- -- 55, if you think of an American today, he thinks football is a part of the American scene, and he will not admit that it ever has not been in it. Because what he calls America is that which comes back every year, you see, as -- certain as that you should flunk this course.

With this strange distribution of certainty, the future totally accidental, the future -- past absolutely recurrent, and our sport calendar -- has just this certain character, our military might -- air carriers, air bases, you see, so powerful that we have our tentacles so far out, you see, that we -- nobody really is afraid in America to this day of an outer enemy. No reason. And with a productive capacity that overshadows everything in any other country, we are very much like the Egyptians, because, gentlemen, the fruitfulness of the earth of the Nile, of this new-given soil really is a miracle to pre- -- primitive man, as much as our capacity of producing tanks, or having oil in any, you see, in any quantities to heat our houses. The wheat production of Egypt had the same productive, miraculous character as our own production today. Obviously as long as there would be an Egypt, gentlemen, people had to worship the powers that constituted this tremendous achievement.

Therefore, I now propose to go with you through the four chapters, and they are not accidental -- let me keep this better temple -- the four chapters of Egyptian religious life. You can see that simply {for man's} sense for novelty the circulation of the religious emphasis -- or the circulation of thought, you may

call it, with the title of my Philosophy 10 class -- the history of the Egyptian religion will be very much a circling, a focusing, alternatingly on one of these aspects after another. It will be an attempt to see, and to digest, and to love, and to worship, and to actualize one -- aspect or the other of these items.

And I open therefore -- I use this chapter, gentlemen, not so much to give you the history of Egypt. I do this in more -- I have more time in -- next year, I am going to give Philosophy 40, comparative religion, perhaps some of you are interested in that, and if you could say -- tell other people that I am going to give this course. There we -- we will have more time to deal with the history of this specific religion. I'm -- thought I should give you this here in Philosophy 8 -- 58 to introduce you to the real meaning of history. Mis- -- history is impossible if you don't have the subject of the history, the carrier of the history. Now the carrier of an historical development in human society cannot be a single man, because he dies too soon. So the history of a -- of -- biography is not inducive to under- -- to make you understand history. You can read the life of Washington, and the life of Lincoln, and the life of Jackson, and the life of Horace {Greenley}, and the life of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and you still don't understand anything of history. Because life, biography, single life unfortunately split history into fragments. It would only be possible for you to use biography usefully, profitably if you could see into one man's life the whole history of mankind. Now in the life of Jesus, this is possible. And perhaps that's the step by which we will overcome this dead weight of a pure biography of Jesus, which has exploded all Christianity, and all Ch- -- belief in the Church, and all life of the Church. We perhaps can -- I perhaps can invite you to see in your own life the various stages of mankind. Perhaps you live through your own life the childhood of man, and the adolescence of man, and the manhood of man. Then you would see that your own life is symbolical, you see, and pregnant with the whole life of mankind, but that isn't done in your biographies. Your biographies therefore are very dangerous if you do not balance them with real history.

Now the history of Egypt is such a chapter in which you perhaps -- from which you should not just take the Egyptian facts, but remind you, if any history book you open today presupposes that you know the topic of which the history is given, and in 99 cases out of a hundred, you don't know the history -- the topical carrier of the history at all, you see. So they tell you a history, and that's why history today has no appeal to your heart. That's why it is such a stepchild in the -- on the modern scene, because how can we -- I'd be interested in the history of something, which I do not understand in its own workings. When is America a going concern? Well, only as long as it is a new world to Europe. So in order to understand American history, you would under- -- have to understand

that for 300 years, people from Europe were magnetized, and attracted to America. In order to understand why they should -- be attracted, you must understand the relation of Europe of -- to America, and you would have to {shutter} your pride and would have to say, "America for the last 300 years has only been important because it stood out in the eyes of the Europeans as a new world." You have not been {abolished} in your own life. Ask your grandfather, who came here. He was interested in getting out of Europe. And here was an opening, and he could get here, you see. So gentlemen, mat- -- it matters very little what America was. It was very little at that time, you see, but it was very -- very much that there was too much of life -- and order and -- and ruins in Europe, so people wanted to leave it. You will never understand an American history as it is taught in this country, because you never hear what it meant that the Mormons recruited all their womenfolk in Denmark, and Germany, and Sweden. That's a Swedish event. That's a Danish event. That's a German event. Has nothing to do with America. But that's how American history for -- at this moment is written, you see. It is not written because you will -- do not wish to admit that to the -- down to the first World War, America was a dependency of Europe. It was spiritually the gold of the Europeans. People wanted to come here, so they carried it in their hearts, and even all the bandits and all the harlots in this country didn't give a damn for their own country here, and behaved very badly; the Amer- -- Europeans who came here in growing numbers, they made something out of this country. And that's the story of America. It's a great story, gentlemen, but you deprive it of its greatness when you begin in even America. You must see it in its togetherness as a -- in a frame of reference in which America was the New World and Europe was the Old World. You see that I do not want to do anything against the glories of this country, but I want to -- put it in perspective, you see. I want to show the dynamic forces which led people into this country. And they are all cut off in your history books. Every -- all the history begins in the harbor of New York. That's impossible.

So you see, you must try to revive history. All -- ev- -- who has taken 57? You remember, this has been my -- the impact of our whole problem. Here I can use -- give you one example in which you see that history is something astronomical. The hearts of man move from one constellation to which they have to bow to another in various intensity -- just as in Christianity I told you, the -- the attention has gone from Mary to the Apostles, from the Apostles to the saints, from the saints to the life of Jesus, you see, to the li- -- now it goes to the liturgy, you see. At this moment, you know, we have a great liturgical movement all over the place, which is a new chapter in the history of the Church. It is stressed how miraculous it is that in centuries past people created the liturgy. And that seems to be the heart of the matter at this moment. And everything else, the dogma and

so, is pushed in the background, you see. Ja? A question?

Here is my scheme. The first chapter is dealing with these gods, especially. The second chapter is dealing with Ra, the sun-god. And we'll see how strange that is, how absolutely is equal to Jesus and Mary, to Christ and Her -- His mother Mary, this change from Horus and Set to Ra. There are then, as we shall put on, other gods coming into the picture at each phase. The third phase is the stressing of Osiris, and his lady, Isis. And there go with it the god Amen and Aton. I just give them { } example. The last phase, that begins at the moment when the foreigners intrude and Egypt ceases to have a government of Egyptian blood, of Egyptian origin, you get the cult under which Egypt is most known, the cult of Serapis, in Alexandria, or the Apis bull. Again, there are other gods that go with it. The deity of Hecate, as it is called in Greece, the goddess of witchcraft, of writing, Hecate.

Now, to begin with the last chapter. In the form of the last religious phase of Egypt, Egyptian belief has reached us, the Christian world. When I traveled in Germany -- Western Germany, I came to the city of Trier. Trier is at one time the residence of the emperor Constantine, who became -- the first Christian emperor -- and was the capital of Rome -- the Roman Empire for the northwestern provinces. Was a very important city. There is still the Porta Nigra, the black gates, a Roman building standing in the midst of the city. There are old romanesque basilicas -- churches, and it's one of those really still ancient places. When you come to Trier, you feel very far from modern times. It's on the Moselle River. Now this city of Trier, the residence of Constantine, of course still holds many remains. And so excavations were going on in the year 1932, it must have been. Ja, '32. And I went to Trier. I came from Luxembourg, and was told that the excavations of the archaeologists were going on near this church of {Saint Seno}. And I went out and the archaeologist told me a startling story. He said to me they had dug out there an Egyptian temple of Isis and Osiris, and Serapis. And they had the vintners, the people who were the -- how do you say "vintners"? The people who grow the wine around -- the Moselle wine around Trier had, of course, flocked to this place and looked at it. And an old farmer, old-timer, had spoken to this archaeologist and when they very learnedly had said, "This is a temple of Isis and Osiris, of the old Egyptian gods," he said, "Well, we knew this all along, that these people here around had a temple. There's a tradition in our community. We knew this. We could have told you beforehand. Here they worship the golden calf." Here they worship the golden calf. That is, for the common man, in direct tradition from the Egyptian times, this temple must have been built, by and large, in 200 A.D., you see. It was kept open

probably as late as 400 or 500 of our era. The -- the people in the region, who had probably worshiped there, and their ancestors themselves, still knew the golden calf had been worshiped. That is, the golden calf is Serapis, or Apis, the Apis bull. For what we call the bull in the Bible is the calf, the golden calf. In this latest form, you all know of the Egyptian religion. And I think it's always good to begin with the end, whenever there is such a tradition, because "golden calf" is condescending, is pejorative. You know all about it and you say we are rid of this civilization, you see. The golden calf civilization is gone, fortunately.

Everything, gentlemen, of which there is a direct tradition in history has always a bad name in the history with the -- the people who had to supersede it. The Jews and the Christians. The Jews in -- in leaving Egypt, and the Christian vintners, the Christian farmers in Trier now living there and having become Christians pooh-pooh what they have been through before with -- before. It's very important. You hear the word "feudalism," gentlemen, today used in the same way. People say it's terrible, feudalism. Gentlemen, feudalism was a glorious thing. Just as Egypt was a glorious thing. If you do not understand feudalism, you do not understand Mr. Wilson today, who's a -- typical modern feudalist. And all this cabinet of eight billionaires and no plumber. We live in the times of industrial feudalism today. You all are -- will be employees. What else are you then, but vassals? But nobody must say it, because with great adroitness the people have heaped all kind of -- of curses on feudalism. I'm all for feudalism, gentlemen, if you know what it is. But you have -- say feudalism in a decaying state, when it had no function, when gunpowder had been invented, and we didn't need any knights living in castles, because the guns would break down the castles, the feudal knights were very funny. They were ineffective. They were just as a doctor of the horse-and-buggy days as compared to the Mary Hitchcock clinic. That's feudalism, an ineff- -- a system turned ineffective, and therefore now contemptible, despised. Gentlemen, in its high days, glorious, very great, and very well functioning, for that matter. The same is true then -- that's why I begin with the end -- the golden calf of Egypt is that aftertaste which it has left behind. Something silly, something superstitious, something to be left behind. As we say, there are no sacred cows in Boston, meaning that we have shaken ourselves free of the sacred cows of Egypt, you see. But that doesn't explain the high days.

So, gentlemen, Egyptian civilization seems to end in the cult of {anims}. Since it does this, we are immediately reminded of the pre-empiri- -- empire states of the tribe, animism. Could it be that the Egyptian civilization, in its ending phase, slunks back to the pre-empire -- days and in order to satisfy the believers everywhere, in Trier, of the Moselle River, has to go back to a ritual which it really had

superseded. If I read today some statements of the Vatican, I feel that it is very pre-Christian, that in a desperate effort to keep the superstitious people, inside the Church, the Church is going behind its own era, in an attempt to save itself. That's very true, gentlemen. It's a great temptation for any group to make concessions to the preliminary stages before its existence in order not to lose out totally. I think you may -- you -- there is great truth in this fact that today the churches are in a great temptation to go back to pre-Christian tenets. They either go Judaic, or they go Greek, or they go Egyptian today in their appeals.

Now the Egyptians went back to tribalism, trying to appeal to every man by the cult of animals, which reminded these primitive people of their own totems, of their own animistic philosophy. This obviously, gentlemen, became all the more necessary the more the cult of the Egyptian gods was carried outside the old empire of the Nile Valley. What could you tell a man in Trier of a river being divine by being flooded every year and racing from south to north, when the nor- -- Moselle River goes from west to east? And is a very winding river, has absolutely nothing to do with the flood, is -- these -- these very steep banks of the Moselle River know nothing of such problems whatsoever.

Now the previous stage, gentlemen, is a stage in which -- the cult has not been blamed as superstitious and to be superseded by Christianity, but in stage Number 3. Egypt has conquered the world. The farmers, the peasants of all of Europe, and Africa, and India to this day follow some ritual in their harvest and seed time of the Egyptian tradition. There is still a wedding celebrated of two -- toy -- how do you call them -- two doilies -- two puppets of straw, getting married in the field: Zeus and Hera, Isis and Osiris. That is, the -- what I told you about the sacred marriage of Isis and Osiris is still celebrated somewhere in the fields, in a Basque village to this day, or in Romania, or in Africa, or in India. The ritual of a wedding, made -- meaning copulation and fertilization, has been inherited. So they still have received it into the -- the womb of time of their own history, all these past. Mr. Frazer, the author of *The Golden Bough* has a very remarkable line on this. He said, "The Church and the Roman Empire have barely scratched the surface of these human souls, but the Egyptian tradition has. It has penetrated, because their work is still blessed by this ritual."

Now you see in stage Number 3, the one point I wish to make is: there is still something to learn from the Egyptians. And this was an article of export, I should say, beginning 1500 B.C. In a tremendous swing, China -- the Chinese received it, the Hindus received it, the Cambodians received it, and finally, here the Americans received it. But more than that. If you go to Tibet today, to the outskirts of Asiatic civilization, you will find there the Book of the Dead. You will

find there what is said to the dying man, when he wants to go to the nether world, and to become an Osiris. The famous Book of the Dead is nothing but the text spoken into the ears of the dying Egyptian. And now you find it as far away as Tibet.

[tape interruption]

... Tibetan knowledge, you see. But she didn't like it at all that this was nothing but something landing at the outskirts of civilization from the Nile Valley, but that's what it is.

So gentlemen, there is another element, a religious element. Osiris is the god that dies every year and rises again. You remember. He is dismembered and he is put together again. He is deprived of his potency, and in the middle of his ruins, he rises again in his glory. Therefore, Osiris is the ideal of the dying man. In the third stage of this -- a religious development, gentlemen, of constellation, every Egyptian farmer wants not only to celebrate the settlement of the land -- Isis being the seed, and Osiris being the maker of the seed, of the throne, of the order, of the orientation of his yard and of his -- the water ditches, irrigation ditches -- they also want to share his fate. The god of the year, Osiris, becomes for every Egyptian at home the model for his own death. Every Egyptian in this third era, which we find from -- especially its first -- from 1800 to, say, 300 B.C. wants to be an Osiris himself. Osiris has now been -- been democratized. Whereas at first it is the whole country, now everybody says, "My own little oekos," ecos -- my own little economy must be symbolized by the relation of Osiris and Isis. So Osirises multiply. Every individual Egyptian now tries to be treated in his funeral as an Osiris, which of course is absurd to think of, just as it was considered absurd that every Christian in the beginning would be a Christ. Today it isn't so -- absurd that everybody thinks he has a private relation to Christ and not a public relation. You know there are innumerable people who have their personal relation to Jesus, but they have no official relation to Him. That would be the same as the stage in which the Osiris religion felt -- found itself in late Egypt, when nobody paid attention to the foreign rulers, the {Ptolemies}, or the Persians, or the Ethiopians, or the {Hückseu}, or any of these foreigners who conquered -- Alexander the Great, you see, hated them but wanted to inherit the earth from Osiris, in -- within his little -- patch of {farmland}.

So in the third stage, gentlemen, we have something like the Reformation, where everybody reads the Bible; everybody can pray to God privately; and nobody goes to Church any longer. That is, by and large, the American scene of today. We are in the third stage where Christ -- that is, the risen power of the

divine life in the form of Osiris at that time -- is entering into a personal relation with every Egyptian family. It is the same time, gentlemen, at which every Egyptian tries to have a private horoscope. As you know, you can now read in the papers these silly horoscopes. They make absolutely no sense, because we have new planets discovered and therefore nothing of the old traditions have any value, of course. It is just unbelievable how anybody can read this stuff. But in Egypt, the state of the democratization of Osiris was also connected with the democratization of the heavens. Man got a private relation to Heaven. In -- quite impossible in the beginning, you see. When you begin, we wait for the end of the world, as the first Christians waited, there is a world catastrophe for all. There is the eternal Jerusalem, with no temple in it, you see. There is the slaughter of the -- of the martyrs, of the elders for your -- for the whole Church's sake, there is no individual problem to be solved. There is only one, great universal history of Christ, with this humanity, with the human race, but with the Reformation and the pietism, and the Mennonites, and the Baptists -- they all want to be privately saved. Everyone wants to go to Heaven, you see, for his own virtues. And therefore, you get the idea of a predestination in Calvinism. Here are the elect. Now that corresponds to the idea of a horoscope for an individual Egyptian. It's a contradiction in terms, because the whole problem of Egypt had been solidarity, all having the same horoscope, all having the same seven lean years, and seven fat years. But you see, religion is very absurd. History is very absurd. The necessity of individuals, living under foreign yoke, to inherit something of the great bliss of the whole of the civilization is too strong. You can't argue. You can't say that's paradoxical, you can't even say you are ignoramuses. You must be glad that these people want to have one more spark of eternal light led into their own life.

And therefore the horoscope that you find in the Egyptian graves of the last thousand years before Christ has something very touching. It means that the private Egyptians now defend the past of their country against the foreign rulers, who do no -- do not really believe in it. When a Persian, or when Alexander the Great, or when Sulla, or when Pompey, or when Caesar, or Marc Antony -- you remember Antony and Cleopatra? -- when they rule Egypt, woe to the individual fellahin, to the individual peasant. What has -- is his relation to these foreigners? He can only despise them. So he clings to the Osiris and to the horoscope. The -- his scribe tells him that he has a special fate meted out in the houses of the sky, and like Osiris, the stars become a private communication to this individual Egyptian. If you think of astrology, it is absolutely crazy to think that a horoscope, you see, can cut out of the firmament, or in its galaxy and its movement, any special destiny for you and me. First, you must -- would have then to believe that all the world's catastrophes, really big ones, are meted out in

Heaven -- the world war, you see, which sends you into uniform. But to begin with the private horoscope is -- is against all the evidence. All our five senses must cry out against such nonsense, because we are, after all, all under one sky. And -- the same sun lights on you and on me. And obviously the difference is minor between your being born 24 hours before, and the other person 24 hours later. The main thing is that you are still living within the same year, within the same time, under the same sky. Isn't that true? But since we have no prognostication at large, the individual horoscope, as it prev- -- is still -- is sold over the counter here in this country is -- is a -- a merciless stupidity.

But I have explained to you how it came to pass, I hope, this anarchy of the Os- -- cult of Osiris in the old Egypt.

The second -- third stage backward, is the cult of Ra. Osiris is a usurpation of the imperial rule by the individual farmer. The cult of Ra is the condescension of the rulers to the plight of the common man. What -- do I mean by this? Ra is the sun. Now, the sun is over every Egyptian's head. Every Egyptian has in the middle of his possessions the Nile. I s- -- told you that this small ribbon of fruit-land on both sides of the Nile. Every Egyptian has nearly daily for any bus- -- some business to cross the Nile from east to west. The ordinary Egyptian fellahin -- that has, by the way, even been investigated -- never sees more than a few square miles of -- around the Nile during his whole lifetime. But every one Egyptian crosses the Nile. In this respect, every Egyptian has as his main street the passage from east to west, or west to east across the river. Every Egyptian has one line of communication a ship, a sailboat on which he can cross the Nile River, and cruise a little bit, perhaps a little north and little south in the next village -- but mainly go from east to west. The difference, gentlemen, between the ruling class in Egypt and the settlers are: the rulers must go from north to south and south to north, over wide stretches of land -- the employees, the officers, the military man, the king, the priest. The living set- -- the settlers, the peasants must be satisfied with the direction east-west.

Now the second phase of religious life in Egypt therefore, began to accommodate the great sky-world of the first rulers, which gave them the good conscience that they could break all the taboos of the tribe -- you remember, everything that we said before on this. I cannot repeat it today -- that these people went back and -- these rulers and said, "After all, we have to live with these hundred thousand fellahin, these hundred thousand peasants. These people do not understand our problem of Horus and Set, because it's only a minority group, the clergy, who executes this, and thereby gets up steam." The people on the river banks -- the {riverains} as the French call it. How do you call these -- inhabitants of the banks

of the river? Any word for it? The people who live alongside the river, you see. {Riverain} is the French, a very good expression for this, because it's a special character that these people have alongside the Mississippi River, you see. The people who -- who ask, "What is there in Arkansas?" And Missouri?" you see, "And Mississippi?" and want to be shown, because nothing ever moves. That's why they say in Missouri, you see, "I have to be shown." They are the typical low-brow people who sit and wait till something comes to them. They do not move.

This is very important, gentlemen. In the second phase, the cult of Ra translates the new belief of the empire builders to the people who live under their rule. There has been much debate; it is absolutely now agreed that the cult of Ra is a late -- of late origin in Egypt, that it breaks in only in the fifth dynasty { } after 400 years of rule of a pharaoh over Egypt. Four hundred years is a big order. It is perhaps as late as the cult of Mary in the Christian church, which also is not mentioned before the middle of the fifth century of our era. There is no vestige before of any such thing. Why? Because the heroes, the martyrs, the saints of Christianity had to do the utmost to establish the new boundaries of the new faith, this worldwide faith which was indifferent to Jerusalem, indifferent to Rome, indifferent to the Caesars, indifferent to the patriarchs, and to Moses. That's the tremendous heroism of the founders of our Church. Now obviously, gentlemen, there comes then a patience, a forbearance, an acquiescence with the people who have not undergone this tremendous all-out movement, who live under the domination of these new faithful, and who accept Christianity without ever having changed their own profession, or their own way of life. All the inhabitants of the Roman Empire at one time or another said, "All right, all right. These bishops, these saints have broken down the idols. Admit it. Idols. They were idols. They have proved it to us. We couldn't get rid of them. They braved the gladiator games. They braved the lion in the circus. We crucified them. They survived it all. Here they are. Now we submit." Now in the same way, Ra comforts now these people who acquiesce in the new domination and says to them, "Oh, we have something in common," just as the faithful in Europe, and in Venezuela, in Mexico, and perhaps in this country, understand Mary more than they can understand heroism, because they don't want to be heroes. But they want to be nice children. And so they want to have this poppycock, or lolly- -- what is it? Lollipop? -- of sentimentality.

So in the same way, Ra is accessible to every inhabitant of the Nile Valley and so people say, "Now look: the Horus, the falcon who carries the sun from south to north, and slays his brother Set, who unites the country, and his father Osiris, whom he empowers to rule the dead, whom -- for whom he builds the pyramids

so that he stays in this country forever and can never migrate away, whom he satisfied by the pyramids to show him that he is locked into this eternal presence." These people -- you -- they -- you can understand them. They are the children of Ra. They are the sun-god's children. They come directly from his might -- majesty. The {riverain}, the man on the river doesn't ask for this problem from north to south. That was an apostolic belief of the pharaoh himself. He wanted to be justified, as Horus, of his divine powers.

So gentlemen, in the second stage, Ra is the communication of the astral faith of the Egyptian rulers and this clergy to the common man, to the members of the tribes now asked to understand, and to share the faith of the ruling class, of the clergy. Don't say "ruling class" perhaps. Say "clergy." Gentlemen, it's very hard for you to understand that in Christianity, the clergy is not something democratic, elected from the bottom up. In the mind of Christ, He is there. And He's the great magnet to attract the Apostles. And the mag- -- Apostles are there and attract the bishops. And the bishops are there and attract the priests. And the priests are there and attract the deacons. And the deacons are there and attract the laity. You do not -- cannot hardly think of this hierarchical origin of Christianity, but it's true. Christ would have never conquered if He had gone before the class in Philosophy 58 and said, "Will you kindly elect me your savior?" No majority principle in the Christian church. Where it is, it's an abuse. But you believe this. It's very hard for an American { } to see that the Church has come down from Heaven above, down to earth. But that's the truth.

I once attended such a modern minister's church meeting where he said -- first had us first sing, "The Church is one foundation, is Jesus Christ our Lord," which is orthodox. And then he said, "Today we found the Church." Well, people who say they found the church know nothing what the Church is. You can't found the Church. It's not a club, gentlemen. It's not a fraternity. It's not an association. It's there, and it waits for you to join it. The same thing as people say that they have -- they have -- they have -- they're seeking God, or they're finding God. Gentlemen, that's all nonsense. If there is a God, the only thing you can expect is that He finds you. He is the acting force. It's all silly of you to call yourself God-seekers, or God-finders and so. Nothing of the kind. He'll find you out. You may be sure of that. Can't escape Him. But it's no use running after Him. He's there all the time. The denial of God doesn't mean that you haven't found Him. But you haven't been quiet enough. You haven't stood still so that He could grab you up. His is the action, not yours.

Now any reasonable civilization has always known this. This is fantastic, your idea that you found the Church, and you found the state, and you found every-

thing. And you found nothing. Stubble, chaff, dust.

Well, the great story here is, gentlemen, that Ra is the understandable part of the sky-world. His movements are from east to south to west. And in order to satisfy the common man, they said, "Yes, yes, Ra" -- just as Mary is called the -- the co-redemptrix, the co-redeemer with Jesus today, in a very, very blatant overstepping of her -- of her qualifications -- so Ra was the co-redeemer of the sky-world for these popularizing stages of Egyptian religion, because, as I told you just before, the sun -- they whispered, the priests, "Actually goes north, too at night. You actually don't see it." There are these high mountains in Europe, the Alps, and the Balkan mountains, and the {Carpae}, and behind those the sun is lifted up and disappears behind these northern mountains. And it doesn't go down in the nether world from west back to east as -- you see, but it goes north. And that has been believed for 3- or 4,000 years, that the Greeks still believed it, that the sun disappeared behind the northern mountains, which meant that the divinity of the sun was underlined, because this was the miraculous star, being able to go in all directions. And since Egypt depended on this totality, that man had a unity inherited, which was the real world, the whole world, that he was really, you see, depicting Heaven on earth. It was very important that the Heaven was all right, that you knew the -- how far the Heaven went. You had to know. Otherwise all the story was wrong, was so much, you see, ballyhoo. And people didn't want to lie. You always hear today of priests who -- who want to betray people. That's not true. All priests want to be in ac- -- in harmony with their folks. The priests are very honest, but they have a very difficult task, gentlemen. Because people who only live from east to west, do not wish to penetrate into the heroic efforts of living from north to south. So you people who want to have a civilian religion do not want to learn in time that you also have to leave your -- give your life for your country. Therefore, you always have to have some priesthood who disciplines you, because they know that life is half-military and half-civilian. And you don't like to hear that.

So in this sense, gentlemen, the laity makes it very hard on the priesthood to be honest, because they always have to compromise with you -- you don't like to be told that half of life is death. You want to hear that life is life. Now the priests know better. And then you speak of the dishonest priests who try to cheat the laity. No, the laity wants to be cheated! And the poor priests in the cult of Ra only went as far as they possibly could in admitting that if you lived in one place in Egypt, it was perhaps enough for you to believe in the lawful order of the sun's rise and setting, and the further secrets of the inner cult of Osiris, and Horus, and Isis, were perhaps not your -- much your business.

And now, we come to the first stage, gentlemen. The rulers of Egypt, as long as they were native, had something that nobody else could use, because their -- the display, the layout of their country was unique. Stage 2 has been an article of export to all the ruling empires of the world. I told you that 3 came as a blessing to all the farming communities, and the cult of Osiris, in the Book of the Dead, too. This is the article of export to the common man. The horoscope, by the way, too. This is the curse, the golden-calf stage, in which people ridiculed it and turned against it. This is the article of export for other clergies. The cult of the sun in this special manner of orientation, of the four directions of the sun, was used by all the other empires. But now we come to the primary phase, the Christian faith, of Christianity would also be the martyrs, and the Apostles, and Christ. No other religion can imitate that. Without the first 300 years of Christianity, you can very well be a so-called Christian. That is, you can be a free mason. You believe in one god, the goodness of mankind, and all these things. But the three -- first 300 years, if you can't swallow them, Peter and Paul, and the Gospel, and the Letters to the Corinthians, you see, you cannot become a Christian. And this is true of Horus and Set, gentlemen, of this strange world of the first 300 years of the Egyptian tradition. So make a very definite line between this period and this period. It is not because I'm -- you need to understand Egypt. But you must understand history. If you take the five books of Moses, gentlemen, and you take the Psalms, and you take the Prophets in the Bible, and you take the Books of Wisdom, you can easily see the last part of the Old Testament wasn't even written in Greek, that the Books of Wisdom was the thing that went over all the world. The prophets, the educated people of today, are very much interested in the prophets. But they say, "The first books -- the five books of Moses, that's just too superstitious. That's the law. We don't care for that." And the Psalms, they interested the clergy. The whole clergy of the Christian church to this day praise the Psalms all over Christianity. That's the second phase. But the third book of Moses, they say, "I -- we are sorry. That's too bloody. That's too cruel. That's atrocious. And geology {sells} us something different." And people don't like to read the books of Moses so much as they pray the Psalms. It's easier. Now there is a very -- more than accidental behavior, gentlemen. These four texts of the Old Testament constitute four phases of a -- of the history of Jewish religion. Now yet, who can deny that Moses prayed Psalms, and was a prophet? Who can deny that in the Books of Wisdom there is still the father of Abraham, Jacob, and -- and Isaac at work? There is unity, and morality. There is a shift in emphasis. The Books of Wisdom, written in Greek, are that which you can see in Judaism from the outside without being an Israelite. The five books of Moses you can only share as an Israelite, as a man either of the new Israel or the old Israel; only a man perhaps in the spirit of the Puritans can celebrate as great revela-

tions, the five books of Moses, because he feels that he has left Egypt. He knows of the fleshpots of Egypt and he feels that in the five books of Moses the freedom of the -- of the Messiah -- messianic race is guaranteed, and in no other place. What could we -- I know of the prophets alone? And yet for the last hundred years, as you know, learned men of this countries and of other countries around the world have said, "Oh, the prophetic gospel of the old Testament, we will accept that." Jeremiah, and Josiah -- Isaiah, and -- you know, in this college, the only prophet who is honored because we believe in the social gospel here, is the prophet Amos, a very small prophet. But Amos, you see, you can -- has an appeal to the modern American. So you omit everything else and you say "Amos." Well, I don't give anything for Mr. Amos. Really, I don't -- I'm just not touched by him. I have nothing against him, to tell you the truth. He is in the Bible, so {seems to be} all right. And some time I may discover him. But at this time, I have no opinion. I would not think that Amos himself could convey to me the fact that God has -- witnessed to his existence through the history of the human race. That would be funny idea to me to think that this depended on Mr. Amos. But it does depend on Moses. I could not be saved, I could not understand the coming of Christ without Moses, or without Aaron. Nobody. You -- all couldn't. You wouldn't know what fatherhood is, you wouldn't know what marriage is. You wouldn't know how a son should live. You couldn't understand that Jesus was the son of God, if you didn't understand why Isaac was spared by his father, why a father spares his son. This had to be taught.

So I'm very serious, gentlemen. You -- I have made this parallel to show you that in the Egyptian history, you have perhaps some means of waking you up to the fact what it means to live in history. It doesn't mean to live in one thing after another. That's what you call history. But it means that in history we gain time to explore and to fructify, and to live up to every one aspect of the great gifts we have received, that every generation can enfold, develop, extract some other quintessence, some other drop of oil from the wonderful plant, you see, which has been planted among us. That's a very different history. History is the harvesting of the whole tree of life, which cannot be harvested in one generation. America was founded in 1776 and it has many aspects, as the Civil War has shown. Many, many facets. Now we have to make something out of the new world. In 17- -- 1860, we had to make something out of equality. And today we have to make very much out of the decent respect for the opinions of mankind, gentlemen. That is still unfulfilled. How shall we deal with the atomic bomb and the decent opinion of mankind? I think it is very lame now that we do not admit now that the atomic bomb must not be thrown. The hydrogen bomb must not be thrown, not because of ourselves, but because of the decent respect for the opinion of mankind. Do you think it is not very telling that the Japanese at this

moment come back to the -- their Hiroshima experience, after nine years? The thing has come full cycle. We should have never thrown the bomb over Hiroshima. As you well know, it was just cowardice. We had won the war with Japan without it. It was absolutely unnecessary to throw the two bombs over Hiroshima. Nobody needed it for victory. Just as little as we needed the Russians to come in and -- and take part in this whole business, as you well know. But we were nervous. We lost our nerves. We lost our sense. We lost our sense of values, I think. So we threw the bombs, and now this is held against us. You see, there goes an earthquake through all of Japan now, with these fishes killing those who eat them; or they think they do. It doesn't matter whether it's true or not. Aren't they right? After nine years of submissive obedience, they wake up to the terrors that have -- we have inflicted on them and they ask, "Is this to be continued?" And do you really believe that the United States as a unit can wield this thunder and this -- this lightning by themselves? It is really obviously owned by the world community, and the French, and the Canadians say -- and and the English -- "Well, you can't throw this stuff without first consulting us, because the consequences are the end of the world, the destruction of England." Mr. Churchill got up, you know, and wept in the chamber -- in the lower house yesterday, or the day before yesterday and said, "There is nothing on my mind that so concerns me, because it means the end of England. If the -- Americans today throw the hydrogen bomb over Moscow, tomorrow there will be no England." That's a high price for being allied to a country like America, where people without a head and without a heart seem to be able to -- to influence this country, even if they come from the middle West.

That is terrible, gentlemen. And there you see that history can only at this moment help us when you understand that the Americans were founded as a new world, as a part of a novus ordo {horitor}, which is on our dollar bills, as you may know. A new order of the whole world was promised in 1776. You must press today the word "New World" until it contains all the older worlds, too -- parts of the world. We were then the newest part of the world, but we said, "New World" not by saying exclusively, "We are the New World without the others." The -- your temptation at this moment is, gentlemen, to race from one event to the other and not to see that there will be no America if you say that America of 1900 is just without immigration, without its antecedents, without its promises, without its Constitution, without its Christianity, without its roo- -- being rooted as a sect, as a branch in the history of the Christian Church. And I have tried to convey to you this in the story of these four. You must admit it is still very short. There's much more to be said. But that's all you can do in such a {meeting}.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Philosophy 58, April 13th, 195- --)

[tape interruption]

... to give you a kind of finishing touch to the chapter of the empire -- on the empires. So we have treated, as the French call it, "les clans et -- et les empires." There is a famous book in -- in French, Des Clans aux Empires, from the tribes to the empires. And we have treated the tribes and the empires as very different from what you generally think. There is no evolution. There is no gradual development from the tribe to the empire, but there is a sharp dialectics, a complete contrast. Those people who kept migrating over the earth, and those people who decided to settle are two different men. We can trace their -- the origin of the new race of settlers to 3000 B.C. and we can follow the first people who spoke with eff- -- efficacy to a -- let me say 7000 B.C. to this -- today, or perhaps 5000 B.C. only -- we may trace the origin of human speech. All the rest, what the prehistorians sell you -- as this infinite, long age of history doesn't exist. That's -- is the bad conscience of the people who have to replace God by millions of years. But we have learned that indeed the tribes made a decision to fight nature, by overcoming the ef- -- effects of death. The ancestor cult means that the grave, the funeral, the burial, the totem pole all allow people to continue, despite the death of one link in the generations. And we said that the problem of the tribe is this victory over death. And the formula, which I recommend to you for the whole tribal order, which you still find in the weaklings of today, is that in the tribal or generative order of blood relations, the dead speak to the living. I told you that here was a president of Dartmouth College who couldn't deliver a speech without feeling the eyes of his predecessor pinned on him. That is the rule of the tribe: that the ancestors look down on you. And there is a perpetual and eternal truth in this: the past does direct our steps, and we owe this duty to listen to what we have been told. So the tribes, gentlemen, have done something which cannot be forgotten, and which originates every day. Put any group in the position of having to migrate -- take the Mennonites, or take the Quakers, and we again have this same problem. And as you know, the Quakers in this country had to recognize the ancestral Quakerism against all their religious tenets. It is inexplicable for a Quaker, theoretically or theologically, that his son should be a Quaker. And yet he is, because the power of the good life lived by the ancestor prevails, even over their theology which said that every Christian should become a Christian himself, you see, without heredity. But you move, like the Quakers,

from country to country, and immediately you have to connect, because otherwise the countries offering only contrast, you have -- would have no continuity, no meaning, no place in history.

So the tribes, gentlemen, make the dead speak to the living. In the empire, we found an opposite arrangement. I have to remind you of this, because we want to take today a step forward -- beyond the two: tribe and empire. In the empire, the heavens speak to the earth. The sun and the moon and the stars reveal the destiny of man on this earth. And the ruler on this earth is a double star, he who connects Heaven and earth, you remember. And the crown of the ruler of the king, these are the rays of the sun, and of the stars which reach him and direct his steps. And from there on, he is able to direct your steps. Every man's, every settler's in the man, and the proclamation on New Year's days of the emperor of China -- directed the steps of 400 million people, day after day for 4,000 years -- 3,000 years I should say, down to 1911. That's a great order, and was bought for one little price: no migration, staying put. Under this condition, we saw that you could have division of labor, you could have the arts and the crafts. You could have classes, and castes, and buildings, temples, palaces, jewels, {the highest} development of any technique ever known. Loads of pillars, and columns, and obelisks, and pyramids piled up in such a way as we even cannot improve on it. And we also learn from these two chapters, gentlemen, that every one of these orders of life is perfect. You cannot do better than the masks of the tribe. If you ever have seen any of these masks, we cannot invent any better ones like the spider, or the eagle, or the lion's head, and carved out on those masks of a Negro tribe, or of an Indian tribe. And we cannot do better than the pyramids of Egypt, or the lion gates of Mycenae. That is perfect. Every one -- two, where the heart is, and where man's god is, he really is insuperable.

Now we come to the two orders, gentlemen, of antiquity on which we stand. The New Testament, as you say, says that today the partition between Jews and Greeks is finished. So they must have understood that the whole ancient world which Christ came to change, or to redeem, there was contained in these two groups of which we hadn't to say a word so far. Who has gotten my -- received my postal card? And did you -- did you -- were you able to tell anybody else? (No.)

Ah-ha. I thought so. So, I put on -- all these cards, you see, with the faint hope of fulfillment that they should tell others. Who has told anybody else? One of you.

(One.)

That's your ancestor-worship. I am dead, but you don't obey me, anyway. I thought that if I sent out 10 postal cards with the demand to tell the others, that at least five of you would -- would be willing to tell one other. Then you would have 15 Bibles today here in class. Now we have only at best five. Gentlemen, I can't work with you this way. You think it's all just a joke, because you are not interested in -- in this stuff -- material, in the thing itself, but only perhaps in me, or wise- -- in the jokes I crack. I mean, you are -- behave like 11-year-old boys. Not one of you feeling when you write such {a ported}, it is for the rest of the class that you do it, when you receive a post card that you have to go out of your way and to tell somebody else. Do you think I write -- this post card in -- for nothing? You still will not induce me to treat you as boys. I shall go on treating you as grown-up people, even if at the end, you will wake up to the fact that you didn't deserve it.

Gentlemen, the Jews and the Greeks defied both tribe and empire, or you may say inherit both and do something different with these two great institutions. As you know, the Jews have a country, like the Egyptians. They even have a temple, the Temple of Solomon. But they have 12 tribes, as the tribes of old. And yet everybody knows that the Jews are not just a tribe and not just a country, but that they are something third, something disagreeable, something hated, but something very different. They are the Jews. They are Israel. And they have left Egypt, the fleshpots of Egypt, the pharaohs, and they have left the tribal order. The Bible is written around this double fact that Israel is neither a tribe, nor an empire, nor a kingdom, but is something third. What is it? Gentlemen, in Abraham and in Moses, you have the two protests against the previous world. We can state today with great confidence that Judaism came into existence when the Great Year of the Egyptians had returned for once in 1320, and when therefore the cycle of such an eternal settlement had exhausted its ultimate possibilities. In other words, gentlemen, people don't revolutionize the world without having exhausted usually all means of peaceful change. Reform of the old order is of course the obvious, as long as you can hope for it. The Russians tried from 1825 to 1905 to reform their government. And only after this didn't work, in the sec- -- first World War, did they overthrow czarism for good. You must understand the slow process of revolution in order to appreciate a genuine revolution. This has nothing to do with what you call revolution in South America. That's not a revolution at all. That's just disorder or anarchy.

But the great events in human history, gentlemen, are very economical. And Israel and Moses came into being only after every potential reform within the realm of Egypt had been tried.

In the year 1357, 40 years before this great event of the return of Sirius to the same place in the sky after 1460 years could be expected, the -- a king of Egypt tried to go to the limit of reform. This man is quite well known in this world, although -- most -- by mere sensational books, as Echnaton, the ruler of Egypt, Amenhophis IV. Echnaton -- E-c-h-n-a-t-o-n. He is the Kerensky of the Mosaic Revolution. Mr. Kerensky -- you do not understand this? Mr. Kerensky tried to reform Russia by introducing parliamentary regime, and by behaving like a good Frenchman of 1789. Mr. Kerensky is still in this country and very much worshiped by the people who hate the Bolsheviks. But you do not understand the depths of the change that the Russians had to make in order to get rid of the czaristic regime. Mr. Kerensky, whom I think -- respect as an excellent fellow, ex-- personally excellent man, is one of these people who, like Mirabeau of the French Revolution, think that they can do a little reform, and not all. It would be like having the British, you see, reform their kingship without beheading Charles I. Horace Walpole always had the Magna Carta and the death warrant of Charles I on his -- the wall of his room in the 18th century. Horace Walpole, a famous lord and -- as you may know, because he -- he knew that the beheading of the king was necessary, indispensable condition for introducing aristocracy in England.

Now, you must compare these events, these actions, if you want to understand Moses' tremendous undertaking. Everything had been tried in Egypt. Echnaton had said, "I wish to give up the superstition of myself being Horus, and having to hurry from the South to the North, as you remember, you see, the basis of all the Egyptian creation, being that one rule could unite these thousand miles from north -- south to north. He went into exactly the middle of Egypt. Tel-El-Amarna, which again is for the journalists of Egyptology not known, is a place exactly in the middle of the River Nile, from the First Cataract to the estuary. That is, these surveyors of Egypt, being great geographers, had by that time been able to measure all the bends and knees of the River Nile, and had found that Tel-El-Amarna was located in the exact center of Egypt. And all empires love to have -- correct measurements and orientation. And their whole problem is orientation, to be the masters of the East, the South, the West, and the North. You remember? And therefore, this city of {El-Al-Armana}, just as Peking, had to be in the middle, as you -- the Chinese called themselves, the empire of the middle, you see, of the center.

Now Tel-El-Amarna was founded there by Echnaton, and he took an oath. Mind you, he took an oath that he would not budge from this place and its four -- outside its four sacred corners. He was so sure that by measuring right, he had brought the absolute harmony of the spheres down to earth, that the Heaven now was in compliance, you see, with all the conditions on earth and vice versa. And therefore, here he could sit and rule and tame the universe, without having to move against his enemies, or for -- to his subjects without any progress through his empire. It was the final, extreme idea of settlement. Even the throne of the empire now was definite, you see. Here he would sit and not budge, like a Buddha, or like Montezuma who also, as you you know, did not budge, did not move when Pizarro -- Cortez attacked him, because here he was, the center of things himself. You can hardly understand the conviction of these people that, by finding the right point, the right cardinal point in the middle of the universe, you see, they would be able to be as stable as the firmament. And the word "firmament" shows you how these people found that the stable thing was up there, and the earth was the transient and movable thing, and that we had to try to bring the firmament, you see, confirmatingly down to earth, by confirming it. Well, this oath of Mr. Echnaton had very sad consequences for the empire. The enemies must have heard of it. And they came in from all corners. And here was Echnaton, marooned in the middle. And if he didn't want to perjure himself, he had to stay there. He did send his generals, but he couldn't appear in person. So you can imagine that the Tel-El-Amarna reform was a total catastrophe for Egypt. And the next emperor, the next pharaoh who came -- took over after his death, or perhaps his dislocation, his rebellion, called himself "Horus" again, very important. This victorious general who dethroned pharaoh, Amenhophis, pharaoh Echnaton in Tel-El-Amarna, went back to Thebes, to the older capital of Egypt, took immediately upon himself the old name of Horus, the falcon-emperor, the real moving double-star of Egypt. The idea of putting the empire -- emperor -- -pire totally under the heavens had failed. The supernatural ruler was still nat- -- necessary to make the connection between Heaven and earth. And he had to be left free. This fate of the Egyptian pharaoh has led the famous philosopher Hegel -- Hegel -- to the statement that in antiquity, one man at least had to be free, in every state, in every empire, you see. The ruler himself. You couldn't fetter him totally. He, when an enemy was announced, had after all go out and campaign. And this emperor who fettered himself, you see, as we did with our -- neutrality legislation, you see, under Mr. -- Borah in the '30s, was like a blind giant fettering himself. That's the best you can say of America. That's the best you can say of Egypt, a blind giant fettering himself, either by prohibition, or by neutrality legislation, or by investigations, or what-not. Always disempowering oneself. That is the tendency of these tremendous bodies of men. The fear of

one's own freedom.

Very strange. But it breaks down. It cannot be done. It is impossible to forbid the United States to be a world power. And by and large, this is what it amounted to, when Echnaton took an oath and said, "I'll sit here. And Heaven is a- -- with, I mean, harmony with the earth. I'll never move." The future was abolished this way. Nothing could ever happen, you see. Everything was predictable, the -- like the business cycle, you see. It would come and go. Seven lean years, and seven fat years. That's the business cycle. That comes from Egypt. Boom and bust. And -- that much the pharaonic tradition knew. There were good harvests and poor harvests, rich and -- richness and -- poverty. All that they knew. But they didn't know anything {surprising}. They didn't know that there could be a race suddenly that wanted to be poor, like the Russians, that had no interest in {wealth}. That's beyond the American and the -- any imperial horizon, gentlemen. The empires lived by the high standard of living. And therefore they very soon ceased to live, because you cannot live by the standard of living. There is no standard of living. Today it's one and tomorrow it's another. That doesn't -- is -- has no -- nothing to do with living.

This is very serious, gentlemen, because I assure you at this moment, no other country is so -- great -- very much in danger of going the way of the Egyptians, back from the Exodus to the Sinai and the Ten Commandments than this country. It's a great temptation to live in harmony with technological processes, which you can manipulate. That's exactly what they did with the astronomical processes. Gentlemen, if you have productivity, it's exactly what the Egyptians said when they knew when the flood came, and when the ground had to be tilled, and when the seed had to be put down, and when the harvest had to be brought in, and how to feed the unemployed during the three months from the stores of Egypt, you see, when they could not live in their little garden huts in the middle of the river, because the flood was there, and they had to move up to the desert. This they mastered. We master this, too. We can produce -- we can outproduce anybody, as you know. But the problems of life are not the -- only the problems of production. There are other problems. And they all -- most unpredictable and unforeseen. And they demand human freedom, and they -- you can't deal with them by legislation in advance, forbidding the president or forbidding the people to -- travel around the world and make for good will, keeping all the passports locked up in the State Department. This is a typical gesture of Mrs. {Shipley,} you know the great dragon of -- you know, we have here dragons too in this country. The Chinese have dragons. The Egyptians. All these empires have tremendous symbols of power, in the form of cherubs, or dragons, you see, of the sphinx. They are all very similar. And we have Miss

{Shipley}. You know who Miss {Shipley} is? She will have a monument. She is the lady who decides over the r- -- your right to visit another country.

That's the Egyptian problem. It is exactly the Egyptian problem, because what did the Jews? They said, "We leave Egypt without a passport." That's what they did. And they succeeded. That's the miracle of the founding of Israel, that they left Egypt without a passport. "Let my people go." You must remember The Green Pasture. Who has seen The Green Pasture? Only two? Oh, what a pity. Try to see it. It's a great play. Do you know what it is? Have you heard of it? "Let my people go."

Now. Gentlemen, the Jews said this cycle of the stars over Egypt can lead nowhere beyond Egypt. The empires have shown that they are finite, and that they cannot be identified with the future of humanity. The empire has reached its fulfillment. Tel-El-Amarna is proof that the best what an emperor of Egypt can do is to sit. Therefore, in Egypt, the present devours the future. The eternal cycle of boom and bust, of lean years and fat years, of the standard of living, of the flood, and the -- the cycle which the Bible mentions under Noah as the cyclical life of the agricultural humanity, this has reached its clear limitation because, gentlemen, where we live cyclical, we are dependent on the environment, on its climate, on its conditions of weather, and rainfall, and so on, and we are therefore unable to be masters of the whole globe. No global order can ever grow from such a -- a settlement, from such an -- empire, from such enthronization of a ruler over a set, certain district, a certain path of the universe. It remains partial. All the empires divide as much humanity as they have -- unite the tribes. Here you see the tragedy, gentlemen, of every piece of progress. If you do something beyond that which went before, you also are doomed to stick to this -- step forward, to this progress, if you can unite, as in China, a hundred tribes, or by perhaps 200 tribes as in China later, or if you unite all the tribes of the desert in Egypt, or in Babylonia, or the 12 tribes of Israel, you still cannot go beyond this act of uniting tribes. And you have not united the whole human race. The empire is then within its limitations, you see, not able to take any step to unite the empires. The unification of empires -- an empire of empires -- would need a new principle, which could not be the imperial principle of a visible throne in the middle of its little district, or universe, you see, or its -- within its orientation from east, north, south, and west; because on the globe, as we now know, but they didn't, there is no east, west, north, south of permanent orientation. This earth is created round. And in Chile, at this moment, they expect tremblingly the approach of winter. And in summer, as you know, you can ski there. So the humanity, very early, gentlemen, long before Copernicus knew that we

turned around the sun, knew that the earth was round, and that the antipodes, and the podes -- that is, the people on two sides of the globe -- could never be united -- unified by either the tribal principle of constant migration and constant warpath, nor by this withdrawal of the Egyptians behind their fortresses into this Tel-El-Amarna {center}, sitting there and saying, "Now, we can't budge. Obviously man must do better."

Now, gentlemen, what did Moses say, and what did Abraham say? Abraham in the Bible placed the role of the superseding power superseding the tribes. The fact that he doesn't slaughter Isaac is the great fact of Abraham's life. And the fact of Moses' life is that he, although he was a professor at Columbia University in Cairo, that he said, "The whole Ph.D. business is a hoax. They learn superstitions here at this university. And I have to take my -- a people -- " not "my people," he probably was an Egyptian, and not even a Jew -- "take them out. I take them away. I create a group which is neither tribal nor imperial." How is it explained -- pressed in the Old Testament, gentlemen? The story of Abraham is quite well known. But nobody today, including all the rabbis of Israel care to understand the story. It is taken as a sacred story. The wonderful thing, as you know, about religious solemnity is that you don't have to understand a word. You just have a pious look and you go to Heaven straight away. It isn't that simple, gentlemen. The Bible is a secular book. It has neither to do with priests, nor popes, nor saints. It is written for you and me. It is written by secular people. It's a worldly book. As long as you read the Bible as a sacred book, you will never understand it. But it is the greatest book ever written, because it is true. And that's much more important than being sacred. The truth is sacred, gentlemen, but sacredness is not at all true. That's your mistake. And that's why you do -- you have no relation to the living god. And that's why you think you can debate God. Gentlemen, you cannot escape Him. But He's in this world. He's in this classroom, even; and He's not in the Church. And you have -- here, one boy who came to me the other day and said, "Couldn't it be enough to -- to call God infinity?" All such nonsense, you -- you see. That is, you little men want to give the name to the power that makes you, that names you. This is incredible. You haven't -- dare this -- such a boy, how he can be a student, I do not know. Anybody who thinks he can replace the name of God by some definition of his own little mind -- his sheep's mind, hasn't even -- doesn't even know -- what powers rule his own life. Doesn't he know that he is an American, that he is in danger of -- of siding with the fleshpots of Egypt, which you today call the standard of living? Gentlemen, put it down. Fleshpots of Egypt equals standard of living. That's exactly the same word. They meant flesh- -- by "fleshpots of Egypt" if you have everything your heart desires, and more. Certainly always more than you can pay for.

You are therefore, under -- in idolatry, and then you say, "Is there a God?" Well, gentlemen, it is the only -- the -- God is that power which can redeem you from your idolatry. Your god now is the standard of living. So obviously you must pray fervently that this cheap idol may be crashed, and crushed, and that you may come in contact with the powers of life that deserve worship. Gentlemen, I have seen a debate of serious men in this college going on about the conditions of the peace after this war in 1945. I think I've told you the story, where with every condition we discussed, the answer was, "Impossible, because of our standard of living." That is, no peace for mankind possible, because the Americans idolize the -- their standard of living. This has happened to me in this college. Twenty-five people present at the Hanover Inn, at a lunch. And the luncheon had a high standard of living, but the mind had no high standard, at all. I have been present when people debated and said, "The necessary conditions of peace cannot be met, because we must stick to our -- high standard of living." This is idolatry. That's exactly what the Egyptians did, what every empire did, they said, "We are at home here, the rest of the world, we -- let them -- let them rot." Very simple.

So just don't miss -- don't think that these Biblical expressions are dead. The escapist mind of modern idolaters always try, of course, a way of expressing it so that it cannot be found out, and not be recognized for what it is. But "standard of living" is exactly the "fleshpots of Egypt."

Now let us read the two chapters, first of Abraham's victory over his own tribalism, and then Moses' victory over his own academic degree, his own wisdom. Who has a Bible, kindly will open the book. It's the 22nd chapter of Genesis. Who has it? Will you read it?

And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, "Abraham." And he said, "Behold, here I am." And He said, "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of."

And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and saddled his ass, and took -- took two -- two of his young men with him, and Isaac his son, and clave the wood for the burnt offering, and rose up, and went unto the place of which God had told him. Then on the third day, Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place far -- afar off. And Abraham said unto his young men, "Abide ye here

with the ass; and I and the lad will go yonder and worship, and come again to you." And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering, and laid it upon Isaac, his son. And he took the fire in his hand, and a knife; and they went, both of them, together. And Isaac spoke unto Abraham, his father, and said, "My father." And he said, "Here am I, my son." And he said, "Behold the fire and the wood: but where is the lamb for a burnt offering?" And Abraham said, "My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering." And they went, both of them, together. And they came to the place which God had told him of. Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac his son, and laid him on the altar, upon the wood. And Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son. And the angel of the Lord called unto him out of Heaven, and said, "Abraham, Abraham." And he said, "Here am I." And he said, "Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him, for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me." And Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked, and behold, behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns. And Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering, in the stead of his son. And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovajireh, as it is said to this day, in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen.

And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of Heaven a second time, and said, "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou has done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee; and in multiplying, I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the Heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; And in thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." So Abraham returned unto his young men ...

Ja. That's enough. Thank you. There it is. "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" is the decisive sentence here. It's a very strange sentence. Nobody quite can interpret it to the full, to this day, can ever -- imagine the eloquence of this. "In thy seed, they shall be blessed." What does this mean? Very hard to understand. Obviously only -- obvious only in that the step is taken beyond all partial orders of the human race. It means the whole human race, but in connection with the step taken by Israel. That is, all the nations of the earth from now on can only be blessed if they have some part of the new principle of -- in the new principle of life, I might say, that is to be established by Abraham. As the pope has said, "Spiritually, we all are Semites." No nation on this earth can live today without having a part in the revelation of Abraham. Therefore, it's quite important, gentlemen, to analyze very soberly, and very scientifically, and objectively what has happened here in this one chapter, 22nd of Genesis. We

know that the tribes have an order in which the past speaks to the present. And you'll remember that I also tried to open your eyes to the fact that the empires created an eternally smiling present. That you would like, by imitating the Chinese and keep smiling all the time. In this keep-smiling world, death is abolished, the future is abolished, because everything is predictable. Everything returns rhythmically, like the straw hat and the felt hat after Labor Day. The eternal present, gentlemen, and the past are still lacking of one other time hence, which you accept grammatically and politically as natural. No American could live without having a relation to what? To the future. To a future that is essentially, totally even, different from past and present. This did not exist before Moses left Egypt, and before Abraham forewent the sacrifice of his son. Gentlemen, the Jews have created, as a strange, very unique group, a people that shall be created, as they say it, or as we pronounce -- call it as a pale expression by which you can go to sleep, by creating the messianic hope. But the Psalm says much more clearly, "I am the Lord of the people that will be, that is to be created." That's enormous. "I am the Lord of a people that is to be created." I think it's the 96th Psalm. I'm ready to give a dime to them -- to him who finds it in the Psalms. It's an incredible sentence. "I am the Lord of the people that is to be created." That is, not a people that is, or has been. In Europe, this sounds even more queer than it sounds in this country, where people still have an idea of a melting pot, and some thin memory that there was a day when there were no Americans, that they all wanted to become a people, but they weren't yet one. To you, who are the lost generation, and the people, the second generation { } which has gone soft, it sounds natural that you are Americans, gentlemen. To Mr. McCarthy also. He appeals to the Americanism as he is. But the problem of the people of God has always been the people of -- as they have to be, as they have to become, as they shall be.

So you may say, gentlemen, and this is literally true: the Jews have invented the category of the future. They are so annoying, and so distasteful, because they are destructive of all idols of the day, and of all idols of the past. They do not worship, and they do not bend their knee to Baal.

Now wh- -- how is this expressed in these two acts of Abraham and Moses? As you know, Moses cannot see the promised land. And thereby he supersedes the connection of the civilized professor of philosophy to his country. He -- Moses is an Egyptian who, for 120 years, is a refugee from Egypt and is not allowed to enter Palestine. This is a tremendous story. As you know, the only Joshua -- his disciple is allowed to set his foot on the promised land. So Moses in his -- resignation foregoes the country, and Abraham foregoes the tribe. Because gentlemen,

in the tribe, the first-born is slaughtered in order to give life to the father, to the chief. In -- this was true as late as the 11th century in Europe.

I'll tell you a story which illustrates the story of Abraham perhaps better than any other I know. The king of Sweden, who governed around the year 1070, was still a good Gentile, one of these appetizing Nordic race-men, and blond probably, stupid, and cruel. And he slaughtered his first-born son in order to add stature to his own vitality. And after a few years, he slaughtered his second son. And after a few years, he slaughtered his third son. And the story goes that when it came to the seventh son, who was a favorite with the people, they decided now that was too much. And they slew the old king, and made the seventh son king, and he became a Christian. And in this moment, the Swedes participated in the messianic hope. And in this moment, they didn't yet become Christians. It's a long travel. You always become Christian by becoming Jewish. The Old Testament is always the entrance -- door to the New Testament. You have to receive the law, before you receive grace. And therefore the first step of a nation that becomes Christian is very modest: that you forego the idols, and forego the ancestor-worship of the tribe and the empire. And that's what the Swedes did in 1070. And in Archbishop Lager- -- Söderblom and in Selma Lagerlöf, they proved that they now were real Christians, or in Strindberg, that it takes 900 years. But in 1070, gentlemen -- that's a memorable date -- you have the duplication of the event of Abraham not sacrificing his son for his own aggrandizement. He had the spirit, the inspiration, "I am called to do great things. I am not here for nothing. I have been spared. I have left my home country, the -- the empire of Ur." And the Bible is very -- very strangely concerned in making it clear that Abraham came from Ur, the most mighty city in Mesopotamia, and Moses came from Egypt, the other great empire. So that in the two -- the two lines, you see -- of the history of mankind should meet. The Bible is very proud that the ancestors of Israel are immunized by -- against the two greatest civilizations of their days. The Mesopotamian one, of the Euphrates-Tigris valley, and the civilization of the Nile. And you have to -- acquire such an immunity if you want to do something new. But in Abraham's case, the imperial strain of Ur is, so to speak -- it's a fact. The story begins, Abraham was a man who lived in Ur, you see, and left and went to Palestine. But the story then concentrates on his victory over his temptation of becoming a chieftain again. The two ways are -- were only open at that time. You either founded a city and became a pharaoh, like, you see, god-priest, or priest-god, or priest-king, or you were a chieftain and led your people through the desert, or through the oasis, or through the -- over the sea, to -- from continent to continent.

Abraham, as we all do not -- we are not like these people with union now, or these other Utopianists, or like Mr. Culbertson in bridge. We are not planners, or schemers, gentlemen. Anybody who has to do something in the world has to discover this under great pain. You cannot scheme whom -- which wife you have to marry. You -- she finds out. And then there it is. But this cannot be planned. In the same way, gentlemen, you are here taken into the greatest secret of creative living in the Bible, because you learn that Abraham had to try first the wrong way before he could know the right way, before he -- his instinct could tell him that the time could not mean, at which he lived, to go back to tribalism. He, who came from Ur -- {Chalsdim} as the Bible says -- and from Haran, two great cities, you see, with all the modern, central heating -- he -- you cannot go back and simply feel that God has called you to be one more of these multiple chieftains of a tribe of perhaps 5,000. And that's why you must read the ironical touch in Chapter 22nd, when it said, "You had wanted to become a chieftain of at best 5,000 men by sacrificing your first-born son. And I tell you that in blessing, I will bless thee, and in multiplying, I will multiply thy seed as the stars of Heaven -- the Heaven." Doing better than Egypt, doing better than any one tribe, by a million times. Something new. Something unheard-of. The promise, the prophecy of the coming unity of all mankind is entrusted to your seed. That's a great discovery, gentlemen, that the future cannot be limited by the political or geographical confines of either a blood-group or a territorial-group. Any concept, gentlemen, which would have said, "You will be a big chieftain" or a big president, a big pharaoh, would have had only quantitative -- values, compared to the existing forms of life. What is the hardest for you is to understand that bigger and better is not different. There's no new quality in this. To discover a new quality of life, a new way of life, you have to give up the old way of life, and you cannot become a bigger and better chieftain, let us say, of 25,000 tribesmen, you see. And you cannot become a larger pharaoh, like the Roman Caesar, who then governs the whole Mediterranean at the end. No difference between Cleopatra and Caesar in principle. Just the same. So they marry. And Abraham however, feels already in 1200, in 1500, in 17- -- we don't know the year, of course. It must have been between fif- -- 1800 and 1200 B.C., he feels called to a new way of life, to something that defies the sedentary self- -- autonomy of one piece of land on the surface of the globe, and the restlessness of the tribe with its aloofness as against all other branches of the human race, with its warpaths, et cetera, you see, and its impenetrability to any other tongue, with its own tongue, you see, alone being able to make peace between different people. Can you see this? Is it clear? Any questions, please?

Gentlemen, in this little chapter, Genesis 22nd, there is then the seed of the specific character of Judaism. The specific character of Judaism is a challenge to the two existing, always-existing forms of government: the family and the city; or in larger terms, the clan and the empire. You cannot be clannish, because God has a purpose for all men together. And you cannot be territorial, because God created Heaven and earth. And that's why the Bible begins with this triumphant song, "In the beginning, God created Heaven and earth. Therefore no part of Heaven can be prescribed you -- to you the law of your earthly existence." No Tel-El-Amarna, in other words. This is written against this attempt, this experiment of the Egyptians. And everybody who heard this knew that this was revolutionary. This was a different way of life.

And in order to emphasize this, gentlemen, before I have -- give you the break, I -- let me make these two points. If you wanted to be anti-tribal, you had to fight the principle of the vendetta in the seventh degree. You'll remember that I told you the raft of time of the tribe extends to seven generations. So what does Moses do? What do -- does the Bible do? It speaks of the seven generations of Heaven and earth. Instead of having this little thing of grandfather, and father, and son, and grandson, and great-grandson, and then the ancestor is Number 7 behind you, he says, "The generations of those stars which you worship, they are your real life story." And the seven generations he projects into the heavens. And that's why the earth had to be created -- the world had to be created in seven days. Instead of seven generations, the Bible says seven days. And vice versa, gentlemen. The stars in the heavens, they move in 12 months, in 12 times 30 days, in 360 days, as we -- I -- you heard. That's the ordinary reckoning of the calendar. So give me 12 tribes instead. The 12 tribes of Israel are written against the 12 months. If you put the 12 number -- sacred number 12 into the family system, then it cannot -- no longer be misunderstood as an astrological calendar notice. And so you get this great wisdom of -- the Bible that every word in the Bible is an attempt to immunize those who are moved by the words of the Bible out of the ruts of astrology on the one-hand side, and the calendar-worship of Egypt, and out of the vendetta and the seven-generation path of the tribes. And that's the Bible, gentlemen. And that's an interesting book, I should say, that from the first to the last word, every word has a meaning, is a battle delivered against the idols which were in every tribesman's head at that time, and in every -- agriculturist's, you see, and in every vintner's head, when the book was written. So that from generation to generation, those who read the Bible, you see, are, so to speak, surrounded by revelations, by -- by orders which defy the sky-world of Egypt and the ancestor totem-world of the tribes.

And that's why today this whole criticism of the Bible is always -- is absolutely beside the point. It is made by people who are deeply immersed -- immersed into -- into Oedipus complexes and Egyptian darkness. You are either, gentlemen, at your mother's apron strings, or you are haunted by the business cycle. Well, against both these gods, these superstitions, the Bible is written. And therefore, it puts the -- number 7, as I told you, in the sky, where you worship the 12, and it puts the number 12 into your family life, where you are just haunted by Aunt Elizabeth and Uncle Maxwell. Now let's have a break.

[tape interruption]

... our problem. Before we shall go into the Jewish story fully next time, I want to show you that there is another way out. It is not necessary only to create a status of constant future, of constant expectation, of prophecy and promise, which is the messianic realm of Judaism. It is -- has been done in antiquity, and it is done today by all the humanists, that they try to escape from the fleshpots of Egypt and from their tribal and clannish vendettas and family feuds, by the Greek path. And I think it is wiser, although it is -- seems perhaps to you irregular, that at this -- this very moment contrast the Greek solution and the Jewish solution. The Greeks are a synthesis of tribe and empire. The Jews are not. The word "synthesis," gentlemen, is a humanist word. It's an academic term. And in true religious life it doesn't occur. Religion is never a synthesis.

So the Greeks, and the humanists and the academics always have to get rid of religion. The Greeks are the people who, in order to be able to synthesize tribe and empire, had to denigrate the gods. And they did very successfully already in Homer. As you know, the -- Homer pokes fun at the gods; he satirizes them. They're funny. How did the Greeks come to this notion, gentlemen? That in order to live in a wider world than one tribe or one empire, you have to satirize the gods. You have to be as areligious as you -- man -- as human as possible. They are the inventors of ethical culture, after all. Because the Greeks were condemned, as the people in New York are, to live in many religions, and in many countries, and with many people. The --Odyssey begins, "Tell me the story of the man who has seen many cities, many countries," { }. Obvious nobody who knows Greek. So, "Call -- give me the man's name who has seen the wide world with all its differences." The Greeks are sailors and they are tribesmen. And when they arrived at the shores of the Mediterranean from their primitive, wood-man's experiences as tribesmen in -- inner -- of Europe, they went to {Sicily}, as you know, as Iason, to -- find the golden fleece. He built the first boat, the Argo, in Thessalia, and Achilles is at home in Thessalia, the Olympus is placed in Thessalia. Thessaly is the country, gentlemen, in which the Greeks met

the sea, and the world of Egypt and Babylonia, the world of the empires. And the Greeks are the Oly- -- people of the Olympic gods, and of Homer, because they were born in the conflict of a tribal existence, and an empire existence. And though they are, so to speak, they have taken -- accepted the marginal value of the tribe and the marginal value of the empire. What is the marginal value of the tribe, and what is the marginal value of the empire? The marginal value of the tribe is the family without vendetta. And the marginal value of the empire is temples without priests, without astrology. And that's what the Greeks have done.

If you look into Greek religion, gentlemen, you have all heard of Bacchus and Dionysus, and Venus, and you are even subservient to Venus and Bacchus, yourself. You are all little Greeks. What is it that you are when you worship Bacchus and Venus? What prevents you from being Egyptians, or Persians, or Chinese? Why are you not feeling like an Aztec when you get drunk? Just -- just feeling like a Dionysian, you see, {orgiast}. Why do we still read Mr. Hobbe's {Anacreotica}, Anacreon being the poet of -- inv- -- who invites us to drink? Because the priests of Egypt ruled over the land. This is not true in the Homeric age. The -- the unity of Greece, gentlemen, comes about by song. The singer -- the epics, Homer -- is the unifying tie of all the Greeks. This is very hard for you to understand, because different from all -- every generation in this college before you have not read Homer. Who has read Homer? Ah. That's in protest, I think. Wonderful.

Now, gentlemen, the function of The Odyssey { } was to unite all the Greeks on all the islands and all the cities and peninsulas of the Mediterranean. There were 258 islands listed in Homer. There were more than -- such a number of cities listed in the catalog of the ships in The Iliad. Aristotle wrote the constitutions of 158 different states of Greece. That is, gentlemen, the Greeks were born as pluralists. Will you take this down? The Greeks were born as tubal- -- three- -- as pluralists. Many tribes and many countries: that is the first thought of a Greek, that nobody is only of one tribe, or of one city. He is compelled, just in order to make a living, to plow the sea, to go across the wine-colored waves of the sea, and to land in another country and to befriend them. And we depend on the other fellow. And the other fellow is not just another fellow, gentlemen. It's a fellow who speaks a different language, and who worships other gods. That is the problem of Greece. The Greeks solved the problem of today's diversity of races, peoples, and creeds. The Jews solved the problem of their final unity, in the end. It's quite a different task. If you land in New York, you must get on with everybody. Armenian, and Jew, and Italian, and Pole, and everybody. But if you want to bring about the ultimate peace of the -- human, all the religions and all

the worshipers of God, obviously it doesn't help you that you are nice to this fellow and nice to that fellow. That doesn't melt down his creed at all, you see. So gentlemen, humanism and Judaism are eternal contrasts. One aims at the end, at the final unification. And the other aims on an immediate compromise. And we need both. You could not live with either one for one minute. Jews and Greeks are of -- both of ultimate necessity. Since there are so many tribes, and there are so many blood strands -- strains, and since there are so many climates, and so many regions, and so many kingdoms, and states, and republics, gentlemen, you have to have two catalysts: one catalyst that makes life tolerable, and therefore the great catchword of humanism is "tolerance," and rightly so. You have to tolerate one another. But if there was only tolerance, this would all dissolve in nothingness. There would be no structure to any life, because we only would hear, "One is as good as the other." You could never say why a Tibetan -- prayer mill was not just as good as the seven words on the Cross.

So gentlemen, Judaism is discriminatory. It distinguishes the upper and the lower, the primitive and the superior. And it waits. And it says, nothing as of today is more than a compromise. It is only as of now. It has no future. It bridges the gap at this moment in an emergency. But it is not the solution which explains how these various compromise units at any one time should disgorge their stream of life into one greater unity. And it's very hard for you to distinguish. As you know, when the Jews came into this country, they all became humanists. And when the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists or the Puritans came to this country, they all became Jews. That is, you have here a queer misunderstanding in this country. You have the strictness of the observance of the Puritans, which was a -- renewal of the old Israel, very strictly so. And you have a tremendous achievement in tolerance. And the bearers of this are -- you -- are, as I said, { } to, in a great exchange so that the Gentiles are the Jews and the Jews are the Gentiles, so to speak, if you call the { } Greeks. And it is very difficult for you, gentlemen, to respect both, and to understand that both are indispensable. You cannot do purely with expectation of the ultimate messianic hope and its fulfillment. And you cannot do only with emergency compromises, from day to day. It is very difficult for you to understand, gentlemen. But the whole liberal arts college has been founded on the assumption that you could understand it. That's why the Bible was usually read here in this college, as you know, and the Biblical history of mankind was given, and the Greek and Latin classics were read at the same time. And that is the miracle of education for the last {five} hundred years, that by giving you both strands of the trans-scribal -- trans-tribal and trans-imperial solutions, you would be able to create in your own generation the solution between the two, the creative Christian step between Greeks and Jews.

In some form or other, gentlemen, we have to do this, also in our generation, without the labels. You can today judge nobody by saying "He's Jewish," or "He's Christian." Doesn't tell any story. Mr. Freud was a great Greek, although the people claim they know that he was Jewish. He had Venus on his desk, the goddess Venus. And he meant it. He is a great Greek. And therefore, I -- I -- as -- I say this in advance, we will deal with the Greeks and with the Jews much more elaborately in the next two weeks, but I have to tell you this beforehand: that you and I are still concerned with these two groups. We don't call them this way. We call the one perhaps the -- the political progressive party, or the revolutionary, or the -- the escha- -- today there is a new word in theology, you may have heard, "eschatology," which is heard -- bandied around. Who has heard this -- this terrible word, "eschatology"? It's so hard to pronounce, you have to {cough} first, and to {cough} afterwards. But it means the same. "Eschatology" means the finding in Christianity the Judaic element of expectation, of unrest, of restlessness, of judging the future in the light of -- the -- judging the present in the light of the future. That's eschatological. And that is the element of Abraham when he said, "I am not able to foretell what my son Isaac is going to do, but I devote my power of life to his future and not to my own will."

So I wanted only to place before you the strange fact, gentlemen: that the two groups that in antiquity superseded the most primitive creations of man -- the tribal order and the imperial order, the Greeks and the Jews -- have not left us, because the element of the final goal, and the element of immediate tolerance between the -- more than one form of life are of the greatest importance to -- to you and me at this moment, and at any moment because our world is plural. The empires and the tribes are all mixed up, you see, and meet constantly. And therefore, they need two things. The -- keeping the road open to the ultimate goal, where the tree -- in which direction the tree must grow, and keeping those lea- -- twigs and branches of the tree from entanglements, from ruining themselves. The tree has to be kept clear from disease, and clear from -- the -- the one -- one branch breaking down and crushing the others.

So Greeks and Jews, gentlemen, are eternal entities. And if you could only take this now down, and underline it: the Greeks and the Jews are neither tribes nor empires. They contain tribal and imperial, or country, elements. The Jews have land -- a country, and the Jews have tribes. The Greeks have cities and temples, but they have no priesthood with power. And they have families, but they have no vendetta. They have made peace between the various clans. And it's still therefore very important, gentlemen, that Greek and Hebrew is learned. If you don't do it, some people have to do it in the world, perhaps the Chinese,

because these two languages contain the -- of course, are built around this problem of bridging the gap now and of pointing to the ultimate goal at the end of time, gentlemen. This -- you must not think that a language is spoken wantonly. I give you a last example of why this country is so sick. In Greek, you do not only say, "I do this, and I do that," as one man write -- wrote a paper for me here the other day, "I -- Cardinal Newman converted to Christianity, to the Catholic Church."

I sat down, "Pardon me, he was converted." But in this poor English language which you speak, everybody is active, everybody is doing the thing, and doing another thing, and so he finally ends in Brattleboro, because nobody can do all the things that have to be done, himself. You are all overactive.

In Greece, Greeks -- the Greek language, there is this wonderful wisdom that you can say of -- of an action, "I know not if I sink or swim." You know the famous poem, the English poem, you see? "There is a ship and it sails the sea," you know this, yes? "But not" -- wie? "And the sea is as deep as deep can be. But not so deep as the love I am in. I know not if I sink or swim." And the Greeks have a special verbal form for this. Because no Greek knew very often whether he was an Egyptian, or an Athenian, or a Spartan, and so they -- invented the medium form. "I -- am in this. I am in love," you may express. But not even that much, "I am," but "I in love, love in me." And nobody can decide in this verbal form who is doing what, because it is just as much done to you as you do it. Now, gentlemen, if more of you knew this, there would be less visitors to Mr. McKenna, because you all have this fancy idea that either you have to do it, or -- you see, or you're sick, or you are -- cannot fulfill your will. You are all over-willed, because your language is very one-sided, utterly lopsided. And therefore, gentlemen -- I mean this -- the people rediscover these Greek and Hebrew languages, I think, in the future as medications. It's much better than barbital to keep you awake, You take drugs, gentlemen, for your body. It is high time, that you again begin to know that when I talk to you, I try to give you medicine. I try to -- try to make you say that there are quite other ways of judging your own actions, and of dealing with your own life. And that's why we still have to speak of the Greeks and the Jews.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Student introduction: (Philosophy 58, April 15th, 1954.)

... the Bible, { } nearly always misunderstood, you can turn which way you want. After the last meeting, I received a question from one of you: How can you treat the Bible scientifically? And I said, "Verbal, verbal," because I was so totally exhausted, there were other men around. I had just talked for one hour and-a-half, and I had really -- made an attempt not to say any more than I had to. So I received a very reproachful letter, because this word "verbal" had not been understood. What I tried to say -- and probably too briefly -- was that I did not have -- did not analyze the Bible last time scientifically at all. And that was just a verbal abuse of the term -- "scientific." That it was verbiage to call -- pin me down on "scientific." What I have tried to do is make you read the Bible. Now, if a child is reading Alice Through the Looking Glass, or Alice in Wonderland, and I'm trying to explain this by drawing the chessboard, as you know, which is in some books -- there's a picture -- that's not scientific. But that's just an attempt to -- to translate the book into terms a child can understand, that's all. So I tried to translate the Bible for you, because the Bible has to be translated to every generation afresh. That has nothing to do with what you call "science." I said it's a worldly book. It's a secular book. It has neither -- the Bible has nothing to do with what you call "religion," with pious hypocrisy, or going to church. But it is a true book of the people that have looked for being created in the future. As far as you still believe, although you go to church, that you will be created in the future, you are adherents of this Biblical tradition, which has been inculcated into the nations of the earth for the first time, then and there. Most of the churchgoers in the United States obviously don't wish to be changed at all. They want to be as old as Methuselem, backward, and no future. So of course these people may treat the Bible as a sacred book. Then they don't have to heed it. But if you treat it as a worldly book, gentlemen, that's not {treating} it scientifically. That's treating as a part of the oxygen which is in your s- -- air.

And let me therefore first give you some vital statistics on the Bible, because the last century has, in your own brains and the brains of your parents, and your grandparents, made a tremendous devastation about the Bible. And that has been done by science. And I'm trying to get you out into the open air where there is neither a sacred book, nor the battle against the sacred book. I'm not interested in either one. I'm not -- I think the Biblical critics are insane, and the fundamentalists are lazy. That's by and large, the relation of their two minds. But they are not interesting. I have never understood how anybody could be inter-

ested in Biblical criticism, in the proof that the Jews didn't believe in one God, but they were just as stupid as we are, believing in hydrogen bombs instead. We are idolaters. You live -- believe in the standard of living, of course. You believe in many gods. But the Jews certainly didn't. But now, for the last hundred years, there wa- -- has been a desperate effort by science to prove that the Jews were idolaters. That's your scientific analysis, by taking it for granted that the agnosticism of the scientists is the -- normal, and that the Jews are perverts, idiots, superstitious, primitive, what-not, tribal, naturalistic -- all the things you have learned in your life, and you are filled with prejudices and superstitions about the Bible. Now gent- -- just let me put down something very simple. Then we'll talk about it. There is -- Moses is mentioned -- you take down, and make a little list -- statistics -- I get this from the famous Concordance, which is the most beautiful book next to the Bible. That's the list of all the places where one word or the other is used in the Bible. It's -- have you -- has anybody ever seen a Concordance? Very useful book. Most interesting for all studies in the history of the human spirit. And -- you will laugh, but it is true that you can -- recognize the character of this Bi- -- book, by taking down the following figures:

Moses is mentioned 952 times -- 952 times; in the New Testament, out of these 952, 80 times. David is mentioned -- the King David, 1134 times, out of which 57 concern the New Testament. Adam is mentioned 31 times. Abraham is mentioned 320 times. "Prophet" and "prophets" are mentioned 500 times. Bear with me. You cannot immediately see the usefulness of these figures. "Peace" is mentioned 400 times. "War" is mentioned 250 times. Egypt is mentioned 600 times. Earth, 1200 times. "The land," 1800 times. "The tribes," 400 times. "The heavens," 750 times. Did I say Solomon? Did I give you the figure on Solomon?

(No.)

Well, it's quite interesting. Solomon is 299 times. You see, one-quarter only of David.

Now the decisive terms for the book are -- Israel, that's 2,800 times; God, that's 4,600 times; and "the Lord," that's 8,841 times. Of course, this is eas- -- there are -- may be mistakes. It's doesn't matter, I mean, one or the other. But I have tried to be quite careful. Now don't laugh, gentlemen. The Biblical critics of the 19th century and of your own time, because you live far back in the 18th century with your mind -- all Americans do, that's why they are so obsolete; because anybody who believes in the latest news belongs to the year 1750, when people began to press for the latest news. Any serious person today is not interested in the latest

news, because we know that the latest news are not the things that make the world. But you believe in the latest news, and therefore you are 200 years behind the times. And therefore, gentlemen, the great ambition of the people in 1750 and the next 200 years was to prove that the latest news are the best news, and therefore, the older back, the more stupid people had to be.

Therefore the Jews were stupid. And therefore, it had to be proven that Moses had not existed. Modern critics-- -- critics of the -- the chairs of theology in our universities all over the globe say, "Moses has never lived. He is an invention." The corresponding myth as -- with regard to the New Testament's scientific myth, the myth of -- fabricated for the conscience of the scientists themselves -- is that there were no four Gospels, but just one out of which all the other evolved. Mark is the source Gospel, and the others evolved out of this. John is put out of the way as very late, and Matthew and Luke are just derived from Mark. And it's a similar destruction. If there is only one Gospel, you see, one original Gospel, then the Bible of the New Testament is just a story, as any other -- as Herodot-- as Herodotus, or Virgil, or Dante. Because the whole miracle of the New Testament is that there are four Gospels. That is the miraculous story, that four people were of the same spirit, and that you don't have to look into the letter of any one Gospel, but that the spirit is between the four Gospels.

Therefore the -- the New Testament critics fight against the Holy Spirit. And the Old Testament critics fight against the children of Israel as the chosen people. So Moses has to go, in the Biblical criticism of the antiquity, because if there is no Moses, then, gentlemen, what is the consequence? Then the Jews are a pre-Egyptian primitive tribe, which is the general assumption, which you hear in all your traditions now. Then they didn't supersede the Egyptian empire. They didn't go beyond the pharaohs, as I have tried to show you. But they fell behind. They just went into the desert, like the Bedouins around Egypt, of which I have spoken to you, like the nomads with the totem pole, and circumcision, and orgies, and initiation, and warpath, and constant war. And the general attempt has been to throw the Israelites before the times of Egypt, and to show they are just tribes -- 12 tribes, yes -- but very primitive, to be neglected, and nationalist-- -- nationalistic Semites or what-not. The very term "anti-Semite" is, of course, really an anti-Semitic term, in the sense that the Jews are -- cease -- cease to be interesting if they are Semites. They are only interested -- -ing, if they are more than Semites, because the Arabs are Semites, gentlemen. The Assyrians are Semites. The Babylonians are Semites. And the Jews are the Jews, despite the fact that they are Semites. The invention of the name "anti-Semites," by the so-called scientific school in the 19th century, is really the destruction of the Bible and the position of the people of the Bible, because as the people of God -- the people of

the Bible are the people to be created in the future. And as Semites, they are the 12 tribes out of which this material people -- race came in which was to be the kernel of the future kingdom of Heaven on earth. You must understand that the word "anti-Semite" already -- or "philo-Semite," for that matter -- already shifts -- begs the question. Anybody who says that he is an "anti-Semite" has abolished Judaism, Israel, the Bible, revelation, and the story of the unification of the human race. Very clever. You can be an anti-Israelite, but that's more complicated. Most people are ashamed of that. That you can be. But you cannot be an anti-Semite, because the Jews have nothing to do with the Semites. Sem in the Bible is, as Japheth and as Ham, the father of any number of Gentile nations. And the Jews are the terrible group that was not even Semites, but declined to be either Semites or Japhethites or Hammites. That's the whole problem. That's why they're called the fighters for God, Isra-el.

Now, as to this statistic, gentlemen. If you break out the person of Moses, as you see, you {elimit} thousand -- 1,000 places of the Bible. That's quite a number. But if you then say that the -- originally the Jews were just as superstitious as the Egyptians or their neighbors, the Canaanites, the Philistines, et cetera, you take away the cause for which the Bible is written, the cause of the Lord. You cannot eliminate 15 -- 13, as I count, more than 13,000 places in the Old Testament and the New Testament in which the word "Lord" and "God" occurs, and the word "people." The word "people" occurs, as you have seen, 2,300 times; "God," 4,600 times; and "Lord," 8,800 times, which together is 15,000, if I have guessed right, isn't it?

In other words, gentlemen, because of these three terms, the book is written. It is written for no other purpose. And if you take that out, it would be just as funny as if you would take out of The Iliad the name Achilles, and out of The Odyssey the name Odysseus. It would be exactly the same. You must put on the left-hand side of your ledger the Bible -- Old and New Testament -- and on the right-hand side The Iliad and The Odyssey, and you must admit that The Iliad and The Odyssey are humanistic songs on two great heroes. And the Bible is the two epics of the acts of God with men. And if you eliminate God, you have no story. And you cannot have Dante's Divine Comedy without Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven. If you take that out, and say, "Dante wrote a story, and belatedly the theologian -- or a theological superstition introduced then the notion of Hell and Purgatory and Heaven," you make yourself ridiculous. Now if you say that the Bible was written as a chronicle of the tribes who came to -- into Canaan by some mystical reason and later the word of the one God and the Lord was introduced -- or of Moses -- you make yourself -- or of "people," you make yourself ridiculous.

But that's what the insanity of the agnostic, college mind has done. You people of this -- these colleges of West- -- the Western world have done this. And can you be surprised that the answer is Bolshevism. Your science, your belief has produced Bolshevism. After all, who are the Russians? The Russians were people who a hundred years sent their students to colleges in the Western world because they had no decent schools of their own. Then these tur- -- people turned tail and made a revolution in Russia. And now we deplore their actions. And they do exactly what every natural scientist on the Western world has preached for the last hundred years. We are the Bolsheviks, and now we are very rueful about it. We sold our poorest enlightenment to the Russians. They aren't any worse than Benjamin Franklin in their stupidity of enlightenment, in their rationalization, in their ridicule of all revelation. Do you think Mr. Benjamin Franklin had more -- to say about God than -- than Mr. Lenin? Much less. And here, you hear even the president of the United States said they are atheists. Well, atheism was the fashion in America for the last 200 years. The people who did believe in God were called fundamentalists. I am a fundamentalist. Much better -- a fundamentalist than to be a liberal.

But you haven't to be either. These parties are just nonsensical, gentlemen. They have nothing to do today with -- with the real situation. We are either a people that is still waiting for being created, gentlemen, or we are a tribe, or we are an empire. As an empire, we must go with General Motors and live for the standard of living. And as tribes, we must go with Gerald K. Smith, and be anti-Semites. And as a people, we have the greatest responsibility on the globe, because we must lead the way into some unity of the human society. Now take your pick.

But I -- what I was going to say, gentlemen, is that I am not scientific when I talk this way of you to Bible. I tried to say what these strange people wanted to undertake. And I tried to show you that if they speak of the Lord, and God, and themselves as the people, or His people 15,000 times, that they obviously meant it, and that all your delightful scientific objectivity and criticism is ridiculous, because it says that the Jews can be understood without God. That's the whole story of Biblical criticism. Let's see how far we can go to explain Israel and Judaism on -- from economic conditions, from their environment, from their so-called background, you see. And the fatality about a messianic group is that they are everything despite their background, you see. If you look at St. Paul, you would not expect that he ever became an Apostle to the Gentiles, because you -- he didn't look Jewish. And certainly Our Lord did. They always paint them as a -- as a Nordic-race man. Don't be betrayed, you see. He had no comeliness, and no

beauty. You would have not greeted Him on the street. It's very complacent, I mean, very easy to say that he was -- looked beautiful. It's the only thing He didn't.

Here in town, we had a minister who -- of whom the children said, "That's the way Christ must have looked," so that was the end of Christianity, and the minister now gets a divorce.

And I have -- old people that say admiringly, "Oh, if he only were this way. Isn't it beautiful that the children say so." Well, children know nothing of Christ, and of the crucifixion, and of the passion.

But gentlemen, the Biblical criticism have been very successful. Here today we have Maundy Thursday and we have college classes. And tomorrow is Good Friday, and we have college. And Monday is Easter Monday and we have classes, so {I think} atheism has conquered. Nobody any -- believes anymore either in the exodus of the Jews, which is on this Friday, or in the crucifixion, which the -- and the Maundy Thursday, the -- the transfer of the Easter festival, the Pesah festival -- the Pesah lamb to the Lord Himself on today and tomorrow. I'm ashamed of myself. It's a -- strange how this country has really mastered the Bi- -- {Biblical criticism} to get rid of the Jews and the Christianity in the same -- at the same time.

It is astounding. I haven't yet found out when it really happened. It's -- it's not older, I think, at Dartmouth College than 35 years, that the last vestige of the calendar of the Jews and the Christians has been abolished. I don't think it was true in the 19th century, because we had still -- chapel service. Now if you have chapel service every day, I suppose, there would also have been some mentioning of Maundy Thursday and -- and Good Friday.

Now today, gentlemen, is such an important day because, as you know, very rarely this is the case -- is at the same time today the Jewish Easter and the Christian Easter. And this exodus from Egypt, with which the whole story of the unifying human race stands and falls, has been eliminated by the Biblical critics, because they say it has never taken place.

I -- I bought, unfortunately on my own -- for my own money, I should never have done this -- the last three books, the best books, scientific books on the history of Israel. And in all three books, the pretension is that Moses has never lived, that the -- on the Sinai the Ten Commandments were not given, or if they were given, that's the wonderful -- speculation of one of these gents, that is, then

the 72 elders of Israel obviously went up to the mountain without Moses. There was no necessity for one man leading the 72. Can you imagine 72 people of some unit that doesn't exist, according to these critics, you see, which is just some Bedouins, you see, walking up to Sinai to get the Ten Commandments, only from hatred against the tradition on Moses, to destroy the fact that 72 people certainly have to be led by a dictatorial person, because otherwise there is no discipline among the 72 elders. It is such a fantastic speculation. You just read any one of these things, and it's just to be laughed at. They are funny. But unfortunately you people were delighted -- I mean, as representing the average American free mason -- they were delighted, because you could whip your minister. You could whip your priest. You could slap them in the face for their superstition. You got rid of authority. Especially divorced people love that, because if -- if the priest can be shown that his Bible is not valid, of course, he has no right to say, "There shall be no divorce." Very simple, because then the Ten Commandments go, too. If you find people over 25, and they rant against the Church, always ask, "Are you divorced?" And younger men, as you know, have also very good reason in a similar direction, to deny the existence of God.

That's how you can divide men -- humanity, by and large, in these two groups: the unmarried for their troubles, and the married for their troubles, and they have all -- every reason to say, "There is no God." It's too cheap, gentlemen, to -- to discuss these things on this level, but I must mention them, because you -- most people discuss the existence of God on this cheap level, of their own personal fear that they might be found out. They don't know that God is very indifferent to their troubles at 14, their troubles at 21, their troubles at 28, in this respect. He has made us troublesome in this part of our body, so probably He is not against it.

Gentlemen, the story of the 7 and the 12 I used last time as an example for the way in which the Bible tries to cure men from their {two of} superstitions of ancestor-worship and mother's apron strings, the Oedipus complex; and on the other hand, of their astrological complexities, of 12 months and 365 days, and the zodiac, and "don't go on the Thursday into the cellar, because otherwise the cellar door will fall upon you," I mean, as all these wonderful columns in the newspapers read.

The -- the atrocities of Egypt, and the atrocities of the {Scythes}, as the Bible calls them, the Sioux, you would say, the Apaches, the -- Shawnee -- Indian, of the Indian, the red man, you see, those two atrocities are fought by the Bible, throughout. And so I suggest that you read the Bible as polemics. You can only

understand the Bible if you understand that it is polemical. To give you an example: Noah comes after a great flood. The pharaoh governs after the flood, and on the basis of the flood. In Babylon, the same was done in the empire of the two rivers, Euphrates and Tigris, and it was the same in China: the authority of the emperor rests on his understanding when the floodwaters will reach their high mark, and when they will begin to ebb. In all these cases, a priesthood has to be appointed, which watches the stars, and the movements in the skies, over hundreds and hundreds of years. Now the first thing you find in Israel is that there are no priests of this caliber. There is nobody who has to observe and to keep records.

The only thing the Jews believe in is the present-day sign. And the extreme -- extreme case of which scientific people always boast, because they don't understand it, is the famous story of Joshua, for whom the sun stood still, and the moon, and the day was prolonged. What it means, gentlemen, is that all the festivals of the Jews rested on observed new events. The Jews are the people of real history, of experienced events; whereas the Egyptians are the people of scientific calculation and prediction. The sorcerers of pharaoh said, in 1460 years, you remember, the Great Year would recur. And it did recur, in the { }, in 1321, you remember, and in 139 of our own era, the Great Year of 2780 B.C. did recur. Mind you, that's some achievement -- feast, some positive thing.

Now the Jews celebrate Easter, gentlemen, I don't know the details, on an observed date of the New Moon, but they had horsemen, on the New Year Day in Jerusalem, waiting till the new sickle of the moon appeared, and then sending out these horsemen all into the Diaspora of Judaism to tell them: this moon, which is really there. This was their means of fighting astrology, that they waited actually because, perhaps, the Lord, in His all-powerfulness, did decide to {disavow}, to disavow the priests, because God is the m- -- god of the future. And so serious were the Jews in every detail, in every feature, concerned with his newness, in his futurism, in his futurity, that you could not pin him down on any law that had gone on before.

Now you may have heard that the most modern physicists have discovered that they cannot predict the future. You hear perhaps that they now say it's only probable. But you are not sure. They have given up prediction. They say there is no natural law in the sense in which you believed -- believe in it. It's very strange that they have come back to this deep reverence for the freedom of the future. God is free. Jewish Easter, gentlemen, is different from every Egyptian or naturalistic harvest festival or holiday, because it waits until it has happened. The Jews have created, gentlemen, the sequence of unbelievable facts which we call

history, and of which I have tried to tell you in the first two meetings here. I said, "History is the sequence of the unbelievable events," you see. Egyptian astrology is the story of the predictable events. And the tribal history is the history of loyalties, unchangeable loyalties where the past must explain the present and the future. But gentlemen, you and I know that the future explains the past and the present. If you have graduated after having flunked 50 courses, and stayed on for four more years than originally planned, then you have suddenly the meaning and the key of your life so far. Well, I mean, any failure, any trouble you go through is only explicable by its outcome. There are fruitful failures, as you know, failures that are inevitable and desirable. And there are useless failures, and we only know from the end. That Jesus didn't die in vain on the Cross, we know today. He didn't. That's why He was -- desperate. So there was the Resurrection.

And fruitful failure, gentlemen, is the content of the Jewish and the Christian story. "By their fruits, ye shall know them," the Jews say. Science says, "By their causes, ye shall know them." That's the opposite. If you -- we should know all of you by your causes, gentlemen, not one of you would be found to merit, to deserve survival. But we all hope for your fruits, so we give you a time of grace. We are all spared, because we still may bear fruit. "By their fruits you shall know them" is the opposite judgment from what the -- world, the Gentiles, the heathen, in your own heart always do. You always judge people by their family background, or the bank account, or their noses, or what-not. But God seems to judge us by our fruits. And so He gives us time, gentlemen. From the very day of birth, we are on probation. And nothing will be held against us, of our background, of our environment, if the probation period proves that we can make good. And that's, I think, the very generous treatment given to most people in this country. That's why it's still a very good country, gentlemen. It is -- we are God's country as long as this is done. America is God's country as long as Mr. Oppenheimer is judged by his fruits, and not by his association.

This is a very practical measure, gentlemen. In Egypt, and in the tribe, everybody is judged -- just judged by his ancestors, or by the stars under which he is born. Don't you understand this? This is very practical. And the stars are just his environment, his class, his grouping, his caste, his profession, where he is found. You all do this, but you know better. I mean, most of you have this strain of the -- in you -- true Israel in themselves, that you are able to forget how a man looks, and to forget what you know of this man, and to wait for he's going to do. Give the man a chance. Give him an opportunity. Isn't that true? Gentlemen, that was unheard before the Jews left Egypt. Unheard. It seemed to be impossible that the future could ever win out over the past or the present. And yet, that's the whole

story. We mean by revelation, gentlemen, something so simple that it has completely lost your -- the orbit of your mind.

You live without revelation. It has no meaning, this word, for you. Now put in the word "veil" instead. The Jews say that God has veiled the past and the future -- present before it is unveiled by the future events. That Bill Mitchell was right was revealed, unveiled by the second World War. Isn't that true? Nobody can know it beforehand. And you are so impatient that you want to predict it and to know it beforehand. Most of you have no -- no patience and no perseverance with this, what Winston Churchill always in his memoir and his books on the World Wars called "the unfolding" of the story. The unfolding of the story. If people -- you don't know of any unfolding. You want -- you know how they write these paragraphs in these newspapers. You learn it even as creative writing, I think, that you have first to tell the whole story in the beginning, and then you enlarge it, and then you have to enlarge it once more. You have no patience, you see. You give away the whole secret at once. God doesn't. He creates a baby. And in the cradle you have no idea what this child is going to do. Savior of the world? Ridiculous. Just one more child in Bethlehem. Have him be killed. So his parents have to intercede and say, "This child is more important than all the other children of Bethlehem. If Herod is going to kill this child -- the other children, we are sacrificing our homeland, and my profession, and my Social Security number, and we are going to Egypt." And that's how the New Testament starts: with the importance of one child, in the cradle, you see, just wetting its -- its pants. And it is important, if somebody loves you so much that he imparts importance to you. The -- child -- the child Jesus is only important because He has two special parents. His foster father and His mother are better than the others, because they sacrifice more for the child. That's the whole story. Otherwise He wouldn't have survived in the first place.

You never read this Bible however with -- except with these rose glasses. It's all wonderful. Gentlemen, it isn't wonderful. It's a very terrible story, that the poor parents, in order to save this one child's life, had to get out of their country, you see. Statue of Liberty in reverse. They want their -- come to the promised land of liberty, you see, with their forefathers from Egypt and now they went back into Egypt to save the savior of the world. Isn't that a ridiculous sarcasm, irony?

To give you an example, gentlemen, of the problems now of the Jews, to wait for the observable event. We may say then, gentlemen, that the tribes are for the facts. "Fact" is a word of the past, what has happened before. And the Jews are the people of the fiat. Fie-at, you say, or fiat?

(Fiat.)

Wie?

(Fiat.)

You see? Let there be light. Fiat lux. That's from which this word f-i-a-t, fiat-money for example, is taken. We only use it for money today. Fiat-money and the government prints notes, you see, and gives us -- benefits of an inflation, which we have today. That's fiat-money, nothing behind it. Just puffed up. But fiat in the Bible is the creative act of God which is unique.

So gentlemen the word "event" is the backbone of all history. And the word "fact" is the backbone of old science. Facts are repetitive. Events are unique. The story of the Bible is the chain of unique events. And therefore, gentlemen, God can only appear in oneness. It is very strange to you to think that the oneness of God should be connected with the human self-cognition, self-knowledge of you and me. You always think that this is an abstract discussion, to discuss God, or the gods. I have tried to show you that the heathen, the Gentiles had to have many gods, because the pharaoh had to be a member of the divine family. The Greek gods also had to form a family, so that the king could be Zeus-born. The family the -- of the polytheistic civilization, gentlemen, is a necessity. Otherwise the ruler cannot be one of them. And I tried to show you that the ruler is the one double-star who can go from south to north, you see, and add to the divine powers the one feature no star in Heaven has. You remember this? In the same manner, the Jews -- because seeing all men eventuated, waiting for being created -- can only think of the power of the next step as the one thing necessary -- the uno necessario in the Bible -- the one thing that is to solve the dilemma, and the chaos, and the war, and the revolution: the peacemaker, the power that can take the next step. If you think of your own future, gentlemen, and your own past, you will agree with me that your past looks checkerboard-like, as I -- I put it here like a feather, many-fold. You went to the West, and you went to Europe, and you had to cele- -- celebrated your father's birthday, celebrated your mother's birthday, you went to one school, and you went to this football match, and you met this girl. This is all polytheistic. Many stories to be told. On one day, you go to the toilet, you go to the dinner table, you go to the bath -- under the shower, you go to the classroom, it's just incredible the variety of environments in which you find yourself, when you look back. But at this moment, when I ask you, "How do you bring on the future?" you can only do it by one act. The next act is always that narrow gate, you see -- as in the hourglass, through which this grain

of sand has to pass, otherwise you can't reach your own future.

The next thing in the future, is always one. God then in Israel, and for all {living} believers today, is that narrow pass of events with -- who -- to -- all taken together are the history of God with men. And therefore, gentlemen, will you take this down? Nobody can ever speak of God without at the same time defining man. And nobody can speak of man without at the same time defining God. If you believe in many men, you must believe in many gods, which most of you do. It's very difficult to believe in one god, because God obviously created the Russians, and yourself, and Mr. McCarthy; and that's not so easy to understand. One god is really quite an imposition. Very few people can believe in one god all their lives. They may talk about it. I mean, they may use some abstract formulas. But gentlemen, can you -- do you really know that the worst command ever given to man is that you -- thou shall love God with your whole heart, your whole soul, and all your powers? That means that you only can at any one time love whole-heartedly one, that neighbor which is sent to you by God for this moment to be loved. You all quote always the second half of this, the Jewish command. You know, that's in the Old Testament, the command I'm quoting now, that thou shall love your -- the Lord your god, with your whole heart, your whole power, and all -- and your whole soul; and your neighbor as yourself. But you always very sentimentally quote this, that you should love your neighbor as yourself, and the -- most good people in this country think that this means they must never love themselves. But at least, you must love the -- yourself as much as your neighbor. We would have less hysterical -- less with nervous breakdown if there weren't so many of you trying to love their neighbor more than themselves. The vice of America is not that people love their neighbor less than themselves. They -- most -- most people really try to love their neighbor more than themselves, especially parents their children. That's why the children are all degenerate, because the parents try to love their children more than themselves. That's bad. Never asked by God. Never do that. Spank them.

The children have no more right before God than you have. But they -- that's the -- the morose humanitarianism of Mrs. Roosevelt, and see the outcome. But gentlemen, we must love God with our whole heart, soul, and power, something you cannot do, because you do not even know you have a soul. You deny it. You say, -- I -- in psychology, that's -- is the description of man without a soul, which it is. Psychology is the science of man without a soul, just with a psyche. So most of you don't believe in the soul anymore. And it's much more interesting, by the way, if you watch people, to find out if they believe in the soul, or if they believe in God. I mean, most people don't know whether they

believe in God or not. I mean, they talk about it, but they have no idea what it really means. But if you catch them, gentlemen, that they only believe in the human mind, and not in the soul, that's verifiable. That means that they have withheld one great part of their being when they follow their star, as we say today -- with an Egyptian notion -- and as the believers say, when they believe -- try to believe in God.

If you say you have no soul, you omit, obviously, one important part of the Biblical tradition by which you should love God. You know what the soul is? It's the power in you and me by which you can overthrow your mentality. The Jews had to overthrow the mentality of the tribal chieftain, when Abraham did not sacrifice Isaac. I tried to tell you this. And the -- Moses had to overthrow the mentality of his professorship and Ph.D. business in Egypt when he said, "I do not care for the business cycle, and for the standard of living, and for the fleshpots of Egypt. And I am leading people in the desert, because the desert is infinitely better than the fleshpots of Egypt. The standard of living must be destroyed." And he called this the golden calf. The standard of living is -- stands in the way of a man's relation as a free soul to his god, because the soul is the un-lived part of you and me, by which you can smash your own mental idols. And I tried to tell you last time that certainly the first mental idol of this country is the standard of living. Nobody can be heard in public who says, "I don't care for the standard of living." He can never be elected to public office. A man who says this is just out in this country. He's an out -- outcast. He -- you cannot say it here. No minister is allowed to say in the pulpit, "Down with the standard of living." And yet that would be the old -- the old Gospel truth, you see, that the human soul may demand from you that you forego all these -- these things, these items. And the whole nation may have to forego it.

But they -- when you ask the American people by plebiscite: third World War or standard of living? They'll all accept the third World War, gladly, in honor of the standard of living. All. Imagine this. And -- please take me to task if I'm wrong. If you put this question to the electorate today, they'll say we must defend the standard of living, even at the expense of the hydrogen bomb. Isn't that true?

It's very strange. Peace is not the goal of any worldly civilization, but one of these idols. Not peace.

[tape interruption]

... that's what I want -- meant -- mean to say. I love all these gadgets, but I try

to live, and I think you must try to live, too, in such a way that it makes no difference whether you have them or not. That's all. They aren't important. They're very nice, because the soul, gentlemen, is the discovery of the Jews as something opposed to the mind and the body. These -- ancestral worship of the tribe is through the body. The tribe is a tattoo-carrying civilization, you remember, and the holy writ of the tribe is on every warrior's body. And he expresses then, he represents, as we say, he embodies -- you know -- he embodies the order of the tribe by his body.

In Egypt, the mind of the priest, the wisdom of the Egyptians, the calendar-lore, the astrolog- -- the astrology, the science of Egypt embodies in the hieroglyphs of the temples the truth about Egypt. But in Judaism, gentlemen, who embodies Israel? The heart of man. The heart of. This organ, which is abolished, as you know, in sociology and psychology -- which are the two Egyptian sciences of our days -- they are two sciences which have tried to describe humanity without speaking of soul and God. They are very significant. It's a pre-Jewish, a pre-revelation science. They say we can know of man without taking account his soul and his heart. The same with psychoanalysis. In psychoanalysis, you have only gen- -- genitals. That's all. And in psychology, you only have a brain with certain nerve reactions, a central spinal system. And in both cases, you have no heart, because what is the heart, gentlemen? The heart, if it is in you and me, the delegation, the messenger of the whole. Your heart is in the left place, here, eccentrically, to yourself, to tell you whether you are in harmony with the rest of the universe. Not -- that's not a thought, gentlemen. But that's -- your conscience tell you so, as you well know. Very much against all your mental programs and systems. You know very well if you allow the heart to speak whether all your systems are not cruelty and just ridiculous, pride, arrogance, what-not. The human heart, gentlemen, overthrows the -- mental and the bodily passions. The heart overthrows, or jettisons, or emancipates you and me from our mental and physical passions. You cannot forego sensuousness, gentlemen, for the mind. The rationalists are always the most sensuous people. If you only have mind and body at the moment, you have to go to plenty of women. But if you have a heart, it's enough that one nice girl smiles at you and you are addressed. More is not necessary. The heart puts the body and the mind in place. Everybody knows this, but nobody's allowed to say these things in this country. Very strange. Because psychologists say there is no such liberating power. And the sociologists the same. You are always under the impact either of mental crazies or cultural lags, or any one of these nonsensical things which are good for animals, but not for you and me. Your heart and mind is at every one moment able to throw itself into the future. That's what we call the soul. The

soul is the heart's power which can crush mental and bodily passions. Now, gentlemen, it isn't good to call this just the heart, because the heart, as a physical, anatomical unit, you see, so to speak, is without connection with the mental and physical passions. We call this "soul," the heart's energy, efficacy, operations, so to speak, you see, when we see the heart getting involved with the contradictions of our body and of our mind. But on the other hand, it is just an operational or functional term for the human heart. Heart and soul, as used in the Old Testament, are there used as, so to speak, starting point and -- and function, you see. The heart is the -- the substratum, the substance, and the soul is the operative -- operative process of the heart.

But gentlemen, you can't get out of this. People who deny the soul, as I said, are much more representative of our civilization than people who deny God. Under the modern set-up in America for the last two years, people are very hazy now about God. I mean, they -- they are evasive, and the -- or they invoke the Fifth Amendment. But with regard to the soul, they are still quite insipid, and they say, "No, it hasn't been proved. There is no soul." Gentlemen, there never is a soul, because that's just like the people and like God. Of the soul you can only see -- say, it shall be as it shall be. What Moses heard of God in the burning bush, gentlemen, that God was He who shall be who He shall be, or who He will be, just as you please, that you can also say of the human soul. The human soul is that in you and of you that shall be as it shall be. And the human mind is that which just is, as an Egyptian mind, as a doctor -- doctor, Ph.D. He has a mind. { }.

And -- and the -- and your -- our bodies, that's just as we have received it. If you have a hunchback, you have a hunchback. If you have blue eyes, you have blue eyes. I mean, nothing you can do about it. That's just your background, your past.

You see, the terrible thing that has happened to you and me is that you call now "background" your social and spiritual in- -- heritage; the church, for example, from which you come. And that you call not the body your background. But the body is our background. In order to have a nobler race, you have to marry, if you do -- are not satisfied with your physical appearance. But in order to have a beautiful, divine soul, you don't have to wait for the next generation. This is still within you. The soul, gentlemen, is which -- that which you can realize. The body is that which you can only realize in the next generation. Now you have a strange idea of the opposite. You think that physically, by exercise and training and so on, you can do much about your looks. And the background? That's what your parents are, and the social register said about you. It's

the other way around, gentlemen. What the social register one day will tell -- say about you, that depends on you. But physically, I mean, here I am. I am not six feet eight. Can't do anything about it. It doesn't matter. I am the embodiment of the past, you see. But my soul is going to incarnate in generations to come. That's the relation, by and large, of embodiment and incarnation, gentlemen. That's -- I have to tell you, because in Judaism, the whole problem was to make adamantly and unmistakably clear that the soul was not to be identified with the embodiment that had already occurred. Neither the Egyptians nor the tribes were good enough for the Israelite faith. The Israelites live on the faith of things -- not yet seen -- to come.

So gentlemen, the -- Abraham lives on faith alone. When he had no son, and Sarah is 90, the gods speak -- said -- the gods come and say, "You will have a son and in he there shall be blessed all the generations of -- and all the nations." Ridiculous, you see. But St. Paul says of Abraham, "Abraham was justified by faith alone." There was nothing to be seen. No embodiment. And I really challenge you, gentlemen. Embodiment is always pluralistic, is always pluralistic, because it is always a thing of the past. The soul is not yet embodied. Now Christianity later comes and says, "We must take the Jewish promise out and say it has already begun to be incarnated, and there is more incarnation to come." That's a later item. I won't go into this. But I want to warn you that if you only get embodiment, as you believe in, then you do not understand this problem of revelation, that there are yet futurities, where the -- germ even of future embodiment hasn't been laid. We call the soul the seed of future embodiments. And we call these future embodiments the process of incarnation. And the word "incarnation" is -- I think, in your own -- ear you can hear the difference -- "incarnating," "incarnation" is a process; embodiment is a fact. And in this there is some wisdom, I embody somebody; I haven't been asked to do this. But if the soul of Christ incarnates in {His} Church, that means that His soul preceded, and His body then follows. Therefore we call incarnation the relation of soul and of body to come. Can you see this?

And Israel is the attempt of gathering enough free soul, enough free soul-energy. It's like now producing this new energy, atomic energy, gentlemen. Israel is a very sober, scientific event or action, undertaking. Israel is an attempt to dam up free-flowing ener- -- soul-energy for allowing a new start, a new incarnation, the next incarnation, for allowing God to find people who can do His will, and not saying, "I must do my will." The whole content of revelation is the projection of free human energy into a future which can dictate to this free energy, because it is not yet under dictation. It is not yet pre-formed. Can you see this? Any question, please about this? It's a difficult concept for you.

But I want you to -- I want to stress, gentlemen, that Israel is a very sober process. The Jews are really there. They are now there for 3,500 years. It's a long time. And the Christians are really there. And they have this problem of forming a free substance out of the human-coined racial matter, which can enter new alloys, new orders, new things. And all your liberal arts education, gentlemen, is an attempt to free you from your pre-formed prejudices, attitudes, obviously, gentlemen, to make you part of this new Israel, to make you maleable, to make you carriers of the substance we call "soul," and to make you independent of your mental and physical passions. Can you see this? The whole educational process, gentlemen, is a question of melting you down from pre-conceived notions, and pre-conceived superstitions, and pre-conceived narrownesses. It isn't enough to be your parents' son, gentlemen. You have to become man- -- God's son. And that takes some maleability. And you have to be exposed, therefore, to an attack on your mental and physical prejudices and passions. And under this attack, you may then become able to listen to the future, to the promise that not everything is as it is -- should be.

If we do not re-create this at any one moment, there is no history of the human race, gentlemen. It's all accident. If you are not entering into this melting pot, into this freedom, if you do not take again possession of this power -- which Moses created first, I suppose, or Abraham, but I think in Moses it became much more powerful -- then the whole story of the human race is lost. At any one generation, gentlemen, this exodus on Easter Day must occur again. Believe me, this is -- that's why we celebrate it. We don't celebrate Easter for the Easter eggs. And you don't celebrate the New Testament without the Old Testament. Jesus went out of Israel, and the Israelites went out of Egypt and that's one and the same act, because it means that the chosen people had left the fleshpots of Egypt, and when their own shell threatened to become a fleshpot, then one of them had also to leave Israel. And then -- only then, had all men inherited freedom. Can you see this? The group -- the Israelites leave Egypt in order to establish the soul. The soul in Israel had also to assert its freedom from Israel, after having asserted its freedom from tribes, and clans and empires; from tribes and Egyptians. Gentlemen, it is very simple to you, and it's very complicated, because it's terribly difficult to bring to your attention, even, that possibility which all your scientific training denies. Therefore you don't know today of Maundy Thursday, and you don't know of Good Friday, practically, in this college. It's accidental if some of you know of it. But most of you just go through the motions. Therefore I have to tell you in class. Somewhere this creative action has to take place again. And so I think that I have not treated the Bible scientifically. Is that true? Then

we have to have a break.

[tape interruption]

... has the task to re-write the previous story of mankind in the light of the newer discovery of a free choice. The chosen people now are free to choose. That's a very strange paradox, gentlemen, that if you serve the spirit of freedom, you are -- yourself free. If you serve the business cycle, you are yourself the slave of the business cycle. We always -- gentlemen, you must know this -- our gods make us and we make our gods. The rationalist of the 19th century, with its small logic, has always said, "Ah. We people -- people -- God is an invention of man." But the power that drives us, gentlemen, to be -- to depict God is God. If you worship numbers, the god of numbers is behind you. You are possessed by the Devil. His name is legion, in the Bible, as you know. "Legion" means numbers. People in this country are -- possessed by the dollar, believe in numbers, in figures. Their name is legion. Their god is legion; "legion" meaning just any number, untold numbers. Very strange that the New Testament just settles the issue very simply. "His name is legion," the Devil's name. It's a wrong god.

Gentlemen, anybody who serves his god then also begins to give this god features for other people to recognize. You can recognize in other people's face which god they serve. And in this sense, we make our gods palatable, understandable, translatable to others. But they say, "Oh, this man just invented God." The story's, however, complicated. God makes us, and then we build Him temples { } If you believe in fertility and wealth, you will make a -- a monument to the golden calf. And so you can say that the people of Egypt made golden calves. They made these gods, but obviously they were driven, or possessed by this thirst for work, this thirst for fertility, for bread, for storehouses of Egypt, this tremendous social security, which they were craving, as I told you, the standard of living as expressed by the golden calf. Now a person who believes in the standard of living is also creating the symbols of this belief -- the stock exchange, and the highways, and the many cars, and {such}, the gadgets -- expression of a standard of living. But it is much more complicated than the cynic thinks. God makes -- our God makes us.

If you have some experience, you know which gods have formed the face of a woman or a man whom you meet. You can see this quite well, which passion, which divinity has had sway out of the many gods, which most people worship. And if you find a man who believes in one god, which is very rare, you also can see it. If you see -- meet a good woman who is at peace, you feel that she has never been swerved from doing the next necessary thing. That's a religious

person, the person who has walked humbly with his Maker, as the Psalm says. You can't do more. Because in walking humbly with your Maker, you discover every day what is now the one thing asked from you. And if you listen to this carefully and obediently, you will remain in contact with the mainstream of life. If you are ever ruled -- are over-ruled by a fanaticism or one thing only all your life, you will probably go on a bypath of the divine, and will also be divine, but separated from the mainstream and thereby -- affect you and mankind quite diabolically.

The transformation, gentlemen, of the traditions of mankind into a beginning of the future, that is the Old Testament. The transformation of the traditions of the human race into the beginning of the future. You remember, it's just what I tried to tell you at the beginning of this course, that the past is that part of the future which already has come to pass, which therefore is already part of our story, because we depend on it in order to be able to do anything ourselves. This is -- therefore it has been rightly said that Israel has created the notion of history. The Bible is the first historical book. This has tremendous consequences. All events in the Bible only happen once. The cycle is reduced to a minimum, whereas in Egypt, and in the ancestors -- groups, you remember, the return is eternal. The grandson is called after the grandfather, because the grandfather comes to life again in the -- his very soul in the grandson. It's the same what happened in the past. And as the Egyptians believe in the Great Year, in the Bible, it is reduced to next to nothing in the No- -- story of Noah. If you read the story of Noah, it is an attempt to accept the great feats of the temple builders and the priests, and to reduce it to a minimum of enslavement. That's the meaning of the story of Noah. The flood is not annual. It happens only once. The result is not enslavement by the fleshpots, but a gladdening of the heart. The curse is taken from when -- which was according -- when E- -- after he had left Eden. For the Jews, you see, for the Old Testament, they didn't have to wait for Christ to do away with the fall of man. Noah reconciles man to God. You must not forget this. This is not -- unknown in Christian tradition, strangely enough. But for the Jew who reads the Bible, the story of the fall of man is lifted, or is reconciled, or is redeemed by the Great Flood. You cannot do more than kill everybody, can you? So Noah is a just man, so if you read the story of yourself with open eyes, you must understand that since all the rest of mankind is annihilated, obviously the curse of the children of Adam is redeemed. Makes no sense otherwise. But if I hear my Christian minister friends talk -- preach, they -- they always forget that there was already redemption in the -- in antiquity. And the first redemption of man was when man left the jungle and began to settle, and to recognize the great bliss of the calendar cycle. And so we go to Genesis, and you look up the -- the story of Noah. God blesses Noah: "While the earth remaineth, seedtime and

harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night shall not cease." That's Verse 22 of Chapter 8 of the Genesis, gentlemen, in which the whole superstitions of Egypt are blown to smithereens. In this one verse, the Old Testament keeps the good side of the Egyptian tradition, of the imperial traditions. And it says, "Here it is. There is a certain regularity in climate and seasons. But man is not his -- its slave." And so there is no story of wheat, of bulls, of the castration of bulls, and the raising of herds, and the producing of milk and cheese. They did all this, the Jews, but you know with Noah is connected with the Dionysian freedom of man to get drunk. The great story in the Bible, which is a very worldly story -- you see, the Jews were not Methodists -- they loved wine. And God even obviously was a smoker, you see, Lucky Strike, because he loved incense. That's tobacco smoke, after all. The -- God -- certainly the god of the Old Testament wouldn't understand the -- the abstemiousness of people who don't smoke and don't drink, and have orange juice for the Communion supper. Because there was a pro -- a propagandistic, aggressive attitude against the Egyptians. It was not the enslavement of flesh, and meat, and bread, which is important, and beer -- the Egyptians had beer -- but it is the extraordinary praise of the Lord when you drink wine in His spirit, and rejoicing over his great acts. It is that God created out of the jungle the good earth, which -- what Pearl Buck has called "the good earth," you see -- that is celebrated in the vineyards of Noah. So man, whenever he takes a step into creation and makes some more -- better use of it, he praises the Lord, in the gladness of his heart. That is, by and large, the connection of the Bible with which it -- you see, does a tremendous service. Neither is man by the discovery of the natural laws now their slave and has to build pyramids in order to get all -- you see, to follow the slavishly the movements of the stars, nor is he Promethean, like a Greek and says, "I buck the gods. I am against them. I am -- I am obstinate not only, but I am -- " how do you say it? What is the Promethean attitude? Balking; protesting, you see; resisting and challenging the gods.

The Jewish attitude is one that every progress of the human spirit leads to a greater elation in his recognition of the bounties created by his Creator. There is a complete harmony between the Creator and His creature, because God is delighted whenever His creature takes one more step into his freedom. It's a much more positive attitude, I think, than in the Promethean myth, where Zeus is so envious of Prometheus that he locks him, as you you know, to the Caucasian rock and has a -- an eagle eat out his liver over 5,000 years, Not a very agreeable situation.

That is the Greek pessimistic outlook on the gods. The Jewish outlook is that not the gods dictate, but the one god as appearing in a human soul allows man a

free step, a free act, the discovery of the next. And He is glad, if man then praises Him for this discovery which he himself makes. It seems so simple, gentlemen, but I have to show you that it is who's aligned between the dilemma of the Promethean ferociousness and challenge to the gods, which is for children and students, and the Egyptian fatalism, which is today represented still in the Moslem world, that everything has to be done as Allah has -- has said it had to. You see, the fatalism on the one-hand side, and the Prometheism -- can you say so? It's a poor word. How do you call this Caliban attitude, or how do you -- this challenge to the gods, this -- ? You have it here with all these brazen people who say, "I'm independent. I'm independent. I'm independent."

(Defiance?)

Wie?

(Defiant?)

What?

(Defiance?)

Ja. That's -- thank you, good. Defiant. So Israel, in the Noah story, gives the clue to man's fruitful attitude to the creative history of mankind, gentlemen. In history, man -- the Creator wants us to take a free step, and the only condition attached is that we recognize us as His elements, the soul as a part of God in the process of this creation. Because the power to break away from the established order of mind and body and create a new future we should recognize as God's specific quality in us. Whereas the Promethean Greek mind says, "My mind invents this," the Jewish faith says, "My soul has been liberated from the fears of its neighbors and its enemies and has had the courage, the guts to stand up, stick its neck out," you see. So in -- with the Jews it's always the soul, and therefore the praising of the Lord. And with the Greeks, it is always the mind, and therefore the pride on your own genius. The Greek considers genius as against the gods, defying them. And the gods envious, not wanting, you see, nemesis, hubris: these are the terms of the Greek world. Man is the genius -- Prometheus -- who steals the fire, who acts against the will of the gods. In Judaism, it's very different. Man is only not pleasurable in the eyes of the Lord if he does what has been done before. But if he does that next thing which is necessary for the redemption of the humanity, then he is himself in God's place. Therefore no reason to be defiant. This is the great, gentlemen, tremendous difference between your belief in one god, and in gods. Since the Greeks still believed in many gods, they had to

be one more god, the next god. The Jew, knowing that all steps into the future were one spirit, could be satisfied that being this one soul, they represented one moment in the history of God with man. Can you see this -- the connection between polytheism and defiance. Perhaps this is the last I should like you to take down today. The Greeks must defy the many gods, because the many gods are all of the past and of the present. And the Jew doesn't have to defy his God, because with God's help, he himself discovers himself as a free agent of the future.

What I want to say, gentlemen, to you is -- will you allow me one more minute? It's too important to go by the clock -- as long as you discuss God and man as concepts, you'll never make any headway. It isn't worth the {candle}. Don't think they are concepts, but God and man are invocations to your own existence. You know very well, by the way, the difference. You know very well when a man in a fraternity speaks against some obscenity committed there, that he doesn't speak as a man, but that he is inspired to speak. Otherwise he wouldn't do it. And the more he speaks with a small, still voice, the more he will be able to impress on his -- on his fraternity, that they should really mend their way; because the smaller, the lower his voice, the less it is he himself, or his pride, or his Promethean defiance, with which he speaks, but the more he feels this is necessary. Otherwise this fraternity, and all fraternities should be closed. And they should be closed by -- as you know, in most cases. It is only these few righteous boys who save the fraternities from being abandoned, as being just dens of the Devil. It's always this one man who has this freedom of his soul, that he can speak not in his own name, gentlemen. And so what I want you to understand is that the discovery of the Bible, that man is always betwixt and between the gods and men, and God and man, that -- that nobody can do anything but be either on the side of the gods, that is the prejudices of the marketplace, the idol -- golden calf, you hear all the official talk today in Washington et cetera -- and all believe in his own gods, self-made men, defiant. Or he is a man following his routines, or he is on the side of God. These four points, so to speak, are his own movement through time. Any one of us commits, you see, the -- all the -- how do you say? Steps, or posits himself on all four points alternately. You cannot help being sometimes a Greek, and being sometimes a genius, and being sometimes tri -- a warrior of the tribe, just a loyal citizen, and being sometimes inspired. So the word -- terms -- take this down, gentlemen: men and God never are concepts with which you can manipulate. They are always the powers in whose name you act. And they are, therefore -- Judah, tribe, and Egypt, gentlemen, are older and more central than all the mentality of the schools and their conceptualism. You are -- live only by concepts. And you do not know that I can spot you, because you live by concepts. A man who lives by concepts acts in the

name of science, or of logic, of reason. So I -- you are not interested individuals as long as you always are the slave of your own concepts, because then you are conceptualists. That is, you are a man who only believes in the power of the mind. You don't believe in the soul. And as a student, you don't, in -- as far as you are just a student, or just a professor of philosophy. Let's hope that neither I nor you are just students or professors of philosophy.

Thank you.

Will you kindly bring to the next class a copy of The Iliad?

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Student introduction: (Philosophy 58, April 27th, 1954)

.. I had to, because we lost much time, and -- it's already a big order to speak of 6,000 years in three months. So will you kindly today allow me to call you back into the facts of antiquity, that in antiquity the various ways of dealing with time have been created in the forms of the tribe, so that every one human being was living in a womb of time. Perhaps you take this down. {They} protected by the eyes of the ancestors, and therefore, in a sense, living backward, always feeling that life as already created was good and had to be guaranteed. You'll remember the shortest formula of the tribe is that the grandson is a reborn grandfather, and therefore, as you still have it in your families, the grandson gets the first name of the grandpa in the family, to remind the middle generation that in the child, they welcome again the best features of the old flock.

This is the tribe in which we today still can recognize ourselves, insofar as we have parents, and grandparents, and sisters, and brothers. We have also the life in cycles, in circles, in seasons. And that's -- there time doesn't appear as a womb of time, but it appears in cycles of times, or as the Bible calls it, "eons" of times, and as you call it, with the business cycle, "cycle," "revolutions," "rotations" of time. This would be the empires, putting themselves under the sky, and therefore treating time as some externality befalling us from the sky. And this whole superstition, that we say Heaven and mean sky, for example in "Our Father who is in Heaven," is very much with you, just as you live in the family, though most of you live in this -- naïve idea that somewhere up there, some god lives, in the heavens. And most people who call themselves atheists are people who have discovered that this isn't so, and then they think they must be atheists because they have misunderstood in their childhood the idea of Heaven. And they have thought that God -- meant that God was in some local place somewhere in Heaven, now then they discover that this isn't so, so they say, "Oh, then there is no God." That's most of you, I mean, you are in this childish {state}, where you mistake Heaven and sky, and sky and Heaven all the time, because you are all a little Egyptians, as you all are a little family-men. You are all half red Indians and half Egyptians.

Then gentlemen, we found that mankind's -- would have withered on the stem if only he had lived here and there on the globe, in -- under -- in the sky-world, or if they had migrated in the womb of time, as you try to live at your mother's apron strings. So the Jews left the fleshpots of Egypt, and they left the

human sacrifices of the tribe, in honor of the ancestor. And in Abraham and Moses, the Jews predicated themselves as the servants of the Lord, that was the Lord in coming. "I have seen a -- seen the coming of the Lord." That is, the advent, the Lord as the advent of the future. As long as you call this a messianic promise, it's too theological. Everything that itches you, gentlemen, to expect something great in the future, is connected with the Jewish faith that the best is to come, that God hasn't done half as well in the past or in the present as He is going to do. And you are going to be a part and parcel of the future. And you cannot be explained by statistics, and you cannot be explained by IQs, because what you are going to do one day, the whole world will -- be so taken by surprise. Nobody will be able to predict you. That is the hope of Israel, and that's the hope of every true Israelite to this day, in the Church, too. The Church is the new Israel.

So we have here not the womb of time, gentlemen, not the cycle of time, but the coming time. And that was Israel. And here we had then to say that by and large, between 5000 and 3000 B.C., gentlemen, a way of life has been created which makes man move in repetitive { } through the paths of the past. From 3000 to 1500, the empires created ways of life by which we can walk every year in a great cycle of seasons, and every Great Year, every 1460 years, even in a cycle of thousands of years, of millennia. And then with the Jewish revelation there comes the third step which completes really the possibilities of the ways of life, that we live in the future, that a Jew is a member of that people which God is in process of creating, which therefore doesn't yet exist.

Now all this should be to you so understandable as chemistry, gentlemen.

What you call antiquity, gentlemen, is the creation of the elements of your own existence. It is nothing of the past in the sense that it has gone by. But it -- are the three ways of life of which you are the heirs. And if you are not the heirs, you are just no human beings. I know many people in this country who are no human beings, because they are so silly. They are degenerates, and they are perverts. And there are many college boys among them. They don't deserve to live. And they will be blown out by any hydrogen bomb, because they have no right to exist. They have no contact with their meaning as human beings. A human being you only are if at least you are -- embark on one way of reproducing a time. And you have to reproduce either in your family the good spirit of the past, or you have to reproduce in the factory system the laws of production every season, from harvest-time and seedtime, you see, to tilling and plowing and harrowing. All our -- your modern factories, you are a cog on the wheel in production. That's Egyptian. Or you have to be in politics. You have to raise in humanity some hope, some expectation for a better world to come. If you are -- do -- not either of

the three, gentlemen, you may be a rooter at the Giants or at the Dodgers, or what-not, but you have ceased to count. You have no right to be a voter. You are a playboy. And most of you want to be that. But you must know that then history is not for you and you are not for history. You are accidental, because, gentlemen, anybody who lives only in his own time doesn't belong into history into time at all. You belong only in -- to the human race if you in your own time -- will you kindly take this down -- a man is only a man as long as he is willing to represent the whole of time in his own time. If you do not represent your grandfather in your own family, then you cannot be the child and member of this family. It is not enough to be just born on August 28th, 1955, or 1935. That's not enough, gentlemen. That's accidental. That makes you into an atom. And atoms are there to be blown into smithereens. You cannot complain that you are sent to -- to -- as expendables to Korea with all your sentimentality. Why shouldn't you be used up for some good purpose in history? That's the minimum, after all, if you don't -- won't do anything else. And you won't. You wish to go to plays, and to movies, and that -- say -- you think, is your birthright. It is not. No fly has the right to complain when I kill him. And it's high time that this utter sentimentality goes, that you all claim, because you are born, that you have a right to live. The famous civil rights, gentlemen, are given to citizens. And human liberties are given to human beings. And all these liberties, as you can see now in the McCarthy pressure under this -- this moboc -- mobocracy under which we have to live now, with 18-year-old boy -- children being given the vote, and such nonsense. If you change the whole world into an ice cream store, you can have ice cream, gentlemen, but you melt like the ice cream yourself.

It has nothing to do with humanity. Humanity is based on the identity, gentlemen, of all the times from the beginning to the end. There is no humanity in the year 1954, if you cannot realize that at this moment, 1954, the first man knocks at your door, and the whole cosmic order of the stars and the suns is there and doesn't allow you to waste all the oil in your own generation, and to blow up the whole universe, that you have to re-forest, and that you have to keep this good land in good and decent shape. Why, gentlemen? Because the times are pressing on you, those Egyptian times of eternal seasons. The eternal presence of the cosmos is there. In the same sense, your good blood is there. You cannot contract all the venereal diseases of the world, and then beget idiots. The family is the claim on your chastity and on your -- on your prudence. And the same is true about, gentlemen, the new discovery of the future. You are responsible that there is more peace in the world a hundred years from now than there is at this moment. If you deny this, gentlemen, out you go. Man, as far as he is a man of the moment, gentlemen, can claim no rights, because all the rights bestowed on human beings, gentlemen, are bestowed through speech. And

speech is the eternal bond through all the ages, and through all the countries of humanity. You cannot speak, and I cannot speak to you, you see, unless I speak to you from the beginning of time, and unless you are willing to hear to the end of time, unless you do not forfeit the privilege of telling your grandchild something of what you have heard. If you do not see that you have -- only have the privilege of being a Dartmouth student because you are a cable, a piece of cable between the past and the future, I'm sorry. You -- I missed your -- your place in this college. No, God help you. But you aren't here for your own benefit, because nobody can benefit himself, you see. That's an old saying. If you want to win your soul, you will lose it. So all your attempts to get an education, and to get something for yourself will come to nothing. Anybody who thinks of himself can never meet the truth. The truth is completely indifferent to you and me. How do you see this? You can't own the truth. And you can't boast to other people, "I know a little more truth than you do, because I got an education. I went to the right course." Isn't this all nonsense? But you -- that's how you treat your intellectual life, gentlemen. You treat it as -- your private property. And so it's completely dehumanized.

You have to enter -- will you kindly take this word up into your notes? You have to enter upon one of these three ways of life in order to be a human being. You have to enter upon them. Now, so far so good, gentlemen. This we had done before I left you. Now when I fell sick, we -- we -- there were just under consideration a fourth way of life, the Greek. The Greek is reproduced today in our colleges. And you live today in a fourth -- on a fourth roadbed. What -- yesterday they called in Shakespeare the -- the road of Mr. Points. Remember? Who has seen it? Na. And you take 58, and you don't go to a play like Henry IV, which is the next best text in -- in -- in -- com- -- how do you say, in supplementing this course. What shall I do with you, gentlemen? Never in your life may you have an opportunity of seeing Shakespeare if you don't go and take it. When I was a child, a boy of 15, I mean, every Shakespeare play I could see in the big city -- of course, I would {have had} to go, because it may never have happened again. Now I have to live here in this part of New England where they give one Shakespeare play, or two at best a year, and then you don't go. You would have seen in Mr. Point, the friend of Henry V, your own image. Why -- can anybody explain to me why the theater wasn't sold out? The greatest play, and wonderful acting, and more actors than spectators.

You know the -- I'm forced still -- forced to go on teaching for two more years, but the only answer to your behavior is to cancel all courses and to say you don't deserve it, because you don't deserve it. You neither deserve 58, nor do you deserve Henry IV, second part. Go to the movies. But why should you then

come up to Hanover? You can have better movies in New York.

It is so utterly ridiculous, gentlemen, to talk to you. It absolutely makes no sense. You are not interested. So why should I be interested in you, gentlemen? You are, I mean, non-conductive material. And anybody who can have copper wire, why should he use plastic? You're just plastic, under the glows of the modern -- modern sensational machine. You probably look at television and look at Mr. -- who has seen Mr. McCarthy on television? Actually more people than have seen Henry IV.

The same difference between collecting fleas, or collecting Michelangelos. Now gentlemen, the Greeks -- you are, of course, ruined by the schools. And that is the Greek mind, and that's your excuse. And I have to wake you up from this, gentlemen. In antiquity, there was created a fourth way of life, a way of mental innovation, without physical change. Whereas in Israel, once a Jew, always a Jew; once an Egyptian, always an Egyptian; once a red Indian, always a red Indian; whereas these ways of life are exacting, it was possible to be a Greek only in your mind. And as you know, you are all as schoolboys in this perverted season of your life, where your mind is somewhere and your body is elsewhere, and your heart is nowhere. You are split. And that is Plato's doctrine, that the ho- -- body is hopeless and the mind can be improved. And that is the Greek tradition of which you suffer. The Greeks split the multiplicity of the men -- mind experience and the simplicity of their political experience, because they live in many worlds at once.

You have listened here, I understand, to the catalog of the ships. And in the catalog of the ships the whole problem of Greece is unfolded. The greatest philosopher of Greece parallels the catalog of the ships who went to Troy, by writing the collection of 158 constitutions of various states of Greece. Now if you have to deal with -- that's Aristotle's collection of city-state constitutions. If you have 158 states, you have no state to which you belong. You can look at all of them objectively. And though the Greeks invented objectivity; they invented objectivity for -- of the mind. They said, "Mentally, I am able to live in 158 cities." The formula for Greece is that the political community of every individual Greek was so small that his mental world had to be the universe. The Jews, and the red Indian, and the Egyptian, or the Chinese, gentlemen, lived in worlds which demand total loyalty. The Greeks live in a world of a political smallness and pettiness, that their mind must step beyond its boundaries and look into a far world, which they call the universe, what you call the universe. Exactly this, you see. The universe is that part of the world which is larger than your political,

your family, and your economic loyalty, isn't it? And that is the Greek world. Gentlemen, it's a very dangerous world. It's the world of the Muses. The word "Muse" in Greece is of course at the root not only of music, but of poetry, of history, of science, of mathematics, of everything -- of the arts, of everything Greek. The nine Muses and the god Apollo, with his lyre, are the goddesses and the god of the Greek mind. Now the Muses and the god of the lyre, Apollo, have this one thing which neither existed in Israel nor in the empires, nor does it exist in the tribes, in the family. They have access through poetry to a second world of mere thought, or what you call figments of the imagination, to fiction. You fill yourself with fiction. You hardly know the difference between fiction and reality. You should go for one or two years without fiction and movies. Then you would wake up to the world in which you really have to live. And then you would be able to make decisions and to act. You see, you are completely wrapped into cellophane of an unreality, because you -- your mind lives quite elsewhere from where your body lives. And as your only -- your own fault, your physical and sexual troubles come from this split. You wait for your healing, for your recovery, so to speak. You hope that after college you can get married and have a job, and forget about this split personality, which you now constitute. That is, you constitute only the split and no personality whatsoever.

But you do constitute the split, because you do read in Plato that the body is wicked and the mind can be pure, which is, of course, all nonsense. God created, of course, just as much our intestines and our bladder as he consisted -- con- -- created our thoughts. Don't think that your thoughts are any better than your bladder. The whole man is just either good or bad. Your mind is no better than your -- your body. It's the other way around, you know. All the things are only in the mind. It's nothing wrong with your bowel movement. That's not dirty. Your thoughts are dirty. But you think the other way around, insofar as you are philosophizing, gentlemen. That's the invention of the Greeks. The Greeks have said that thought is chemically pure, and that the body is chemically dung.

Now gentlemen, the Bible -- you have to know this, because it's lost on many Christians -- the Old Testament stands for the purity of the human body, and says the mind is the sinner. There's nothing wrong with the heart of God, or the womb of God. God has His kidneys, and His wrath in His kidneys as we have. That's not a wrong simile, because we know what wrath is only from our own kidneys. But the -- there -- the high falutin' Greeks have always put their finger to their nose and said, "How bad taste! How anthropomorphical!" They think -- speak of God as though He wasn't pure mind. Gentlemen, God is not pure mind. That's nonsense. That's Greek. That's -- that's blasphemy. But that's what you

believe. You believe that Christianity is a philosophy. And ev- -- whoever tells you that Christianity is a philosophy is a Greek and has not the faintest idea what Christianity is all about. Christianity is the force that came into the world after the Greeks had ruined antiquity with their division of mind and body. Who knows this today? Isn't this true, that I say that you don't know this? Is it true? Gentlemen, the Greeks are the great offenders against the unity of our way of life. They have split you and me and have said, "I can think about many things without doing anything about them. I can objectively look at them -- at the universe, and be somewhere else." And you know how the tragedy of the human man and his {dometary} is because he thinks that is his privilege to read all Rabelais and all the obscene literature without doing himself any harm. Gentlemen, any one boy who says, "I cannot afford to read something obscene, because I am so sensuous, that then afterwards I have just to do something about it," is must more moral and much more virtuous, certainly, than the man who is so hard-boiled that he can sit down and read every Sunday all the obscene papers he can get his hands on, and then say he has the strength to do this. I don't understand these people, as I do not understand people who go to burlesque shows instead of going to a brothel. If I have -- would have to go to a burlesque show, I would have to -- sleep with a woman right away, because I cannot afford to look at somebody else doing this.

I don't understand your degeneracy, gentlemen. But I am told that thousands of young and old people in this country have the -- have the impotency of no interest. I'm too potent for this. I cannot afford it. I'm too weak. I'm too easily tempted. And I think you would much -- live much better if you would say to yourself, "I am easily tempted." That settles it. Then you can -- { } call it your weakness.

But the Greek says "No. My mind can bestride the whole universe. Every niche and, you see, nook of the world can be telescoped, and macroscoped, and microscoped. It doesn't do any harm to my mind. My mind gets better all the time."

It doesn't, of course, but that's the Greek idea of the scholastics and of the schools. The Greeks created the schools, gentlemen, in which life lived elsewhere can be taught to children brought up in any one civilization. In the Greek method of life -- ways of life lived elsewhere can be met, can be seen, you see, can be envisaged by people in a very narrow city like Sparta, or Athens, or Corinth, or Rome, you see. Very small city-states. In order to prove this to you, let me know schematize. As I said, I have to make up for so much time, you must

allow me a kind of -- of skeleton picture. If it is true that the tribe and the empires and the Israel are made technical elements, like helium or hydrogen, composed of a certain construction of hydrogen -- of -- of -- of electrons, as we -- you know in chemistry that is true. It is true about political forms of human existence. If the tribe centers around the past -- you remember the grave, or the totem pole -- and if the whole center of gravity then goes, in this way, that the future has to be expiated at the altar, that the totem pole and the grave have to be reconciled, because people have to look back all the time, and if it is true that inside, you have the dance and the orgies, for the mating of members of the tribe, and outside you have the warpath, it is worthwhile studying now in comparison the construction, the chemical, or the atomic -- atom-structure of the four -- three other forms. I have already done so once for -- for the Egyptians. And I wish to repeat it now. Let me put it here.

In the temple, you remember, a piece of the sky has been brought down to earth, and is -- the movements of the stars, day and night, are depicted on the temple walls by the orientation of the walls: east, west, north, south. And we said such a temple-state, as you may call any one of these empires, temple-states -- the Aztecs had a temple-state, the Inca had a temple-state, you see, a state circling around the temple, because the temples made sure you were in harmony with the universe of the sky -- stars -- of the sky. If this is so, we said they were very helpless with regard to the marketplace. Here they were left to accidents. The empires had to future, no relation to the future. They have, however, a relation to the seasons, in the economy, and they wall off the enemy by there being a fortress and by their emperor choosing his -- his -- his residence behind the walls of his fortifications. So we had -- we had the -- the word "ecos," "husbandry," "house," in a fulmi- -- in a -- in an explicit sense. Economy is the order of the house, the husbandry, you remember? And so I -- in Greek this is the word oekos. In English, if you want every -- any similar word, it's -- would be the word "dominion," "domain," coming from domus, house, you see. The United States have eminent domain over the tidelands, despite the decision of Congress to throw them into the {forces} of Texas.

This is then the order of the tribe, the -- the orientation, the compass-needle, the construction of the compass-needle. Now in Judaism, it is -- of course, the beginning of Israel is the exodus. Neither tribe nor empire. It's a negation with which Judah -- Judaism begins. And who -- they believe in the god who has led the children of Israel out of Egypt. That's a remarkable statement that a whole nation looks upon that which has happened before as to begin -- negate it. Now you had to do this, of course, if you wanted to have a group that belonged exclusively to the coming of the Lord. If you wanted to be -- have a messianic people

you had to put -- bring the past, you see, into the negative rubrum, just as the future is in a negative rubrum here with the marketplace, and just as the future is negative -- negated by the altar, and the expiation ritual, you see, and the whole code of penalties for any breach of the customs of the tribe, of the law of the jungle. So in a similar way, the Jews had to reverse the process and had to say, "Everything that calls us back to the fleshpots of Egypt or to the altars of the tribe is bad."

There are two things by which this becomes very evident: that it took the first 500 years of Israel before they were allowed to build a temple, that the temple had to be quarantined. Solomon's temple was only built after Israel -- Moses had left Egypt long ago. Gentlemen, forms of another way of life can only be admitted after a quarantine. The Greek school in which you live, the liberal arts college, was quarantined for 1,000 years. From 529 of our era to the year 1445, there was no -- no academic way of life in Europe, because only then did people think that the horrors of Platonism, the horrors of the division of body and mind, the horrors of homosexuality, and onanism, and all the terrors of an unfulfilled youth could be overcome, that we could afford again to have liberal arts colleges. Sometimes I believe that it was a very hasty conclusion.

Gentlemen, the Jews begin with the exodus. Outside against the other people, they have the fence of the law. As you know, the Jew doesn't eat with other people. He doesn't eat, not because it isn't good to eat ham, but because he wants to distinguish himself against the others. The fence of law reminded day and night that he is not wedded to the gods of the land, the idols of the marketplace. That is the idea of the fence around the law.

Now if you compare the fortresses of life, of Egypt, and the warpaths of the tribes to this externalization of your frontier, in Israel, you see a remarkable change. The ritual, you see, of all the rules and regulations, which do -- don't allow an Israelite to work on a Saturday or to eat with his friends, were based not on an enmity of physical warfare, as with the warpath, you see, and not on a geographical separation, as in Egypt, where the desert formed the fortress, and you couldn't reach the Chinese, because they were so far away; but in Israel, you see, the -- it's a much more settled frontier. You are in the same city of New York, or Boston, but -- or Alexandria in antiquity but you are not able to surmount the invisible frontier between those who enjoy everything today as the end, the final, because you are waiting for the coming of the Lord. You are waiting for a different period of time, and you must remind by your behavior the people who invite you to dinner, that their dinner to them means all they have, and to you it is a preliminary dinner. It's not the real dinner. That is the great idea of the fence

of the law, which most Jews -- they do not understand themselves why it is. It is very inconvenient, of course.

Inside, gentlemen, if you now would then always put here -- make a list in your notes, and put these elements: outer, past, future, and inner, list them -- then you will find that we compared the warpath of the tribe, the fortress of Egypt, and the fence around the law, of the ritual of the five books of Moses as meaning the same for these three different political groups, separating them from the other groups, you see, setting them aside. Can you see this? Ja? Is it -- do you understand?

(No. Not completely.)

Well, let me first -- accomplish this -- this cross of reality here with regard to the Jews. Inside, the Jews are not -- have not -- no special way of economy. They have always had a half-agriculturalist, half-pasture land economy, skilled workers, jewelers, everything. So you cannot say that, as in a caste in Egypt, you have here a warrior caste, a priest caste. No such thing. The Jews inside of themselves are highly democratic. Every father of every home is his own priest. And that is, therefore, the inner life of Judaism, gentlemen. Every father of a household is a priest. It's a universal priesthood of the fathers of a family. Each family is not interesting with regard to its economic function, as in Egypt. It is not interesting and important with regard to the excitement of the dancing ground, where people rant, and mate, and get their new names. In -- Judaism, the main point is that the family conducts the divine services themselves. And every Jewish family is fully empowered to speak with God, which is unknown in the tribe. They have to wait for their meeting, you see, to become -- eloquent, to get going, you see. And you have to go to the temple in Egypt before you can even get orientation where the gods have to be invoked, because they have to be invoked in the East, or in the West or in the North at a certain day of the calendar, otherwise they can't be found, you see. They -- you have to be the birds that -- who fly, and you have to -- the intestines, in -- with hieroscopies, investigated. You have all the ritual of priesthood and clergy, as you still have in the Catholic Church to this day. It would be terrible for a Roman Catholic to think that all the sacraments can be administered in the family. But that's the Jewish principle. The whole clergy in Israel is Israel. Israel is a clergy, gentlemen. It is a chosen people. The word "chosen people" means clergy. It's the same word.

So the inner way of -- Judaism is that the whole nation is made into a clergy, which is very strange. In order to do so, gentlemen, the orgies of the tribe, as I have mentioned to you, but you probably have not understood it, were already

done away with in the youth. Circumcision was made an act at birth, so that it would not interfere with puberty, you see, and the later life. Whereas in the tribes, circumcision was the great process, you see, of waking a person up to his personal destiny and to his marriage. And in a similar way, as I said -- Solomon -- King Solomon opens the temple in Jerusalem. If you read it in Kings, it's a very beautiful place where it says -- Solomon opens the temple and says, "O Lord, of course I know that you do not dwell in man-made houses. But just the same, you seem to allow us now to give you a special abode." Gentlemen, will you take this down? The Jewish temple is, just as circumcision, only a kind of -- concession to the weakness of the Jews to have a temple like the others, but with the opposite meaning. A temple in antiquity, or in your estimation, many people today too, means that here is a special place for God, you see. In Judaism, it meant there can be no special place for God, because He's everywhere. You see, it's the very opposite. It's a concession to the weakness of the human- -- human heart that despite the dogma that God cannot be worshiped in any special temple, the Jews were allowed to have a temple, just in the -- toward the praise of God. Just as although 24 hours a day God is present, we are allowed to give praise to Him at one moment of the day more fervently than the other day -- moment. If I do right at this moment, gentlemen, I have not denied the presence of the Lord. But yet there would be no objection to -- to read a Psalm in His honor, what would be the difference? God would be more present when I read the Psalm, or when I invoke His name? Not a minute more, you see. But yet, into our weakness it is given that we may strengthen our own faith by doing so. But God doesn't wait for His presence until you have been good enough to turn your face towards Him. Isn't that true?

So the Jews are a clergy. God is present in the life of the race. That's why the only race that exists are the Jews, because it's a divine race. The other races are very poor. They all have to be dissolved again. But the Jews have made the race the carrier of the divine presence. That's a big order. So Hitler went Jewish -- imitated the Jews in all his orgies, because he -- he was envious, he was jealous. All anti-Semites want to make their own nations into Jews. They want to have the presence of God guaranteed. But gentlemen, the price the Jews had to give -- pay for the presence of God in their midst is a terrible price. They had to forego, as you know, 3,000 years of political power. They had to forego the -- gods of the marketplace. They had to forego the intimacy with the people around them. They had to forego the eating, and sleeping, and dreaming, and writing fiction with the others. Their sciences, and their arts, and their political units were not for the Jews. As -- if you want to do this, then you would probably be today a Quaker, or a Mennonite, or an Amish-man, and would then be the new Israel again. But it would cost you the price of living in the future, and not being

present, and not being a creature of the past. It's con- -- a price -- you have to take the choice. You can't have it both ways.

Gentlemen, if you -- I have now to put the last touch here to the cross of reality of Israel. That, of course, is the coming of the Lord, the Messiah. The Jews wait for the coming of the Messiah. So if you complete now this form: clergy, chosen people inside, fence of the law against the world outside, the future represented by the Messiah, the past represented by the exodus from Egypt. And the word "exodus," of course, is a very poor word, because you do not quite realize if you would say "emigration to America," it would be more to the point perhaps than "exodus," because an exodus means leaving behind a home and mother country, you see, not some far-away -- event in Egypt, from -- going out from Egypt, but always giving up the womb of time, always giving up the cycles of business, always giving up then the climate and the sky, under which you are born, and always giving up the naïve family relationship to which you would like to claim, because it's so nice and warm. If you do not understand the word "exodus" in this profound sense, you cannot understand what the Israelites constitute. They constitute the revolutionary race on earth, who say to every generation, "This isn't the story at all. The best is still to come."

Now we have these four forms. And now let me then, since you said you didn't follow -- let me put these points here, all under one and another. The grave in the -- in the tribe, and the temple in the empire, and the exodus in Judaism would correspond in these three ways of life, if this is tribe, this is empire, and this is ... This would be each time the past. Then we had the warpath. And we had the fortresses, and we had the fence of the law. Now if you have any better word for fence of the law? Do have a -- some -- wie?

(The Torah.)

Ja. Ja. If you understand it -- right, all right. Although Torah would be all form. It would also be the calling of the people, as the clergy. The Torah is not just the fence of the law, isn't that true? It is the whole order, you see. It's the positive content as much as the negative content. I prefer to leave it this way, gentlemen.

Now we have two more points to make. Will you kindly help me? We have here the orgies of the dancing ground, the meeting place of the tribe. And I told you, there is no tribe unless there is such meeting, because that's the only way in which the tribe is integrated. The word "orgy" should not frighten you off. It -- together -- goes together with "orchestra," with dancing, and the tribe is consti-

tuted by dancing. So the word "orgy" I have -- I have no quarrel with, if you { } a better one. People there are danced into a political -- union. Here they are not danced into a political union, but it is here the -- the division of labor, what I call the ecos, but I'm afraid the word "ecos" has no great standing, with you. It's a very wonderful idea that the house is -- is the center of the division of labor, gentlemen. And you are very impoverished, because in your imagination, the word "house" no longer has this. You think of housing administration and housing authorities, you only think of a box, with 24 square feet for this and 22 square feet for that. That's not a house in the old sense of the word. But you are very poor off, because you don't have this -- this feeling anymore of this great beauty, that in a house there are various processes, you see, united and yet specialized. That's the organic, you see -- a revamping of the organism of an animal. In houses, in economies, man imitates the creation of the big animals. There is a central nervous system, called the General Motors headquarters. And then there are the workshops. And then there are the laboratories. And then there are the trade routes on which the salesmen travel to sell those products all over the world. Gentlemen, that's a gigantic creation, you see, in imitation of the animal kingdom by division of labor of specialized tasks of glands, and muscles, and nerves. And all this is implied in the beautiful word "ecos" and in the beautiful word "house."

It isn't implied in the word "division of labor," because it's just as much integration of labor as it is division of labor. And I assure you, you will never conquer Communism in this country unless some of you think of a better word than "division of labor" for the greatness of the division of labor. You see, Karl Marx discovered the importance of the division of labor. And since we have nothing to oppose him with, which recognizes the greatness of this division of labor, we are all going Egyptian today. It's un- -- irresistible. He has discovered something very -- very great. This -- these Marxians are no stupid people, gentlemen. And we will only compete with Communism successfully if you can stretch your imagination so far that this word "ecos," this word "house," this word "economy" regains its dignity as a tremendous story, you see, of human imagination, of human creativity, that you and I can pull together, you see, and do greater things together than ever -- any one of us can do separately.

The next, gentlemen -- {one} was the division of labor. This was the -- the clergy. Here you have no division of labor, no caste system, no -- vocations. Every Jew is a clergyman, is a priest of God Almighty. Every Jew is. It's a remarkable achievement. It's the oldest democracy in the world, because it is a priestly democracy, which is much more than a democracy of farmers and workers. It's a

democracy, you see, of the divine word, so that every Jew can speak with full power the whole truth about the human race.

Now the -- last point would, of course, be the -- here the marketplace, here the altar, here the Messiah. That's the future. And the Messiah is represented in the present by the prophets, in -- in Israel. So now we'll have a break, and you and I together will help then to replenish the Greek cross of reality, those four points for the Greeks. It can be neither the exodus from Egypt, nor can it be the temple, nor can it be the grave -- the cult around the grave -- which constitutes the past of the Greek city-state. And the same is true about the other { }. And once you have been able to -- to place these four points, you should become able to get orientation about your own life, because once you have these 16 points, gentlemen, you have the 16 elements of every modern human being's life.

Let's have five minutes.

[tape interruption]

... do owe them the arts and the sciences. The arts and the sciences are -- the arts and the sciences are the powers of a young woman and young man. The fancy, the creative mind in the sciences -- that's the genius of the male. And the poetry embellishes the beauty of the -- of the youth of the feminine sex. That the poets write of transfigured beauty around that what -- with whom they are in love. Love song is the -- at the root of the arts. Romeo and Juliet you only have to think of. And Beatrice in Dante's Divine Comedy is the -- the mainstay of the poetic element in The Divine Comedy. It wouldn't be -- The Comedy would be just theology if he hadn't Beatrice, you see, to whom he could sing.

So gentlemen, the arts and the sciences have been -- taken shape in Greece. And we turn to the Olympic god, and to the Muses, and to the tragedy, and to the orchestra, and to all the Greek terms when we speak of drama, for example, or lyrics, or epics. These are all Greek terms. It's not accidental. But if you want to speak of prayer, you speak of the Psalms. If you speak of the future, you speak of prophecy. These are not Greek terms. There are no prophets in Greece. There are no Psalms in Greece. I don't recommend you a Greek prayer. It's very boring. We have some texts, of course, because people had to pray even in Greece. But they are not outstanding. That's not for you and me. But if you want to have Greek -- Greek at its best, you read a Greek tragedy, or you -- a play, perform a Greek tragedy, because the arts are perfect in Greece, to this day. And if you want to go and study the highest, you study philosophy. And philosophy is Greek. The -- the lust for truth, for wisdom is philosophy. Lusting for truth, you can translate

"philosophizing." It means to be in love with thought.

Now gentlemen, the arts and the sciences are unable to form body politic -- bodies politic. Neither a piece of art can do anything but attract spectators for entrance tickets on Broadway. But you -- obviously Broadway is situated in the city of New York, in the state of New York, in the United States of America. That is, the political unit inside which Broadway exists is not of the making of Broadway. The artists and the scientists, gentlemen, cannot build societies. And that's brought home very painfully to Mr. Oppenheimer at this moment. Einstein and Oppenheimer are great scientists, gentlemen. And Mr. O'Neill is a poet. But the political order is quite a different story. And the ecclesiastical order is quite a different story. And that's very hard on you, because you want to confuse all these words so easily. And you think that the arts and the sciences, if you are liberals, are enough. If a man has art and science, then why does you -- care -- you care for his religion or for his political convictions? He can afford to be pinned. You have to be in Greenwich Village.

Gentlemen, the arts and the sciences are the life of the mind. They are not the life of the community. They are not the life of families. They are not the relation between children and parents. They are not the relation between armies and civilians. They are not the relation between legislators and vested interests. The arts and sciences have nothing to say about the relations of the French and the English, and the Americans, and the Germans. That's politics. That's state. That's boundaries. That's fortresses. That's armies. That's war, isn't it?

Now you always confuse these things. This is an absolute confusion in the world today about these four elements. The Greeks have isolated the arts and sciences. They have de-religionized and de-politized the sciences and the arts. And you see from the atom bomb how difficult it is. Can you dissociate \$2 billion invested in hydrogen bombs from the budget of the government of the United States? The scientists would like to, because they are not interested in the state. They are interested in their discoveries, you see. But immediately somebody comes and clamps down and { } says they are security risks, because that's politics. That's not mind. That's not mental, the question of character, the question of quite different realms of behavior.

The sooner you learn this distinction, gentlemen, the more you fit yourself for a world in which you will have to distinguish the Greek element and the Jewish element, and the country element, the civilization element, and the racial element of your own existence. Whom you marry -- that's a question of what family you want to -- to see living on this globe in the future. Where you work, that's

the decision over your economic order. What you read, that's a question of your scientific interests, and whereby you are developing your tastes, and your -- your dress, and your fashions, and your style, that's a question of your artistic case. These are four very different things.

Now how did the Greeks -- were they enabled? I showed you -- told you the principle of the Greek mind is that the bestrides a much larger territory than his body and soul do encompass. The Greek is at home in a tiny fraction of the Mediterranean. And the universe in Greece is symbolized by the ocean, that is, by something too big for political organization. Whenever you find the Greeks, you find them interested in the sea. They are sea-farers. They are the first -- the first story of the Greek mind is the Argonautica, the great sea-enterprise. How did it happen? The Greeks came down from the mainland. They had never seen the sea. They didn't know how to build ships. They passed the Olympus, and they came down in Thessaly to the shores of the Mediterranean, and they learned -- probably from the people who lived there already, and had learned it from the Egyptians and the Babylonians -- how to build a ship. And they called the first ship the Argo. And they called themselves the Argonauts. The boatmen -- nauta means the boatmen -- the nauta, the boatmen of this great ship. And that made the Greeks. The Greeks were tribes from the inland, who learned to go to sea, and to trade with all the empires around the coast of the Mediterranean. And so the universe of the Greeks became the { } of water. The water had beams for the Greeks. That is, it carried them, the keels of their boats to various countries, to many cities of men, to many religions, to many different divinities. And so, gentlemen, instead of having a medicine man, who would embody through his mask only the hero of their own tribe, they gave Homer and the great poets the place of this tribal priest -- of the -- tribal masquerader, impersonator, and sorcerer, and the place of the Egyptian priest. The Greeks -- they didn't want to know anything about the everlasting stars on the sky of an empire, and they didn't want to hear anything about the bloodline of their own ancestors. What they wanted to be told, in poetical forms, is the co-existence of many groups, of many people, of many cities. The great riddle of our human existence as of today, that before the messiahs come, and before their own mankind is organized, and before our little group, you see, it becomes -- domi- -- there is an in-between. The Greeks have created or dominated, or have mentally mastered the world between my own world and the final world. They are on the way, you see, from one -- the many small ones, to the one end -- final one. And they are establishing a humanistic, or humanitarian, or human goal in between. And the great place where the Greeks do this is the theater. The greatest thing

the Greeks have done to all of us is that they have created the theater. In a theater, people of many countries, of many tribes, of many families, can sympathize, and be enthused by one and the same event. The event doesn't mean anything in your life, or in my life. But it means something in both our lives. Isn't that strange? If you go to Henry IV, or if you go to any play, you go to any movie, it isn't your life that you see, that is aggrandized as in a -- liturgy of your church. That's your own service in your church. But when you go to a theater, it's not your sermon, you see. It's the second world, gentlemen. The Greeks -- the theater world is the second world of the imagination. It's a second world. It's very important, gentlemen, because you do -- have forgotten that second worlds are unreal. The whole Greek mind lives in an unreal world. There is nothing more unreal and more abstract than the world of a Greek philosopher, or of a Greek artist, or Mr. Einstein, or Mr. Oppenheimer. They don't live in the real world. They live in a world of electrons. have you ever seen an electron? I see you, and I see me, and I see Mr. Oppenheimer. And in reality Mr. Oppenheimer is a very poor mortal. And he's under pressure at this moment. And that's his real -- the real man. But in the abstract of his mind, he's a great {man}. But that's { }, you see. It doesn't help him in his -- the dates of his biography from 1900 to 1954. There he has to struggle for recognition, and for livelihood, and he has to educate his children, and he has to go to study in Europe, and he has to invent the atom bomb, and he has to organize Alamo and -- Los Alamos, et cetera. That is, he has daily duties. But then you consider him in his place of science, that's his second world, a world of thought, a world of thinking.

And the same is true with the arts, with the sci- -- with the play. You go to Hamlet, has Hamlet ever lived? No. Is he real? Yes, but where is he real? In a second world, in a world that is perhaps more real than yours and mine, but it isn't the real world as you and I understand it. You can't put Hamlet on the scales and say he weighs 160 pounds, because he doesn't. He weighs nothing. He's very flimsy. He's just a figure of the imagination. No use, you see, telling me and you how -- what his -- what his chest measures. Every actor can play him differently. Isn't that true? Isn't that true -- strange that Hamlet can be so much alive in the second world, and is so little real, that he doesn't have even any measure in quantity, which you can -- to which you can pin him down. I can always tell you by saying, "You measure," "You weigh," "You have these fingerprints." Hamlet has no fingerprints.

But you are so little educated, gentlemen, to the -- your own -- working of your own imagination, that you constantly mistake Hamlet and reality. It's very hard for you to understand that where Hamlet exists, he lives in the world of the

arts and the sciences. And he lives nowhere else. That's a very real world, and yet it isn't the real -- the most real world, isn't it? The more -- I cannot tell you all about this mysterious way of the human mind, but I can only warn you, gentlemen, to know that there are -- is a world of the mind which is not real, yet it is real enough to pay great respect to it, and to see that it gives us a tremendous uplift of the mind. But it's only between my today, real world -- where I have to eat, and to shit, and to breathe, and to sleep, you see, and to be clothed, and to get the wherewithal -- and the next day where I have to do the same again, that I can be entertained by the second world. It's an entertaining world. And the word "entertain" means in between, holding in between. "Entertaining" means to -- inter tenere. Inter tenere means to hold a place between two real places. That's what is entertainment. It is neither here nor there. It's on the way between here and there. Entertaining.

All the arts and sciences, gentlemen, are entertaining, just as the Prince Hal entertains himself with Falstaff on the way between his princely descent and his coronation. It's entertainment. Very important, because we are so bored, gentlemen. If you think what money you waste just for entertainment, you suddenly come to know that nine-tenths of your energy, of your -- of your money, of your time goes for entertainment. {It's a charade} what we sacrifice for entertainment. Before you get married, you waste nine-tenths of the patrimony of your fathers -- if you can, if he allows you to do it -- you certainly give -- spend on nasty women, or on lotteries, or on horse races, or on a bicycle, or on a roadster, or anything you can lay your hands on, just to waste your time and your money. Some blow out their brains. Some blow out their bladders, some blow out some -- but some part of them they blow out. That's all entertainment.

It's a world, gentlemen, between the decisive moments of life. The decisive moments of life bring a real world down to earth. They build a city. They found a state. They go to war. They conclude peace. All this the arts and scientists cannot do. Mr. Oppenheimer can construe a hydrogen bomb. He can never tell when it should be thrown. The decision is not his. Isn't that obvious, you see? He creates possibilities.

Gentlemen, the arts and scientists create possibilities. They never answer necessity. They enlarge the realm of possibilities, of opportunities, you may also say. But they never tell you, "Is it necessary to throw the hydrogen bomb?" You and I may, you see, be much poorer scientists. You and I -- I cannot construe a hydrogen bomb. But I claim that if I have developed my five senses and lived well, that I know better when to throw the hydrogen bomb than Mr. Oppenheimer. I'm superior to Mr. Einstein as a political animal. He is not fit for judging

what we should do with -- {with} an opportunity created by the Greek mind. The Greek mind, gentlemen, must serve. The Greek mind cannot decide. That's very important for you to know, gentlemen, because when you read these Greeks, they also tell you, Mr. Irwin Edman, et cetera, that the Greeks, the philosophers should be kings. That's nonsense. Let's hope that never will there be philosophers who are called to be kings, or presidents of the United States. If you make the philosophers kings, you get the Platonic stud farm.

So, gentlemen, what have the Greeks done? Well, they have put at the starting point of their birth the marketplace. They have built -- looked into the world as -- as a theater. They have gone { } inside of themselves and have philosophized.

Famous picture of the { } philosophy theater. Marketplace as starting point.

And the future is beset with novelty, with sensations. You go in the history of literature, of art, of science, you go from -- from one novelty to the next. What next? What's the latest dope? What's the news? And you see how Greek we are at this moment, because you know how this country spends all its money on organizing the news service. Heavens, gentlemen, how cheaply you would live if you would only live without the news. Do you think they are very important, the news? Every news is worse than the news before. But you don't believe it. You think that the news is better all the time. And that's the Greek idea of sensation, of the -- of the tickling of your senses of novelty. The Greeks prefer the new to the old.

Now the sense of novelty, the sense of the news, is the sense of sensation. The -- we discover a sixth sense, gentlemen. Man has five senses -- smell, and taste, and vision, and audition, and touch -- but the Greeks have given us a sixth sense. Victor Hugo has said of Baudelaire that he { } -- Vous nous avez donner un {frisson} nouvelle. The new -- what's {frisson}? Who knows French? A new tickling of the senses. Frisson. He said of Baudelaire, when he wrote his -- his famous *Fleurs de Mal*, *The Flowers of Evil*. Because the flowers of evil give you a new tickling of the senses.

And gentlemen, the nations today are in a tremendous combat. The Russians have discovered that a great nation must live without the tickling of the news.

And we will not survive if we do not rise to the occasion and rid ourselves of this ticklishness of the sensational character of the news. That is the superiority of the Russian system; nothing else, that they are indifferent to the news. The news is not better than the old. The news is just murder, and jealousy, and drunkenness, and shooting at the waterfront. If you really look at the news of the last 365 days on the front page of your paper, you cannot say that the news deserves your admiration. It would be much better if you could live without the news on the

front page. It isn't important. It hasn't made a dent on your existence. It shouldn't. If it has, it's wrong.

The Greek, at this moment, gentlemen, is under judgment. That's why I have to emph- -- stress this. For the first time in 400 years, gentlemen, the blind admiration of the arts and sciences, of the Greek 400 years in our Renaissance period, is under scrutiny. I don't think that you and I can afford to live the next 50 years with this blind lip-service to Mr. Hearst and his principles. Not even to the principles of The Reader's Digest. You have to live on wavelengths of -- of very different scope. You cannot live from sensation to sensation. You just -- and I think you have already learned this. If I look at your generation, gentlemen, I think in some unknown way -- ways unknown to you, you have already tried to live a life which is not immune, but which is lived without being too much under the impact of the -- of the latest news. Am I right? Or am I not right? I think there has been a change, compared to the -- 20 years ago. And it's all to the good, I think. So gentlemen, the market -- the man who lives, grows up in Brooklyn, or where there is no tree, or there is one tree, and -- or in any marketplace-civilization, in an urbanized area, gentlemen. Take any boy who has to go to a city school. Well, his life begins not on the marketplace, but on the highway. The highway is today the civil { } of the market. We would then say today it isn't so much the market, but the highway on which the modern human being begins to get orientation. He doesn't get orientation at home. He doesn't get orientation in school. He gets his orientation on the way from his home to the school, because that's where he sees the millions of people mill, and live. And he takes it for granted that this is life. Isn't that true?

So gentlemen, put here in brackets, to market -- highway, because -- to tell you a great secret which everybody knows -- all America is one big city. There are no cities anymore. Don't believe that there is anything like New York or Hanover. Hanover is a suburb of a suburb; but nobody knows where the metropoli- -- metropolis of it -- of this suburb is. You only know that you are here in a suburb. Damn it. It's a suburb. People live in suburbs here. That is, they belong to something bigger than the place to which they seem to belong. You don't live in Hanover at this moment. Everything is -- is far-flung. You -- live -- you live in a suburb of -- of the City X, the City Y. Isn't that true? Can you feel this? Well, the proof of it is that when we looked at the picture of Beaver Meadow, of Beaver Meadow {of} Mr. Sample out there, not one of the boys who looked at the picture had been to Beaver Meadow. Well, Beaver Meadow is five miles from here. If you would really live in Hanover, you would -- certainly would have made a visit to the neighborhood, but you don't live in Hanover, you see. You live in

some buildings that are taxed by a community of old -- called Hanover, but you live in a suburb.

So let's -- I have completed my list. I have not quite completed the practical application. But if you put here the theater, or everything that you see envisioned in movies, television movies, if you put to philosophy all the things your practical knowledge you require, from plumbing to {flying}, and then you have the complete list, or -- and here you have all the new inventions, the new discoveries, the latest news, the new crimes, the new events of the week -- then you have, by and large, the eternal Greek. And I would be very grateful if one or the other of you would make the test when he goes and he asks himself, "How much of this world is really screening -- acting as a screen with regard to the other three worlds?" Isn't it true, that at your {age} { }, gentlemen, your mind is so prevalent, that you try to think that this is your world, that you try to live in Greece, you see. And that these other things only come in, so to speak, by -- against your will. You are, of course, reminded of all { }. You are drafted. And you have a girl somewhere, and so on. And you have to make up, if you have flunked a course, which would be the altar of expiation, and so on. All these things, these other things exist, these 12 things. But I think in your own so-called world view, or philosophy of life, you would try to live on this -- on this -- on this home of your mind, and think that's it.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Student introduction: (Philosophy 58, April 29th, 1954)

[Opening remarks missing]

... enlarge into the field of varieties. So the Greeks begin, gentlemen, with the single, and they end up with the many. And that is the Greek tragedy. And how was it -- you however begin with the many, and you will be cursed if you don't find a single. And that is your problem. If you will remain deracinés, uprooted, and never have any one cause, one aim, one single god to whom you can dedicate yourself, you remain unborn, as the -- as two boys who wrote a report on the modern American boy 10 years ago in my class, came back with a report of their canvass: the soul remains unborn. The soul remains unborn. Gentlemen, the human soul remains unborn as long as you have many people whom you know. You need an alter ego. Unless you can say to a person, "Without you, I cannot live," you certainly have not discovered a soul. And that is the way God speaks to you one day, when He says to you, "I need you. And you have to give up what you want to have in life, because I need you." At this very moment, you discover your soul. Otherwise you have no soul. Don't think that you have a soul on -- on account with your grocer. You cannot go there and say, "Deliver my soul." It isn't there. It hasn't been born.

Therefore, gentlemen, the Greek problem is your problem, only in the diverse ratio, and diverse direction. The Greeks are 1000 B.C. to the times of Christ the discoverers of the many in addition to the one. Your problem, as students in a liberal arts college is the discovery of the one in addition to the many. And since you decline even to look in this direction, you remain unborn. Most of the souls of modern men are unborn. They look so funny. I mean, that's -- I think we invented all these televisions and -- and motion pictures and so, because we can encompass there so many people. And they all look alike, and they all can be reached by statistics. And they all act alike, day and night. You can predict every one of you. I know exactly what you will do for the last 50 years -- next 50 years of your life. You are stinky boring. Uninteresting. Uninteresting. You are just the products of your environment, and you boast of it. You say, "Everybody does it." That's your justification for your actions. Everybody does it. Why should I -- should I be interested in somebody who does as everybody else does? Zero. A hundred times zero is still zero.

You say so. You say, "I too have to behave, because everyone" -- I have heard,

people say to me, and you hear this every day, "In days like today, you have just to act." Do you think the people had any other problem in any other time of -- in the last 7,000 years of the race? You should have -- give up such a stupidity to telling me that in our days you just have to do this, unfortunately. Yesterday you wouldn't and tomorrow you won't. But today. Gentlemen, so stupid former people didn't dare to be, to excuse themselves with the attempt not to exist, not to be born. That's what you do -- from morning to day -- to evening, your whole endeavor is not to be seen, not to be exposed, not to be held up, not to be one of the Joneses. That's your whole { } ambition, not to be -- to be noticed. Well, gentlemen, certainly. A drop in the -- in the bucket.

So gentlemen, will you see that the Greeks were only alive as long as the compromise between singleness and many-ness, that no -- even the Greek order is impossible as a real order, if it is many-ness only. Your idea is that many-ness itself, The New York Times, and everything it stands for, is -- is possible, is order. It's only disorder, gentlemen. It's -- has to be wiped out, our papers and all our enjoyments. That is just Broadway. That cannot stand on its own legs, you see. That can be the spice of life, the condiment; it can be an addition, but it is never the thing -- your own thing. You cannot go from one theater on Broadway to the next, and to the next, and to the next. You must have one principle of which you know when to go to Broadway for entertainment, between two {real acts} of life, you see, when it doesn't matter. Broadway doesn't matter. But you think it matters.

Now gentlemen, the way into the Greek tragedy is a very exciting way. We have to assume, and we know, as -- as more than assumption -- that the Greeks were tribesmen who came to the sea. I have mentioned this last time, {did I?}. We also know that Homer is the first form in which the Greeks talk to each other of the many-nesses of their very many forms of constitutions of cities. You remember the catalog of the ships, in which they presented to each other the glories of every one city. That is Homer's act, that he acts as a matter -- master of ceremonies between the tribes of Greece. The tragedy, the Greek tragedy, as acted after 500 by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, and by the comedian Aristophanes, is a compromise between cult and epics, between Homer and religion. That is for -- unknown to you. And I mention it because it is very exciting. The history of tragedy demanded the pre-existence of Homer. It is not an accident that Homer is 300 or 400 years older than the Greek tragedy, because the epics were decidedly not the present of the Greeks. It was the far -- the far-distant past in which many-ness could be stomached. It was harmless. They were one on a common enterprise against the Trojans, you see. And the modern man could be reminded of this one -- of this many-ness of the Greeks in the past, when they

came first into the Mediterranean. The Greek tragedy, gentlemen, as you can see, makes use of Homer's discovery, of the many cities of man, of the many ships, of the many heroes, and endows the individual tragedy with both the full fervor of a cult. It's still one hero in every one tragedy -- he or she, and nobody else, you see -- but it allows to go on from one such purification of the soul to another. So each tragedy is not epical, because it's only one hero, you see. But the existence of tragedy as a form of art, inherits the Homeric many-ness, the inherent plurality. Can you see this very strange process? And there comes -- you can still trace it -- in the fact that the tragedy is composed of chorus and hero, the main actor. And in the first tragedies, the hero does not speak. Like the hero in the cult, he is in the grave. He is dead. He has to be worshiped. You have to expiate for him. You have to make sacrifices. All the ritual of the true hero-worship of the tribe is still to be seen, for example, Prometheus. When the stage, you see, opens, he doesn't speak. The others act for him. He is silent. That is not accidental, gentlemen. The Greek tragedy doesn't begin with the discovery of a soliloquy, as in Hamlet -- "To be or not to be" -- or with your own lyrics, as you would think poetry --. You take for granted that everybody can speak. That is a discovery, gentlemen, under what conditions people can speak. The chorus can speak among themselves about the hero. That's the Homeric, lyrical discovery, or epical discovery, carried then into the choirs -- songs of the choir; and it took a long time to invent the second actor on the stage who would be then enabled to -- to get between the silent hero and the chorus and inter-mediate, so to speak, {and produce} the dialogue.

So gentlemen, I {take} to the -- I can only deal with these things in a very brief manner. But perhaps you formulate it in one great thing, that every one form of human utterance, gentlemen, had to be conquered under tremendous difficulty. Everything you take for granted as a way of expressing yourself was at one time non-existent. At first, gentlemen, children and women did not speak, but only the men in the orgies of the tribe listened to the impersonator of the dead. You remember, the masks of the -- of the sorcerer speaking to the living. The dead spoke to the living in the tribe. In the Egyptian temples, I tried to tell you that the heavens spoke to the earth, that these movements of the stars were impersonated by the priests in their hieroglyphs, and taught the people on earth. As in Heaven, so be it on earth. Now in Israel, the prophet speaks already of the future, you see, and the future speaks to the present, and gets people into the future out of their present and out of their past. The future, the messianic -- messianic prophecy speaks God, who is in coming -- the coming Lord speaks to the people that are here in their incompleteness of their creature existence. In Greece, gentlemen, it is neither that the dead speak to the living, nor is it that the heavens speak to

earth, nor is it that the future speaks to the present. What is it in -- in Greek? What is the Greek tragedy? It is dialogue, that people in different orders -- remember Priamus and Achillus. You heard this in -- in class, you see, that they are both using their own cult, their own political principles, their own traditions. And yet they speak of those separate fates, destinies, traditions, to each other. That is called humanism, gentlemen. And you misunderstand it. You hear this word "humanism" bandied around a lot in this modern world. Humanism is something very specific. Humanism is the power of a member of one group to meet a member of another group. The wrong definition of humanism is that human beings meet, naked individuals, you see. That's your idea of humanism. It has never existed. Priam, as the father of Hector, and the king of Troy, meets the heroes of Thessaly and the son of the sea-goddess Thetis and of Jupiter. And they can exchange their fatal separation in dialogue. They can see each other in their awkward -- division. That is humanism, gentlemen. Humanism is man's power to look into other men's orders and ways of life. What you think is humanism is -- that's bestiality. That's the modern zoo. One animal seeing that -- another animal is hungry and scratches itself. That's not humanism, because there is no way of life that can go on on both sides. They're just two apes. That's not humanism. That's why humanism today is dying. There is -- in this liberal arts college no humanistic tradition anymore. Because nobody takes the political limitations -- the Constitution of the United States, the religion of your Congregational church, or your Episcopal church -- {any way serious}. Do you think you meet another fellow regardless of his way of life? Gentlemen, if a Roman Catholic and a Moslem really meet, that's a tremendous victory. That's a great effort. The -- Franco has now concluded a treaty with the -- with the Mus- -- mullah of Egypt. And so, in fact a Roman Catholic extremist, like Franco of Spain, and the most fanatical Moslem leader of the world have concluded a treaty. That is humanism, because they have two ways of life to defend. And they have compromised.

But if you meet somebody else in a pissoir or in a poolroom, you meet there without any paraphernalia, without any dress, without anything you present. You don't send for anything. You have abs- -- you have given all up, all your bondage, all your bonds.

I always tell the story, gentlemen, of the -- of the Aramco in -- in Arabia, who have on good American dollars built a city for the Bedouins there to make them {more} -- drill the oil. And they have -- they are flying there the flag of the prophet -- I think it's green, and the half-moon, the crescent moon. And you can

read then on -- on American ground, and American -- paid by American money, "Allah is great, and -- and Mohammed is his prophet." That is the decline of humanism. These Americans no longer have anything they stand for. But in order to win -- make money, they are willing to worship another man's religion. And you are sick from this, gentlemen, and this country is doomed as long as it does such things. Nothing makes man more despicable than to do such a thing. It's contemptible.

It's not nice. It's not human, gentlemen, It's the opposite from humanism. Because here is a human being who has given up his own humanity. There's no excuse for this. A Frenchman nearly fell into my arms and embraced me, in Egypt, and said, "Tell the people in America that they mustn't do this. That's the end of the world." A Frenchman, in the desert of Egypt. He -- he cornered me on this. He talked to me about it. He made -- drew my attention to this fact. And he said, "This is the end of the world. If the white man does this, he deserves to be immediately wiped out."

But that's what you call humanism. And that's why I have to draw your attention to the fact that the Greek tragedy still is tragic. That is, the hero remains a part of this one order of life. Antigone, you see, and Agamemnon, and Oedipus, they face a tragic death, and that is tragedy, gentlemen, to be still part and parcel of one way of life, and not to be able to say, "Oh, forget it all," you see. "We take a -- go on a cruise to the Bermudas." That's what you call humanism, when nothing is serious. Gentlemen, the Greek tragedy is still terribly serious. But through the fissures, through the -- through the seams of the column in -- into which every one hero is bewitched, so to speak, you can hear his cry, you can hear his sigh, you can hear his yearning for a wider world, a larger world in which the conditions of his law and of his city may be changed. But in the meantime, he has to pay the penalty. But if it were with you, you see, you wouldn't pay. Why? Benedict Arnold, must he be shot? Must people be executed? Must the Rosenbergs be executed? There you have a very clear case. The intellectuals of this country, and of France, and Europe didn't understand, that of course, an intellectual has to be more executed than the man who is not an intellectual, that this was justice.

We go back today to singleness. The -- I think the Rosenberg case will rank in the history of the United States as the moment in which the blind reception of the Greek renaissance came to an end, in this country. And we discovered singularity -- singleness of purpose again, where we had to shut up with many-ness, and with news, and with marketplace, and with arbitrary, you see, arbitrary ideas -- every day another one.

Here something happened and you had to draw the line. Nothing to -- that's pre-Greek, gentlemen, the Rosenberg case. It's a very important case, gentlemen. I had to defend this country in many letters to Europe on account of this case, because the Rosenberg case has been abused by the Communists in Europe to a violent anti-American propaganda. The Communists execute a million people; we execute two, so of course we are the barbarians and the Russians are very sweet, you see, and progressive. And it was -- is incredible how it has worked. I am told that there is a book by a Rabbi Feinberg -- has anybody seen it, on the Rosenberg case? -- in which he describes the endless serpent of woe produced by -- this.

Gentlemen, if you wish to come to the root of American weakness at this moment, it is this definite superstition of every American college boy, that he lives in a world of many objects. That's Greek. And that he looks around and gets acquainted. And that Hamlet is an object of his interest, and that Othello is an interest of another moment, and Henry IV. You treat the world objectively, don't you? And that's why you cannot live. Nobody can live who treats the world objectively. We are not born into the world objectively, gentlemen. Who has taken Philosophy 9 with me? You may recall that I there -- very seriously there exposed to you the fact that we were prejects, that we were thrown forward into time, you see, and that we came out of a past from which we were trajected, and that object and subject were only a very minor division of inner and outer. Now the Greek world, gentlemen, of object and subject is a world today under indictment. You and I are neither subjects nor objects. Are you the objects of what I am saying at this moment? Am I the subject? If this were so, you shouldn't listen. We are not here together as subjects and -- and objects. In what capacity are you in here -- and I -- together? Has it -- makes it any sense to call me a subject of what I am saying here? And you the object? The objects of my treatment, of my teaching? As -- it has been defined in textbooks even of education that a student is an object of a teacher. Of course, he isn't. It's obviously nonsense, you see.

What are we then, gentlemen? What are we -- in order to get out of this nightmare of Greek -- mere Greek humanism -- misunderstood, in addition. There are two features, gentlemen, about the influence of the college on your mind at this moment, on which I wanted today to be very explicit. One is that you think your allegiances can be many. Wherever you have the gods instead of God, wherever you happen to have the sciences instead of science, wherever you have any plural, you have no time sense. Wherever we have the plural, gentlemen, we have no sense of timing, because the first discovery of the time sense is

that there must be one thing only, now. The next. God's unity, gentlemen, in Israel, and the creation of the future are identical. God is only one, if He is coming in the future. If you look at the gods, as they have created the world in the past, there is absolutely no reason to believe that South America and Africa were created by the same god. No reason to believe it. Many. It is only the future that makes you and me, you see, in -- squeezes us in such a position, in a vise, where we with necessity must yearn for the one and only. And only who he yearns for the one and only understands the God of Christianity, and the God of the Creed, and the God of the Old Testament. The Biblical God is the God who is, because He is the future God, the one God.

Everything in the Bible about the past is said with regard to the future. God created Heaven and earth in the beginning, because at the end there will be the Sabbath. You and I expect the peace of God at the end. And because God rested on the seventh day, therefore we also understand what went on before. He acted so that He might rest. That is, the future explains in the Bible every past history. It is not a story, as you think, beginning at the beginning and then leading somewhere -- nowhere, you see. Quite the contrary. The whole Bible is written from the end back into the past. When Moses led the children of Israel out of Egypt, he said, "Now I understand everything that happened before. It must have happened as we left Egypt behind. So Abraham left behind human sacrifice. Now I understand why he didn't sacrifice Isaac. Now I understand why the heavens were first created light and then -- as one generation of God's action -- and then on the other six days all -- everything came to pass. That wasn't evolution. That was as powerful a breakoff, a decision, a cutting off of the ways of life of one day by the ways of life of the next day, as now, where we shall stand in the desert, we have to create a new way of life quite different from the Egyptian way of life."

That is, gentlemen, the whole Bible is written from experience, backward.

That's the meaning of the Bible, to write backward. And that's why God is one, even at the beginning, where all the other cosmogonies have many gods.

We'll see in the New Testament how -- how important there the same -- the same principle is. But the Greeks, gentlemen, say many. They say "states." They say "citizens" -- "cities." They say "politics." They say the plural of -- about everything, and therefore they have no future. The whole philosophy of the Greeks and of Mr. Toynbee, who is a good Greek -- or a poor Greek, that's as you like to call him -- and Mr. Spengler, and all the books you worship or you are asked to worship, they are all Greek. They cannot have anything about one. They can only have about many. I don't know, how many civilizations has Mr. Toynbee to

offer? Twenty-three is -- I think it is. Of course, what else can you expect from a man who looks not forward and is not taught by the task of tomorrow, who isn't waiting for God to come, and doesn't explain the past by the future. Gentlemen, I will only be able to understand your biography after you have gotten married and have grandchildren or no grandchildren, and have a vocation. At your 70th birthday, I can say it makes sense that you went to Dartmouth College. At this moment, it's very doubtful what it means. It can be the beginning of the end. It can also be the end of the beginning.

The future explains the past, gentlemen. Therefore the singular. Wherever you try to do without the future, for explaining life, you get the plural. Wherever you get the plural, gentlemen, you get the division of man into object and subject. Every Greek mind is fascist, because the mind always wants to predict and to understand. The Gallup Poll is Greek, fascism is Greek, Malenkov is Greek. We live today in fascism and Communism under the domination of the human mind. These people are people who say, "The mind is not made over by the future, but the mind brings on the future, he plans the future. He," you see, "he forces everybody who doesn't com- -- com- -- comply with my categories of thinking to go to the concentration camp." Because the mind rules the rest of the world in an objective, in a scientific manner. And you believe it. You think that's good. It's terrible, gentlemen, if people are governed by the scientific mind, because then they will become very cruel. The scientific mind is the most fanatic mind there is. All the mis- -- superstitions of the past, gentlemen, were all scientific. That is, they were all here, from the mind, without the heart. The mind had to be right. If you take the astrologers, the sorcerer of Egypt, they were highly scientific, gentlemen.

Don't believe, gentlemen, that the mind is not the seat of the evil. You say -- I have said, you have to decide. Plato said the body is the seat of evil. And I can only hold against this the experience of all non-Greeks, that the mind is the sinner, that the human thinking makes it so. I -- in itself nothing is good or evil, but thinking makes it so. That's good Shakespearean truth, as you know. Where is it?

(Hamlet.)

Yes.

Now, gentlemen, what are you and I, I ask you? I certainly am not the subject of what I am trying to do, and I -- you are not the objects of what you try to take with you. You are younger, and I am older. So obviously we are related through

time and not through space. You are not standing against me as objects. This is the first error, gentlemen, of objectivity, that it divides space. You can't get out of the fact that all science is wrong and unreal, because it divides space -- which cannot be separated, it's one -- into two spaces. One of the observer, and one of the facts observed. The observer is in one space, because otherwise you cannot observe the facts. And therefore the -- direction, the fragmentation of space is a fallacy of your mind. All minds want to have a mirror image, and the mirror is always a different space, produces a second space from the thing mirrored. I am not mirroring, and you are not reflecting on me, gentlemen, if you learn at this moment. If -- you can very clearly see how -- what happens when you treat me as your object of your attention. As soon as you look at me as a quadruped, and say this man has a blue shirt, and such shoes, and such hair, and such height, and such looks, and such accent, you have ceased to listen to me. You look at me. You can do this, gentlemen, at the penalty that you are here for no good purpose. That is your objectivity. The objectivity, gentlemen, eliminates our being together. We cannot be together unless you cease being objective. All your attempts to be objective with your sweetheart and psychologize, is always a testimonial to your frustration. I mean, all people -- every prostitute in Paris will tell you this -- that all the men who are cowards psychologize and try to be objective about their own feelings. The lusty ones, they have no time for psychology, because psychology creates a break between the object and the subject. You try to observe yourself, and you try to observe the little girl, or whatever you do. Poor little girl, and poor bachelor, who you are then, you see. A man in love is not objective. You have to take your choice, gentlemen.

But you -- you boast that you can even be objective when you are love. Of course, it just means that you are not in love. And that from vanity, and impotency, and fear, and curiosity, and all the other influences on you -- you bury your birthright, and you become objective. Don't -- don't be interested in objectivity when you are in love, gentlemen. Lovers are much cleverer than objective people. They know much more. You know certain things when you are in love you will never know from objectivity.

Now to tell you the truth, gentlemen, we -- if we at this moment would not be able to be interested in the march of time through us, I could not teach this course. And the whole -- necessity then for you and me is only that we appear strung on one line -- I have chosen these words. I think they are quite apt. You are thrown into the future, and that is for a student the predominant situation. And I come from a large past. I have degrees, and titles, and what-not. I have learned something. Individually, this may not be true. Perhaps I have more of a future and you have more of a past than it seems at the surface. I don't know. I

still think I have quite a future. But from my office, as a teacher in this college, and from your office as a student, it is obvious that you are more connected with the future, and I am more connected with the past. Isn't that true? Now, gentlemen, therefore when -- in getting together, we try to establish one channel of energy so that my relation to the past, and your relation to the future can be dovetailed, and can be gotten in such a position that the current can run from the times before me to the times after you. That's the problem, you see. Man, when he speaks, always tries to connect some time which I have not seen physically, and some time, you see, you have not yet lived physically. That is, gentlemen, the spirit of man only begins to work when your and my momentary existence are made subservient to a larger integration of the times. Before, it is quite unimportant what we say. We could also just point out things to each other. We wouldn't have to speak. But speech becomes necessary, you see, at the very moment when that which I have said may have to be said after I'm dead, you see, and after you're dead. And when it had to be said before I was born, before you were born, that has to be said in articulate language, because otherwise it cannot be repeated, you see. It cannot represent that which has to be said at all times. Therefore, gentlemen, the Greek danger is the use of the word "object" and "subject," because it brings the stream of life to a standstill. The people who meet in the schools on these benches, and in front of a chair have ceased to live at that moment in their own estimation. They look at something else, at other people's living. And they therefore are in the terrible danger of unlearning the natural, you see, that at every one moment they are at a certain point in time. And that even if you look over the whole Museum of Natural History in New York and learn it all by heart, it only makes sense if you do something with it, and bring it back into the stream of time at one point -- all your knowledge, you see. And revamp all these objects -- objective facts, into an action of now, you see, of necessity, where it is necessary to know the thing, in order to solve your next problem.

So gentlemen, the whole Greek world is under the necessity of service, just as the report -- who -- you made -- gave the report, Mr. Martin, in your last sentence, you see?

Two things then I wanted to fight today, gentlemen: the plural, and the word "object." If you are aware of these two downfalls of your mind, you can begin to love -- live. In a preparatory and an entertainment state, you may be objective. But object -- to be objective is always a second-rate situation. It is always second-rate to be objective. We have to be objective, because there are so many second-rate situations. At this moment, you can't make a declaration of love. You can't

go to war. You can't build a house. You can't do a great deal. Here you sit on your fannies so -- be objective, yes. But know that it is second-rate, that you are waiting for the moment where you can stop to be objective. It is not, gentlemen, that you -- we must argue against of being objective -- or being subjective, which wouldn't help at all -- but that you see the hierarchy, that the tribesman and the empire-builder and the Israelite, the priest of God Almighty come first; and that the Greek schools, and the Greeks epics, and the Greek theaters come second. So in antiquity, gentlemen, what has been created are three full, real -- and real ways of life, and one that copes with the intermediary world of the co-existence of many.

What can we do for you?

[unintelligible]

You understand, gentlemen, after -- that after this had been done all over the globe, after there were either empires or tribes anywhere on the surface of the globe, that something new had to happen. Our era had to come which takes for granted one people lives in the eternal presence of the stars; one people live in ancestor-worship with the totem pole always behind them, looking down on them; other people live in the messianic hope of prophecy; and then we have all the curious storytellers of Greece, and their -- with their objective gathering of facts. And who is man? Can he be either one of these four particles? Must he be either Jew or a Greek, or a Scythe, or an Egyptian? And the great yearning came, that the times might be full-filled, gentlemen.

You read in the "Letter to the Ephesians" of the New Testament that when the time was fulfilled, and the plentitude of the times were there, you read this with a pious misunderstanding. Sentimentality is always destructive of sobriety, and un-understanding. The whole Bible today is read by churchmen without the slightest understanding. But {of course}, it is dealing with something very practical, very real. It is dealing with you and me being able to be at the same time a tribesman, and an imperialist, and a prophet of God Almighty, and a student of science. Every one of us takes these privileges, gentlemen, that had to be produced. And it has been done in the last 2,000 years by what we call the Christian era. The Christian era is an attempt to make -- open up the four different ways of life to each other. That's Christianity and nothing else. Christianity is the way by which all the ways became open to each other, so that a man didn't have to stoop to one of these four ways exclusively, but could get the three other ways into his system, too. So that today, you don't have to be a Greek, but you go just to a

liberal arts college and become a little bit of a student of the Greek mentality. That's all you do. But you are not one of these silly Greeks lingering in the city of Rome, the graeculi, the Greek servants there, you see, drunk with their rhetorics and their -- and their Greek language and going -- being good for nothing, and being despised by the Roman masters of the universe, who really rule and govern. You can rule, and become president, and read the Greek tragedy at the -- at the -- on the side.

This has been, gentlemen, the yearning of all the times, that man should be free to live in all times. And perhaps you begin to understand that all this, what you think fills history is not interesting. Neither the wars, nor the religions, nor the superstitions, nor the discoveries, nor the sciences, but the problem: how to be so free that when you -- ever you want, you can emphasize the past, you can emphasize the future, you can emphasize the present, and you can emphasize the Muses, the leisure, the getting-out of harness, the waiting, the entertainment, the intermediary period, you see, not now, not the time for decisions, you see, "let's wait and see."

And don't you think that is a tremendous task? Can you see -- understand now why the enemy of the understanding of time is what today is called "history." The history departments, gentlemen, are the one great obstacle to the understanding of the simplicity of history, because they deal objectively with any number of different civilizations and orders. And they decline that in any one of these fields or times has ever been created on which you and I at this moment still depend. They tell you that -- Jeane d'Arc was burned at stake at 1430, was she? Or 1428 -- what year was it?

(1429, I believe.)

All right, it's a compromise. Good. Do you think it's true?

(I'm -- I'm almost positive about it ...)

Ja. See. So, we say what of it ...

(... I wouldn't stake my life on it.)

Would you please -- ? I didn't get it.

(Oh, I just -- I said I'm almost positive it was 1429, but I wouldn't want to stake my life on it.)

The Greek mind.

So gentlemen, we have to -- you have to split yourself into two people. The people -- the man of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, who says, as you say, "It's just one of those many facts about which you can be mistaken," and the other man says, "What do I need for my own life?" Now you will understand that the Jewish, or the Greek, or the Egyptian, or the family life is something you cannot wait to create yourself. You have to accept it. You have to be very grateful that there are still mothers and fathers at this moment, that you can go to Sharon and get married. All these forms are ready-made, are they not? They are held open for you. There they are. And you -- at the time -- when the time comes, you can say, "This is now for me." It's waiting for you. Then that's the real history of the -- mankind, all the ways of life waiting for -- to be fulfilled or chosen by you and selected. And woe to you if they aren't ready. For example, take a country in which you cannot become a monk, or a nun, or a priest, or a professor, because it's forbidden to become either one of them. Then you would neither be in -- in -- able to share the ways of the old Israel, or to share the ways of Greece, and because you couldn't become an actor, you couldn't become a professor, you couldn't become a monk, you couldn't sing the Psalms day and night. In any one of these ways, you are still able to find your own satisfaction today.

So gentlemen, this only deserves the name of history. History is not something that has gone by, but the things gone by are only important insofar as they helped or destroyed ways on which we depend at this moment, which we need for our own existence. History is very much alive as chemistry, gentlemen. What would you do without uranium {being here} -- doesn't help you to know in the abstract, but that -- {you're} meant to find it. And you have to use it.

But gentlemen, history are all the uraniums, yes, of the past 7,000 years created by human endeavor. Because what is uranium? Heaven brought down to earth. You know this word, "uranium." Uranus is Heaven. Uranium is something from Heaven brought down to earth. And I hope you begin to see now that this is not a myth, but that is very true what I have tried to tell you is that man one day began to speak, and he didn't before. And one day he tried -- organized the cosmic order and settled, and lived by the stars, and on the stars, and from the stars, and with the stars, you see. And one day he expected the ultimate goal of men -- all men under one god. And he began to do something about it. He left the fleshpots of Egypt. Gentlemen, that's history. History is only this which at this moment is still open to you and me, accessible. The rest is museum. What you call history doesn't -- isn't interesting. It's anecdote.

So gentlemen we need very little history, but we need one history. And all the histories which you receive today when you buy books have this tremendous criminal aspect, you see, of tempting you as though there were any number -- arbitrary number of history. You can either read the history of Babylon, or of the Aztecs, or of China, or of Egypt, or of Rome, gentlemen. But read one of them with the feeling that's your history. If you read all seven, you will probably, you see, be weakened, and get much less benefit from history than otherwise you could. If you study one of these great empires, you may be overawed by the discipline of these people and what they did in agriculture, and in building, and in skills, and in craftsmanship and so. If you read about all of them as you do, in the geographical magazine, on -- such other places, you say, "Oh, what of it? I have heard it all. One did this and the other this," and probably it's all equally boring, and equally indifferent. Gentlemen, do you see what multiplicity does to you at this moment? It ruins your sense of values. It ruins your sense of discipline. You don't have to know about all the civilizations on this earth. But you have to be very serious about one.

So let me give you now once more the skeleton of this course. We have dealt so far with antiquity, and we have divided it into four chapters, you remember. And we have said that in any one of these chapters, one thing is created, but with any number of varieties, of variations. That is, any one of these ways of life has 15 or 17 different forms. There are 100,000 tribes. If you understand what the tribe is, you don't have to learn all about the 100,000 tribes. A tribe is an institution to produce marriages. This is the center of the tribal system. You don't read it in any sociology. That's too simple, you see. They have to describe any given -- every different tribe as a different tribe, you see. It's utterly unimportant. That's not for you and me to know of every -- {after all, there are almost} 100,000 tribes. But in order to produce marriages, the people had to speak. They had to name people. They had to give them family names, you see, and names of their relations to each other. And in these names, they had to recognize each other, and to respect each other. And they had to put themselves under this name for a lifetime. And they had to listen to the man from the mask who appealed to their sense of honor and dignity under the name, and in the name in which they were addressed. And so we still today in the -- church have to pray "In the name of our Lord," because otherwise the people wouldn't know that they did pray in one spirit, and were in any way one family. But you -- nobody today seems in this country to understand why we praise the name. When I see -- look at these desperate ministers, they always fall asleep when they have to say that. They don't understand it anymore, because they no longer believe in the creation of history -- history. They think it's a formula. It is not a formula, gentlemen. As

soon as this goes, the whole Church goes.

Now. So gentlemen, the -- the difficulty for you and me is to understand that one thing can be created in -- in many variations. A tribe is once created, and yet, because it is alive, it spreads into 100,000 different forms. An empire is created, and yet it can be found in different parts of the globe in various forms. Can you see this? Our history -- and that's what the Bible, the Old Testament tried to do -- is only interested in the creation of Adam, of Noah, Abraham and Moses, which is the tribe, and the empire, and Israel, you see. And the Greeks, of course, being contemporaries with the Israelitic venture, are omitted from the picture in the Old Testament.

So the Bible, gentlemen, is fully aware that there are many nations. But you can trace the meaning of the history of mankind by giving the typical history of one nation. So we have to avoid the -- the -- the -- the two extremes, gentlemen. We must not simplify history. No reason for this. Let it stand in all its wickedness and all its wastefulness. And we cannot get -- believe in the anarchy of history. It is not true that you and I can tolerate a history where for every town and every nation there is a different history. It's impossible. There's one history for all mankind, but innumerable diversifications of the same story. Can you get this point? This -- this via media -- via media as -- as Cardinal Newman would call it -- the -- road between two extremes, neither is every one fact, you see, done -- in -- unconnected with every one other fact, nor is it so that there is one model tribe, and all the other tribes are not spontaneous, you see, or original; just as there is a family here and a family there, but the father there and the father here, you see, have to represent the same office. We are all accustomed to -- to acknowledge this in our own personal story, that my father and my relationship to my father, and your father and your relationship to him are different, and yet identical. Both -- this has to be admitted. Can you see the difficulty, you see? You understand from your own experience what I say when I am talking about my father, and vice versa. So we interpret each other's different story by believing in the essential unity of the two. It's quite a big order, gentlemen, for you to understand. But it's the essence, today, by which we have to escape from your encyclopedic knowledge, and from the departments of history, and from all your errors that -- that is this -- is just an arbitrary number of facts, history. It's a very severe and simple order, and yet a tremendous underbrush and a tremendous diversification of branches, and twigs, and leaves, and birds on it. Can you see this? That this famous picture of the Tree of Life, gentlemen, of the Old Testament is very legitimate. The Tree of Life has many branches, yet every branch, as you know, repeats the shape of the whole tree; and every leaf on this branch repeats again the shape of the leaf -- of the -- of the branch. Very queer, this

identity, you see, in shape. And yet, the difference in size.

Now what is left for us, gentlemen, is to see how these ways were open to each other. And by now you will understand, gentlemen, that every one of these forms had to take on a different shape by being open to the other way of life.

Out of Israel the last form created in pre- -- in antiquity, there became the Church. The Church is the new Israel, even { }. Out of the sky-world of Egypt, the world of Heaven and earth became the new nature of today, the natural -- world of natural science, the universe.

Out of the tribes of mankind, gentlemen, there is at this moment not yet created, but bound to be created by your and my stupidity, effort, suffering, what -- what-not -- there is to be created something -- how do the socialists call it? -- the unity of society, the one great society.

So gentlemen, ever since the coming of Christ, the world has tried to transform the many tribes, the many empires, and the many chosen people, the many people who try -- thought they were called by God into oneness, open to all. You may say, gentlemen, that the society is a tribe of tribes, or it will not be the great society; that the universe is the world of worlds, of all possible divided worlds -- we'll illuminate this a little further, later -- and the Church is certainly the worshipping the God of all gods. Did away and {absorbed} all the gods. You have a strange -- or you can also call this here the people of people, but I prefer God of gods -- tribe of tribes, world of worlds, God of gods is the task of our own era, gentlemen, a very simple task, to make all the tribes, you see, recognize themselves as parts of one integrated tribe -- tribe to the second power, so to speak -- to make all the worlds over the different climates, the different earths, the different boundaries of empires, make them into one world. And to make the Church in which -- into a place in which all the names of Jupiter, and -- and Jehovah, can be all called forth as of one god to name, as participants of the one God of gods. Gentlemen, the main point I today have to make in these last five minutes is -- here is no place at this moment for the Greeks. Let me put this in. The Greeks are as we -- I tried to tell you, the world of the mind, the ivory tower, the academic meditation, the leisure class. All this history of our era has been accompanied by schools, by scholasticism, by academic {trends}. And in my class or course, in Philosophy 10 I develop this behavior of the Greeks as concomitant with the three chapters of {real} history. At this moment, I wish not to say more about this. But I wish to draw your attention to one tremendous fact. If you look at this: we began the story of mankind with the tribe. We went on to the empire, and we went on to Israel. That is, Israel is the latest in antiquity, the latest in antiquity.

Now gentlemen, that much you know of the history of the last 2,000 years: that the first events of our own era are the history of the Church. The second events are the history of the world. The discovery of America, for example, is a typical event of the second thousand years of our era, 1492. In -- at the same time, 492, in the first millennium, you get religious events: squabbles on the Creed in Constantinople. And then you get the -- Islam, you see, and you get all kind of religious warfare in the first thousand years. That is, gentlemen, the Church inherits Israel, the first form of the new era inherits the latest form of antiquity. The history of the world covers, by and large, the times from the Normans to today. Our Arctic Institute is one of the last attempts to find some part of the globe that could -- might still be discovered. It is not -- there isn't much left, obviously, you see. You now have to go and get into the stratosphere to make hay. But Mr. -- Admiral Byrd and Mr. Washburn, so to speak, are the latest Christoph Colum-buses. And -- that is, they belong into a thousand years of world history; not Church history, but world history.

And the second millennium of our era then, gentlemen, is occupied all by -- or with the transformation of the many worlds, of the Chinese, and the Hindus, and the Mexicans into one world. That's the history of the last thousand years: how the world has become one. History of the first thousand years of our era: how the Church has become one. You understand? Now we are obviously, gentlemen, beginning a new chapter of unification, how the tribes might become one. We are now on the verge of beginning to create one great society. Most people in this country still think that society is a plural. You look in the telephone book and you find there's a society for cruelty against animals and then you find the society against cruelty for animals, and on it goes. That is, society is still treated in this country as an agreeable Greek plaything. You can have a society for anything, you see. Gentlemen, that's not what I mean. The society of which I -- we are going to see the birth throes at this moment, under which Communism is the great pioneer and herald, is one society all over the globe. One, and one only. Not many societies.

So the struggle is on today between the Greek societies, that are very cheap, and the tremendous discipline, that it will take to work all over the earth together. You see it already coming, I mean, what discipline it would take. All our problems today are of this -- nature, you see. Take the -- take the uranium problem. It's a typical worldwide problem at this moment, you see. And oil is similar, you see. Wheat. All of these problems can no longer be regulated by any one part of the world.

So gentlemen, I have today tried to bring you to the point at which you

understand where we at this moment are living. We are living after we have in two great millennia absorbed two great contributions of antiquity. Israel, the -- the belief in the free future, and the power of organizing society on one world into -- of organizing the world geographically, under all skies in all climates. We have not yet organized the division of labor, as in a tribe. The cooperation of all men in the intimacy and the integrated forms of one tribe. We have not yet created the tribe of tribes. We can therefore say by definition that in the year 1954, we look back at two achievements of the Christian era, and we look forward to that which has not yet been achieved. It would be quite erroneous if you would think that that history of the next thousand years would have the same theme, or the same topic as the history of the last 900 years, or the last 1900 years. In the year 300, the only interesting event was that Constantine became a Christian, because the history of the first thousand years of our era is the history of the gods, the many gods becoming all one God. The history of the last thousand years is what new continents, what new islands, what new rivers, what new mountains -- Mount Everest, you see? I forgot the Mount Everest. I mean, that's of course -- that's the great event here, at the coronation of Elizabeth, they -- that they climbed this last mountain, and acted in a truly, empire-like way. You see, that was for the Queen Elizabeth a good reminder that although she officially no longer is the empress of India, she still has an empire, and a good one, to rule. And at this moment, gentlemen, then we have an orientation which the usual history cannot offer you. The orientation is that we live in the Christian era, and we live after the fulfillment of two chapters, and the beginning -- at the beginning of the third. The whole story of our era, gentlemen, is set off against antiquity. And again, our own moment is set off against the first two-thirds, so to speak, of the Christian era itself. Do you see it? And now ...

[tape interruption; end of tape]

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Student introduction: (Philosophy 58, May 6, 1954)

A few meetings ago, I gave you the elements created by our forefathers in antiquity. I split it up rather pedantically in 16 atoms, so to speak, of behavior: remember the warpaths, or the fortress, or the fence of the law, all of them implying some resistance against the outer world. But on the warpath, you are a warrior going into the jungle; in the fortress, you sit behind your sacred frontiers and think that this land is given to you, and ... Whereas in the -- in the warpath, you have no relation to the country on which you move: you just try to take -- to ambush your enemy. You march down from Canada into Massachusetts and destroy the village of the natives, as the French used to do. And you retire again, in the -- that is, on the warpath you do not occupy any part of the created universe as God-given territory. You move. In the fortress, you sit behind -- the -- the Egyptian desert, or the mountains around Babylon, or around the hills, the seven hills of Rome, and defend what you have to hold onto, because your whole life is settled. Your whole life is limited to one great service of the sky, down on earth, reflecting the will of the birds, the will of the sun, the will of the stars in this little square of land.

And I try -- tried to show you that all these were ways of life. And today I am trying to show you how all these ways were changed, where they opened to each other, as on a crossroad -- on the crossroads, and man became able to be in part a family man -- as we know it today, which you take for granted -- without going clannish, being in part a patriot of one's country without being isolationist; being in part a believer in the coming of the Lord in messianism, without sacrificing the arts and the sciences, and the buildings, and the property, and the ways of the -- old, just for the waiting of the coming of the Lord.

So the -- the whole lecture today must concentrate on the meaning of the word "way," w-a-y. When you think of your own righteous being, you think in terms of concepts, in terms of syllogisms, in terms of logic. You want to be logical, gentlemen. Living people do not do this. The Greek mind thinks that you sit back and take stock. And the way of the Greeks then, is a way of the armchair philosopher, of the ivory tower; and you can describe the ways of the Greek mind -- in which you indulge at this moment, during the four years in college -- as a way in which your body sits down at leisure -- as you sit here at this moment on your back haunches -- and looks around, and the mind wanders. The mind migrates. That is, if we start now to define the ways of life, which the way

of Christianity or the way of our era had to integrate, we may define the Greek way, which it -- to you is more natural than any other way of life, as a way of the mind only, the ways of the mind. The learned Greek, or philosophical term for this is "method." The word "method" means to have a way of dealing with things. The word "method" comes from Greek, *methodos*. And that means -- "hodos" is the word -- Greek word for "way." So what you call meth- -- a methodical thinker, or an objective thinker, or a reasonable thinker, is a man who knows the way of the mind, and how to travel on this way of the mind to reach satisfactory conclusions. And in this sense, you all think that to be on the right way means to use your mind in the right manner. The symbol of this is the seat, the chair. That is, the gravity of your body is excluded when your mind goes traveling, as I tried to tell you about the Greek mind.

So I begin my story of the ways of antiquity, by going backward, and by beginning with that kind of mind of which you all are addicts, quite naturally, because you have -- we have made you go to school for the last 20 years, and so you do not know any better than the mind has the right to think about the world, about the United Nations, about China, about Mr. McCarthy, why -- as your own existence is completely omitted from the picture. "Who are you, Mister," I would like to ask any of you, "that you have the right to deal with -- dabble in politics, and to make up your mind on things you haven't the slightest notion of?" But you all do this, all the time, 20 days a week, I would like to say. That is, far too often.

The Greek mind is a -- is on a way which is purely mental. The Greek way of mind is a method, a method of thinking, which does not include your real existence. You -- think that you can think right, without taking into consideration where you live, how your parents make a living, what supports you at this moment in this college. Well, whereas if I -- you were an existentialist, if I were not a Greek mind, I would say, "Well, whose bread I eat, who -- his praise I have to sing, you see, who supports me." So all the institutions which support you at this moment in life are in some way at this moment already agreed upon by you, because they support you, and you make use of them, and you presuppose their existence, and everything that this implies. Very complicated. By being at Dartmouth College, you write -- underwrite a number of tenets, you see, without your knowing it, because you are a member of an institution. But the Greek mind doesn't care. The Greek mind says, "My mind is free. I look at Dartmouth College as objectively as I would look at the rest of the world. The fact that I am enrolled in this college at this moment plays no part." The way of the mind, gentlemen, separates the mind from soul and body, from your loyalties, and from your food. And you know that Marxism is the great revolt against this Greek

mind, by saying "I don't care what you think, Mister, I only care what you work, and who gives you to eat." It's a very -- reasonable revolt against such an exaggeration of the Greek mentality. But it is a -- a great possibility. And I don't wish to disparage at this moment the Greek mind, but I want to symbolize it by the division of mind and body.

In the Greek mentality, gentlemen, the body occupies a definite place in space and time. You are a member of the United States, which is very limited on this globe. You live in 1954. You were perhaps born in 1935. That is, you also occupy a very limited period of time in the life of the mind on this globe. But you indulge in thinking that, because for 19 years there has entered some pass-by of spirit into your brain, that with the help of these 19 years of participation in the mental life of humanity, you can make up your mind about all of minds. You sit in judgement about Jesus or Moses. You say Moses has never lived. You say Homer was a rather poor poet. You say, "I don't read any more Edgar Allan Poe." Or you say that -- that Whittier after all is a very pure poet of hymns, and you don't sing them anymore. In other words, the strange thing about the Greek mind is that although your body obviously exists only for a very short time on this earth, isn't that true -- only 19 years at this moment, or 20 years -- you use this mind to sit in judgment over all other minds, all other times, and all other spaces. You call some other country barbaric. You say it is primitive, from the height of your refrigerator plant. And you are quite sure that you have a power to pass judgment with your mind on the physical universe.

This is very strange, if you come to think of it. It's a very extreme case on one way of life which is expressed by the chair. I am holding a chair on philosophy. I am in the Greek position then to be asked to pass judgment on other times and other spaces which I physically do not occupy, you see, but over which I am elevated, so to speak, you see, and allow you and me to have some insight into. But we all make use of this at times. As I said, it's an entertainment between serious decisions, which have physical consequences for ourselves. We try to gather information. We try to look around, as from a beacon, you see, as over the wild sea. And we can't do without it. The Greek world -- way of life, gentlemen, is necessary. It is limited, and it is symbolized by the division of mind and body: the body only being in a single space and a single time, and the mind trying to reach out in all times and all spaces. This is the paradox of the scholastic, the school-man's mind, of the student's mind, of the professor's mind, of the academic mind. And you -- we all have it. And -- and you can say that America is -- is absolutely possessed by this idea, that the mind can deal with all times and all spaces, and the body may have -- can be forgotten, because it's just too bad that it has to sit on its fannies in this definite one space here in Carpenter 13, where

we are, obviously, as limited as all the people we try to judge, we try to understand, you see.

Once you wake up to this fact, you see that the Greek mind is impotent to change the world. There is a great saying, gentlemen, by the greatest historian of Greece. His name is Jakob Burckhardt. He was a Swiss, and I think you should know this man, because he has said a very remarkable sentence -- or written it. He has written on world history, on Greek history, on the history of the Renaissance. His book on the Renaissance is still considered the best book on the Renaissance. And his guidebook through Italy, on the art of the Renaissance, is still the Bible for any man who ever travels through Italy. If you ever go to Italy, buy *The Cicerone*, as it is called; that is, the guidebook of Jakob Burckhardt to all the treasures of art in -- in Italy. It's the greatest book on the styles there to be found in the various arts. This man Burckhardt, in his Greek history of civilization -- history of Greek civilization makes one very simple remark. He said that the Greek mind has proven impotent to change one divine service, to break down one temple of Greece, to abolish one superstition. That is, all Greek philosophy, gentlemen, since it is objective, since it can only state that in 158 cities of Greece, there are 158 different constitutions, as Aristotle did, this is no power to say that one constitution is better than 157, and specially there is no way of saying, "Now is the time to do something about it!" The Greek mind has no time sense. And Jakob Burckhardt expressed it in this very simple way. He said, "The Greeks, although they rationalize and criticize the gods from beginning to the end," Homer already does it, you see, and Plato does it, and the tragedy does it, and they all -- the Stoa does it, "they were unable to change the bodily, physically anchored world," because the Greek mind has no way of descending from the universals, from the general principles, from the comparative idea of "give me all the facts," from what you call *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, encyclopedic thinking, thinking in a wide circle -- that is encyclopedic, you see -- into your own personal situation at home and say, "Now is the time to tell my mother that she must change her way with me." This you can never deduce from any generalization, you see. That the heart must tell you. The mind cannot. The mind can never tell anybody when to do anything. And the Greeks therefore, gentlemen, have never changed the physical universe. Please take this down. They have not been able to change the physical or the social universe. But they have been able to understand it, in all its particulars. And all modern science, as you know, owes the Greeks the power to describe. There is no more wonderful way of describing plants, for example, or animals than in Aristotle. And the great Linnaeus, Carl Linnaeus, the Swede, who'd invented botany for the second time, in the 18th century, who is famous for his beautiful description of the rose, of the violet -- in a very pithy language, with a few words, giving the whole picture of this specific

plant -- borrowed his style from Aristotle. We know that he learned Aristotle as a young boy by heart, so to speak, and then went one better and, so to speak, improved on Aristotle's style in describing plants. So the Greek mind, gentlemen, is descriptive and universal, critical and factual, everything you want to be: objective, encyclopedic, systematic, philosophical. But it is not creative in the sense that it can tell one little child to fold -- his hands and pray to God. This no Greek mind can do. Greeks -- the Greek must abolish all local and chrono- -- how would you say, temporal loyalties. The result of Greek thinking is always cosmopolitan thinking, because you try to think for the universe. And there is the cosmos. And to be a cosmopolitan means to find yourself as a citizen of the whole, you see, and to say, "Well these smaller loyalties are just too petty for me to care for. I mean, I can really not stoop to think that -- that Rhode Island, Providence, and Plantations deserves my loyalty." So instead of becoming governor of Rhode Island and Plantations, you become professor at Harvard of Greek philosophy.

And now you see already the implications, gentlemen. The symbol of the chair is a very serious one. To hold a chair for a certain topic, means to be asked to think in generalities. And it is something you and I need for education, for entertainment, for information, for preparing action. It's a preparatory state, and it is an afterthought state. When action has occurred, we have to think about it, meditate about it. And before action starts, we have to prepare action. And that's the Greek mind. But if the Greek mind says this is the only way of life, we all will land on chairs, and we'll all get hemorrhoids.

Gentlemen, if you now go to the opposite extreme, and you ask yourself, you go to the Iroquois, or you go to the Sho- -- Shoshone Indians out West, or the Algonquins up North, or you go to the Amazonas people, { } tribes who live there on the upper sources of the Amazonas River, you wouldn't think of ever mentioning their having chairs. If they should have chairs, it would be a minor matter, an import -- article of import; at best they squat on the ground, as you know, like the Turks. And they don't sit in order to think. They dance, and they march, and they move in procession. And if you want to have the way of life of the tribesmen, you will think of processions. The Catholic Church, in marching outside the church buildings at -- at Corpus Christi, has the -- still one remnant of trying to emphasize a mind -- mentality, by your whole physical appearance in marching, in walking, in dancing, in a rhythmical movement. Or, and you go here to the Episcopal church, and say -- or the Catholic church, they march in, the whole choir, you see, with the minister leading. That's an attempt to say, "I think in walking. I think in marching. That's the best thinking I can do, because I'm fighting the enemy. I'm in -- symbolizing movement. I am in harmony with

the spheric movements. It's a very beautiful feeling to be a good walker." And don't ever estimate, gentlemen, that the best things -- thoughts come to yourself in walking. If you are -- get stuck in your studies. Leave it! Don't sit down in Baker Library, or where it is. But walk, and you certainly will see things in a different light, because you are yourself in movement. And a person who is movement sees the world with a very different way from a person who sits down and looks at the world, you see, and sees only that the world moves. In a tribe, gentlemen, the world is standing, and I'm moving. So -- that's an exaggeration, but it is more or less the difference, that -- an Iroquois medicine man feels that he is dancing. He is at the -- at the crest of the wave. He is the wave that breaks over the earth. And that's how the tribesmen really felt in their -- and we speak of waves of migration, of migratory tribes.

Gentlemen, these are -- is -- are not metaphors. That's true. Human beings can feel, if you go to an attack in a battle, you go over the parapet in waves. This is true, gentlemen. We are then creating the change and the movement, you see. That's the very opposite from the Greek mind. The Greek mind insists -- the very word "insists" is very good, you see -- insists on -- on standing still, himself. And the more he can be static, the better he can observe these things. Isn't that true? Whereas the tribesman feels that he knows the secrets of history, of what is to come, of what he should do, by first getting into the swing of things, you see, an get on the merry-go-round. And the more you swing, the more you know how all the other things should be moving, because you have the feel of the swing first created into your own limbs. This is very little, gentlemen. These are no metaphors. Please, you are so spoiled by the Greek mind, that now when I say that -- that the tribesman is thinking by dancing, you think I'm just joking. You think that's a metaphor. There's a simile. Well, gentlemen, all the professors of literature who talk to you about similes and metaphors and synonyms, they just don't know what life is. They are all Greeks. They think they should sit and look at these things. But that's not metaphor, when an Iroquois can only speak of rain and sun by feeling that he rains himself down on earth; by jumping, leaping up and down, he only can realize what he's talking about. Before, he doesn't know. How can you know what rain is, if you have never rained yourself? It's a very passive experience to see the rain fall on the roof, you see. But when I speak, gentlemen, I can feel -- sometimes, when I am eloquent -- that this is the rain, that this is a { }, that this is a downfall of eloquence on you. It's of course wasted, I know that. But still I have the experience of downpour. I have the experience of waste, too.

So please, begin to believe, gentlemen. What I'm trying to revive in you is the experience of the total man in you, and that includes these tribespeople. This

includes these people who can, by dancing, realize creation.

A little story, gentlemen. In Windsor, Vermont, it is a little town. I have friends. And there was a late-born, little son in a family. The parents were quite old. And the youngest was only three years of age, or four years. I don't have -- don't recall -- Russell was his name. And Russell was taught by his mother, who was a good schoolteacher besides, that God created the world in six days, and when He had created it, He saw that it was very good. And he learned this. And the next day, the mother came out onto the garden and -- on Main Street. In Windsor, they have a very beautiful old house there. And he had dug up a little molehill of a -- of -- from sand, with his spade. And he was dance -- dancing around the molehill, crying -- or shouting, I should say -- with joy, "And God saw that it was very good." That was his creation of the molehill. And that's not a metaphor, as you can see. But that's the only way in which he could absorb and assimilate the story he had been told, you see. He became the creator himself. And you can say of the tribesmen that that's just what they did. What you call this --- the whole -- the ritual of tribal worship, gentlemen, is something you have to aspire at, because it's the exuberance by which you first realize what it is to be exuberant. You think you can sit down and define "exuberance," before you have been exuberant, if you're all the time only prosaic, and count your dollars and cents? It's impossible. Before you haven't wasted all your money on the second of the month already, which you only should spend on the -- in 30 days, you don't know what exuberance is. Exuberance is something -- some -- is a time when we spend more money than we have, for example, and more energy than we could possibly stretch on weekdays. And if you have never been in this divine mood, you -- I'm sorry for you. You are very prosaic, and you may become a certified bookkeeper, but that's all.

And all the social workers of America tell the poor people in this country that they must distribute their budget so that for 30 days it will carry them. And they must never get drunk, and never go spend their money. And so, of course, the result is that the -- in any decent family of self-respect under care of the social worker goes and has no money left on the second of the month, because they want first to exuberate, you see. Instead of the decent social worker who would say, "I know. You first must be enthusiastic, and inspired. And spend all you have on this. But think just that afterwards there will be a time where you will have also to eat and to drink. And then you get a reasonable budget -- 60 percent, you see, on pleasure, and 40 percent for real economics." That's by and large a reasonable budget in any good family.

But look what we have done to the world with the Greek mind, with the objective mind. And that's why the social workers are so funny. And all your social policies and all your economic thinking at Tuck School, it doesn't lead anywhere. Nobody ever lives that way, because they only act at one hour after another, destructively, objectively, factually; one hour is as good as any other. Gentlemen, do you -- go -- are you going to say to me that while you are shaving and that while you are under the shower, this as good an hour as you are allowed to spend at this moment with me? It is not. It is a better hour. And you have to respect it. And that's why you are after all shaving, getting up, so that you are able to be a student at Dartmouth and get such courses. And if you have not the courage to say that this time needs a greater energy and a greater investment than the 19 or 23 other hours of the day, I'm sorry for you. You can't be a student. But that's un-Greek. That's not destructive. That's not objective. That's not encyclopedic. But it is very, very human, gentlemen, and it has been experienced by the most primitive men in the world, in their dances. That it is worth to give in their orgies, in the orchestration of life -- and "orchestra" means dancing -- on the dancing ground, to give their all. And later life will take care of itself. I mean, a person who cannot waste -- oh, I'll give you a practical story. Friend of mine is psychiatrist. And he has a woman coming to him, deep melancholia. And he finds out that this woman is just ruining herself with ethical culture. And that she always thinks how she ought to feel. And her melancholia is nothing but the resistance of her inner being. She doesn't like certain things, but ethics command that she must like everything as it comes along, you see. So she has -- builds up, of course, inside this tremendous flow of tears and sorrow for herself, because she is not allowed up here, you see, ever to admit that anything makes her angry, or that anything is bad, or so, or that she hates a person. So she -- he explained the situation to the husband. He was quite reasonable. He is a normal being. And he said, "I'm going to borrow money so that we can go on a second honeymoon to Bermuda. And I know this would change everything, if my wife would really have a festive -- a festive time again with me."

Very reasonable. My doctor friend of course subscribed to this a hundred percent. And said, "Yes. It's worth the loan -- any ..."

It came to naught, because the wife said, "We can't run into debt." Wie? You see? So she prefers the {crematorium}. And the psychiatrist dropped the case after that and and said, "I wash my hands of this. There is nothing doing."

And that comes from your way of rational thinking, gentlemen. You cannot

understand that you can only realize that part of marriage, in this special case, you see, which deserves to stand out and to hold you and carry you through all the discrepancies, and all the idiosyncrasies of life, if you sacrifice for it, if you lift it up, and make it a special occasion in which you are dancing, gentlemen.

What is this, gentlemen, dancing? It's the opposite from the chair. In the chair, we condemn our body to follow its natural gravity. I'm not joking. You will see at the end that the symbols of the chair, and of the dancer have a tremendous significance for our whole Christian religion. But in the Iroquois' makeup, you want to be lifted up and overcome gravity. This woman, if she had allowed her husband to, you see, take out a loan in the bank, would have overcome the natural gravity of her thinking, you see, where 10 is 10, and 100 is 100 and 4 percent interest are 4 percent interest. And she didn't know that she can all -- could earn 50 percent interest by going to Bermuda on a -- on a credit, you see, because life would look different afterwards. She couldn't see it. She couldn't become Iroquois. So she couldn't be healed. She could not change one way of life, of pagan antiquity, the clever way, the circumspect way, the New England way, the Yankee way, the savings bank way, you see, for the Savior's way, who said to Mary Magdalene that she did right to waste all the ointment on His feet, you see, and who -- who rebuked Judas Iscariot, the financial wizard, who said, "We could have bought so much other things for this oil which she wasted on the master's feet."

Now this -- that's the dancing, gentlemen. And you will take down perhaps this note, that standing, walking, dancing is a way of fighting gravity, of overcoming gravity, to allow us the experience of flight, of movement, of harmonious rhythm. He who doesn't move doesn't know what rhythm is. And he who doesn't know -- move, gentlemen, does not know that life is life, and not death. The Greek, even if he describes death -- life, still is describing death. The doctor who is just a Greek can only see the anatomy. That is, he can only see the dead things, you see. The doctor who wants to get his patient well again must know what it takes the patient to come to life, despite the threat of death, despite the onslaught of the disease, because the disease will bring about his death. So the doctor must side with the side of life, and must know what will enthuse this patient so that he rises to the occasion. For example, he will send a wire to the best friend of this patient and say, "Come, because your appearance will show this patient that it's -- it's worth living. And that will help him more than all the penicillin." But nobody does it in this country. Have you ever heard of a doctor, who instead of going to the -- Putnam's drugstore says to the -- tells -- sends a wire to the best friend of the person, the sweetheart and say, "You come." That

would be good medicine, according to tribes -- tribal medicine. But not according to Greek medicine. It's inexplicable in Greek medicine.

Now the third symbol, gentlemen. We have the walking, the fighting, the dancing, and we have the sitting -- the chair philosopher. We come now to the worship in the temples of Egypt, in the temples of all the great empires. There people kneel. They kneel in worshipping the sun and the moon and the stars. And I want you to understand, gentlemen, that to kneel, which has completely gone out of existence in this country, is a normal attitude of human reverence and human worship. Reverence, of course, is not very much liked. The last reverent in this country are the ministers, you see, what is -- you see, some people are "Misters," and the people in the lower income class are -- "Reverends," that's all. But I mean, really, it is no -- now to -- very m- -- a distinction to be a reverend. But it was, at one time, because it meant that people took towards that which is to be revered the attitude of kneeling. That is, they distinguished high and low, upper and lower. We have some high-brow and low-brow, but in this country, as you know, we kneel before the low-brow. So the higher-ups are all -- over -- oben in Heaven kneeling and looking down to the low-brow, and beg- -- asking for good weather from them. That's, by and large, the attitude of the American educated classes, to the -- to the populace.

But high and low are very strange terms, gentlemen, which can only be understood as -- in terms of reverence. This is nothing you find in nature. There is nothing high or low in nature, really, because you can always turn around and look down, or look up. What is high? And what is t- -- low, you see? It's really very seriously, gentlemen, that you have to consider that in any civilization, that to which you look up -- in this country, for example, Hollywood -- is revealed by some kneeling attitude. That is, you take what goes on in the so-called higher circles, or higher spheres, as the law. And you do not criticize. You withhold criticism, because they set the law. Somebody told me yesterday that he had always measured me by some other example of somebody who knew. And that he had learned only in a hard struggle that this would -- didn't do any good to compare. But we all do this, naturally, you see. We have some fixed point, which is high, which is our highest authority, you see. You -- I don't know whom you consider today the greatest wizard in America. Whom would you call the mo- -- the greatest spirit here in this ...? I don't know if you think of Mr. McCarthy, or Mr. Einstein, but one of the two, perhaps. And -- like the little girl, Lewis, you know, {Houdine}, from Burlington, Vermont, who was called to -- to the telephone to greet Mr. Eisenhower's brother. And he said, "Do you know who I am?" She was six years old and she said, "Oh, yes. You are President McCarthy's

brother."

Well, she had reverence, you see. This is a term again that is quite unknown. I'll give you another anecdote about reverence to show you that it is quite practical. There was a man, Harold Lasky, in England. Who has heard of this -- this man? Ja. And he was typical of the pink era. And he was a great friend of Oliver Wendell Holmes, the judge. And he was a leader -- a leading light of the left wing of the Labor Party in England. And one day he lunched with Ramsay MacDonald, who was a Laborite, too, but was -- had come around and governed England in 1931, and was a man of positive action. I think his son is still in the forefront. He was minister in the Labor government, the son of Ramsay MacDonald. You have heard of the old man, perhaps, too. And Lasky -- Harold Lasky and -- and MacDonald had lunch in Soho. Soho is a -- are quarters in London where you have lunch. And that's the best you can say of Soho. And they -- they quarreled on politics. And finally MacDonald said to Lasky, "The fault with you, Mr. Lasky, is you have no reverence."

And he certainly hadn't. He was one of these gruesome fellows who are -- always know better, and impertinence is their whole makeup. All his books are just impertinent. And -- and he's -- I -- I have always been scandalized by the man. I think he's terrible. And the English, you know, they have so little mentality, so little brain that they are terribly impressed by these people. They don't act -- do anything about such people, but they let them do -- act. They are very -- very funny. So Lasky could play a certain part in England. He had no effect on -- but he was there and he -- they looked at him as -- as a funny creature.

Well, MacDonald was annoyed, like -- as from a wasp or a gadfly. And he said, "You have no reverence."

Now that is one-half of the story and you think, "Well, the old man was just a pompous ass, and he wanted reverence and he didn't get it, and so he was nervous and sensitive." That's only one-half of the story. And I happened to be able to follow this up. This story was told to me by one man, of course, who is a professor at Harvard now. And the other story was told me 10 years later by another man, Dartmouth graduate, who also is a professor at Harvard now, but -- but I think they hardly know each other. When this second man went to England from here to study at my advice, I asked him to do this. I said, "You go to the London School of Economics, but I only will persuade your father to send you there under one condition, that you do not listen to this rascal Lasky. He is an impertinent fellow and that's -- you have enough impertinence." He was the editor of The Dartmouth. "So this, the one thing you do not need, to be more

brazen, and to talk about everything without knowing anything."

Well, since he depended on me for my persuading this father, who trembled in his shoes and wanted him to go to Yale, and said, "How can a man from Yale -- from Dartmouth go to London? That's just not done." I prevailed. He went to London, and of course he had promised not to take lectures with Lasky. When he came back, he confessed that he had gone to Lasky, of course he would. And -- but he said -- this was 1938 and 1939 -- and my talk -- my story of Ramsay MacDonald must have been dated in 1931-32. You know what this second man, who by now is -- has -- has made the grade and is a professor at Harvard Law School, what he said to me? In reporting on his impressions from Lasky. Of course, I asked him, "Now what did you get?"

"You know, it was strange. He was exactly as you told me he would be. But he always had one remark at least during every lecture I attended." They lecture very little in England, you know, once a week. One hour. "See, he always used to say, 'At any one occasion, you must have reverence. You must have reverence.'" So here, you see, that Mr. Lasky, in the process of getting -- becoming a dignitary himself, and a professor, and a leader, had inherited from Mr. MacDonald the recommendation. And although he had no reverence, he at least handed it on. And he asked the students to have reverence for him, Harold Lasky. "You must have reverence." I think this -- these two pieces together really make a great story, because I think they prove one thing -- now quite seriously, gentlemen: that even the most -- Bill Cunningham's character has a weak hour in which he wants to be knelt before or kneel himself. That is, have reverence. Kneeling, gentlemen, is something that has gone out of existence in this country, and without which you cannot be. And if you kneel not before God Almighty, you will kneel before the golden calf. I have seen this happen in this course -- a Great Issue course two years ago, when the richest -- one of the richest men of this country gave a lecture, which was neither fish nor flesh; it was absolutely nothing. But all the students were deeply impressed, because this man was God. He had made money, married the richest heiress on the world, and so on. And I was very depressed, because this was certainly reverence wasted. It was the golden calf philosophy. That is, you can be -- take this down, gentlemen. We all kneel before something. The rationalist kneels before -- kneels always before sex. The ra- -- will you take this down? The rationalist will always kneel before sex, because he cannot explain it, that anybody loves him. You will find that all the rationalist businessmen or philosophers will pay any price, and will be subservient to any woman who's good enough to -- open her bed to him. Fantastic. That's why the ancients depicted -- the Christians in the Middle Ages depicted Aristotle, you

know, lying on the ground, as a quadruped, and being ridden by a whore, the famous {Lares.} Because he said -- they knew that Aristotle was so clever that the only miracle he couldn't explain was that somebody could love him, because no reason can ever explain that. Reason will kneel before affection. Hasn't to be sex. That's the one thing reason cannot explain. And therefore, gentlemen, atheism will always kneel before power. Hitler was worshiped as the golden calf of Germany, because, you see, the power -- a weak country in its -- in its defeat, you see, worships power, the one thing it hasn't. We all worship that which by our reasoning processes we cannot explain. And we kneel before it. And kneeling has to be reintroduced and perhaps you use the word "reverence," gentlemen. There is nobody without reverence, I assure you. And if you are all defiant, gentlemen, in the hour when the executioner tries to put you to the electric chair, or to Auschwitz in the gas chamber, you do kneel, and then kneel before the executioner and ask for his mercy, or you can kneel before God Almighty and say -- who gives you the power not to kneel before this wicked man who is going to execute you. But you have to kneel before one of the two.

This you do not know, gentlemen, because you have never been in need of kneeling, of trying to save the life of -- your sweetheart or your beloved. At that moment, you do kneel, whether to the medical art you kneel before, you think the doctor may think up an operation, or some such thing. And it's very hard to talk to you, gentlemen, because you do not kneel -- know that you kneel. You decline to accept -- admit that you do kneel, somewhere in your mind. But -- we all do. We can only kneel before the living God, or between the golden calf -- before the golden calf. But you do kneel.

Now the Egyptians taught us reverence. There is no more piety than in these old best temple services, whether its the -- the holy lamb, or whether it's the apses of the cathedral, with its dusky light, you see, where the old -- women kneel down in reverence, you see, before the unknown, we all kneel, or we must kneel. And they have created this attitude of worship in reverence, which is not the same as the -- worship in ecstasy, as in the tribe. The tribesmen are ecstatic, you see, but the empire-builders have taught people to prostrate themselves. That's the opposite word, if you don't want to -- use the word "kneel." I prefer kneeling; it's not so learned, but it's a physical attribution of our body that you and I can kneel. And if you analyze for one moment this kneeling as a physiological thing, and don't despise the body, because I am not a Greek and God created our body for expressing His -- our spiritual allegiances, just as much as our mind -- if you accept this for one minute as my heresy, then I -- let me tell you that sitting and kneeling are complementary. When you kneel and when you sit, your body moves in the opposite manner. And look what you do to your legs, in

both cases. They -- they move in the opposite angle, don't they? In kneeling, you stretch the knees forward. And in -- in sitting down, you bring your back down. So you fall forward in kneeling, and you go backward in -- in sitting. That's not accidental, because in -- in sitting backward and leaning backward, you want to get out of the situation, you want to be objective, you want to have distance, detachment. And in kneeling, gentlemen, we attach ourselves, we attach ourselves to the ground and we say it's sacred ground. And we kneel down in reverence. And so attachment and detachment are very clearly expressed by these two strange attitudes, which you can grossly imply in this manner, that would be the seating one and that would be the kneeling one.

We come now to the Jewish attitude. Jews do not kneel, except on Day of Atonement, because kneeling led to the abuse of kneeling before the statues of gods, or kneeling before the emperor, you see, as the priest-god; he himself is the God incarnate, so the Jews do not kneel. They do not sit. And they do not walk. Or they do all three occasionally, perhaps, I should say. One day in the year, they do kneel, as I said, of the Day of Atonement. But their soul, gentlemen, is unearthly, totally unearthly. The Greeks -- the Jews living in the future have as a nation -- has discovered the pure soul without the physical. But it is certainly not sitting down and taking stock, you see. But it's {soaring}. It's outside this world, in the sense that it's expecting the messianic hope. It's on the way out of this world. The highest day of the Jewish religion is celebrated in the day -- in the dress, as you know, in the shroud of the dying person. You have died to this world. And so you are lying, as in a coffin. So the horizontal line would be the most appropriate line, so to speak, to curl out the physical attitude of the Jewish faithful with regard to his God. God speaks to him and he is extinguished. He fills him, He inspires him. The prophet is lying as one dead.

Now I'm not a designer. I always hope that in my lifetime there would come a painter, or a sculptor who would help me, gentlemen, to implement my -- these four great symbols of life. I put it very crudely. The walker, the lyer, the kneeler, and the sitter really exploit four different attitudes of our body which insinuate mental attitudes. The mind has its physical appearance. And I -- think we would come out of the abstract art very soon if the people would trust the senses and the body again -- the painters and the sculptors -- and would know that the spirit itself speaks through the body, because after {all}, what does a sculptor or a painter -- trying to express this spiritual meaning of physical appearances. Now 500 years ago, if he wanted to -- to paint a prophet, Michelangelo had to make -- give him a tremendous beard and a great gesture and book in his hands, because people thought that his -- the dress of the prophet and his gestures were the thing. But if you see that this is an attitude in which man can be transformed by

his ex- -- by his inspiration, by his experience, the painters could perhaps take to real forms of nature. I knew one young painter who said that he felt that in all the bacteria, in all the little cells, of the cellular body, or the physiological, microscopical research, there were great secrets of -- of attitudes which the painter should reveal. He should -- he should take a leaf from all these forms, like leaves, and trees, and express spiritual truth in these forms, because they were eloquent. They were not just accidentals. They tried to express some -- some attitude of one -- perhaps of the lower spirits of the universe.

This leads me far at this moment. But I wanted still to suggest that these four attitudes deserve to be taken seriously. It is not necessary to -- to depict a king with a crown on his head, or a chieftain. If you have a -- a vigorous, walking man, he impresses you as having an attitude towards the universe, by which this universe is kept moving. He is in the center. How do you call the little thing we play with, with a whip, as a boy; I mean, keep it going.

(Top.)

What?

(Top. Top.)

Cup?

(Top.)

A top. A top. Yes. Sure. That's what I mean. We are tops. Let's have a break here.

[tape interruption]

We have made four points, gentlemen, that the word "way" is the only term in all four ancient ways -- civilizations which they have in common. The way of life of a tribesman, of a Greek, of a Jew, and of an Egyptian differ, but they all are on a way. The word "warpath" -- "path" is perhaps the most important word to express the fact that the path of the tribesman leads through the bush. It is a path whose features you even -- vestiges you try to obliterate. You read in -- in Leatherstocking, of course, that the skill of the tribesman is to discover a path which is kept down to a minimum of clarity, so that the enemy cannot find it. That we call a path. A path is a way, gentlemen, of the least ostensible evidence. A way -- a highway is a way in which the evidence, so to speak, is underlined, underscored.

But they are all ways. The Egyptians tried to make the way a highway. The tribesman tried to keep the way a path. As in your youth, you try to be Boy Scouts and Pathfinders, because you want to imitate the tribesman. And in -- later, you get a -- too-big a car, and you drive on the six-lane highway. Then you have lived, you see, the Egyptian way.

The Greeks, gentlemen, invented the use of the word "way" for ways of the mind, for methods of thinking. And -- you may take this down, if anybody's interested. It's quite important that the poet, like Pindar, the great hymn-singer, for the Olympic victories, who was very physically minded, very -- in love with the athletes of his days, of course, because he was -- that's how he made his money, yet has already this frequent use of the word "way" or {keloitos} for the ways of thinking, for the ways of the mind. He already speaks of the crossroads of the minds, which confuse the righteous man so easily where he then misses out on the right way of thinking. Something you take for granted, after all is something that had to be discovered one day, gentlemen, that Main Street and East Wheelock can be used to describe mental processes. You will see how artificial this really is, you see, that this is a second experience. First you walk, after all, body and flesh, and body and soul along the road or through the jungle on some errand. And it is quite a long way {before} you discover that the mind can be treated, you see, to be on the road, or on the way. You all take these things for granted. My whole endeavor is to show you that they were not at the first -- in the beginning at all accessible to man. Such an artificial idea, the way of the mind -- that's the creation of the Greek -- of the Greek way of life, because the Greek way of life was a mental way of life, and not an ecstatic way of life, and not an attached way of life, not a reverential way of life. It was a critical way of life.

So the mind in the critical attitude is detached from the rest of the world, so that -- the only way it can move is inside itself. So the ways of the mind, you see, have this very dangerous attitude, you see, of being autonomous in one way, free, but also arbitrary and self-centered. As you well know, your danger at your age is to become self-centered, because the mind is the thing that functions best in you. And it has a habit to be self-centered.

So the mental way of life is a self-centered way of life. The path through the jungle is least in evidence. The way of the temples is most clear, beautiful roads of procession. The first buildings already around the temples are highways, you see, to get up the corpse of the pharaoh into the pyramids, for example, you see. Tremendous -- hundred feet wide, these old roads already were. Roman roads are wonderful to this day.

The fourth way of the Jews is the way of God with man. That is a way which is miraculous. It takes everyone, so to speak, by his forelock and which cannot be seen. The way of the Lord, the way of righteousness, the way of truth. And it is explicitly said in Isaiah, as the announcement of the way -- of the new way which will unite always "Voice of him that cries in the wilderness, prepare you the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." So that's the future. That's the -- our own era, gentlemen. A way of ways. That is our era.

And let's now look into this Christian story a little bit. Look up Acts: 19th chapter, 19th verse. Wait a minute; 9th verse, I'm sorry, 9th verse.

"Divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude ..." Then Paul departed from them.

Now here, in a very shorthand manner, that way is the Church's. That is, gentlemen, you -- may have learned this in your Sunday school, but if not, please repeat it now, and take it down -- the original name for Christianity was "the way," and that's why the Methodists today still call themselves with this term "methodist," the people of the way. I told you that the Greek word "method," you see, meant the mental way. They should have not -- the Methodists should not -- never have called themselves Methodists, because that's too Greek. They should have called themselves "Hodists," because hodos is the Greek word for "the way," and it's the official name in the New Testament, gentlemen; 19:9 is one seat where we learned this, then 19:20 -- verse 23, you have another place, where it says, "And the same time there arose no small stir about that way." And the last, I -- you can give you here, of course it would have to be 24th chapter of Acts, 22nd verse, where the Roman great procurator, who -- before whom Paul has to render accounts, is interested -- 24th chapter of Acts, 22nd verse. "And when Felix heard these things, having more perfect knowledge of that way, he deferred them." So again, you see that "that way" is a term -- technical term for what Christianity tried to be, a way of life.

The other place I may list, 16 -- 17. There are other in Acts where it is especially mentioned that the word "Christian" is very -- was very late. It came up in Antioch, and before the people were called Christians, they were all -- only called "people of -- that way." Nothing else. And I think we have to return to this, to get you out of your habit, to look at Christianity with some sentimentality enough to understand that it is the daily reintegration of four ways of life, as created in antiquity, the ways of the ecstatic tribesmen -- tribesmen, the way of the prostrat-

ing worshiper of the gods in the sky, the way of the contemplative Greek mind, with his mental meditation or contemplation, you see, his mind being the temple, so to speak, in which he worships the world, and the way of the Jew, like one dead in his shrouds expecting the coming of the Lord.

Four ways of life to be unified: that's the problem of our era, gentlemen. This has nothing to do with your allegiance to a church. You are in this era today, and you have to live it, whether you know it or not. In other words, gentlemen, there are nothing but Christians in our era, including the Jews and the Gentiles. By now, in 1954, you all have to solve this very problem: when to look backward, when to look forward, when to look upward, and when to look inward. And you can't get out of it. And you would like to. And we do not have to wait until you are good enough to confess, and to go to confession. You are in this ring. You may be too stupid to know it. You can blind yourself to your real way of life at this moment, and you go one way or two ways or -- instead of all four ways, instead of being a free agent between the four ways of life, you can be hipped on clannishness, and try to be in the social register, only, and do everything to live on Park Avenue. Then you are just nothing but a tribesman, and clannish. And you can only think that you meet people in the -- in the Porcelain Club or some equally stupid society, but -- {Porcellian}, pardon me -- and -- but we all are one way or the other, as this language has it, one way or the other, you see. And you are complete men if you know that these four ways are all the time inviting you, tempting you, inciting you, welcoming you, beckoning you, and that at every one moment, you have to decide on which of the roads to travel.

You would not believe me, however. By the way, this -- the prophecy of -- of Isaiah is one of the few sayings of the Old Testament that is actually quoted in all four Gospels. This way -- "Prepare the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God." In other words, gentlemen, all the four Gospel writers had to take up the cue of the word "way" to make sure what they really were doing. They had to answer the ways of antiquity by the better way, the new way, the final way, or however you call it. I have looked this specially up and I find that in Matthew 3:3, in Mark 1:3, and you'll see this is quite important, in John 1:23 and in Luke 3:4, this prophecy of Isaiah is taken up. And as I said, there are very few places where all four Gospel writers, you see, feel bound to repeat the same.

But gentlemen, if you want to grasp the fact that the way of the Lord is the way of freedom between these four choices -- treasuring the old, treasuring the new, treasuring the inner -- speech of the heart, or trust -- treating, giving into the outer pressures of the physical or the natural world which we know as objec-

tive world -- this freedom between Greek and Egyptian, and -- and Iroquois and Jew was quite conscious to the fathers -- the founders of the Church. The four Gospels are written as freeing one of the four ways in particular. There has been much discussion about the origin of the four Gospels. There have been more Gospels tentatively written. Five, six, seven, as you may have heard; but there are only four Gospels indispensable, gentlemen, in order to turn towards the Greeks, the Jews, the tribesmen, and the Egyptians in saying that the old ways -- the old four ways -- have now to be superseded by the way of the Gospel. So gentlemen, the four Gospels have four addresses, or four fronts. And what I want to do now, is to introduce you into this incredible fact that there couldn't be fewer Gospels, and there didn't have to be more. The minimum that had to be done was to say four times that this was a new way, because the people to whom the Gospel has to be brought live -- and lived at that time, of course, even more explicitly -- on these four different ways. And you per- -- can perhaps now see, gentlemen, that the Gospel is a specific way of turning around the old twisted way. You look at Matthew and you see that it begins with -- with the genealogy. The first book -- the first chapter of Matthew says, "I am the continuation of Genesis, the book of the generation of Jesus Christ." Now the book of the generation of Adam is the first book of the Old Testament, and so obviously the first Gospel was written to say, "There is more to say -- be said about Genesis. Man himself is now to be created -- recreated -- he has to be created; the perfect man has come." And now comes a long list of many paragraphs, and many people in the last 200 years especially have poked fun at the funny names, that -- this is the list of the "begats." You may have heard of the "begats" and that seems so funny. Gentlemen, the book of the tribes all insist, as you know, that the hero comes from somewhere, out of the dark, out of the bush, exorcised by the old tribe and begins a new tribe. I told -- I told you that the loss of tribal history is any memory of what preceded the founding of this tribe. All tribes are shrouded in an uncertain beginning. Suddenly there is a hero who has a band around him, gathers like Romulus and Remus, you see, a band of people around them and begin to live, and forget where they come from, create a new language, branch off, and conceal the branching-off point, conceal the growing point from which they sprang. All tribal history, you remember I made a point to show you that -- show that you would understand the importance of this, all tribal history conceals that which connects this tribe with all other tribes. Can you recall this? Who does not? This suppression of the way in which the expellee from one tribe has to branch out, you see, and found the next tribe. Now the whole genealogy of St. Matthew is written around the dishonorable points of the genealogy of Christ. There are three whores in the story, three

harlots, or two harlots and one near-harlot. The lady who married King David, the wife of Uria, who was slain in battle, you see, at the behest of the king so that he could marry the wife of this slain warrior. Not a very agreeable story. But a tremendous revelation. The veil is drawn away from the real facts of life. All mankind is one. And the suppressed points are the important points. And man must get the courage of self-criticism, self-introspection. He must not write, as your people do, genealogies for -- for money, you see, that you come from David Bruce from Scotland, or from King David of Israel, in so many generations. But you have to mention the -- the criminals from -- whom you also have come. Obviously in every family there is a skeleton in the -- in the closet, and they -- you never find this in those genealogies.

I had a friend who was president of the academy -- Medieval Academy of America, Mr. Ralph Waldo {Pram}. And he was one of these fancy guys who wanted to have a top-notch genealogy. And he went to great lengths to invent one, and he told me about it and he said, "You know, we -- I can trace it down to -- back to 1640 in England. And -- and then I have a family in Germany, 1538." And I said, "What's the connection between those?"

"Oh there's no connection. But I hope there -- I -- one day I will find one."

So it's typical, I mean, typical dream of this man. The people in Germany in 1530, whom he wanted to have as ancestors were noblemen, and the man in 1614 was a shepherd in England, and he said to me, "You know, my guess is that the -- the man in -- in Germany, in Hildesheim, had so many children that one of them left for England and there he became a shepherd."

And I said, "Funny, but I thought that the ancestor of 1530, as far as you were -- told me was a canon of the Roman Catholic Church, and was not married."

But you do anything for the "begats."

Now gentlemen, the people who poke fun at the "begats" in the Bible are so funny, because they do not {poke} fun at their own desire to -- to have the begets in their own ancestry. The greatness of St. Matthew is, gentlemen, the complete indifference to excellency, distinction, or disrepute. The greatness of the genealogy is that there, for first time, the savior of the world is put in the light of the deficient pedigree. He is not said to come from Jove. He does not descend from Juno, or Artemis, or Apollo, or any of these fancy stories of the Greek genealogy. He doesn't come from the Manitou himself, or the Great Spirit,

or Wotan, or {Dorda}. Not at all. If you read the story, the greatness of the story is in its frankness. And the whole four Gospels, gentlemen, are written against the prejudices of the four ways of life, the splendor of any one of these four ways. And they have taken us into the abyss of truthfulness. And it is this, why the genealogy of Matthew to this day has long ago -- long anticipated psychoanalysis, because it brings out the repressed facts of history. {Well}, there's more to it. I can't go into this.

Now, you open St. Mark. The second Gospel. That's not written against the 12 tribes, and clannishness, and the tribal worship. That's written against the Egyptian, the Roman. St. Mark was a deacon of Peter in Rome. Peter, as an old man, probably in the year 54 of our era, or perhaps in 48, left Antioch, where he had been a bishop. He first lived 20 years in Jerusalem; then he went to Antioch, where the name "Christian" came up under him and with him. And then he became bishop in Rome. And in Rome, he held lectures -- sermons to the pagans, to this great, mundane city, where they worshiped the -- Jupiter and the sun, and the Egyptian ritual of Isis and Osiris, and many other such things, Bacchus, of course, and Dionysus. And Mark wrote down the teachings of Peter. And Peter knew -- know -- in having Matthew before him, had to cut out everything that was not fit for the Jews, but was for -- fit for people in the big capital of Rome. You cannot teach people in New York anything so serious as you can teach people in Vermont. The level of New York is, of all the big cities, always the lowest intellectual level you can have, because they live by sensations, and they have no memory. So you can sell them anything for today, because they don't remember what was true yesterday, and they have no idea that something must be true tomorrow. You are quite mistaken. You only think the intellectual standard is high in New -- in a city like New York. It is -- pretty poor -- it is absolutely superficial, you see, because it is never tested against the background of wrong time. What is true today in New York isn't true tomorrow.

But however this may be, the Roman Gospel of Peter is short. It had to excise all relations to the Old Testament, because the Roman people of course had no memory, just as a New Yorker today; whereas the tribesmen, of course, knew their Old Testament by heart, you see, having memorized it in their youth. These people on the spur of the moment in Rome had to be told what is what, now. So the whole Gospel of St. Mark begins directly, not with the genealogy of the whole story of the Old Testament, but: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the son of God, as it is written in the prophets, behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way -- thy way before thee. Make this paths straight, prepare ye the way of the Lord." And on it goes, immediately with the baptism in the Jordan, which every pious citizen, you see, can strive for,

for an immediate purification, a { } or something like that. No questions asked about his -- where he comes from, no denominational investigation, so to speak. He is not clannish. He has not a long descent of spirits of the ancestors to worship, you see. There is no worship around the grave. But here is a man in his immediacy, uprooted in the big city. It is also in Peter's letter that he is crying out that Jesus is the morning star, rising in our hearts. That's a clear turn against the Egyptian star-lore, and the Roman star-lore, where you worship the morning star, you see, Venus, or Isis, you know the great star Sirius, rising in the star. Take this in the letter of St. Peter, together with Mark and you have a pretty simple starting point for understanding the interest of Peter in converting the Romans. The interest is: don't burden them with the Old Testament. Don't take these Roman, urbanized people through the whole act, but deal with them under the sun, as of today, you see, and free them from their solar- and lunar- and -- star-lore. But if you can do this, then you have gotten them moving.

Let me turn to Peter. You have Peter there? Letter to -- there are two letters to Peter, as you know, of Peter in the New Testament. Can anybody find this place? {Where}?

(Right after Hebrews.)

Oh, I know where the letter is. It isn't right after Hebrews; there's James in between. But I want to -- inside Peter the same thing, of the morning star. That is the great saying, because that is set in antithetical, you see, emphasis against what he found in Rome. Rome was at that time taking over the cult of Alexandria, and of Babylon, you see, and it was called in the New Testament "the great whore Babylon," for this very reason. So it is an anti-Babylonian sermon, which Mark has to deliver. And I want only to show you, Mark cuts out the references to the Old Testament and it concentrates on the purification of man's existence between Heaven and earth. And it introduces the -- the distinction between sky and Heaven on which the English language is built, you see, that sky is physical, and Heaven can still be understood -- stood spiritually. If you say "Heaven," you are not an Egyptian. But if you would worship the sky and the -- the stars in the sky, you would have fallen down from the Gospel of Mark and of the Letter -- from the Letter of Peter, you see. And you would have become a pre-Christian mind, again. Isn't that obvious? In the word "Heaven," as distinguished from "sky," we have an introduction of the influence of the Gospel of St. Mark into our present-day English language. Other languages don't have this privilege, by the way, and are handicapped.

Has nobody found it?

(No.)

I want you to find it. I don't see why I should find it.

Now.

(Chapter 2, Verse 9.)

Oh no. It's similar. "... He has called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." Of course you're quite right. That's already in this direction, but it comes then out much more sharply, because the word "morning star," as applied to Christ, who was humiliated, hanging from the cross, you see, in the darkness, when the earth was -- the sun went out of existence; as you know there was an eclipse of the sun, during His crucifixion, that is the incredible reversal of the natural worship, of the physical appearances in the sky, you see. The human heart is made the morning star, gentlemen, instead of these feeling -- unfeeling stones in the sky. Where is it?

(The Second Epistle, 1:19.)

Thank you. That's exactly it. And take this down, gentlemen, because it's the -- the Magna Carta of human freedom against astrology and against human freedom -- human enslavement by the natural elements. "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed as unto a light that shines in a dark place, until the day -- dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts." Now this day star is when you don Christ, when you put on Christ, as John Paul calls it. "And the day star arise in your hearts." Gentlemen, that's a tremendous sentence. It's only eight words, and it finishes a whole world of China, and Aztecs, and so, with an incredible simplicity. The day star -- you people, it says, of whom -- which you have worshiped in the sky, when it appears on July 19th, in a certain rotation of the heavens, you see, it rises at one time in your heart, when you become ripe and mature to die with Christ and to rise with Christ. "And the day star arise in your heart." If you don't forget this, gentlemen; you have learned a lot.

The second -- the third Gospel, gentlemen, Luke -- I -- let me please go on with this. And then I can say the final thing. Luke is written against the -- Israel. Not the tribes of Israel, but the -- the scribes of Israel, the prophet, prophetic Israel, because Luke -- somebody had also to tell the prophetics, the pious Pharisees, you see, who were great people, that their time was superseded, that the fulfill-

ment of the law {was in order}.

You today read the New Testament in two wrong ways. One, with the fundamentalist view that the Pharisees were wrong and Christ was right. And you think that the Pharisees were hypocrites and so on. Then there is another, modern, ethical, cultural way in which you -- people have come to say, "Oh, the Pharisees were just as good as Jesus. They were excellent people; they were very pious. And you should not say anything bad about the Pharisees." Both -- things, gentlemen, are the not the way in which the New Testament handles the situation. The -- New Testament is represented by -- Luke was a Jewish doctor, probably -- or who wrote certainly for the pious Jews. His point is that Jesus fulfills the law and the prophets. And so it all climaxes in the story how He never said that He was a Messiah, but let Pontius Pilate says this. It's a, so to speak, brief, Luke's representation of the mental health and chastity of Jesus, that Jesus was not a Greek magician running around, or a poet, or an inspired man, but that He was a receptacle of God's will, and that He fulfilled what the prophets had foretold of the Messiah.

So Luke is, has to convince the leading priests, the leading spirits, the prophetic element in Israel, so to speak, the John Baptists of the period. That is, the point is of Luke: don't mistake Jesus at His best for a prophet, because that would belong to the old, you see, dispensation of a mere Israel among the heathen. And don't mistake Jesus as a Greek genius, because that would make Him an offender against the law of Judaism. And of course, He had to be more than a Jew and more than a Greek if He was to be the Messiah. And -- Luke is -- is written with great delicacy in this -- on this point. And if you want to understand Luke, you must understand that it is written for people like the Jews, in a second state. It -- it's as you say in the first verse, "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us ... It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed." Gentlemen, what is this? It's a second Gospel for a man who is already a Christian. If you go to Sunday school, and this is all -- you must all become atheists, after a while. And you -- most of you do, because you have no second instruction. You have no alternate education. It is the belief of -- an elder in Israel is of course a mature belief, not that of a tribesman, of -- of Judah, or Levi, or just born into the fold, you see, and having this absorbed as a child. And it is not the rationalization of an individual free-thinker in Rome, who has to be convinced that astrology has to be replaced by a deeper faith in his own heart. But it is -- you may say that which is most lacking in your life, an initiation

into the same thing, on a higher level, the second time. That's how Israel enters the world. Over the tribe and over the empire, as I have tried to show you, Moses, you see, and Abraham forego these first layers of consciousness, and wait for a greater will to be fulfilled. That's what Luke therefore makes his appeal to. By, "Here, Theophilus, I'm writing you this book not for you not as a child, as a {primitive}, you see, beginner in the faith, but for a second time, when you are irked already by this greater piety, this greater maturity, and then you are irked, perhaps, by the arrogance of Jesus, to say He's the Messiah, which is a very dangerous proposition.

Well, I can't go today into this, of course, but I wanted to s- -- tell you that you will understand Luke if -- and you will understand the Pharisees if you know that they are both purified from the dross of primitive living. Neither the Phari-sees, gentlemen, nor the bishop of the Episcopal Church of New York today, Mr. {Sharon,} or whoever it is, are primitive. They still have to be converted to Chris-tianity. That is, the Churches today represent the synagogue as of today. And again, the Gospel has to be written in such a way by Luke to say that the coming of the Lord is still to be expected. I mean, a church that would say, "Oh, we know all about it," you see, would go illegal, would go Old Testament. As you know, the danger of any church is to be just Jewish, that is, to be just the -- the sanctu-ary of old. And Luke sets out to say to Theophilus, "You have to appropriate this faith a second time. You have to read between the lines. You have to come to know a second time what is meant by what's already reached you."

Well, it shows the whole tension, gentlemen, between baptism and confirma-tion, or baptism and your own -- sacrament as the priest of the Lord in your own right. We are all priests, as well as we are baptized or initiated into our religion. And it is this tension, gentlemen, of the second coming of the spirit into your life, which distinguishes Luke from Mark. If you open Mark, it begins with Christ's baptism in the Jordan. And it's enough for these Roman citizens that they first are baptized. And so the simile is, "Get baptized as Christ." It's not very much, it's not the whole story. But of course, for the pagans, the Gentiles in the Roman world, it was the one thing that first had to be done. That's the first step of mis-sion. But at the heart of heart of the true Israel, gentlemen, Luke had to speak quite a different language, because for these great Jewish prayers of the Psalms, these things had not to be said, that Mark had to say, you see, against these sun worshipers. These Jews did not worship the sun. They did worship the living God. They waited for the coming of the Messiah.

And so you must understand, gentlemen, that if you open Luke, you move into quite a different world. That's a world already of real faith already, and

piety, but it's an unfulfilled world, a world that has forgotten that it must be impatient, that it must be pushing forward, you see, that there's something to fulfill every thing they allegedly pray for and they have ceased to really -- to expect.

So I have to stop here, I'm sorry, today. But bring the New Testament next time.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Opening remarks missing]

... it never dawned on you that when you want to have something, you have to pay the price that it costs to get { }. Of course, you cannot sit down, as you can -- read Esquire, and read the Revelation. But you assume you {read} it. In half an hour, you read the Revelation and you disapprove of it. The gentlemen said that the seven candelabras just made no sense, the seven chandeliers. Why should they make sense to an idiot? I said to him, "{Read} the funnies, you have ruined your brain."

He didn't believe me, but I think he has, because, gentlemen, seven is a tremendous thing. There is -- are not accidents that the week has seven days. I tried to show you that the seven days on which the world was created was an act of human freedom, a great deliverance, because in nature, we find only the seven generations important; and the -- in the stars, it's the 12, Number 12, in the astrol- -- astr- -- it's not an accident. Three -- seven and three, the three is for -- of the human mind -- thesis, antithesis, and synthesis -- but everything worldly in the cross of reality is always four directions. Seven is always the component of the divine and the earthly, of Heaven and earth.

Well, if a man has never given a thought to the seriousness of the -- of this figure seven, that we express Heaven and earth by three and four, how can he understand the seven churches or the seven chandeliers in the Revelation? The same with the other friend who invited me to speak to his ministers. Why is it un- -- impossible in America, that people in humility come and say, "What conditions do I have to fulfill in order to understand?" And as long as you don't do this, gentlemen, you will never learn anything. You demand from your teachers that they can tell you everything in five minutes. That you call an introductory course. The {introductory course} in Humanities 11 -- 12, always consist in telling you in five minutes about the most and greatest things. And you s- -- you don't despise yourself, even for this. You should spit at -- yourself. This is prostitution of your mind! Do you really think that all the holy and great things of -- for 7,000 years of standing you can have by buying Life and looking at the Madonna there, topsy-turvy in wrong colors, because you pay 15 cents to Mr. Henry Luce? But you believe it. And you have never heard of anything else. So this man has the im- -- impertinence to ask me to speak for half an hour on the great issues of life. And the other man who -- gives 20 minutes to Revelations

says, "This is not a good book." And that's what you think thinking, gentlemen. It's the opposite of thinking. It's impertinent. And it's destructive. You destruct the sacred things, the holy -- things, and you destroy yourself. The only thing by which you can make any mental progress is to ask yourself, "What conditions have I to fulfill to understand this specific thing?" You do it in the laboratories, naturally. You put on rubber soles if you don't want to be conduct- -- ducive to electricity, don't you? You wash your hands for an experiment. You use glass in the laboratory. You fulfill all the conditions of the experiment. And that's why you can understand science, because you pay the price. The doctor puts on a white -- a white coat and he is sterile before he w- -- makes the surgical operation. Gentlemen, why don't you ask which surgical -- or which operation you have to fulfill before you can understand the Bible?

You never ask the question, so you can never understand. It's impertinent of this man to ask me to speak to -- 30 minutes on religion to ministers. But the ministers are the worst offenders. They think they can understand everything in five minutes. And from them it has spread to you.

So, I am very sorry, gentlemen, that I have touched the New Testament at all. It isn't right. It's an abuse, because you don't approach it in the right spirit. I have began to -- begin to think the only thing is to bring it now -- to completion. But I know I have gone wrong. I should not have brought this book in -- into this classroom, because you are utterly unprepared to read it, because you -- not because this is anything sacred, gentlemen. Because at every one truth, or every one meeting of a -- if you meet a woman, you have to be prepared. You cannot meet her as a swine, just by looking at her breasts, or what -- anything obscene. You have to take this whole woman in as a representation of the divine life on this earth, of fruitfulness, of the whole future of the human race, of beauty, or you can't see her. And you can't see women, you don't see them, because you want them. That's too simple. And so you want Revela- -- you just want to have these things, as you want to have a woman. You can never get the woman. A woman does not surrender to the one who wants only to have her.

I -- you ought to know this at least, gentlemen, that this college does every-thing to destroy your mind. Complete lack of reverence on anything.

We have -- still have to today deal, however, with the figures that the two Gospels cut, Luke and John. We were in the midst of dealing with Luke. And I tried to show you that with regard to the -- Israel, Luke is the Gospel writer, because he does not speak to the tribes, to the people of the bloody sacrifice, as Matthew does. Matthew is the man in the -- the carnal man, the publican who is

converted b- -- as you know, by Christ, because being of the lowest order of social status in Jeru- -- in Israel, being in the service of Rome, he can speak to the primitive mind, to the materialistic mind, so he speaks of the "begats," of flesh and blood. Then we saw that Mark, in the service of Peter, converts the inhabitants of the great astrological universe of Rome, the heir of Babylon, the heir of Egypt. But in Luke, it is different. He meets people of a higher spiritual rank, who have superseded already tribal and empirical -- imperial living and -- and live in the Temple of David, and sing the Psalms, which the Church to this day does. That is, they have a faith that must not be superseded, that cannot be superseded, that in every church of the universe still is worsh- -- is imitated. When you go to church, gentlemen, and have responsive reading of the Psalms, you are still in the spirit of Israel, because the 150 Psalms are used for your responsive reading. That wouldn't be possible if these prayers were not the eternal prayers of the human race. They have not been dismissed. They are not obsolete. They are just as fresh today as they w- -- ever were. And anybody who cannot say the Psalms is an atheist, because God has died in his heart, and God always dies when we have ceased to pray. Prayer is our relation to God. There is no other relation. Theology is not a relation to God. It's a -- talk about God. But prayer is.

Now Luke, as I said, makes this special point to plead with the Jews to understand that he -- Jesus fulfills the law, and does not break it. And so the high point of Luke, I think -- there may be others, I mean, it would be a -- I have made this investigation too long now to repeat the other points, that there is his -- Luke's special point to convince them that he -- God ha- -- Jesus has not blasphemed by calling Himself the Son of God, because that is for the pious Jew, for the Jew of high standing, to this day the accusation against Christianity: that it is shameless, and that it -- I -- invokes too cheaply a -- a nearness to God of the individual person which only quacks and -- can -- can claim. Our humility forbids us to say that we have a telephone line to God Almighty. You cannot do like the Moral Re-Armament people: sit down every morning at 10 and have a telephone connection with Heaven and say, "What -- what's doing? What's the business today?" That's what these idiots -- literally say. I think they are just feeble-minded. You have heard of the Moral Re-Armament people. They live in {Ko} -- on the Lake of Geneva. They are Americans who pervert Europe at this moment.

I had a wonderful experience. A Dartmouth boy from Colorado -- so a double primitivism -- had been in my courses and he has graduated. And I had provided some spiritual nurture for him the following year, so he felt that before going in for -- totally for specialization in medicine, he should make Europe. Well, I didn't know this, but I -- I only knew that one day in June, he sat in my living room,

straight from Colorado and said, "Professor, I must see Europe. My heart is -- is yearning to see the culture of Europe."

I said, "Well, whatever are you do- -- going to do about it?"

"Well, I am trying to find a passage in New York. I don't have a ticket, yet. It's in June, you know, when everything is crowded," was two -- three years ago.

"And I'm going to -- however, to try. I have a friend in New York, and I shall stay there and perhaps there is some opening."

I said, "Well, do you think when you land in Le Havre that the culture of Europe will be just there? It's a very dirty port."

"Oh," he said, "But what can I do?"

"Well," I said, "since you came all the way from Denver, Colorado, I'll tell you. I think I could do something for you. I know on the Lake of Geneva a center of ecumenic Christianity, study center, and the head of it is a friend of mine. He's a Dutchman. He's a very fine man. And if I put his -- your whole case before him, he might be willing to use you as a kind of secretary, or assistant, a man who puts the chairs {there}. If you stay there in all these two and-a-half months you have there at your disposal in this one place, then you may make great friends for life people all over the earth. You also will be introduced to what's going on. But of course, you have to be humble, you have to serve. And that's the only way in which you -- I can recommend you to this friend of mine. It's a great risk, because he will judge me by my recommendation."

Well, he was of course very emphatic, that he would be very grateful. And I said, "The only condition is that you stay these two and-a-half months in this one place. I have nothing ..." it's the same as reading the Revelation in 20 minutes "... I have nothing to do with you if you just browse through Europe -- 16 countries in 15 days. But this is your opportunity. And I tell you why it is your opportunity. A man who does what I t- -- here recommend to you can return to Europe. He can come a second time, because he has made friends."

And you poor people, who all waste your money in one summer, you can't come back, because it's all done, which is -- I can't go into all the Dartmouth cases where just this happened, where a man really ruined his whole life, because he wasted his opportunity of seeing Europe in his -- at his first occasion. He never did anything to prepare his return.

Well, to make a long -- very long story short, this boy made terrible trouble for me. I lost this friend in Geneva -- in -- it's near Geneva in {Bourcy}, because he heard of the Moral Re-Armament people. That was the impera- -- American religious department store, you see, on the Lake of Geneva: Gimbel, Incorporated, or Macy's. These are Americans, as I say, who have -- sit down -- Mr. Frank Buchman, you may have heard of them, they were once called the Oxford Group even -- and they sit down every morning at 10 and speak of their sexual troubles, and of their relation to God in the simple way and then say, "Now God, please tell us -- give us our -- or grant us our commission," as their battlesong says, "The Bridge Builders." Some of you must have heard of all this. No? Well, what he did then, my friend, was, he -- he fled to {Ko}. There he was very well treated. He -- met a number of nice, young girls. He could tell of his sexual troubles, loud, and openly, and they told him hers -- theirs. And he was also said -- told that absolute purity, absolute love, and absolute sacrifice was the simple three conditions to fulfill in order to go to Heaven.

Now, you know life is not for absolutes. We are not absolute. We are not God Almighty. Absolute love, absolute purity are sheer nonsense. We are a very unholy mixture. We certainly were -- were -- absolute love is nonsense. You also hate. And absolute purity is nonsense. We also shit. And this is all nonsense. It's just ni- -- not even nice. It's -- it's an absolutely ridiculous schoolboy idea. That's what it is. It was thought -- thought out on Princeton campus. And -- so they go to New York for the dirt, and for the purity they are on Princeton campus. And -- well, this man tried this. And he believed it for six weeks. It was enough to ruin his stay in Europe. He induced my friend to run into debts, and to pay the very high tuition in {Ko} -- in {Ko} with the money he borrowed from the man to whom I had introduced him, and who had willingly -- and given him a berth in -- in his center there. A typical and incredible story, you see. A real, total abuse of my trust. My friend in {Bourcy} of course resented it very much and held it against me. Then he came back. And then the most funny thing happened. And Mis- -- this Mr. X from Denver then tried to convert me to the Oxford Group movement. That was the climax.

That was my payoff for sacrificing my friendship for his sake, and for making really a play -- I mean, you can say -- see how I had to put myself out in June to get this friend of mine to give him this -- this place. I introduced him to other friends. They invited him for dinner in Geneva, and he never showed up. And so -- the usual Dartmouth thing. Happened to me this morning. Boy of -- one of you said he would be at my house at 8:30 in the morning, so I cleaned the whole house and he didn't come.

Well, the story had one interesting end, or two ends. One was that half a -- half a year, of course, he had -- began to despise the Oxford Group movement, and the gr- -- or as they call themselves now the Moral Re-Armament people -- and was through with them, because he found out about absolute purity, you see, just from bowel movement. And -- studying medicine. And -- the second thing was he gave up converting me -- what was it? There was some {other point}. Well, he did not pay back his money, that's one thing. Oh yes, yes. He regaled me then with an absolute shameless confession of his religious convictions, which he had written down for me, and wanted me even to read them. I wasn't interested, I told him frankly, with his abstract statement out of the blue. You don't make such statements, I mean. That was his rationalization of the whole event.

Well, certainly this man has wasted his time in Europe. And I only wanted to me- -- mention this because it's a typical, I think, student behavior, that he threw away the precious pearl, the opportunity of a lifetime, to be introduced to real men and people in -- in {Bourcy}, where I had { } him, you see, that he bought a cheap sensation instead, and thought he did better, trying even to sell it to me, you see -- to convert me to it, and then he has been to Europe for no good purpose, because that was -- is cheapest Americanism which he would have gotten much better in Denver itself, or in -- or in Los Angeles, what he bought there as Moral Re-Armament. It's just a branch, you see, of the American Central Office, to which he went. So why should he go to Europe for this?

It's a very sad story, but it's a very explicit story, gentlemen. If you take it to heart, it may save you much trouble. It seems to be your temptation, when you go to Europe, to look for the American things there. Now I think it is the same with the Bible study and with religious study, that you think you must be introduced to this very foreign world by paying 15 cents for Life magazine in which they have at least sometime -- always these religious pictures, as you know. Mr. Luce has after all, a Catholic lady for his wife, and he's very pious himself, as far as circulation goes.

And -- I think it's a very contemptible situation, this selling religion for 15 cents, with the necessary spices on the other side of the page. But that's {where} you think that you can find it. You really believe -- you do not throw away these articles on religion which Mr. Whittaker Chambers wrote in -- in Life or in Time for \$30,000 a year. This is what America calls religion, a paying proposition. Religion doesn't pay, gentlemen. Life doesn't pay. Life leads to death, but it's wonderful to live it.

Now, Luke speaks to the people who alone -- don't buy Life, but who go to church, and who are very touchy with regard to shamelessness, impertinence, arrogance and who demand religious humility. So Luke speaks to the highest class of religious people in every -- in every era, and it's very interesting that the Marcion, the greatest heretic of the second century of our era, and Ernest Renan, the greatest heretic of the 19th century in France, live by Mark -- by Luke. Luke was appealing to them, because it's written against or for the conversion of the educated man of -- claim to sensitivity, the man who is not interested in bloody sacrifices, and who is not interested in ritual and liturgy, you see, but who wants to have spiritual uplift to light and clarity, and decency.

The fourth Evangelist, gentlemen, there has been much said about him: he is the friend of Jesus. And so he represents Jesus' genius. Jesus is -- has a mission, but He's also like any Greek genius, endowed just with the gift of greatness, and poetry, and creativity. And you must not think, as you always do, of these four ways of life: Jews, and Greeks, and tribesmen, and Egyptians as though they were not in you and me. You are a genius, too. You could be much more than you know. At 12 years, you -- most of you were geniuses. You have just given it up. Some of you are now in the Dartmouth Christian Union as -- and so they read Luke. And some of you are in the business cycle in Tuck School, and so they read -- should read Mark. And some of you are just good materialists, and they should be threatened with the threats of Luke -- of Matthew. But some of you are -- have still genius, and they are the brothers of the Lord, by nature.

John, as you know, is by nature a Christian. He's not a convert. There's a very strange place in John at the end where the Lord says to Peter that the ways of John were not the ways of Peter, because Peter is a convert and Paul is a convert. But John just loves the Lord. He is His brother. And brothers are not converts. He is a Christian just as Christ Himself, and he is volunteering to be the younger brother. And so if -- if you read the letters of John, you'll find the great temptation. He's fighting, you see, anti-Christian. The anti-Christian, see, you don't understand, is the man who puts himself in Christ's place. "Anti" in antiquity means in Greek, "instead of." And the temptation of the Johannites, the Johannine Christian is always to say, "We are geniuses ourselves. We are by nature Christians. So we don't need Jesus. We don't need the first. We are just as good as He is. We are His brothers." John's genius consists, however, in taking upon himself the glory of being the disciple. But for this -- him, this means something quite different as for Peter. The stubborn fisherman who discovers his spirit only through the word of his master who calls him and says, "I show you to fish better fishes," you see. "You shall become a fisher of man, instead of fisher of fishes."

For John, this is all quite different. He lives like, well, say -- let's say, like Herman Melville or like Lord Byron, or like Keats, is perhaps better still, or like William Blake. He's a poet. He is in the Spirit. To him nothing is surprising. It's much more natural to him that Jesus is the son of God, than that He is the son of Joseph. To you, it's the other way around. You are -- you should read Matthew. You are clannishly minded. You ask, "Who is -- are his parents?" But for John it is quite natural that any spiritual man falls from Heaven, directly, and that his parents have no real claim to his -- to auth- -- on -- of authority over a man of genius. You would still say this of Thomas Wolfe today, that regardless of -- of who his mother and his father are, he's straight from Heaven, isn't that true? Because he is inspired. He's a very good case in point, you see, that he is a son of God, of course, or a son, at least, of Apollo. Of a god.

You have forgotten all this, and you don't believe it. That's why it's so very difficult to talk to you about these things. But in John, this breaks open and you -- all the people all ti- -- of all times have always felt that the Gospel of St. John appeals to the non-religious reader, not the man in a denomination, not the man in a nation, and not the man in an -- state, as I tried to show you, that Mark does appeal to the man, the citizen of a state, of an empire. And Matthew does appeal to a man of family background, who wants to have the genealogy, and who thinks that nothing new can ever happen under the sun.

Now for John all these things do not exist, gentlemen. He lives -- like the Homeric, or the Athenian artist -- in a world of new creation. And so he begins, "In the beginning was the Word and the Word became flesh." And his great poem, which he offers the world as the Gospel of St. John, is that the poem -- that Jesus is God's poem. The word "poem," poema, which is found in the New Testament, is of course in -- in the Greek language double. You say "poetry," gentlemen, and the Greeks say poietes. That means creation. Where you today say Kreat- -- "creative writing," you try to come back to the meaning of "poetry." A poem is a creation. That's the literal translation of "poem." So when in the New Testament it is said that we are God's poem, it has this double meaning, you see, that it is -- we are his poetic creation. You are far from that. To you poetry is an idiocy. Doesn't make money. You want to have best-sellers. But poetry is the highest creation -- creativity of our own spirit, gentlemen. And if Jesus is God's poem, then it is God's most perfect revelation, what man is. Adam is, so to speak, God's prose; compared to Jesus, as God's poem.

It is the simplest explanation I can offer you, for giving you the description of what John does in his Gospel. He makes Jesus out as God's poem, and then, of course, it doesn't matter that He's an Israelite. It doesn't matter that He's a Jew. It

doesn't matter -- or Benjamite, or whatever He -- clan He comes from, or tribe. And it doesn't matter under whose jurisdiction He has to pay taxes. That doesn't exist for John. He is God's poem. Just as your great man, in -- you -- the people you think great are God's poems. In the -- but you must, so to speak, aggrandize, inflate this word "poem" to have the full, total meaning of the po- -- of the word "poem" in St. John's Gospel. And I think in this country that's very hard. Perhaps if you think of the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven. That's at this moment in this country is willing to receive that s- -- as some divine inspiration. With mu- -- with regard to music you aren't so totally dead as you are with regard to poetry. So if you compare -- include, for example, symphonic composition of Bach, the "Requiem" by Brahms, or something like that, you come nearest to what John tried to say. God doesn't create poetry, and He doesn't create symphonies, and He doesn't create operas. He creates men. And His greatest poem is Jesus. Now, gentlemen, if you go back now from there, you will see that all four Gospel writers changed, you see, the story. In the -- Matthew says, "You have believed in scapegoats, in victims, in bloody sacrifices," because all the tribes, as you know, sacrifice. You remember the pre-Abraham situation of all -- all tribesmen, sacrifices to expiate, the altar in the center. Now Matthew had written around the altar. And he says, "The victim on the altar is the savior, is the only decent person. All the victimizers, the priests who slaughter the victim, are nothing compared to the victims." So you see the paradox of all the Gospels that they put the thing -- stand the thing on its head. The altar in the tribe is the place where the victim has to redeem the tribe. Now Matthew says, "That's exactly what happened, but in a sense you never thought. The victim doesn't redeem the tribe," you see, "but we have now to become as good as the victim. The victim is the real high priest." That's the content of Matthew. The victim you have made is the leader, is the head of the tribe, is the chief. It's this paradox of ... And now the same of -- in John, you see. The Greek mind -- genius wants to have poetry: Electra, and Homer, and Iliad. And he says, not the teachings of Jesus are His poetry. You always -- we want to have words, books. Jesus did not write a book. He was God's book, right in Himself. And so the -- John's Gospel writes -- ends with the triumphant cry, "If anybody would try to write down what had to be said about Jesus, the world would not contain all the books that have to be written about Him." And isn't it true? For 2,000 years, men has tried -- have tried to write Him out, and they haven't succeeded. Whole Dartmouth Library hasn't been able to contain Him, because God's poem is so infinite, so in- -- inexhaustible, that all the little books that you write -- or you read, gentlemen, and all the magazines you buy are just nothing compared to God's poem. That's much richer. And you can live another 5,000 years, and that what has to be said

about Jesus is yet not finished.

So again the paradox. Instead of the book, as a poem, it's the man who is the poem. We have the same relation between altar and victim, you see, as we have between Poem and poem in St. John. In Luke -- I don't know if I can at this moment reconstrue; I have done this, but I'm just -- escaped me, with the -- with the Romans, of course, it's very simple in Mark, that the morning star is rising in your heart; earth and Heaven have changed places. The child in the cradle is Heaven. And Heaven has become earth and looks down on -- in the cradle in order to find the real sky-world. The humility, you see, of the savior is that earth and Heaven have changed places, as in altar and victim, the -- have changed places, as in Poem and poem, so it is with -- with Mark, that the -- ever since Christianity has come, the word "Heaven," gentlemen, has lost its local place, upstairs. St. Augustine has said, which modern Roman Catholics unfortunately do not seem to learn, that of course, "Our Father in Heaven" means that God is nowhere in space. The superstitious old ladies in the Roman Catholic Church still don't know what the Church really teaches. And the priests are very careful not to tell them. But it is true doctrine, gentlemen -- you have to know this -- from the first day of Christianity that Heaven is no spatial concept. And that is Mark, and you have to know this. And I'm ashamed. Of course, it's -- it is terrible because all -- your whole understanding of our faith is thereby curtailed. The -- as an atheist, you say, "Well, I cannot believe that God is on Sirius." Of course He is not on Sirius. And as a Christian, you say, "Well, I have -- seem to have -- to have to believe that the souls are somewhere in the universe, and they aren't. It's hard to believe." Of course, it's hard to believe. You don't have to.

It is very strange that such superstitions should still be rampant in 1954, in a place like Dartmouth. But I run all the time into people who really think the Church -- Church teaches that Heaven is somewhere. This is out, with the Gospel of St. Mark, as taught by Peter in Rome.

Oh yes. With Luke, of course, it is the prophet. You see, the important thing which I have to leave with you is one: that, of course, prophecies are at an end. The prophets are spelled by the Apostles. The New Testament had put the Apostle in the place of the prophets, because Jesus is the prophecy fulfilled. He is prophecy fulfilled. He is that who -- or He of whom the prophets have spoken. But He is not a prophet. Again, in this modern world, where everything has been forgotten, I can always see people say, "Well, he's a prophet," or "He's a teacher." All the things He is not. If He were a teacher or a prophet, He would belong to the Old Testament. He is prophecy fulfilled. Now you -- you can deny the Lord, gentlemen, but you must know His claims. His claims is -- are that He is the

victim of the tribe, that He is the morning star of the Egyptians, that He is the prophecy of the prophets, and that He is the poem of the Greeks.

The old -- Church has always known that the four Gospels are the practical application of the new way into the four other ways. And you can see now, perhaps, why with my paradox it is actually the turning point for all these four ways; because if the victim on the altar is the high priest, if the -- the pro- -- prophecies are fulfilled, you see -- the prophets have spoken, and He is the prophecy fulfilled -- if the poem is not the thing to be read out loud, but if Jesus -- His walk on earth and His resurrection are the -- the poem -- God's poem which He has prepared f- -- at the beginning of time, and which He is then going to carry out, ever since Jesus has been -- has transmitted the Spirit into you and me -- when this is the poem of God with man, then in all these cases, gentlemen, the road which the four old groups, or the four eternal groups in mankind: the family and the clan, the country and the state, the arts and the sciences, and the Church, the praying church, the monks, the Psalmists, which they always try to warn -- if Jesus is the fulfillment of all four, the way is suddenly turned in reverse. Out of a dead-end street of these four ways of life, these ways can open to each other, because it's all now in reverse. From Him, we learn how the world looks when the prophecy is fulfilled. From Him, we learn how it is when you and I lead a poetical life, instead of reading poetry to us, you see, or listening to it on the stage. How about you being Romeo or Hamlet, and treating your life as -- as a drama?

So the way of Christianity, gentlemen, is a quadrilateral way, a -- a four-fold way, into the four other ways. And so the Church gave these four Gospel writers the attributes of one-fourth of the divine, by saying that the cherub, as described in the prophets, consisting of a bull, an angel, a man, and an eagle -- a lion and an eagle, that is the complete miracle worker of antiquity, that such -- as you have -- also have in the sphinxes and so on are an attempt to -- to give all the power of all the natural world above and below us. The lion, you see, the animal world; the bird, the eagle; the angel from Heaven; and what's Number 4? The bull, the working animal, the domestic -- animal of Egypt. If you see any old picture of the four Gospel writers, you find that John has the eagle, as having the relation from Heaven, the inspiration, spirit, like the eagle of Zeus. You find that the lion is given to St. Mark, the animal of the desert around Egypt. The lion is the -- always the symbol of the kings, or power, you see; the Babylonian king had the lion with him, the Egyptian pharaoh has him. That Matthew is represented as an angel. And that Luke is represented with an ox, with a bull, as the -- as the plow-man, as the animal that ferti- -- that is the -- agriculturist, so to speak, and does the second job. As I told you, it's the -- it's a second Gospel written by

Luke for the people who are already on a higher level of training and education. So you find -- who has seen these emb- -- symbols of the Gospel -- of the Evangelists? They are very famous. You find them in the churches. You find them everywhere. Eagle, bull, angel, and lion. If you go to Venice, the symbol of St. Mark, of course, everywhere there in the great cathedral of Mark is the lion. Don't think this is laughable, gentlemen. This is very serious. And in these four emblems, you have the connection of our own era with the -- their world of the ancients.

But I think the time has come -- let me first go back once more to this statement. The Church then has always known that the four Gospel writers represent four aspects of the truth, as they must appear to the people of these four different ways of life. The same truth appears as the truth of the eagle; that is, ecstatic, from above, as revealed. And it appears as hard work by learning, by -- as the Jews learn the law in the synagogue, in Luke -- in the bull, in the ox; and it appears as power over Heaven and earth in the lion, as in all the priesthoods of the empires, who tame weather, and sky, and seasons, and are the calendar-makers, and can tell the people where to work, and what to build, and what to observe. And finally they are like the angels, that is, the spirits of the dead in the tribe, whom -- with their wings, who tell the living how the dead want them to behave, because that are the good angels -- the messengers, you see, the connecting spirits between the nether world -- the world of the absent, so to speak, the non-born, or the already passing away and ourselves. The -- from the spirits, from the animistic traditions of the tribe, the angels are derived.

We -- I told you, can no longer for the last hundred years take these symbols very seriously because mankind, in the last hundred years in the machine age has lost all contact with bulls, eagles, angels, and lions. We can't help that. We have a bulldozer, but we have no bulls. And the same way we have no lions and no angels in which you can daily, so to speak, believe as the m- -- ways by which you understand life. That's why I have made this appeal to you beforehand, to s- -- replace these four emblems, gentlemen, by the walking, the lying, the sitting, and the kneeling four Gospel writers. Mark, as the deacon in the Church, where Peter preached, kneels, {you see}. Matthew fights the Jews. He argues. He's the lawyer, who leaves the tribes of the Jews and, as the legend has it, and went to Ethiopia to convert the Ethiopians. Matthew's Gospel was the oldest Gospel. It was written in Hebrew originally. And was not o- -- we only have it in the Greek translation. Mark was written in Rome. Luke was written for the Diaspora Jews, for the educated Jews, probably in Boeotia in Greece. Luke died in 84, so the -- his Gospel must have been written before that time. And John wrote his Gospel

in his old age in Patmos in Asia Minor. And he is of course the prostrate, ecstatic genius, struck by the inspiration which he relives as Jesus had received it. So if you -- I foresee, or I hope, or I pray that some great artist may come -- probably not in this country, but wherever he may come -- who will take up a new symbol -- language of symbols for the Bible. And one of the parts of this symbolism would be to find in our pos- -- potential attitudes of kneeling, and sitting, and lying, and walking spiritual dialects, spiritual idioms. While we stand and argue, we are of a different mentality than while we lie down in the morning hour, perhaps when you wake up and you are still before the worries of the day, and you know that this is where your mind is poetically minded, where you receive into yourself some great vision. I hope you do. Every human being from 5 to 7 in the morning is a poet, or should be. If he isn't, he's not a -- normal man. And the same is true -- we have to -- we would have then to replace the lion, who licks the feet of Saint Anthony in the legend with the kneeling, the priest, who has all the power over Heaven and earth, because of his humility, because of his obedience to what the stars and the heavens and the earth tell him. Well, I can't unfortunately give more time to this, gentlemen. Perhaps you see that the Bible can be read as a very modern book. You can start to read the Bible as though it was written in the year of the Lord 1960. What is 1984, this terrible book, compared to a book like the Bible, of which you can say that it was written for tomorrow? To this day, the Bible is new, gentlemen, because it is written for four eternal situations in which you find yourself, your neighbors find themselves, the Russians find themselves -- every human being finds himself in these fourth { } -- on these four ways, and beware that they don't become dead-end streets. Don't get married and become clannish, and think that the jealousy of your poor wife can separate you from the Spirit -- Tree of Life, which you all more or less do believe at this moment in your weakness, that your wife has the right to determine who -- what spiritual ties you may have, or may not have. Terrible in this country. No country which is so Jewish at this moment, so clannish, where no spirit can enter, if the lady who went to Smith doesn't say so. You are no longer the leaders of your family, spiritually. You are quite little, little guys. Homunculi. She has to say everything on culture and civilization in this country. That's why -- the Bible begins from scratch w- -- in this country. It has all to be -- re-read and re-written, gentlemen, perhaps re-written. But you must know that it is -- the Bible is written not for the past and not in its own days. The Bible is an attempt to explain that the altar, and the sky-world, and the poetic, scientific, artistic world of the Greeks, and the world of the Temple of David is at every one moment under judgment, and at every one moment, you and I decide

whether we are geniuses or family men, or political citizens of the state, or prayers, monks, hermits of the Spirit. And you have to decide this. And every one has to decide it in his vocation. And everybody has to mix this all through his life, these four ingredients. You have to give to all four, gentlemen. That is man's difficulty and this is man's grandeur, that he never is on a one-way street. The way of the Lord is always in this sense invisible, because it consists of your personal in- -- integration, or combination of these four ways.

And on top of it all is your freedom to change all this in every minute, to hold onto these four ways, but to determine how much of it. That's our business: how much of it -- each of them. We have given, for example, to arts and sciences everything for the last hundred years, in Europe, you see, until France fell. And now we have suddenly to give to Church and state, and you're all good conservatives, because there's a deep feeling that perhaps something has to be remedied, that we just can't -- cannot just go on producing chemists and physicists. Now gentlemen, the Church is an attempt to implement these four ways all the time. The Church is nothing but the way, incorporated. And that's why we say that Christianity teaches incarnation. We would say corp -- "incorporation," or "embodiment," because you no longer think anything -- in -- under the word "incarnation." The teaching of the Church is -- the teaching of the last 2,000 years then is incarnation. And the four Gospels are the first form in which the Word was divided up into the four ways. But it is only in the form of the book that the four Gospels stand out. There also have been four ways in the life of the Church. And to give you a cross-section of these four ways, I will now turn to the 4th century of our era, to the moment when Christianity became officially the religion of the state, when Constantine, the emperor of Rome became Christian. Then, at that moment, the four ways of Christianity had to be there to enable from then on you and me to live this free life of sons of God, and not just of Romans, or Americans, or Vermonters.

You see how necessary that is. We have now, as you know, Vermont now consists of one-half city people, and the other half professional Vermonters, and no Vermonter left. It's terrible, because they don't -- won't give up in time their ways. They have just gone the way -- the pre-Matthew way. They are now just a tribe, funny, on exhibit, on exhibition. And the people from New York go to Stowe to find Vermonters.

This happened in my neighborhood the other day. A rich man built a house, with Picassos, and with -- filled with pictures or paintings of Mr. Picasso. And his neighbors are one from Chicago, and the other from New York. They came a few

years earlier. And I'm from Germany; I'm his third neighbor. And he put in this house and the road, and some sewer -- sewer sep- -- system, and he -- he got in trouble not with me, but with the two other neighbors because of the septic tank, and where he put it, and wasn't very nice about it. And there was a quarrel. And finally they graded, because his neighbors were much more reasonable than he. And so he said of this Chicago gentleman and of this New York gentleman, of me, the German, "You know," he said to a friend, and he was overheard saying this at the Post Office, "I think from now on I shall get on with these Vermonters quite well."

That's all there is in Vermont, you see. People who came two years earlier. So this has to be reborn, otherwise Vermont will be a joke. If you read Vermont Tradition, by Dorothy Canfield Fisher, you see the sad story of degeneration -- degeneracy of a tradition. There's nothing left. It's just funny. It's all dead. You call it form, which is another word -- term for the same thing.

Now gentlemen, this is quite serious then, that the Church in the 4th century already had to have four -- not four Gospels, but four ways to enable the people to stay Christian. These four ways are represented in the 4th century by vier -- four great saints. The name of these saints are, in the order of their lives: St. Anthony, St. Athanasius, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome. The real name of this man Jerome is Hieronymous, and that's I think right for you to know his real name. The others you can recognize. Antonius, and Athanasius, it's -- and Augustinius -- Augustinus.

Now gentlemen, what did these -- do these four people represent? The four ways by which Christianity became recognizable as a way out of then-existing orders of life. Anthony is the father of the monks. He went out like a Jew, out of Egypt; so literally Anthony went into the Egyptian desert at a moment when all the fruitland of the empire was under the yoke of the emperor. That -- when this emperor now became a Christian, the great danger was that it was mistaken, this empire, for being Israel. So Israel had to go into the desert. And you don't -- not understand what monasticism at all if you do not understand that the monks are the re-creation of the eternal Israel. A monastery, gentlemen, is Israel in the desert. Out -- it represents the exodus from Egypt, from the fleshpots of the empire, because with an emperor a Christian, the great danger was that the pagans, who now feign to be Christians, you see, the millions and the millions in the empire, would say, "Well, since our emperor is a Christian, we can just treat him as pharaoh. We kiss his -- his sandal, you see, and we are back to normalcy, you see. We call him as a Christian -- we call ourselves Christians, and we call

him Christian -- and so he is in Christ's place."

The second man, gentlemen, is Athanasius. We owe him the Creed, one thing which has been pooh-poohed by your fathers and yourself as ridiculous, because it's a dogma. Of course, it is a dogma. It is a dogma of your liberty, because the Creed says that the only man who was God was -- died on the Cross under the Roman emperor, and the Roman procurator, Pontius Pilate. You know what it also says? That the emperors of Rome were not God's servants. Now in 325, gentlemen, when this was stated in Nicaea, as the Nicæan Creed -- we owe Athanasius and the Nicæan Creed -- the man who was the president of this council was Constantine. This Constantine was the successor of 300 years of Caesars. And every one Caesar had been worshiped as a god. They were deified. Caesar was a god. If then, a god becomes a Christian, it was -- had to be said emphatically that by this, he ceased to be a god. And this you could only say in the Nicene Creed by saying that the man, whom the emperors of Rome had crucified, was the god. That was drastic enough to prevent the world from then on to believe that Mussolini or Hitler were the new sons of God. That's exactly the same. And you know, Hitler tried very hard to be Christ. I -- I have been told by a minister in Germany personally, that I would have a wonderful future in Germany, because most of my demands in education and so could be met, I had only to make one little admission: that Hitler was Christ.

Gentlemen, shouldn't laugh. You should not laugh. That's not permissible at this moment, because I'm trying to show you the importance of the Nicene Creed. And you should therefore open your mouth and your ears very widely and laugh about yourself. That you never so far have understood the central importance of the Nicene Creed and ask yourself if you have understood it. Why do you laugh over Hitler? That's unnatural. Laugh over yourself, or weep over yourself, over your own stupidity, that you think man can live on- -- without such dogma, from generation after generation. Aren't you surprised that men don't worship McCarthys or Huey Longs more, since they laugh at the dogma which says that only one man is god, the man whom the Caesars have crucified? If you abolish this Creed, gentlemen, you are back to pharaoh. So please laugh at your own stupidity, and erase from your vocabulary this sneer with which you say, "Oh I'm not dogmatic." Poor people who are not dogmatic, because they cannot affix any epoch to their thinking. In 325, freedom came into the world of politics, because every human being today can say to the powers that be, "Don't you remember that the righteous one has been crucified by you, by the powers that be? You are not proven so far as being just. Even though you were elected by the people, you may -- a bloody tyrant." That's very serious gentlemen, it's nothing to laugh about. But you learn nothing from history, of course. You --

Hitler is nothing to laugh about. He killed, after all, 6 million people in gas chambers. So it's natural that he should say, "I ..." he's Christ, the only -- basis on which he could extend his power. And the Creed was forgotten. Well, we aren't so very far from this, gentlemen. Fifty years from now, this -- country will have a dictator, and then the Creed, which you now have spit at and make ridiculous, would come very handy. You with your undogmatic Christianity and your ethical culture, and all this spineless, beliefs and opinions and what-not. This was paid in blood, gentlemen. Athanasius was saved by the monks, from 325 to 371, this patriarch of Alexandria, he was archbishop of Alexandria, had to live off and on in the desert with the monks, because he was, of course, doing evil in the eyes of the emperors. The emperors didn't like it. The -- successors of Constantine wanted to get away from the Nicene Creed again, because it stood in the way of their own authority. So from 325, gentlemen, to 371, the Athanasian Creed was in abeyance. He was only allowed to return in 375 to his seat and for four more years, the good man was allowed to act as archbishop of Alexandria. When he said good-bye to the monks in the desert, who had sheltered him and protected him, they said, "Don't forget us, Father Athanasius, when you now return to the empire and become the archbishop again." And he said, with the words of the 147th Psalm, I think it is, "If I thine forget, O Jerusalem, my right hand should dry up ..." What is the Psalm? Does anybody know the English version? "If I have forgotten you -- thee, Jerusalem." Do you remember this? One of the most power- -- who has the Psalms here? Anybody the complete Bible? Look up at the end of the Psalms. I think I -- and I think this quotation shows you how these people lived in the Old and the New Testament at the same time. He greeted the monks in the desert of Egypt, these Coptic monks, with the words of the Old Testament.

No?

(137:5.)

Which is it? One ...?

(137:5.)

Good. Yes. "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." Now, Athanasius, in quoting this, in -- instituted, so to speak, the monks, the monasteries as an essential part of the Church, and they have remained this, as you know, to this day. That Protestants

have to admit this just as much as Catholics, gentlemen. That the monasteries have saved Christianity through the last 2,000 years, in many forms. But the monasteries are the new Israel, because they are outside the empires, outside the interests of men. That's why the individual monk, you see, is as much in exile as Israel is in exile, ever since the exodus from Egypt. It's outside the fruitlands. It's outside the -- today's orders of the calendar, and of the class system, and of the politics of the nations -- of the Gentiles. That's the 137th Psalm tells how. Who was good enough to know this? Who is it? Who gave me the chapter and verse? Good. Thank you.

The four- -- third man, gentlemen, St. Augustine, is the man who wrote The City of God. He opened, in the very same century in which the emperors became Christians, the Christian soul to a future beyond the Roman empire. The city of God is that city which is the real home of man, regardless of his political home at this moment, because The City of God is written around the problem of the two cities: the city on earth -- that is, the state on earth -- and the city of God. It's two cities. And so, gentlemen, again the same danger that the Christianization of the emperor of Rome might induce the Christians to identify Church and state, to identify the Roman Church with the Roman empire was overcome by a fourth saint, by the mighty sermon of St. Augustine who threw all Christian souls into the future of world history, and said, "Rome is not the city of God by a long shot. Rome is the city of the sinners. Rome is the same -- is the city before the Revelation, it's the city of ...

[tape interruption]

... city of Rome, you can only, if you compare to Revelations. The city of Rome is Revelation once more. And -- I mention this because I want to open you at least one little access to Revelation. John did in 70 what St. Augustine did for the whole Roman Empire in 416, when he wrote The City of God. In Revelation, a new history is opened beyond the fall of the earthly Jerusalem. As you know, Revelation deals with the heavenly Jerusalem, because in the year 70 the temple in Jerusalem is destroyed. So there is nothing the pious Jew or the pious { }, any believer can cling to on this earth by which it is said that God enters history. And so John writes the Revelation in order to proclaim that the epochs of God do not coincide with the existence of the earthly temple in Jerusalem. That is the first thing you must understand about Revelation, that it proclaims a new period, or a -- how would you say? -- articulation of the epochs of history. And in this sense, John and St. Augustine belong together. John and Augustine -- John creates for the believers a future beyond Jerusalem, and St. Augustine at the end of antiquity -- of the Roman antiquity, creates a new future beyond the history of

Rome. Can you understand this? That this has to be done, before people can breathe and feel that they are not connected with the downfall of the -- of the Roman city, you see, the city of Rome, or the downfall of temple of Jerusalem. It is just as if you take a Frenchman now and teach him that the fall of France has happened and that he must live despite of it. If they only would learn it, you see. Now you find France saying, "France has never fallen," and therefore they can't lead Europe. The difficulty is that no St. John and no St. Augustine has appeared in France to tell them that they must live in the new epoch of history. They still want to live before 1940, so nothing works. They go on hating everybody else, especially the Americans. This has to be done.

And the fourth saint, gentlemen, Jerome, as you know translated the Bible into Latin. We -- the Catholic Church to this day, as you know, has the Vulgate, the so-called Vulgate, the -- St. Jerome's translation, as the book that is read in church. And you all ask, "Why does the Roman Church stick to this Latin book? Why aren't they popular? Why isn't everything in English? Why can it -- can it not be preached with a good, Southern drawl?" Gentlemen, again the Church has to fight the ways of the flesh. If you proclaim that your language, the King James Version, is the Bible, you are quite mistaken. It's high time that you burned the King James Version. It's the misery of Protestantism in this country that they worship the King James Version instead of reading the Bible. It's a nice book, the King James Version. We have the Luther Bible in German. That's an even better book. I assure you the Bible of Luther is in better German than the King James Version is in English. And still Protestantism in Germany dies just as much from Luther's Bible as the -- as the -- religion dies in England from the worship of the King James Version.

The wisdom of the Vulgate, gentlemen, and the wisdom of Jerome, and the eternal way of Christians into the ways of the flesh is just this little fact: that the languages are the sheaths of the Spirit, but not the spirits themselves. The language -- any language is the sheath of the sword of the spirit. You have to distinguish between the letter and the spirit. And that's why all Christianity is based on translation. Neither your native idiom, your mother tongue is sacred, nor the original tongue in which the Gospel is written. Is this an incredible wisdom, that for the last 2,000 years, the Gospel has to be preached and to be read neither in the native tongue of the mis- -- of the -- of the newcomer to -- the faith, you see, of the native, wherever he lives -- in North Carolina or China, it makes no difference -- and that it must not be preached in the original language in which Jesus and the Apostles taught, because then again, it would be an -- a nationalistic affair like the Koran, which cannot be translated, which has to be

printed in Arabic, because Mohammed happened to speak Arabic. It is equally poor, gentlemen, to say the Spirit is -- speaks English, and that It speaks Aramaic. The Latin version of Jerome says that you must have distance from your own native idiom, that the Latin is as far away from the original tongue of the Epis- -- Apostles and the Gospel writers as it is from your own idiom. If you can penetrate however into its meaning, you are free, because then the letter doesn't kill and the Spirit will live { }.

Gentlemen, that's very practical for all Protestants today, to understand that language is a medium, and it mustn't be -- idolized in itself. You know, we had this jubilee of the anniversary of the King James Version a few years ago, you remember? Does -- who does remember this? Well, it -- I wonder that you do not all -- don't all remember it. When was -- when did it appear, do you know? (I believe last year, June last year.)

What?

(Wasn't it last year? The Guttenberg anniversary was last year. The Guttenberg anniversary was last year.)

Oh well, that's the unfortunate invention of printing in general. That of course, should never have occurred. But that is, you see, the -- the versions were made then on the basis of this devilish invention.

Gentlemen, will you take down the limiting years of this great period of the Church? 284, Anthony goes into the Egyptian desert. And in 428 -- 429, I always forget the year, St. Augustine dies. It's either '29 or '28. Would you look it up? You tell me next time, Collins, will you?

(Sure.)

Ja?

(Yes.)

And so you have a period of 140 years. It is the period, gentlemen, from Diocletian, the last persecutor of the Church, to the inroad of the Vandals in Africa, that is, to the downfall, really, of all Roman power. I don't know the life dates of Jerome. Perhaps you also are good enough -- look them up, will you? Jerome. Bring to me the four men's dates next time. Here these four -- Anthony, Athana-

sus. They all became old men, gentlemen. And this is quite important. At the end of the anti- -- ancient era, gentlemen, it isn't the question anymore to become a martyr and to die young at 20 like Stephen, or like the Lord at 35 -- or however old He was; we don't know -- but to live long. All these men became very old, because Christianity had become established, a state religion. And you see how the ways of the Church in the 4th century had to be transformed into new ways. There was no monasticism needed in the 1st century, because people went and were burned and thrown to the lions, you see. So you had not to withhold your assent to the life of everyday, because it was very simple. You were yourself killed in the process. This was the time of the martyrs, in the catacombs. And I could have shown you the four ways of Christianity in the times of the four Gospels -- parallel to the four Gospels, by the life of Paul, and the life of Peter, and the life of John, and Phillip, and Thomas, et cetera.

But I wanted to show you that from 284 to 429, in a new situation, in which Christianity has lost its sting, and its stigma, you had to reconquer the four ways. This is just an example how in every century, gentlemen, Christianity has to re-establish the four Gospels, by implementing four new ways into the world. In every one moment, gentlemen, the world wants to come to terms with us, and wants to say, "Oh, arrange -- arrange ourselves." If you just worship the -- the stock exchange, then it's all right. Or if you worship graft, or if you worship the military, or if you worship physics, or if you worship the press, or if you worship television, just -- just costs you nothing, I mean. The signature of the Devil, you see, is just done with one drop of blood, but it's the drop of your own blood. I'm quite serious, gentlemen. If you let your imagina- -- would allow your genius to work, you would find that Anthony, and Athanasius, and St. Augustine, and St. Jerome are again men of the future.

Gentlemen, what we call the Church, or the Gospels, or the saints are those powers that still wait for your allegiance. That is, they are far ahead of you. You are behind them. It is one of your tremendous errors of your imagination, of your laziness, that you think that Jesus died in 33 B.C. You died in 33 B.C., gentlemen. He's coming. St. Augustine didn't die, as far as he was able to -- establish a new future for you. But you have lost your belief in your future, because you don't see any future beyond the United States, and -- under the Constitution of 1776. You have no imagination, and you have no faith in any future of mankind that does not include the independence, and the isolation, and the sovereignty of the United States. You really can't think of this. You don't believe in it. You tremble. That's the whole excitement about it, that you are -- have not read, and you have not written a new City of God. All your history books just end in 1898, or somewhere there. Have -- has your history any future? I tried to tell you in the

beginning of this course, gentlemen, that man has as much history as he has future. You haven't. You have neither history nor future. Now give me one American who believes in the facts of life in the year 2100 more fervently than in the facts of life of 1898. The Spanish-American War is by and large the last thing most Americans believe in. They won't give -- they wouldn't annex Cuba and they won't give back Puerto Rico. Now I would perhaps annex Cuba and give back Puerto Rico, I don't care. But I mean, for the fut- - in -- with the light of the future of the America -- United States, to me the whole Spanish-American War is a very doubtful performance. And perhaps we should do something about it. Now a man who has a future, gentlemen, and a nation who has a future can go back on its old history can say, "Oh, we have to redo this." But you can't, because all what you call history is just the past, without any goal, without any aim, just accidental. All accidental. Now what about Puerto Rico? How do you feel? Is this a part of the United States? I think the -- this is a very practical question at this moment, and it means if you have a future, then you can re-write the history of the Spanish-American War in the light of the real destiny of America. And you can say it was a -- a futile, a chauvinistic gesture, an infection from Europe, a bacteria. It was a mistake. There have been many good liberals, gentlemen, in this country -- they are forgotten now -- who broke -- died broken-hearted because of the Spanish-American War. From 198- -- 1898 to 1908, there were many old people who when they were -- went to their grave frustrated and said, "The United States have fallen from grace, because they have ceased to be the people of the exodus. They have ceased to be the people of the promised land. They have ceased to be the descendants from the Puritans. They have become an imperialistic race, who just go to war for the sake of going to war." And this is still not solved, gentlemen, in your heart. You have no history. You have no future. You have neither St. Augustine, nor St. Anthony. You have no feeling that any -- element in this country might have to be the new Israel, that makes the exodus from the power policy of the United States. And on the other hand, you have no feeling that a true history of man may go far beyond the United States. And before you don't know this, how can you judge the political steps of this community? How can you vote? But they give the vote now to 18-year-old children, you see. And that's the end of the world. Next time, gentlemen, I want to show you in the -- that in the history of the United States, in a mysterious way the whole history of the man -- human race has been telescoped, that in 150 years, or 200 years, or 250 years, this country has lived all the phases of which we have spoken so far. And I hope -- I haven't done it yet, but with your help we might rediscover the elements of St. Augustine, of

Jerome, of Anthony, and of Athanasius in American history. I think American history is very interesting, you know. Not the way it is taught here. American history is nothing by itself. Will you take this down, gentlemen? The program for the next meeting is the American history as a recapitulation of the universal history of the human race. The American history so far, is a recapitulation of the universal history of man, because in 200 years, we have done nearly everything in great haste...

[Closing remarks missing]

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Student introduction: (Philosophy 58, May 11 --)

[Opening remarks missing]

... the father of the monks lives from 250 to 350 -- supposedly. That means, you want to say that he's said to have become a hundred years old. { } poor source of the information. The main date for his action is 285, gentlemen. It's terribly important. That's the year of the Diocletian persecution of the Christians' {faith}. Take -- take this down, because if you want to understand history, gentlemen, then you must understand that one man acting freely -- I have told you this before -- like Moses taking the Jews out of Egypt, is worth more than 100,000 people acting now, because McCarthy wants it so. One man turning against Communism in 1930 in this country is more important -- or the only important thing. All the people like you, who say, "Well, I -- now I won't say a word, because they may hold it against me 20 years from now," you aren't worth a damn. But that is the error of -- people go by mass movement, and they think that the people who now suddenly go conservative are conservative in this country. You are just accidentally conservative. Next day, you are something else, according to the fashion. But Anthony, you see, became a monk sensing the success of Christianity in the world, without any external com- -- compulsion, and so he becomes the father of all monks, just as Nietzsche in our time, because he went out of Europe in his heart and mind 20 years before the World War I happened, is today still an important man. And all the -- his contemporaries are forgotten. And so you will be treated if you don't do in your life something voluntarily, from the compunction of your own heart, by saying, "This isn't good enough. I have to prepare something better." And this is Anthony. And the important thing is, gentlemen, he is the only man whom we remember as having come before Constantine, before Christianity became -- became fashionable. He did not jump on the bandwagon, but he delayed the bandwagon, and that's what you all have to do, gentlemen: despise yourself when you jump on the bandwagon, and respect yourself when you delay the bandwagon, because the bandwagon has to be delayed. Otherwise you go around the next curve in hundred -- at 100-mile speed. And all the girls from Smith in the car are killed.

So Anthony is such an important figure today, because you and I -- we have a hard time to understand monasticism, to evaluate it, to do justice to it. It's so far away, the hour in which it was introduced into the Western world, that for you it is very difficult to understand. Monasticism is the consecration of the desert. It is

the consecration of that part of the earth which God has created, and which for man has no use. Now God is always greater than geography of man, or than thinking of man, or philosophy of man. And Anthony said, "Since the desert is created, is a part of the earth, it's good enough for me. If it isn't then good enough for the Roman emperor, that's just too bad for the emperor."

You must understand, gentlemen -- you remember what we said about settlement, that all the empires of old settled in the fruitlands where they could have agriculture, and where the calendar could apply. The desert has no calendar. It's the desert all the year around. The great decision then of the first of these four fathers of the -- of the recognized Church, is the great -- his great act is to accept man's role as wider than the role of -- in any civilization. It's written -- Mr. Antonius acted against Toynbee and the idea that we should be interested in civilization. No decent person {is} interested in civilization. You have to be interested in the salvation of mankind, or something better than sal- -- civilization is a by-product. If you are ashamed, that's the history of your soul. Then you go to a tailor and have your loin-cloth made. Is the loin-cloth important? The experience that one should be ashamed is important. That's not civilization. That's an act of faith. You are all damned, because you -- hear all the time around your ears that -- civilizations come and go. Of course, they go like fashions. Civilization is nothing better than a -- a bathtub. Now Walter Crane in America makes all the bathtubs; before, they made the -- in the village -- the -- the carpenter made them out of wood. What's the difference?

Now the second man, gentlemen. Anthony -- take this down, fruitland and desert, in Antonius are brought together as one earth, under the great sentence: "The earth is the Lord's, and everything that is in it." Whereas an Egyptian, a Roman, an American says, "Hah! Where -- I have the land of the white man and I have the reservations. And the reservations are definitely no good. That's why I give them the Indians -- to the Indians." That's, by and large, the morality in this country between desert and fruitland. If you go to these reservations, you are ashamed of yourself. We have given these red men -- people a piece of land on which they can neither live or die. Now, strangely enough, they have found oil, which is their end -- final corruption, in these reservations, because now they live on money. They have nothing to do.

The story, gentlemen, here, of the desert is a very important story. You know the overgrazing of the cattle in the desert in the West, you see, another lack of respect for the character of the desert. Or take the dustbowl. You are all so frivolous that you don't know -- know what it means to ruin a part of God's earth forever. Just ask the people in Texas what they have done in the last two years,

or in the last 10 years. I have a friend who invested all his money in a Texan farm. He was a soldier. He made a -- lot of money in his -- on his flight pay of war, but he's broke of course, because there's no water. And that's not arbitrarily done. That could have been avoided.

Athanasius, the second man, gentlemen, does not go out of the empire, but he imposes on the bishops of the Christian Church and on the flock a condition for the compromise with the emperor. And again, gentlemen, I insist that this is of very practical importance for you and me today, because it means that the whole body of the Christians says to the emperor, "If you become a Christian, you have to stop to be an emperor of the old type." You read so many -- or you used to read; you don't read anything. But your forefathers, and grandfathers read very strange stories about the baptism of Constantine. Many Protestants have dated the downfall of the Christian Church on the fact that the emperor of the -- the Roman emperor said one day, "I'm a sinner, like all other Christians, and I have to be christened."

Gentlemen, the Church cannot turn down even the greatest sinner. So the Church couldn't turn down the greatest sinner of his time, the emperor. The emperor was the greatest sinner because he said that he was God. That's blasphemy. All this you do not understand. You read the story all with perverted eyes. Gentlemen, think that in a group of people who have come to the knowledge of the true faith, as it is -- the true Israel, there comes a man and says, "So far, I have -- the people have paid me homage and respect with regard to my divine office, because I connected the Heaven and the earth. And I -- in my priesthood, I could predict the weather and the fruitfulness. And I took an oath as an emperor," as any modern king still does, where there are kings, "swinging my sword to the four cardinal points of the globe, of the compass, that I will provide good harvests, as far as is in my power." Just what you expect from Mr. Eisenhower, to provide good harvests, to provide the busi- -- prosperity. You are very near again to the Constantinian and the pharaonic empire. And if you go on like this, this country is out for a new Egypt- -- Egypt -- Egyptian darkness, because you really think that your political leader can make prosperity, which is fantastic, which is ridiculous. And it is certainly not in the Constitution of the United States. The United States say that the president of the United States is to -- there to provide peace externally and justice internally. And he certainly has nothing to do with jobs, or any such economic things. It's not the business of the president of the United States. But in this holy confusion, in which you leave today -- live today, we today watch the transition from -- we shall see at the -- in the second half of this period today -- the transition from a free Greek city-state called the United States of America, to the worship of the golden calf, on which

you all depend for your jobs, and for what reason you all of a sudden are no longer interested in civil rights, but only in civil pensions.

Now Athanasius is exactly in the position of the year 1954. He says to Mr. Eisenhower, Constantine, "You'd better join the Presbyterian Church. That is, you recognize that there is an authority that is higher than your office in this country." Gentlemen, I'm quite serious. Everything depends that you understand that the separation of Church and state means that the man who is in the state recognizes that he himself is also in the Church. You cannot have a separation of Church and state, of which you talk so glibly, if not everybody is at the same time Church and state. Otherwise the separation makes no sense. If anybody can be just state, then you get a pre-Christian community. Then you get Diocletian, who says, "I am the state. You bishops are the Church. Down with you." That's the separation of Church and state in a pagan world, gentlemen. In the -- world of America, and you have never been taught this, it means that you -- every one of us is at one time a citizen of the United States and at the other time, a citizen of Heaven. You, the same person. And Athanasius, who was just a deacon, he was -- that is, he was not even a college professor, went to the Council of -- Nicaea, opposite Byzantium. You know it by the -- Nicaea lies on the Asiatic shore opposite Constantinople. And that's the great council in which the Trinity was for the first time formulated, 325.

And he said, "I'm sorry, but now something has happened which, to the Jews, and Greeks, and slaves who became Christians, never happened. We have now a man in our church who has declared himself to be God for the last 300 years, as far as he was a ruler. He was in touch with the universe in a mysterious way as no other mortal. He was emperor. He was pharaoh. Therefore at this moment, we have to assert that the only God on earth is Christ. Because otherwise we get many gods again. Every king will say he is god."

And I tried to show you that the Trinity, which you do not understand, is the first Magna Carta of your liberty, because it said to the emperor, "You too have a membership in a church which has a higher head than you. You are just a very little member of a unity," you see, "which is not the empire. The Church. You have an organic place. You are the greatest sinner whom we are now willing to forgive and to receive on hope into the bosom of the Christian Church, or on the body of Christ."

Now you can understand, gentlemen, how difficult it is. You are so proud in your own brain, that your brain cells do not come down like emperor Constantine and say that they have to be christened. You know that the brain cells

cannot be regenerated, in your brain. It's the only part of the -- your -- yourselves that is dead for good. All the other cells every seven years are renewed. But not those of the brain. Now the -- your mind however still thinks that it is better than the other parts of the world -- your body, stands higher and is more clever. I think the opposite. I think the mind is the most earthly part of our existence. It has constantly to be called to -- to order by the heart, and by the other organs who are constantly keeping us in touch with real life. The brain is always behind the times. But you think the opposite. The emperor Constantine said, "I, as ruler of the universe, have to use all my brain. I'm on top. I'm the brain trust," you see. "And I have to say that this brain is second-rate. At the heart of the world, which is Jesus, that the heart of the world has been -- has to be good enough to pro- -- graft me upon it, despite my cleverness, despite my high reason, and despite my rationality." Because reason is boring. Reason is just logical. It is uncreative. It can never understand any new event. Because logic -- by logical conclusion, you can always prove that the future cannot happen. You can see it in the papers all the time. Everything that has happened in the last 30 years was proven by philosophers that it could never happen. John Dewey spoke, to sat- -- his satisfaction that neither Stalin nor Hitler could win. Or come to power.

The brain, gentlemen, is dead. And to rule is, of course, the exercise of reason to the highest degree. And the Church is the discovery that to rule is not enough, or to conquer. And as -- as the first sentence of the history of the Church is, "Let us be more than conquerors." And this means that your reason has to take orders from the heart, from the destiny of mankind. And if your reason says, "We cannot fly," you still cannot burn Mr. Orville Wright at stake because he's a witch. You have to allow him to try. And he can disprove your reasoning. We have learned this by bitter experience, that you have to allow a man to prove what logic, you see, has disproved.

All the Christians, gentlemen, are a people of whose lives it has been said beforehand that it couldn't live -- Jesus, Paul, Peter, Athanasius, Anthony -- are people of whom it was -- could be read in the books that they couldn't exist. The same has been said of the Puritans at home in England. "Oh, they'll perish in the wilderness." Nearly they did. Not all. That is, gentlemen, the man of our era is a man who cannot be predicted. He is the uncalculable. Take this down, gentlemen. In a play by Galsworthy -- I'm stealing this from Mr. Galsworthy -- Escape, this is the -- the end of the play, that man, the real man since our era is incalculable. You can also say unpredictable. Inasfar as you and I are unpredictable, we are Christians. Inasfar as you and I are logical, you are heathen. Rational people are not interesting because they can be pre-calculated. You can predict their actions. And you can buy them. You can corrupt them.

Now Athanasius, gentlemen, said just that much on the Council of Nicaea. He said, "Now we have this God-man, the emperor ..." or man-god, I should say, "... this man-god. Therefore, we must now put the God-man on the throne." This is literally true that they played with this cult of man-god, and God-man. Constantine, you see, is a man declared God. And Jesus is God becoming man. The direction is from above-down, and in Constantine, it's the lifting up by your own bootstraps.

Now, that is the meaning, gentlemen, of the Trinity. To this day, nobody has been able to devise a better expression of this. And I take it to be a scientific statement. Has nothing to do with any belief, really. You can't live without the Trinity, because the next time you will land in a concentration camp. If you don't believe in the Trinity, there's absolutely no reason why the Communist Party shouldn't have the right over death and life over you. If you cannot invoke your membership in the body of the real God against the men -- powers that be, then the powers that be say that they are more divine than you. In a sense Mr. Eisenhower is undoubtedly more divine than you, because he has been elected by a landslide of votes, by 32 million people, and you have not. So by the 32 million people who voted for him, he's in power. And yet can he not take your life. Why? Because you have a membership that is much better than the membership of the United States of America. And that's the reason that you can trust a man in government, as long as he admits that he and you are members of this other body. If he denies it, you are in danger.

It's so simple, gentlemen, that I'm always ashamed that I have to apologize for my reactionary attitude that I think that the Trinity is a scientific fact. And I cannot understand you people who think that you can live without such a definition, which is the historical background of your and my freedoms. If you do not recognize this, gentlemen, I'm sorry. I think you are the most stupid people in the world. Because if you cannot to every new power -- McCarthy, or Huey Long, or Eisenhower, or Hitler, or Malenkov, or anybody, or here -- Mr. Mao, or what's this hero in Viet Minh? If you cannot say, "Very nice, we meet on the political field, but we also meet elsewhere, and the membership in the second realm has quite a different order of merit than the order in the political field," if you cannot say this to these people, you are lost. They shut your mouth. They execute you. They exile you. And they have every right to do it, because you have given the advantage and say, "Of course, there's only the order I see. Only the order to which I pay taxes. Only the order in geography." As soon as you say this, gentlemen, you find yourself in this unholy spirit of yours, which is no spirit whatsoever, except one of job-hunting, and getting married, and forgetting the

world at large. You no longer are members of anything, neither of the world nor of the Church. You are just members of your little household in Wigwam Circle. And how long will that last? As long as they are good enough to feed you. You are just cattle. Are you -- any longer at this moment -- I don't see very few citizens of the United States at this moment. Very few. The people who go to lectures certainly are not the citizens of this country. It's very serious, gentlemen, because for hundred years as you know, rational, reasonable, proud, philosophical, scientific man has said, "The Trinity is ridiculous. I'm not dogmatic." Gentlemen, how can you base your rights -- if you aren't anything if you are -- have not a dogma? Do you wish to wait for human laws, which can be altered every day by some coarse majority, which is against you, which says every -- people with colored hair are to be deported? If you believe in majority rule, where will -- where would this country be? This country is based on the domination of a free Church over the majority rule. That is, that there are sacred rites of members of the free churches in this country, that the worshipers of -- of God, of the eternal God against the majorities of the moment.

Now, Athanasius said that much. And that's why he said, "The second person of the div- -- deity must be called equal to the Father." Gentlemen, I have repeated this whole story, because I had to underline one thing: that in Athanasius, the Church, in answer to the emperor, the man-god of Egypt becoming Christian, was good enough to condescend and to take upon themselves to use one non-Biblical term: the word "homoousious," or God -- equal to God -- to God, which played a great part of the discussions of the following centuries, and which, as you may know, the -- the Unitarians of Boston threw out and thereby abolished Christianity victoriously. At this word, "homoousious," which means equal or the same as the Father, being equal, it means -- that this word cost Athanasius a piece of his life, and he has written time and again, "Did I write to introduce into the Christian Church a worldly term? Because there is nowhere in the Bible the term." But in order to stem the tide of Roman, Greek, pharaonic, Persian, Arabi- -- Babylonian lore he had to invent a word which the pagan mind would also understand.

And so, perhaps you put down this paradox, because it is very interesting, it always so happens: when we love the world, as God loves the world, in order to redeem it, you always have to accept an element of the world. We have to get down to brass tacks. You have to get earthly. You have to get your hand -- fingers dirty. And in response, you can then save a part of this world and graft it upon the Tree of Life everlasting. When the emperor accepted to become a member of the Church, the Christians had to pay one price: that they talked in one term, at least, the language of the world. It's the Greek, philosophical term,

"homoousious," of the same substance, or of the same being. And "being" and "substance" are not books -- words for which the Bible cares at all, because they are words of comparison. And the Bible is concrete and names everybody by his name. But the Greek school, you remember, always compare, because they lived in the wide world, and they always have many cities, and many people. And they always said, "Oh, that's like this," you see. They always compare. Comparative religion, comparative law, comparative comparative. And so -- on competition -- all these principles of the Greek life -- and so the word of the Church used by -- by Athanasius has become really the turning point of world history, because it was the word which opened the flood of philosophical terms, like "existentialism," which you today are using so freely, or "idealism," which were all forbidden to Christians before 325. You could not be -- be a Christian and speak Greek or take philosophy. But when the Greek philosophers, and the Roman emperors, and the lawyers, and the generals became Christians, you see, the Christian Church had to begin to speak their language, too. That's a long process and it isn't yet quite finished. But you ought to know, gentlemen, that when when Mr. Tillich today speaks of existentialism, for example, that this is a story, that in the year 1954, the Christian can use, instead of the word "sinner," the word "existentialist." The Greek -- so far, for 2,000 years, the Christians called a man who just existed, without a connection with God and the Church, a "sinner." And now we very politely call them exist- -- existing. It's the same thing, from the Greek point of view.

Very important, gentlemen, because it's a similar problem as in Nicaea. In Nicaea, it began that one man, Christ, who started us -- as a body of living divine history escaped existence, mere existence, and became the carrier of the future life. And as you know, the existentialist today says, "Let me throw myself into the future, if I can only find it." They are all -- the sinners who are {hungering} for the future. And as much as Constantine understood, when he had to confess that Jesus was like God, it -- because it meant that Constantine was not like God, you see, it meant that the emperor could not say of himself "homoousious."

So in the same sense, gentlemen, now you people with the natural reason and the natural mind have now found, finally, the same way as Constantine, because it is now possible to say of every man that he exists. So that's an experience you can make without relation to the dogma of the Church. But that's -- that still doesn't mean that it's anything different from sinning, that is, from being {asunder}, or as Mr. Tillich calls it, from being "self-centered." That's a very polite expression for the sinner.

Who was -- who listened to him on Sunday? Well, you remember. These are

all good theological terms, but they are adapted to the stupidity of the living generations. But it doesn't alter the fact that "homoousious," gentlemen, is true, although it is a Greek word spoken to the Greeks with the full faith from the inside, "Yes, Constantine, we can allow you to become a Christian. And we will talk to you in a language which you can understand."

So I only wanted to vivify to you the life of Athanasius, you see. "Forty years," he wrote, "'I have sacrificed of peace, and of bishop -- being a bishop and ruling in peace in Alexandria, for my daring to introduce this new, one term." Now you can say of Mr. Kirkegaard, that he also sacrificed a whole life for introducing the word "existentialism," "existence," into the language, you see, to save it from the Hegelians and the scholastics, the existence of the sinners. Who has -- who knows a little bit about existentialism? Anybody? Not one! Well, good. You will know that this is all very connected, you see, because Kirkegaard said against Hegel, "Hegel, you think because you are a philosopher, you are God," you see. "But there's only one God, and you are just an -- in existence," you see. That's the whole -- same issue between idealist and existentialist. The idealists, you see, are the Constantines before their baptism. And the existentialists are the people who have discovered that they exist, regardless of their so-called ideals, you see. And that is their poor -- poverty, and -- and their -- their limitation, and their mortality, and their short-livedness, you see. This is Kirkegaard-Hegel, is exactly the same relation as Constantine -- as Constantine and Athanasius, or as in this country Royce and -- Josiah Royce, for example, here, the great Harvard idealist, and -- whom we -- shall we take? Thornton Wilder, as an existentialist.

Why do you make such a face? Do you understand -- do you know Thornton Wilder? Huh? Do you know him? Do you know his play? Wie? Well, how is it called -- by -- on Mr. {Anthropus}. By the Nick of Our Teeth, isn't it?.

(The Skin of Our Teeth.)

The Skin of Our Teeth. Ja. Skin of Our Teeth. Ja. That's -- that's existentialism against Josiah Royce and his idealization of every man a god.

You see, gentlemen, this story of Constantine and Athanasius is -- the story of Anton- -- Antonius and Diocletian is left in every generation. If you have made wealth as under Diocletian for the Christians, Antonius said, "It's high time that he clear out, and go into the desert." Then you have man's pride, you can -- you must say, that if this man wants to join us in the same club, or in the same fraternity, or in the same -- in the same outfit or profession, then it's high time that he put down clearly that he is not God Almighty. Otherwise we can't live with him.

He becomes too dangerous. We can't empower -- it's high time that we tell the doctors that they are creatures, and that they are not sorcerers, and butchers, and chemists." Today we have to say a doctor is God, in this country. Yesterday, you had the orator, Mr. Daniel Webster, as God. And then read what Whittier wrote about him in "Ichabod," the poem, you see, what a star had fallen, what a blasphemer Mr. Daniel Webster had become. In every generation, gentlemen, the Antonius situation and that the Athanasius situation exists. And now I'm going to show you that the two other situations always always exist.

The third man is not Ambrosius, Sir, I'm sorry to say, but St. Augustine, St. Augustine. And St. Augustine lives from 354 to 430. And I told you that he takes the people not out of the fruitland into the desert, and he does not build resistance up in Rome or Byzantium against the governing body of the emperor and his ministers and his soldiers. But he is a third type of emancipator, of the ways of life into -- he creates a wider era beyond the Roman era, because he writes *The City of God* and he says, "When the era of Rome ends, that doesn't mean that God's era ends, at all, because there are two cities, and we are citizens of two. And man's real story is as a citizen of the city in Heaven. And that's only a perfunctory story, his membership on the -- on the -- in the city of Rome, or in the Roman Empire." And *The City of God*, gentlemen, written in 416, is really -- should not be translated with this title *City of God*. It should be translated with the title, *The Citizenry*. That's what *civitas Dei* means at that time. That is, the united people, the united group of people. And you hear "city," you -- you think of the walls. That is not in the word "civitas." "Civitas" is the citizenry -- that comes nearest to the literal translation. And some -- one German translator a few years ago made this point very clear by calling it the -- *The Citizenry of the City of God*. So whatever you hear in *Humanity 11 and 12* is wrong. It is not the city of God, but it is the citizenry of God, which brings it home that you are not somebody who is some place, but that you are only able to live in history if you are not just a citizen of the ter- -- terrestrial -- terrestrial community. Nobody can go to Heaven with {Grover Vail}.

This is of practical importance again, as you can see, because today again, America has no future, because you have absolutely identified your existence with the history of America. Now a city has only a future insofar as their -- its citizenry have a larger timespan to live than the political existence of the United States. The -- you have to instill historical existence into the body politic on this earth. You can't borrow it from it. The people who founded the United States thought they were children of God. They were creatures of the God Almighty. They were Christians sent into the wilderness. They were missionaries, pilgrims, crusaders, whatever you want. But certainly they were just now founding the

United States of America, because that was the will of God. And the will of God they knew, because they had it in their hearts. And the {walls} and the roads of America they built because they had legs and hands. But the legs and hands were in the services of the human heart, which this in -- building these roads, and these states, and these capitols, and these constitutions acted out what their membership in their free churches had told them. So gentlemen, will you take this down? Atha- -- the Church is older than the state in any human heart. And as long as this is the case, this country will be renewed and regenerated. And as soon as you think you are first Americans, and then you have a nice chapel, or an ugly chapel like {Lawrence} Chapel, in addition, you cannot preserve the existence of your country. A country is saved by the people who are not at home in this country, but who make it their home, and who know that a home on earth is in the image of our home in Heaven, and who have in their hearts such a vision that they can populate this earth with the right rooms, walls, houses, streets, as in the Jerusalem upstairs. If you have no such vision in your heart, how can you do right?

So gentlemen, the story of the City of God and the City of Man is a very practical one. Any city of man has a short-lived existence of, by and large, 120 years, 150 years, 300 years. That's the maximum. There is no -- no government on earth that ever lasts longer than a hundred years by itself. It can only last if the citizens under this government recognize a higher government, by which they can take their government to task and demand from their government to change, to improve, to reform. Any wish for reform in a new election can only come when the electorate knows better, when they have a firm conviction that man can do better. You all believe this still. You have heard, at least, fairy tales of your ancestors who came to this country and for 300 years believed in every election that they could do better. Gentlemen, that can be lost if you say, "This, my environment, makes me. I'm just a behaviorist. I'm just adjusting myself," as you all are told by these psychologists today. To what do you adjust? You adjust to corruption. You adjust to stupidity. You adjust to laziness. You adjust to the standard of living. You adjust to all the vices that surround you. You don't even see them, because you are obsessed with the idea, "I have to adjust myself."

Here always you people come to me after class and say, "Well, you understand in a coun- -- in a society as of today, I just can't do as I want to." That is, they have the impertinence to tell me that we live in a special society today which differs from any other society in the history of the world. Gentlemen, a Quaker who was burned in Massachusetts, could much -- with much greater right have said, "I'm sorry, I can't be a Quaker, because in this society, there's just no place for a Quaker." Now you all live on the Quakers, are proud of them, and say,

"They are the very best part of America." It took 300 years for learning this, because no Quaker ever said -- used your excuse, "You understand, today one cannot do this."

As long as this word "today" comes out of your mouth, you have not come under the influence of St. Augustine, because St. Augustine has made it clear that every today is under judgment of the real time. But "today" doesn't count in the history of man, will be forgotten. Tomorrow you will not understand yourself that you paid any attention to today. Augustine has a wonderful sentence in this book, in another book, "How many of our todays have passed through the needle of -- the eye of your needle, O Lord?" "How many todays of ours have passed through the ear of the needle -- of Thy needle, O Lord?" I hope you cannot understand this, because it's a very great phrase. But take it down, just the same, because I hope that in 40 years, you'll learn what it means.

"How many todays of ours have passed through the eye of Thy needle, O Lord?" That's Augus- -- Augustine, gentlemen. It gives -- he gives you the power to understand that the timespan of your expectations of life transcends any visible form of government. It gives you the power, for example, to emigrate from one country to another. I could not stand here before you if I was not an Augustinian, because if you -- you cannot emigrate. You have to eat ice cream in the midst of Berlin or Moscow. And if they have no ice cream, you say, "Well, I can't live here." So the Army has to provide it for all the boys. You are completely dependent on little America wherever you go. Otherwise you aren't satisfied. So you are slaves of your environment, indeed. Or you are not, gentlemen, but then you know that you are not just Americans. And everyone who has the right spirit knows that he doesn't carry America with him, but he carries with him the creative spirit which founded America. That is, the very best of America, of course, is the hearts of those men who came into this country when there was no America. Isn't that simple? Who -- put it into -- into -- into reality, you see, out of their connection with the infinite, with the unconditional, with the unlimited.

This is the story, gentlemen, of St. Augustine, that he {tells} everybody, "A course in American history cannot save your soul, because there was a story of God with man before 1620, and there must be a story of God with man after 1960, and the cobalt bomb."

The last man is Jerome. Hieronymous, whose dates you have not given us, Sir, whose dates you have not given me -- is the translator of the Bible from the Greek into the Latin. And he makes sure to this day that the Word of God is neither in the language of the living generation, nor in the language of the

founders, of the first generation, that God's Word is spirit, and not letter, that the letter killeth, and the spirit vivifies. Gentlemen, you take this again far too unctuously. This is a very practical, scientific rule, that when you get any text, you only have absorbed the text when you can translate it. That is -- you will learn this in later life -- the only person who knows anything is a teacher. You begin to learn, but only if what I tell you here has become so much your property that you can teach it to others, do you know what it means to know this. You have no idea of what you are learning at this moment. This is just the beginning of wisdom. Only he who has to make a choice and say -- and select the fact that he has to teach, and has to remember everything he has learned, and has to discard everything he thinks is false, and has to emphasize everything he thinks he has learned is important, only he actually is -- has the full presence of mind to be really certain that this is so. You can repeat what I say, but it doesn't mean that you know it.

You begin to learn, gentlemen, the end, the finality, the destiny of learning is teaching, gentlemen. The end of learning is teaching, because if my truth is great, you are responsible that everybody comes to know it. If you really learn, at this moment, you cannot limit learning to your examination. That's why I despise examinations. And I despise you, because you forget everything which you have learned after the examination is over. You cannot learn, because you actually think that it is important to spit out what I have put into you -- like this -- like a -- puke. I don't teach for your puking. But that's what you understand by learning in this country: 120 hours' credit, 1.8 average, and then good-bye.

Now that is what Jerome has tried to avoid. Gentlemen, in the word "translation," there is a much greater importance than you think. Translation is nothing special. It's "transport," "transport" in the old sense of the word "transport." You are transported. You are transported out of the flesh into the spirit. The flesh is the language. And would you take this down, gentlemen? Time and again, Christians have forgotten that the word "flesh" did not mean the skin, or the bowels, or the stomach, or the genitals, or sens- -- the senses. That's only misunderstood Puritanism. Today, the people hold this against the Puritans, as though they ever taught such nonsense. Gentlemen, the Puritans meant by "flesh" your way of taking examinations. That is the flesh in the sense of the New Testament. The flesh is when you think that by repeating the words, you have done everything that's needed. I'm very serious, gentlemen. Reconquer the sense of carnality. Grandmother Called It Carnal, is a very nice novel in New England. Has anybody read it? Grandmother Called It Carnal. Well, the book is around this -- what is carnal, c-a-r-n-a-l? Well, that's the flesh. And what is the flesh, gentlemen? The flesh is that which is just the sheath of the spirit, and which by you is

taken to be the sword.

And {you know} the language, I told you last time is the sheath of the spirit.

And that is what Jerome has tried to remind you of constantly. Ev- -- the -- the Bible cannot be read in English, and the Bible cannot be read in Aramaic. The great story of Jerome is only the finishing touch on the history of the Gospel, gentlemen. St. Matthew wrote his first Gospel in Aramaic, and it is lost. And the greatness of the revelation perhaps doesn't stand out more clearly than in this fact that we only have the first Gospel in its Greek translation, because it means that we are free. We don't depend on the original wording of any text today. Imagine what this means, that at the -- just as the Crucifixion, the failure of Christ stands on the beginning of the Church, so the failure of a Gospel to survive stands on the beginning of the sacred texts of this same church. The first Gospel is lost. Matthew wrote in the -- in the language of his people, in Jerusalem, and in Judah, and they didn't recognize it. He left them. The text was just lost. And that's a great Christian pride that it doesn't matter when the text is lost. The spirit lives on. Just as -- John Brown's body could die in the sea, and his soul is marching on, in exactly the same sense, you and I have the Gospel, although we don't have the original text. Can you understand this? That is flesh.

And please, contradict all the idiots who talk of Christianity as though it was against the flesh. God has loved the 10 toes and the 10 fingers of your hand and the breasts of your women; and the womb, certainly of Mary. Hasn't He blessed it? And the whole body is beautiful. Sinful is your mind, and that is flesh. And that is dead. And that had to be brought under control. And that is the expression of the -- your idea of translation. In every generation ...

[tape interruption]

... perhaps can see now, gentlemen, that these four people have taught us to live. Jesus, Peter, Paul, the martyrs have taught us -- St. Stephen, the first martyr, have taught us to die. Christianity begins with a lesson in dying. And then Anthony, Athanasius, and St. Augustine, and Jerome give you a lesson in living. And that is the difference, gentlemen, between a Christianity in the catacombs, and a Christianity in power. That it is very difficult for a Christian in power to live, if he doesn't see the importance of monasticism, of dogma, of translation, and of an historical horizon of history. This -- would you take this down, gentlemen? -- dogma, asceticism, a doctrine of the eons, or of history, of the epochs, and a power to translate are the four pillars of the Christian life. If you don't understand this, you can go to 20 churches a day and you are not a Christian. Doesn't help you that the pope says you are a good Christian. You are not. That

has been consecrated by these four saints. And they are therefore still salutary. And that is the meaning of "saint," a man who brings us this sanity. We can't say today "salvation." It's just a question of sanity. And the people today, gentlemen, who have not these four saints around them, are insane.

Go to Washington and you find a city of a million people where the majority is insane, because they have neither a desert, or asceticism, in which they are indifferent to the prosperity. They are all frightened to death by the depression. Second, they are all believing that the history of mankind is identical with the history of the -- of America. Third, they all believe that there is no dogma which unites mankind against the Devil and tyr- -- tyranny. Just a question of labels. They are all given to the devil of propaganda. And what is the devil of propaganda? That I can say to others what I do not believe myself. That is propaganda, that I can say to others what I do not believe myself. Dogma is that I must stick to certain terms and prefer to be burned at stake, before I shall give them up. If you don't -- but you don't have that, so you are like the leaf in the wind. But the Quaker who went to the stake in Massachusetts just had it. And the fourth thing, gentlemen, is when you go to Washington, they do not know that they must speak to the Russians not like a governess in an American school. They cannot translate. We irritate the whole rest of the world because we behave, wherever we go, just as the lady on the Orozco fresco, teaching the schoolchildren there in the nice little schoolhouse, to be good. And the answer of the whole world is, "You don't have us to tell us what's good. Good-bye."

So gentlemen, Washington is today a godless city, regardless of the fact that there very nice -- many nice people. That is not the question today, gentlemen, you understand. But as a city of 100 -- of a million officials, who live on these four premises: there is no dogma, there is no retreat for me in which I live quite indifferently from the prosperity and the business cycle, and live the good life whether there is a depression or prosperity. And I'm not frightened with the end of the world, because there are 10 million people unemployed. Or better still, we cannot pay the interest on the government bonds. The third, that we have to translate the human language away from the flesh of our own morality, of our own sour morality, of our {moraline,} alkaline, or whatever you call it. And the fourth, that the history of God is much longer than the history of America. And that the history of America can only be saved when we put it into the history of -- God's; that is, as a chapter in the history of universal history, American history can always be saved. Now I have to make a -- have promised a break, so here it is.

You don't need it now? You should have reminded me. Can you stand it, if I

go on? We are so pressed for time, I would be very grateful. Ja? Am I permitted? Gentlemen, now I turn therefore to this fact that the American history is a chapter in the universal history. Of this all Americans have been convinced before 19- -- 1898. In 1898, when America went into the Spanish-American War, this great place of America for the first time was badly shaken. It was a purely gingoistic, imperialistic war. And so we are saddled with Puerto Rico. We made -- this was nonsense. But before and after, there has always been the American tradition that this is a chapter in the universal history of the world.

And I suggest to you that I -- you now take down the fact: there are three histories of America. That is, three ways in which the history of America can be told. You remember history has to be told. Now you can tell the history of your own country in three different ways. You can say that Governor Bradford landed in 1620 on the "Mayflower," there and there on Plymouth Rock. And half of the people died in the first winter. And now, new people arrive for unknown reasons, from somewhere in the world, call it England, later Holland, and other parts of the world -- of the European continent, and you begin your story with the landing of people on these shores. That's how you read it in your books. And that is a naturalistic history of America. That is, you tell the history of this country, regard -- of the -- in a carnal way, in the way in which the people became visible on these shores, as flesh. And you only tell it in his- -- in terms of the present of such an occasion: landing, battles. Then you can have a somewhat Greek -- that is a naturalistic -- the chronicle of the tribe, or the chronicle of that city. And that's how the city of Boston will write their story, or New England people will write their story or -- if you are from Kansas, they even now have a historical society in Kansas. And that is a naturalistic approach, which you can have -- a dentist in Kansas City. I know a dentist in Kansas City. And he made history when he left Kansas City and went to Egypt as a missionary, in 1874, and was a great -- the greatest man of Kansas City, but he doesn't appear in a naturalistic history of Kansas, because since he left, the Kansas people haven't found a way of saying that these are the fine people which Kansas City produce. They only think of the people who are lying there on an expensive cemetery in Kansas. And they think these are the people of Kansas.

The naturalistic history, gentlemen, has no antecedents, and no future for the facts that happen. And it ends today, in this poor today of which Aug- -- St. Augustine has spoken resentfully, because gentlemen, naturalistic history isolates a past from the future. And it says, "I know the American history of the past, and I can write it, regardless of my expectations which I have for the future of America." That is nat- -- nature, gentlemen, which has no speech, and which has

no future. The natural scientist deals always with things dead, never with the living. It tries -- he tries to reduce life to death. He tries to reduce reality experienced to experiment. He tries to reduce the believed-in to the known. And always kills the future. Things under natural science have no future. They can just go on forever under natural law the same way.

So gentlemen, that's naturalistic history. That's what you call here American history. This poor country America under your treatment has no future. It is just -- it has a history from 1620 to 1954, and television is the answer, is the end of the world, of the American world. It is, of course, not true.

Gentlemen, there is a second story already, which is a little better. That's the comparative history. You can tell the settlement. That's Greek. What you are learning is pagan, just pagan, tribal or Egyptian. It's just a -- a review of your ancestors, of your pedigree, all description of your country, in its eternal cycles. But gentlemen, the Greek story is comparative. That is, you can say, as the people in 57 heard -- who was in 57? Ja. You remember what we said about the emancipation of the slaves? That in the same year in Russia, they were also emancipated, the serfs, you see, and that therefore obviously the event in this country must be compared with the event in Russia. And this would be a comparative history of America, and very useful. Railroads are here and railroads are there. We have summer time, but you know who invented summer time? Well, it's Winston Churchill, in the first World War. It's not an American invention. But you see, you believe that many things are American, when in fact they are just in one edition American and in the others, they are quite international. Most things are not American, which you think are American. And a comparative history just tells you so, that the things originated parallel, or equally well in other parts of the world. You have a strange picture of what America all did. For example, in a comparative history, you would learn that Thomas Elva -- Alva Edison is not a scientist, but an inventor, and that he needed 300 years of science in order to make his invention, and that invention depends on a very slow, and patient, sacrificial, unremunerated life of scientists far away from the glories of the day. You worship Thomas Alva Edison without comparing his one-generation achievement with 250 years of careful preparation in Europe. So you cannot understand your modern, technical world, gentlemen. The atom bomb is not an American fruit. It's the fruit of 300 years of European science and applied by some transported Greek slaves to this country, to this new Rome. And you bought it for money. And now you have it and don't know what to do with it. But the bomb is not an American invention. And it is not a Russian invention, as you well know. They -- they stole the -- the other half of the German scientists who made it.

But that's not pleasant hearing, because gentlemen, in a comparative history, we go beyond the hero-worship. Now you recall, gentlemen, that heroes are the coverup points of the pedigree of the human race. A hero is a man who opens the new way, order, community, and you forget where he learned his trade. You remember that we said of the tribes that they do not explain where the first -- the founder of the tribe came from, where he learned that he had to create a new language, and a new ritual, and a new custom. The modern sects are like that. The Mormons say that -- that Brigham Young did it. But any sect, of course, borrows from Christianity, and has a hard time to explain what happened between the coming of Jesus and the beginning of the sect. The Catholics say, rightly to the Protestants, "You are funny people. You say Luther began the right faith, or Calvin began the right faith. What happened in the meantime? Where did they get their Bible from? Wasn't that the monks who copied faithfully for 1800 years, so that you could still have it?" The Church can always ridicule the sects as being hero-worshippers. There is Mr. Fox -- George Fox, the first Quaker. And there is, {as I said}, Mr. {Schwiegfeld}, the first -- he is the first -- then Menno, Simons Menno, the first Mennonite. There's Mr. Amman, the first Amish man, and so on it goes. And these are all the tribal forms of the tribal Virgin Birth. And that is why the dogma of the Virgin Birth was inserted, to -- to make up for the hero-worship of the pagan. But that's a long story. I am glad to talk to you of this privately, when I have finished this course. But it's very interesting, you see.

The whole dogma of the Christian Church takes sides with the errors of the pre-Christian world. And all tribes believe in the -- Virgin Birth of their tribe, and so you do. You actually believe that they are Americans. Now gentlemen, that's of course not true. In 1620, there was not one American. And if you don't remember this, then you are hero-worshippers of a purely American naturalistic history, where the story begins with the first American, or -- who's the man who crossed the Alleghenies?

(Boone.)

Wie?

[unintelligible]

David Boone, isn't it? And that would be the hero of this country, without ancestors, without tradition. Or Thomas Alva Edison, is a case in point, too, you see. He invented the electric bulb, because he just stole it three months before

they did it in -- in Europe. And you believe it. You believe that these three months are the true story. That is, with naturalistic history and -- this can already be cured by a comparative history, gentlemen. But it doesn't land us in universal history. There's more than a Greek story, gentlemen. There's more than a pharaoh --- Egyptian story. There's more than a -- than a tribal paean of self-praise. There is the true story, the Biblical story of America. America also belongs into the Bible. How is this done, then?

I propose to you that the sketch, which I can only deliver, but is so -- you know the facts, and I only have to give you the suggestion that would -- might also comfort you in your present-day troubles. {I'm quite comforted} -- I'm proud of being an American citizen now, and I think I am in the real American history, but I reject the natural history of an America. No newcomer to the United States can be satisfied of being just a naturalized citizen, gentlemen. I am a creature of God. You are, and God didn't begin my life when I landed on these shores. And He didn't begin your life when your parents landed on these shores. Mankind's history is much more connected. It's much more one. And we should be proud that we continue the great struggle of the humanity accidentally on these -- on this beach of America.

And that's why you have to have immigration, gentlemen, because the first generation in this country is the only one that is -- has always kept the America in the universal history of the human race. That's why the McCarran law is a wicked law, because it has made me a citizen, second-class. And that's wicked. I can't go where I like. I am prevented by this law. I -- you don't even know this, that Mr. McCarran has canceled out the religious background of America. The religious background of America is that in every generation, the newcomers remind the people who are here that they are more than Americans. That's a great thing, a great division of labor. You didn't need universities here. You didn't need sciences, and philosophers, and poets to remind you of this. The newcomers, whom you had to welcome in this country, reminded you of this fact, and that was much better than all the wisdom of the Germans, and the French, and the Ox- -- people in Oxford, where this was just expressed in so many words. You had to form a welcome club and make the people at home through Tammany Hall in New York, and they learned how to vote. Don't say anything against Tammany Hall. That is just the most primitive form of making the next generation at home in this country. Very cheap today to scan- -- to be scandalized about Tammany Hall. But they had to do something. Because 500,000 people landed every year in New York. And they had to tell them, "We treat you as brothers, although you are not Americans." And by this fact, whether they were Rome -- Roman Catholics, or Jews, or Greek Orthodox, gentlemen,

makes no -- they were Christians, because they recognized that any -- the man who wanted to be mayor of New York had to prove that he was a member of the Church of God and a member of the United States of -- of America. He had to be in Church and state, because to the newcomer, he had to be human, regardless of color, race, and creed, and nationality, long before this man would ever be an American citizen. He had already to be treated as a potential citizen. And I have tried to show you that you are at home in the Church before you are at home in the city, of this earth. And so this has all been enacted here in the greatest possible manner, not with denominations, where people go to church in a stone building, gentlemen. That isn't the church. But the Church is the fact that you and I belong to two worlds.

Have I told you the story of my friend and the Armenians? I think I have. And St. Peter? Have I not?

(No.)

I have a friend, a wonderful person. She has six children, and -- and she was -- studied architecture herself at MIT. She was young -- is now a grandmother. But in 1918 -- '17, there happened the atrocities in Turkey against the Armenians. And most of them were slaughtered. But some 10,000 survived, escaped the massacre. And she got interested in saving them and bringing them to this country. And she went to the State Department and she said, "You have to give these people passports." And they said, "We cannot do this. They haven't applied, and they haven't a letter of conduct. And they have not -- they have no recommendation from their embassy," and so on.

And she said, "How can they? They are massacred in Turkey. They are at war with Turkey. Are you crazy? They have to come."

They said, "No."

She said, "But they have to come."

The official got nervous, of course, and irritated. And said, "But they can't, Madam. And what are you going to do, anyway?"

"Oh," she said. "It's very simple. You are going to die."

The man was very {smart}, and had to admit it.

And she said, "And I will be there when you come to see St. Peter about your -- about your entrance into a certain place. And I'll tell him, 'Don't let him into Heaven. He hasn't let the Armenians in, either.'"

And they got in, the Armenians.

And so, 30 years ago, this country still had for an official in the government this double passport in Heaven and on earth. Don't laugh, gentlemen, because you have lost that. I cannot appeal to you in this same manner. You won't give me a passport for the Armenians. You will say the FBI forbids it. And you have been impoverished. You are all monists. That is, you live in one world only. Nobody can live in one world only, gentlemen. What is the other world? The other world is the world -- or the other way, the other way, the Christian way is perfectly indifferent to the failure or success of the -- of the secular way. The official felt that at that moment if he was fired for giving the passport, that was an honor. That was an honor! For -- before, he had said, "I'm afraid. They might fire me," you see. And she made him see that it was a great honor to be fired for such a -- at such an occasion. And that is the story of failure as victory. And that is the only reason why you have to be at home in state and Church. If you cannot from your heart suddenly see that what the country calls defeat is your greatest success, you have ceased to be -- live in the Christian era. You live on the clannish, or on the Egyptian, or the Jewish, or the Greek road. And you have no longer the right to say that you are a modern person of our era.

Gentlemen, the -- the United States began with an errand in the wilderness, as the fine fleur, as we say in cooking, as the quintessence, the finest perfection of Christianity in the Old World. America's history begins in Europe, and it begins in the history of the Christian Church. And it has absolutely nothing to do with geography, and has very little to do with the discovery of America by Christoph Columbus. And that's therefore rightly so that we do not date the history of America into the year 1492, but in 1620. That is, the "Mayflower" is actually more important than Christoph Columbus. Why, gentlemen? Because the future rewrites the past. I have tried to show you that the past is that part of the future which has already been achieved. Nothing else. The rest is dead. It's natural history. Who cares for the diluvium? That's dead, that's gone. But we -- you and I -- must know those facts of the past which have begun that which is our own destiny. Obviously we couldn't continue if you do not learn English, and writing, and prayer, and building cities. Then we cannot continue and do better. Gentlemen, history is that part of the past which has started the future. Your and my future, understand. Therefore, nobody could found America who had no future. The Pilgrim fathers were one of the earliest who had a future in

their heart. They came here, remember, the people -- you in 57 -- they came to America to teach the people in Europe how to live the good life. That is, gentlemen, they were a hothouse for the final life in Europe. That was called their errand in the wilderness. You remember, in 57, when we read "The Errand in the Wilderness." Ja?

Will you take down, gentlemen, that the 17th century has Christians reform the Christian Church in Europe on the soil of America. That is the first chapter in American history as a universal history. Now you get this tremendous contrast, gentlemen. The wilderness, physically, or in the -- and spiritually, let us use the term that has later rightly been used. Every man came to this country in the 17th century -- not every man, but most -- were latter-day saints. I expressly use this term, which good American, regardless of the Mormons. It includes all the people who came here. They were the latter-day saints. They built on the first church a new -- new perfection. You have to raise the term "latter-day saints" to a much more comprehensive meaning than these people in Utah. The whole American attitude was latter -- to be latter-day saints. And the -- Brigham Young just, so to speak, narrowed it down, to his ladies from Sweden and Denmark whom he got there for polygamy.

This isn't the story. If you understand me right, let me put it in -- in -- in brackets. But you -- perhaps you understand that I want you just to sit -- take stock what America really stands for. America is latter-day sanity, latter-day saintliness. Latter-day. That is, based on the disappointments with Church and state in Europe, and {with} the saying that this is a New World -- but not a new world of prairies -- but a world in which every man would be a member of a church and of a state. The word "world" is a very unfortunate word, gentlemen. And I'll come back to this next time. Latter-day saints, gentlemen, in a new world. That's the 17th century. And make it clear, gentlemen, by your writing it down in your notes that the word "world" is so ambiguous. I'll explain to you the -- the horrid consequences of your no longer understanding what the word "world" mean -- means in the na- -- in the -- in the mouth of a Puritan, in the mouth of a pioneer. Something quite different from what you call -- call "world." So my time is up. And you -- I have only tried to show you, gentlemen, that the universal history of America begins in Europe. Naturalistic history begins with the bodies of the people thrown into the sea, because they fell seasick. And the comparative history in between is indecisive. It can be this way or the other. It is neither naturalistic nor universal.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Student introduction: (Philosophy 58, May 13th, 1954)

[Opening remarks missing]

... strange enterprise to place the American history within the frame of reference of a universal history. For this, I had to go back one moment to { } the data of that strange church which the Pilgrim Fathers carried to this country. We figured that the ways the Christians had to open up at all times and still today are four-fold, and I tried to show you that the bloody sacrifices of the tribes, of the clans, the star-worship of the pharaohs -- of the big feeder as they have it now with Mr. Stalin again, or Malenkov -- or prosperity around the corner, that the Greek worship of curiosity, of mental enterprise, and the Jewish expectation of the coming of the Lord, in the scripture of The Messiah, that these ways were surpassed by the Christians because they enabled a man at any one time to choose between these four roads. And that was liter- -- that is -- was literally so, I tried to prove to you from the four Gospels, every one of them being written to open one of these four roads. And then we went to see that at the end of ancient Christianity, in the old Roman Empire, there was the same problem of giving man freedom -- that was Anthony -- of giving him the faith that he could regenerate what his forefathers had done, in the right creed even against an emperor -- that was Athanasius, with his trinitarian creed; the great problem of living in the proper era, that was the action of St. Augustine, who took the soul of Christianity, the citizens of Christianity out of the citizenry of the -- of Rome; and the freedom of speaking your own tongue, because the letter was not important, but the spirit, and that was the action of Jerome in translating the original Bible into a new language.

So these four people -- I first want to go into this for a moment to correct your notes. We haven't quite placed them. The dates of Jerome are -- which you want -- wish to add to your notes, 345 to 420. It is not superfluous to know these dates, gentlemen. You know so few dates in history, you -- perhaps sometimes you don't even know that Jesus is supposed to have been born in the year 0, but that's a fact. And these years from 250, the birth of Anthony, to 430 contain everything that the people who came to this country remembered. This is a second thing I now have to prove. If you ask me, "What filled these people, the Pilgrim Fathers, in their own heart in Europe?" you can find it in this very famous book, by Arber. Who knows this book, Arber, The Pilgrim Fathers? Well, it's the best present you can give to any girl of your friendship for Thanksgiving.

The Story of the Pilgrim Fathers, as Told by Themselves, Their Friends, and Their Enemies. It's written by an Englishman, of course, because this country doesn't care for the story that happened before on the other side. There are 346 pages in this book devoted to the state of heart and mind of the people at home. And then only the rest, another 300 pages, or not even that much, to the actions here of the people in the first years in the colony. I was asked whether this was only true of New England. You'll see from this book that it isn't true of New England, because the negotiations were carried on with the Virginia Company at home, Virginia Company being already in existence. And already in 1610, the Virginia Company had a song, sung in London, that they were going to plant a nation where there was no nation, yet. That's 1610, that's all -- happens all in England. Then there is a very strange passage on -- or not strange, but { } should expect, as a matter of fact -- why the people came here. And of course the reasons are all of a nature that -- quite unconnected with this continent. They hadn't been here when they decided that they should go. And at the end, there is a funny thing about the people who should not come to America. You'll see how this has changed, how now most people come for the reasons they are warned off in here, cautioned against.

"I heard some complaint of others for their -- ample reports of New England, and yet, because they must drink water here, and one -- many delegates they here enjoy in England, could presently return to the Old World with their mouths full of {clammoths}. And can any be so simple as to conceive that the fountains should stream forth wine or beer, or the woods and rivers be like butchers' shops and fishmongers' stores, where they might have things taken to their hands? If Thou canst not live without such things, and hast no means to procure the one, and wilt not take pains for the other, nor hast money to employ others for the rest where Thou art: for as a proud heart, a dainty tooth, a beggar's purse, and an idle hand be here intolerable."

I think these four words you should take down, gentlemen, the four things that are -- the four ways that are useless in America: "... a proud heart, a dainty tooth, a beggar's pur- -- purse, and an idle hand be here intolerable." So that person that had these qualities in Eng- -- in the New World is much more abominable. Now I think the world -- the New World is full of these abominable people, today with the standard of living. I think you will find many people who have a proud heart, a dainty tooth, a beggar's purse, and idle hand. But it isn't the American way. The American way is -- was to exclude these four. What was the positive content, gentlemen, of the faith of these people?

If you want to have it embodied in one old father of the Church, this way of life, you may turn to St. Ambrose. St. Ambrose was in a somewhat similar position as the Pilgrim Fathers. St. Ambrose -- perhaps you take this down, too -- lived from 340 to 397. He's very famous because he required the emperor of Rome to ask forgiveness for his slaughter of innocent people before he could be received by Ambrose in Communion. That is, Ambrose was the first bishop who ascertained in actual fact the emperor's submission to the sacraments of the Church. As you know, that was the battle of Athanasius. And in this sense, Ambrose simply accepts the Athanasian creed that the emperor is not a God-man, or a man-god, and that therefore he has to humble himself, as anybody else.

That was -- be very much within the line of the Pilgrim Fathers, who also thought that the royal majesty was just a human being as anybody else, and didn't believe in the divine right of kings. That's Ambrosian. The second thing you hear from Ambrose, that he wa- -- introduced monasticism into his dioceses of Lombardy, the richest province of the empire, you may say. It's still today the most fruitful part of Europe. Cotton grows there, and maize, and -- and rice and the mulberry trees for the silk, and if you go through Lombardy, you can hardly compare any other region, even in this country, to it in fertility. Well, in introducing the monks to this richest part of the empire, you can see that he asked for the Puritan character of asceticism, of renouncing the world in some form. Whether you don't smoke, or whether you don't -- listen to television, in some form any reasonable people -- person has to draw the line between himself and the world that surrounds him. If you fall for everything that the world offers, you have lost your freedom.

So the Puritans, of course, are direct descendants of the monks. They are worldly, secular monks. And again, Ambrose is a person who, in a kind of synthesis, inherited from Anthony and the other monks this one feature. And he's very famous -- Ambrose -- in what you sing every Sunday in any service in the world here, is the father of the Ambrosian chant, Te Deum laudamus. Whether you -- sing, "Holy, holy, holy," that's all Ambrosian tradition, or any one of the other famous songs, from the first hymn in the hymnbook to the last, Fa- -- Ambrosius is the father of hymnody. He's the first who has written Latin hymns. And all our choral services stem from him.

The -- you find the Ambrosia center sung, the Ambrosian song itself out of which most of our modern hymns are in some way derived. Most what Watts -- Isaac Watts and Charles Wesley has composed is -- is enlarging on this. You find it also in the Catholic breviary, where the monks have -- pray it every day, at

matin: Te Deum laudamus, te Dominum {confitemo}, and I think once in your life you should hear it. "We praise you, O L- -- God; We confess You to be the Lord; Thee as a father in eternity all the earth worships; To Thee all the angels, all the heavens, and the powers of the universe, to Thee the cherubim and seraphim with an incessant voice proclaim," -- now come this Number 1 of the ordinary hymnbook, "Holy, holy, holy, the Lord God Sabaoth, full are the Heaven and earth of the majesty of Thy glory." And now comes -- you must think how important this was in the wilderness here, the very simple statement: "Thee, the glorious choir of the Apostles; Thee, the number -- praiseworthy number of the prophets; Thee, the white -- white ..." I have to translate from the Latin here, "... Thee, the white-clothed host of the martyrs, praises. Thee, over the whole orb of the earths, of the lands, the sacred Church confesses; and the father of immense majesty, as the unique Son and as the Holy Spirit."

So in these few words, gentlemen, you have the whole Old and New Testament and the history of the Church, the prophets, the Apostles, and the martyrs. And that, with this background, the people landed on these shores. So you have the Jews, and the Christians, and the verification through mission, which is in such three lines just enshrined in the heart of every one who came to this country in the first 200 years, to America. I think that's not unimportant. And you may take down Ambrosius then as the shortest quintessence of what the people in the 17th -- 18th, also 19th century, I would say, took for granted. They took it for granted that there was a meaningful history of God with His children. They took it for granted that there were {continue} this. They took it for granted that this history was known, and was told, and that they would have to tell it their children -- all the premises of a universal history we have spoken about, you remember. And that the whole same story had a direction, and an end.

It is very necessary for you, gentlemen, to know this. Protestants and Catholics, as you know, today still wage war -- I think it's a superficial war -- between themselves and the Jews too, as with regard to the meaning of the times between 500 and 1500, so-called Middle Ages. It is very important for you to see that the people who came to this country took the Church certainly of the 4th century with themselves. That is, not just the Gospel, and not perhaps the whole story of the -- but that burden wasn't necessary. But the four people -- Anthony, St. Augustine, Jerome, and Athanasius -- were with them. And I only mention St. Ambrose as a fifth father, because he is a kind of combination of these four ways of life. And when people ask you, gentlemen, "What is Christianity?" you must not say it's the New Testament. That's a book. And you can also not say it's the story of the last 1954 years, because that's much abused. And dissent, and heresy, and cruelty, there is the Inquisition. There are many things we cannot swallow.

The Protestants tried to throw out all the martyrs, what is called in the -- ma- -- the Saint -- Ambrosian song, the "candidate." But they kept the Creed, for example, which only dates from 325 of our era. Now I offer you a compromise here. You can see that the fight against the worldly powers of the 4th century is still in the Pilgrim Fathers very definitely. So that there is no such break between the Church and the New Testament as some people w- -- make -- try to make us believe.

Now we return to the American story itself, after I have reminded you of the -- once more of their -- of the treasure they though they carried with them: direction, promised future, and a great, glorious ancestry -- certain ways by which they could free themselves from the world by denouncing it, like all the vices, beginning with drunkenness and adultery, to smoking and dancing, or as I said, television and -- and similar things, according to the time, always different. We smoke, probably in -- or we drink, probably in 1650, you would also have thought some -- differently on these matters.

The second thing is the unity with the people of the past as expressed in the Creed, that there is a continuous minimum by which every human being is taken to task, by which even the greatest tyrant, be it Mr. Hitler, or be it Mr. Stalin, or be it Mr. James I of England, you see, is taken to task and put down. We cannot tamper with the freedom of conscious, of the individual, or with his right of resistance, or his right to emigrate. And as you know, this is again very practical today with the problem of the American passports.

The third thing is, so we have freedom of the living generation, gentlemen. But regeneration of the right living of the past, that's Athanasius. Then we have future, a free future, an era which is not yet to an end, but which has a clear destiny and a clear direction. And then we have in the language problem the tremendous task of every generation to be transported again to the pure source, and to bring forward new fruit. Now the people in the 18th -- in the 17th century, and this book is -- is a witness to this, thought that they would set an example for the people at home. And so in the 17th century, there are the Church in the wilderness, with the great expectation that the people in England would become so jealous that they would either call them home, or would conform to the life of the colony here. And the word "colony" therefore had at that time not the -- what you call "colonialism," but they were very proud that they were planters, the word "colony" meaning planting, plantations. And so Providence was called, as you know, Providence and Plantations. And it's -- also important for you to know that in the 17th century, nobody thought when he used the

word "colony," that this was anything of second-rate. Quite the contrary. It was an improvement on the metropolis, to be colonial. Only if you hear the different color, you understand the Pilgrim Fathers. They did not think that they were second-rate because they were in a colony. As you know today we -- we debate colonialism, and we are torn, because we don't see why the Viet Minh shouldn't have their independence from the French, and why the American policy now to bet on the wrong horse. After all, we are against -- against -- we are for the small nations, so it's very terrible for us not to be on the side of -- of the independence, of the people in England. That's much more normal for us, and -- today. But you must hear in the 17th century that these people were the Church in the wilderness, and therefore very glad to be called the Plantation; just as Paul said that he had never planted a church, but he had watered it and irrigated it, and cared for it. Peter planted and {bought} -- fed it, or cultivated it, or pruned it. These are again colonial expressions. And you should see that the very word "colony" in the 17th century, gentlemen, was not a worldly expression, a secular, political expression. It was a religious expression. They felt that they were planted as a Church. And that is true of Roger Williams, just as well as of the theocracy of Massachusetts, or of the people of Virginia, that they were the branches of the Church universal. And it's very important that you must see, gentlemen, that whoever came here, of whatever denomination, whether it's -- were the Catholics in Maryland, or the -- the theocracy in Massachusetts who were the Congregationalists, or became the Congregationalists, and -- that they all far more -- if you had asked them at those days -- would first say that they are members of a Church before they would say that they are -- were members of a political commonwealth, or a political intent. And so the -- the result of the 17th century, which you have to keep in mind, is that in America, the Church is older than the state. The Church is older than the state. And all our problems in this country, now with the school bus, and the lunch -- school luncheon and so, come from this very fact that this is not clearly recognized, that in this country, the relation is the opposite from Europe. In Europe, the state is older than the Church, but in America, the Church is older than the state. The Church is first, and has then made certain concessions to the state. But the state is just tolerated. And if you give that up, you lose the background for the soul of the citizenry here. And that is in jeopardy at this moment.

So you have to -- there is an instinct now, many books on Jonathan Edwards are written on the Pilgrim Fathers, on the 17th century -- everybody feels in this country -- or not everybody, but the serious people feel -- that we must link up with the beginnings of America at this moment, that's also the meaning of the courses in American history, because if we do not link up with those people in

the 18th and 17th centuries, before the Declaration of Independence, gentlemen, we'll make mistakes. For example, we will not deal rightly with the issues, Church and state, which will plague you and your children for years to come. It's a very difficult issue. And I'm not going to offer you a cheap solution here at all. But I want to draw your attention to the fact why that must be so: because the people who came -- have come to this country belong to a church before they believed they belonged to the commonwealth on this side of the ocean, because they were at home carried out of their political bondage, because they had a second home -- their Church -- which told them, "Leave the state in Europe. Leave it, and come to another state." So you see that the sheath, or the tube, or the channel, or the way of hibernating, of lying in wait, of being in suspense, was that these people had an allegiance beside their allegiance to the political kingdom of England, or the political unit of France, or wherever they came from, or the Palatinate, where the -- all the -- where Mr. Eisenhower's ancestors ca- -- have come from. Why did he come, Mr. Eisenhower, first? Because in the Palatinate, the princes there, the so-called Elector of Palatine, changed from Catholicism to Protestantism, I believe seven times, within 50 years, and that became intolerable for the inhabitants. And they were more serious than these princes, and so they left. And they left very early, as you may know. They left in the first half of the 17th century. I think Mr. Eisenhower's pedigree goes back to that. Does anybody know? It's very interesting, gentlemen. He's -- he's -- the Palatinate people are the old- -- one of the oldest groups of settlers in this country. I was quite amazed when I learned of it. When I came to this country, I met a Miss Knapp, K-n-a-p-p. She was the headmaster of her school in Concord, Massachusetts, and we became well acquainted. And I said to her one day, rather casually, if she was of German descent, and she said, "Well, it's 300 years back." Three hundred years back, she -- was 1642. So that starts -- startled me, of course. So gentlemen, the Church is older than the state in any families arriving in this country. And whether you call this the Church, that doesn't matter. I call it this way, and I offer you that you have to find this as the best term, whether it's -- these were Jews, or heathen, or free masons, or anarchists, or Bolsheviks who came to this country, they all belonged -- while they were on the Atlantic Ocean, while they were on the Atlantic Ocean -- no longer to Germany or Austria, and not yet to America. But since nobody can live without belonging, you just have to ask yourself where they -- did they belong. Ja. Where did these people on the boat belong, who had left the last port of embarkation in Europe and had not yet reached New York; who were on these ships before 1840, as you know, sometimes three months; who were very seasick, who died in great -- large numbers; who buried their children on board ship; who saw children born on board ship.

Who were these people? Have you ever thought of it? Who were they? They certainly were not just fish and cattle. They were real people. They were baptized. They were given a name. They were received into some community, but it was not a political community. And once you begin to ponder over this, you see that America is certainly the first country that wholesale has been settled as a Christian country. That has never happened before in the history of the world. It's a quite unique venture.

And I spoke to a very wise man about this some days ago. And he said, "Well, more has happened. More has happened. In the year 1945, there went a tremendous tremor through all of Europe, and 280 million people in Europe were ready to leave and to come to America, if they only would be allowed. That is, gentlemen, there has been one earthquake, in 1945, which you have to take together with the earthquake of 1620, and which means that at one time, the Europeans were all ready to board ship and to put Church before state, and to believe that they should make a new start and drop their old history. Every one of them. That is a slight exaggeration, but not very large, because as you know, even the French today, the French youth, when you take a plebiscite in France, they have 60 percent of the younger generation said they would be willing to come to this country, preferable to staying at home.

The so-called annoyance with us in -- in Europe and the animosity is just the counter-picture of this, because they can't come. They have to prove to themselves that America after all is very bad. That is, at second thought, if you have to stay in Europe, you see, with the -- with the falling franc, and the lack of government there and so, you have to hate the Americans, because you can't -- you can't do it. But that's just an afterthought. I think the wave of pro-Americanism in 1945 to 1949 and the animosity at this moment against us is the same story, a tremendous shakeup of the foundations of the Old World, and a certain consciousness that we have an advantage. And that isn't just the automobiles, gentlemen, but the very foundations of America are different. Everyone here came as a person who knew that he belonged to two orders. Had to, had to, in order to live. And such a man is free. And such a man is -- has inherited Anthony and Athanasius, and he's -- has inherited St. Augustine and Jerome. He's free with regard to the language he speaks. He's willing here to learn a new tongue, and even to change his cockney accent of English to the American drawl, or the nasal sounds of Chicago. That is, even the English who emigrate change their tongue. And so the four freedoms of which we speak in our politics, gentlemen, are not the best freedoms. I think every American inherits the four freedoms of Anthony, because he says, "I can do without the fleshpots of England, France, or

Germany," what I read to you. "I don't expect to do anything but first to wash dishes in New York, when I land, to begin from scratch." That is Anthony. That is the -- that is the desert fathers, or the Pilgrim Fathers. He expects that nobody here shall be his boss, with ultimate authority. That is, he -- he subscribes to the Trinity against the Constantinian man-god of imperialism. He does, as I said, live in a new era that doesn't coincide with the history of France, or the history of Sweden. And he lives in a freedom that the language will not matter if his children should learn English, and he goes on to speak Italian, that will not break the intimacy of the family. They will still be his children, and he will still be their father, as you see in so many -- especially Italian families, or any other group, of course, in this country is exactly the same -- which is a tremendous experience for any simple mind, you see, that the language, the mother tongue is not the basis alone of mutual trust, and love, and hope.

All these things have to be experienced, gentlemen. In Europe, they clubbed each other to death. If you didn't speak the language of the country in which you lived, you were a traitor.

We come now, gentlemen, to the fact that from 1700, from the -- you may say from the founding of Yale University in 1702, which is a -- to a certain extent the end of a chapter in American history, from 1702 to 9- -- 1898, as I told you, for this country has glorified its existence as the new Israel, and as the new Greece. That is, from simply being the Christian Church in the wilderness and setting the example for Europe, obviously from 1702 to 1898, America separated from the Old World more and more, and went independent. And this independence, of course, had again to have some imaginative illumination. Now you go to Montpelier, in Vermont, or you go to Concord, New Hampshire, or you go to Washington, in the District of Columbia, and you go to the political buildings, and what do you see? They are built in the Greek Styl -- style, and they all have Latin names. They are called the capitol. That is, America went Greek and Roman in its political bearings, in its political interest. That was the great cradle of liberty, the Greek city. And Rome was the cradle of -- of political power and wisdom. And don't think that's a -- an accident. In no American -- European country do you find a capitol, except the old, real capitol in Rome. But in every of the 48 states, you do find this. And you all -- everywhere you find these pillars. They are either Corinthian, or Ionian, or Dorian. But they always have the same problem of impressing you with the classical civilization issue. The term "democracy," or the terms of our Constitution, of politics are Greek, obviously. The word "democracy" is Greek certainly, and the word "politics" is Greek. And in our worship, however, as you know, the sects have kept the balance to the Greek issue by being the -- the true Church, and being like the Puritans, very much in the paths of the

Hebrew tradition. And the Psalms have formed the backbone in most services in this country, the Psalms of the Old Testament. And it has been often said, I need not -- you know all this, that the Puritans in many ways tried to be as strict as the people of the Old Testament.

That is, the renewal of the Church, when the Church ceased to be up in the air as the light for the heathen, when the Church comes into its own as a living matter, will always be the realization of Israel. That's especially true of the Presbyterians, and especially true of the Congregationalists, but it is true of all the other groups as well: that the strictness, the church discipline will always look very much to the -- alike to the pious Hebrews, to the patriarchs -- life of the patriarchs, and it is no accident that all the names of the Old Testament have been received here as given names into the families of this country.

When -- when Thomas Alva Edison invented the gramophone, a clergyman came to see him, and said, "I want to find out if you really -- if you really made this invention, or perhaps it is a hoax."

"Well," Edison said, "How are you going to find out?"

"Oh, I know," he said. And he said, "Can I speak -- bespeak one of your disks? Or rolls it were, at the time.

And so Mr. Edison said, "Sure, go ahead."

And he immediately began to -- in a tremendous hurry to give -- a sequence of thousand names from the Old Testament. He said they're all the names of the people of my -- of my parishioners, which are actually still there. {Althenial} or, you see, and all these very {Anintophle} and so, very difficult names.

And when it was all through Edison said, "Now, so what?"

"Oh," he said, "I'm the only man in this country who can speak these names so rapidly, and also they are only from my own church, and therefore they -- if you can repeat them now, this cannot be a cheat. Then it's actually true that you have invented the gramophone."

So Edison was very satisfied, because he was able to reproduce the -- these names, only to show you that the names of the Old Testament have played a very great role here and that this must have been -- when did Thomas Alva Edison invent the gramophone? 1876? Later. Does anybody know? Gentlemen!

Aren't you interested? Edison was my hero in my youth, but I'm ashamed to say I have -- I've forgotten the date. Nobody knows? When did he invent the gramophone. {Mark}, make a guess. When might it have been?

(1843.)

What? 1843? Does anybody know when he died?

(1924.)

(1931, he died. '31 or '32.)

Ja.

(1932.)

What? In the '90s he invented it, I'm pretty sure.

So gentlemen, the synagogue, and Greece, and Rome were the old ways which the Americans claimed to renew, to regenerate in a new way in the last two centuries. When you look at our college here, Dartmouth College, a liberal arts college, based on Latin, and Greek, and Hebrew, and preparing people for the ministry and the law, and if you think of our orators, Daniel Webster, steeped in Cicero and Demosthenes, obviously, that was the thing to do, it's long ago; you hardly understand the importance of these models, but the people in this country were trying to be the people who regenerated these two ancient worlds: the worlds of Greeks, and of Jerusalem. And they meant it, and I think they did it. And that is the specific American character between 1700 and 1898 that nowhere in the world was this classical enthusiasm and this Old Testament enthusiasm taken so seriously, always on the basis of the New Testament. But the sequence, gentlemen, and now you may begin to observe the miraculous story of America, and its uniqueness -- trying to find a piece of chalk. Well. Your imagination will -- must help you.

The story begins here, with people hanging out far, on the European front, as the foremost Christians, the most vital ones, the most electrified, the most sensitized, the feelers, so to speak, of the whole animal, feelers stretching now into the -- future, and coming to this country as an avant-garde for the people who are the most advanced at home. For the Cromwells and the Miltons who stay at home, but who feel that here really the decision is made. And Roger Williams, for example, went from Providence in the '40s and spoke to Cromwell and told him

what he had to do. And Cromwell said, "I wished we were over in America, because then we could institute all your radical measures. But at home, we are handicapped. We must stay -- go slowly." But they were great friends, and Roger Williams impressed him -- them as having the newest deal, a better deal than at home.

So gentlemen, if you kindly would now begin your strange draft of the American situation. On the left side, we said they begin from scratch in the most primitive earth, with conditions which are similar to those first men who settled in a new valley 5000 B.C. And you can then equate the wilderness of 1620 on Plymouth Rock with 5000 B.C. And on the other hand, you must equate the spirit of the people who land on Plymouth Rock with the foremost missionaries, the most modern man of 1650 at home, who were in advance of their time -- people in Europe. And you get this tremendous tension that people are in a situation of geography, of climate, of economy which is 6,000 years behind. And in spirit, they are a hundred years out in front. And that's America. Stretched out, not on a cross of gold, but on -- crucially between the most primitive situation of the pioneer, and the most advanced situation of the spirit. If you cannot grasp this, you do not understand how modern, how old-fashioned any American is at the same time. We all are. I, too, am, gentlemen, after 20 years in this country, I have to -- we have no help. We have to do everything ourselves, where the Europeans have very refined conditions. Today still you have no servants. And the man in this country has to do many chores, which no European would ever think of doing. So we are still more primitive in many ways, and on the other hand, we are also more advanced, more simplified. We have reduced human tyranny, and human pride, and human daintiness, and human beggar's tooth, and what he calls here "idleness" to a considerable degree. You remember what the man said, who should not come into this country, these four points.

On the whole, I think, this has been very successfully done. If we have rich people, their -- their children are sure to waste their money so quickly that there is no great danger that this money can be abused for long.

Now the -- the second phase, gentlemen, adds then to this far-flung, far-out position, a building-backward into the past of Israel and Greece. You'll remember, Israel and Greece are the two worlds of antiquity which came last, came before the coming of Christ, and were not the first forms of life on this earth, but already rather refined and complicated forms.

Now 1898, as you know, we went to war against Spain. And that was nothing superfluous, gentlemen. It was a complete change of scene. After the frontier had

been closed, and the promised land and God's country had been occupied, and Arizona and -- had become a state, America changed its whole character, and it's still changing since two world wars, as you know. And we have far-flung bases. We have the Philippines; Heaven knows how we got there, but there we are. That is, although they are independent, we must defend them. And we have even Okinawa. And we have -- although we don't say it, we are disinterested in the Suez Canal, but we would be very angry if we couldn't have our fly -- Air Force around the Suez Canal somewhere, and we are against Gibraltar, because that's colonialism, but we are just building air bases in Spain.

So we are certainly turning towards a world order. And the word on the -- are the -- on the money of the United States, "novus ordo {oritor}", a new order arises, perhaps you don't know that this sentence is found on your -- on their dollar bills, but there it is. Novus ordo {oritor} has a very profound meaning at this moment, because novus ordo oritor -- we become suddenly today the police force of the whole globe. And that's all we're debating today in the papers. Really, I'm so sorry that the good people in government don't have time to devote themselves to this question, but have to devote themselves to very superfluous things. That is suddenly the responsibility of our government for prosperity, for Point 4; that is, even for the prosperity of the other nations in the Marshall Plan, for example, and especially for the prosperity in this country. You think that's natural, gentlemen. But do you think that in 1800, any farmer of New England believed that his crop depended on the government in Washington? He prayed for his crops. And in -- at Thanksgiving he thanked for his crops some other power. And there were no rainmakers at that time. Or if they were, they didn't function.

And that is, in other words, gentlemen, Greece and Israel are two orders of life in which the economy has nothing to do with politics or with religion, but in which everyone is fending for himself, and in which a farmer certainly knows that if he has weeds on his plot of land, it's his fault, and not the president's in Washington. But today the man in economics -- in economic field meets weeds, he immediately has a lobby in New -- in Washington and says, "These weeds should not be. Will you kindly do something about it in Washington?"

This is Egypt, gentlemen. This is empire. This is the world before Greece and Israel, which is suddenly coming into your -- slowly rising into your consciousness. And that's why you are so different from your great-grandfathers, or from the people who fought the Civil War. You would not go to war for your own personal enterprise because you have none. You are employees. And therefore, you don't understand the whole problem of a hundred years ago, when the

majority of the people were not only independent from England politically, but independent personally, economically, and making their own weather. And not blaming the government at -- when they had nothing to eat. We do that, and perhaps we have to, because it's so complicated today that you and I probably would starve if the good man in Washington wouldn't do something for us. But we have a little bit become like the red Indians, who also speak of the Great White Father in Washington. And at least we should have an uncle there. Now gentlemen, this is a change that nobody can have. It's all over the world. Where you get machinery, and where you get powers like the atom bomb -- nuclear power, and sea power, and solar energy, these energies, gentlemen, go beyond individual use. As you may know, in 1935, some very decent people in this country formed a committee on economic power. Paul Hoffman was one of their leading -- spirits. And he said, "Let's forget all these damned European slogans about capitalism, and socialism. We have no interest in these in America. But there is a very simple, other process. A plot of land plowed up one yard deep, that is -- can be under the care of an individual. An oil drill going deep 5,000 yards cannot be under the care of an individual. If you touch the -- the -- the -- the ground so deeply, that's different. If you dive into the deep sea for the algae, for food, you get so much capital invested, that no individual can handle that." And that's our problem with Aramco, in Arabia, with the oil. And they just investigate it and grade it, so to speak, things and then say -- they said, "Tie, here -- this tie can be made by an individual enterprise. And this clothes still can. And the shoes still can. That is, what you wear that you can have for yourself." Already with these bulbs, it becomes a -- a corporation. These bulbs are not made by a small man in your hometown. And -- it's General Electric. And you know how often these -- these bulbs anger you, because they stop burning. If you had a local man, you would be very energetic and go to another local man. But you can't do this with the bulbs, because electric power is far more concentrated. And you cannot create it everywhere.

So this committee on economic power, this group just showed that we hang in different nets of energy, and if it comes to -- when it comes now to nuclear power, or cobalt power, or -- or hydrogen power, the whole earth has to unite, or we go -- are ruined. So we have to live in various societies. You can still have your bread baked at home. But already your button which you sew on, you cannot produce -- the Amish men were very wise, as you know, in Pennsylvania, they don't wear buttons, because they thought -- felt that would make them dependent on the next city. And the Amishmen have no buttons, as -- if -- as you know this, to this day, because it was the first discovery that they would then become dependent on the -- an economy which would not be free enterprise,

which would enslave them. And they would become dependent on the merchants in Philadelphia.

That's very wise. If you and I could live in self-made things, we would be very proud people, probably. But it's useless to talk about this, because we live for everything we use in a different radius, in a different circle. At a conference of technicians, and engineers, and architects and -- three years ago, I was the co-master of ceremonies, and I had to sum up what these inventors and technicians said. And it was quite interesting that we were able to formulate the law of modern technology. And the modern law of modern technology is very simple, gentlemen, so simple that you hardly can believe it. It says that every new invention accelerates the timespan for the act, destroys the social group in which before we have been living, and enlarges the space on which we depend -- the area on which we depend. If you take this down, you have the reason why the United States at this moment can no longer live like the Greeks and the Jews in antiquity. We cannot simply live in 48 states, because the 48 states, as you know, politically have lost their meaning. Earl Warren is -- could tell you something about this, in his country in California, where he abolished even the distinction between the Democratic and the Republican Party. The 48 states are just too small now because, gentlemen, with the cable of electric power carrying -- or the water of the Hoover Dam carrying the water into California, the whole problem is how to distribute the water between Arizona, and New Mexico, and California, and Nevada, as you know very definitely. And if they wouldn't unite, they would have to go to war against each other. And therefore these four states formed for all purposes of water consumption absolutely, you see, closed-knit unit and they cannot make any decision, any one of these states on their own account.

Would you repeat the -- take down this law, gentlemen? Any technological progress accelerates the time, widens the area, and destroys the previous social group. When I have a pump, water pump on my lot, on my house -- in my house, over in -- across the river, as I had in the beginning, I depend on my own power to pump, by hand. If I install an electric pump, I immediately become dependent on the power corporation. If in White River, or at the dam, or anyplace where there is a strike of the electricians, I have no water in my house, which is a very serious matter. I no longer am self-sufficient. Even with regard to water, let alone to light, { } I used to have a kerosene stove. I have an electric stove, so if anything burns through, a fuse and I have no fuse in my house, I have to wait until I can get an electrician to repair my stove. It happened the other day. I had a new -- a new stove. And I was very proud of it. And it was a Westinghouse. And out went my old -- my old stove, and I had a kerosene stove in reserve. And I said,

"Now I can part with my kerosene stove," and gave it away. Well, the next day, I wa- -- couldn't cook, because the fuse had burned through and I had to wait until the electrician found time to repair it. And I thought I was very funny having a house in the country, not being able to cook. But that's how we live today.

That is, the electricity enlarged the area which has to be integrated. It certainly accelerates the process by which I have been able to cook. Because I just push a -- button, instead of having to carry the wood from my woodlot into the -- into the -- and lit- -- and fill the stove. So the time is infinitely curtailed, abbreviated, and shortened, but the area, which must be integrated, is infinitely lengthened. And certainly the people with whom -- on whom I have to rely in my neighborhood, change with every invention. That man who had to repair my stove could not be found in Norwich, where I live. That is, the group -- social group with which I have neighborly bonds of economical identity and solidarity, changes the very minute I depend on Sears, Roebuck, or on General Electric, or on any such institution, because I must wait until the space between those people and myself is bridged, and I lose interest in some of my neighbors in the next -- in the same town, because I no longer can integrate my -- situation with theirs. We have nothing to say to each other. We have no dealings in an economic sense. So we meet at square dances, and for other nice purposes, but that's just merriment, and that isn't necessary, and that isn't really neighborhood.

So gentlemen, this is a strange law, which is very -- little known. And this was done, as I said, in -- in Darmstadt, in Germany, at the international con- -- conference of technicians. And I'm very proud that I formulated it, and it was accepted, this law, that any technological invention accelerates the time, or shortens the time, lengthens the area -- it is perhaps better to say: shortens the time, lengthens the space, and -- or widens the space, and destroys the so- -- the hitherto social group. You must now link up with other people, living far away. That's the case with anything we call progress. That's the essence of technological progress. And people are very blind. They don't want to admit that this is just so. That's why we have to come to terms with the other half of the world. I think if you don't want to -- to -- that's a serious business now, because nuclear energy obviously can only be dealt with wholesale. And that's what people don't like to hear at this country. So -- I saw an article on how to protect American industry against the bomb. That isn't the issue. But it is the issue, as you well know, that the chain reactions can get out of hand, and whoever produces the bomb -- the Russians, or we, it makes no difference -- they -- if their chain reaction gets out of hand, or our chain reaction out -- gets out of hand, while we produce this, or

while we experiment with it, the -- the geographical boundaries, political boundaries will not respect, you see, will not make this chain reaction stop. And I think that a few years from now, or even shorter, the people on both sides will be -- get so afraid of this chain reaction business that they will say, "Well, we'd better do something." You see, we had an explosion. Now, as you know, that was 17,000 megatons, instead of 5 thou- -- 5 million -- was it? Or 5 -- 15,000? What was it? 15,000?

(Twenty megatons, instead of 4.)

Wie?

(Twenty instead of 4.)

Twenty instead of 4 megatons. Well, that gives you a foretaste of the kind -- what I call chain reaction, that while you are doing with something, something very different happens. And if you know these dimensions, it just means that no smaller unit than the whole of mankind can handle this energy. But that's true already of electricity, gentlemen. It was already true of the steam engine. And we are very lazy in our thinking. It has taken us 200 years to discover this law, which James Watt set in -- mobilized in 1760. This law, that any new invention accelerates and widens, it shortens the time and widens the area, and destroys the previous social group. If you once think this through, gentlemen, you know what we are in for. And it's ridiculous to think that in Hanover you can pass this resolution on peace and make a dent. It's not the issue.

The issue is that when you work larger units of energy, you have to form a larger group that works as energy. And you can't -- there's no -- no way out of this. It is impossible to have an electric power plant in Hanover alone, or in -- into -- in Norwich alone, except under the most exceptional circumstances. You have a private Niagara Falls, you may do that. But if you have this, you will want to export the energy, and I think the people in Buffalo don't benefit very much from Niagara Falls, for themselves, the electric power. I don't know. Does anybody know how the electric power is exploited there? Do we have -- electric power from Niagara Falls?

(Oh, the power, all the power developed { } and all of Niagara Falls is shipped all over the Eastern -- yeah, Eastern New York state.)

And how about Canada?

(Oh, Canada's now developing its own side.)

What?

(Canada's now developing its own side, in addition to the plant that it already has. That new project there will create double the power output.)

For them. For them.

(Yeah. { })

So they do participate. So it's already an international source of power, is it?

Well, the same is true of the energy, you see, of Swedish, and Swiss energy -- electricity, all Germany, up to Westphalia and the Ruhr gets electric current from -- from Switzerland.

So gentlemen, the degree of energy determines the degree of cooperation, or the -- the -- the size, perhaps one should say, of the energy, of the source of the energy determines in what units we have to work. Now this poses for the first time the same problem as the Nile Valley and the Tigris and Euphrates valley posed in antiquity. It is the river, as you know, that made Egypt. It is the river that made -- the rivers that made China. And it is now the energy that makes the new economic units, however you like to call them in the future, inside which we must exist, and inside of which we alone can have our dai- -- bread and butter, because either they destroy us by being bombs, or they feed us by giving us work, or also by making us unemployable. Whatever you do, you cannot get out of the cycle created by the sources of energy, which we now begin to use, and which are like the -- the Cataracts of the Nile, which determined the flesh-pots of Egypt, and which en- -- enthroned these emperors of China, or the Peruvians, or -- or the Aztecs in Mexico.

The secret of agriculture at that time, and the secret of energy in our time lead to the same prob- -- way of life, gentlemen. And we will call it for brief -- for brevity's sake the problem of the Great Feeder. The problem of the Great Feeder. As I told you before, I think, already in this class, it is very strange, your generation really thinks that the man in Washington is responsible for prosperity. The clothesworkers of America, the textile workers { } they said it, last -- two days ago, there. They accused the government that they didn't do enough for prosperity. I'm very old-fashioned and I still think that a government is a political institution for justice, and I still hope that enough private enterprise is left in this country so that the worst can be done -- can be -- how would you say? -- can be

avoided by the reasonable action of private economy. I think that is to be hoped, because I don't -- hate to see a tyranny established, like the Egyptian tyranny, or the Mexican tyranny, where the emperor has to say, you see, what you plant, and what you do, and what you earn. But we are on a -- in a lonely fight, it seems to me. More and more people in this country simply believe that they -- people in Washington owe them a living. And the more people come to think that, the more we make this man the -- into a Great Feeder, feeder, I mean, a captain who is not a captain for justice, or for political freedom; but a captain for jobs, and a captain for -- for salaries, and a captain for bread, and so on and so forth. And as you see, we are in a very exciting period, because what began with the prelude in 1898, when we went to look at -- take a look at the globe and say, "We must be -- pick up the last relics of the Spanish-American empire" and took the Philippines, that is now the case all over the globe. This whole business in Indochina is a case in point. Of course, I need not tell you this. It may be that it is a semi-globe. It may be that we are only responsible for the sea lanes. I am inclined to think that America is an empire of the seven sea lanes, much more than of the land masses. But there we are. Fifty percent of the earth, certainly are self-- have fallen to our care, and in the process, we are also responsible for the -- using the energy of this half of the globe, while { } in this nuclear business, of nuclear energy, you see the handwriting on the wall, that we have to budget the energy ...

[tape interruption]

... in this way and that's all the problem of the pharaoh, of the pharaoh, the idea of feeding people, which had never occurred to the days of -- in the days of the Republic under Washington. It wasn't George Washington's business to feed the people.

Now I can -- you can hardly exaggerate, gentlemen, the transformation. Greece and Egypt, gentlemen, how are they -- how do they differ politically and mentally? As -- when you grow up -- or your fathers -- in one of the 48 states of this country, with one capitol, and a golden cupola on top of the capitol, in the -- in the center of your state, the idea was that the world was wide, and import, and export, and travel and immigrate, and -- and {some} money everywhere and capital and labor could move freely all over the world, capital goods and labor moved, and you lived in your little home country. And from there, you directed your energies, exactly like the Greeks. In Greece, gentlemen, and in America in the 19th century, your home country was smaller than your trade, than your trade. And your economic interests could be larger, wider than your political loyalty. That's the important thing of Greece. You remember when I said that --

were 258 cities in Greece. Well, every Greek was a trader, a sailor, a merchant, a jeweler, and he sold his goods all over the globe. You find Greek vases in Northern Italy with the Etruscans, and you find them in Spain, you see, and obviously the Greeks, you see, were between -- between all the other great countries, you see. That is, their home political unit was small, and their interest was world-wide. Mr. Walter Crane produced bathtubs. He went 32 times to Russia, selling his bathtubs. And so we have a great foundation now, under which people are sent to Russia, you see, for study for a year. He left it. That was a typical American enterprise. His bathtubs covered a much wider realm than his political loyalty. When he cast a vote in Illinois for an election that was limited to Illinois. But when he produced bathtubs; that was unlimited.

Now gentlemen, in a pharaonic kingdom, this is the opposite. When you make the man a Great Feeder at the center of your government, then he is responsible for the oil in Arabia, where you can't have possibly any political interest. And actually Mr. Eisenhower is responsible for the peace in the Near East, because the Near East is the buffer between Russia and us, and what happens in Turkey, and what happens in Saudi Arabia, and what happens in {Zion}, and what happens in Egypt is of our -- greatest concern to us, in every respect. But you and I -- you can still trade in a much smaller area. That is, we are not Greeks anymore, with regard to the world. Everything is changed. We live within a -- one-half of the globe. The political order, gentlemen, now is one-half of the globe. And your economic interest is dispersed. You may still export to Sweden, or to France, but you -- probably there were -- I don't know if there was any enterprise in this country that is more global than the politics of the United States must be. For the first time, the home in which we have our political loyalty is bigger than the area in which we trade, as individuals. Even as corporations, but certainly as private people.

Therefore, gentlemen, we are topsy-turvy. From the whole -- before 1900, it was a valid suggestion to say that an American had a home -- political home-community, and a wide area of import and export. For example, he got his books from England in the 18th century. So the book trade, obviously, you see, was larger. He bought books from the country from the country with whom he had separated politically, you see. And you get all these lecturers from Europe, like Mrs. Jennie Lee. And that was quite reasonable in the 18th century. I don't think it is, nowadays. I think we didn't learn much from this lady.

Well, it's a habit, you see, still from the old days of the Republic. But we think we must import these people, for lectures. You must include this into -- to see the American scene, gentlemen, by -- why do I call it Greek, and why do I call it

Israel? When a great sociologist of Europe in the '90s or the first years of the 20th century came to this country, he said, "I didn't know America. That's a wonderful country. I'm a ..." he was a Calvinist, himself, in -- and he said, "You know, in America, I -- you must believe -- belong to some little group, some church, a congregation, a community, a club, in order to be something, in order to -- to make -- to make a career in politics. You have to have some background, and some contacts. And we think of America as a mass of people. But no! One is a free mason, and the other is a Baptist, and the other is a southern Baptist. And you have to know this, and that makes all the difference. And that's why there are 56 men who are Methodists -- Methodists in the Congress, because they are close-knit." And he described this wonderfully and as a matter of fact. It's the best thing this man has ever written. It's the famous sociologist Max Weber, W-e-b-e-r. And I have never -- I otherwise think he's not a very sound thinker, but he was overwhelmed by the closed-knittedness, by the grassroot idea in this country, that you have to belong somewhere. And you know the constitutional expression of this fact is that you have to have residence in the place where you are elected, for Congress or for anything. That doesn't exist in Europe. In England, Mr. Disraeli, or Mr. Palmerston, or Mr. Churchill, you see, just sends a young man to Manchester and the people in Manchester have to elect him. Now if this were so simple, you see, you know what would happen in Wisconsin. But it can't happen, because if you {aren't} at home in Wisconsin, you can't be elected there. Nothing doing. That is, we still have this political at-homeness in the small town, or in the small district or in the town meeting, which the Europeans have given up long ago, and that's why I call it Greece, because that was the power of the Greeks, that they had 258 little states in which you could be at home, and make a career, and become famous, and become a pest for the rest, for the 257 other states.

All this is unknown here. It's very strange. We should be proud of this, gentlemen, but we should also be very serious, because obviously there are now two giants that are trying to win our new loyalty. We are going before Homer, and before the Old Testament. We are pre-Homeric men, now, once we begin to believe that the government owes us a living. Wherever we do believe it -- as far as we do believe it -- the farmers seem all to believe it already -- we think of our human situation in terms of one great economic order. And for this reason, we're beginning then to think our -- shift our loyalty from this small home-community and our political career in it, and our -- the little church with the white spire, to the man who can give us jobs, to the famous 60 million job-man, of whom Henry Wallace spoke 10 years ago. You have forgotten this, that Henry Wallace, once vice-president of the United States published a book at the beginning of the Second World War, 60 Million Jobs, and that ever since, instinctively, all the stat-

isticians and the professors of economics have looked at the labor statistics and have always -- found comfort in reading the figure, 61 million jobs, 62 million jobs, and 63 million jobs, because he had laid out this rule -- laid down this rule that America had to be a country of at least 60 million jobs if it should be prosperous. You know we had 40 million jobs in 18- -- in 1929. And in 1933, we had 30 million jobs. So to have 60 million jobs is quite some achievement. The value produced of national income in 1939 was 83 billions. And this year, as you know, it was 325 billions. Compare these two figures. It's just unbelievable, even if you -- if you accept the increase of the -- of the -- or the decrease of the m- -- value of the dollar, it is still staggering.

That's why we are in for a change. And I -- as I said, it is good for you to remember that the three events -- the Spanish-American War, which placed us squarely into the world at large, into the Pacific Ocean, and into the Atlantic Ocean, and didn't allow us to speak of our country as a wilderness, or as a beach, or as a frontier, or as something -- you wouldn't -- rolling, so to speak, on, something infinite in space, but which defined our place between Russia and China, Japan and Europe, you see, for good, that this first event then was followed by two world wars, in which we got more and more cornered. And now we are brought to bay with the bomb. We are vulnerable. We are in the midst of the world. Detroit is more vulnerable than any other city in the whole world, because you cannot defend this whole, vast Arctic region north of Detroit. The -- that's nowhere. And there is the Northern Pole. That certainly -- this -- we should have never discovered the North Pole, obviously, because it's now the most dangerous point in the world.

Well, I mean to say, gentlemen, we are suddenly oriented. Egypt was oriented. You'll remember what we said about orientation. We are fixed. In 1800, when we conquered -- when we -- when Jefferson bought Louisiana, a man wrote, "We are thrown into infinite space, like a meteor -- like a flash of a meteor." This letter shows you how the Americans felt at that time. It was all indefinite. "We are thrown into infinite space." Today we are in the opposite position. From all sides, the people encroach on us. We find that suddenly, because of air warfare, our two seashores do not protect us anymore, and we are cornered. And that's a new experience for America. Nobody could say today we are thrown into infinite space. But we are pinned down into finite space. That would be today the -- the term that we use. And gentlemen, that's a complete change of feeling. The Greeks in their islands never felt anything but infinite space, because this -- they went to the other shore, and freely sailed, like our clipper, the China clippers. These people from Maine who went around the -- the -- South America and Straits of Magellan, and went out to China to sell ice. Fantastic. Infinite space.

Going nowhere and coming from nowhere, so to speak. Everything is changed. We are suddenly in the midst of something; and it isn't very agreeable, this something.

And therefore, gentlemen, we are building up -- we have to build an empire around ourselves, or we find ourselves being now empire builders. We have an empire state, and we have an empire building, and we even have empire-builders, I'm afraid to say. Or I'm not afraid, but I'm very conscious that it has to be said. That is, gentlemen, the Church in the wilderness, those Christian pioneers and messengers have been followed by the new Israel, and by the new Greece and Rome. And now we -- building a new world order, which very much looks like the old Egypt. The feeding problems is uppermost. We must take the tide of -- by the flood-lock, and we have to organize energy. And that is simply the same problem which the old empire-builders had to face with their irrigation projects. And the third -- last thing is, gentlemen, that coincident, of course, with this tremendous order of a whole globe, this global problem, we have to get clannish. We have to integrate our little groups. Otherwise we freeze to death. The community, a city-state like Nevada or Vermont are unreal today. They are unreal. Any community is. If I would limit myself to the people who live in my own town, for my friendship and acquaintance, I would starve to death, morally and spiritually. That's true of every man in our little town. We are 1500 people, and every one of us has to have friends elsewhere. If you want to live happily today in this country, you must say to yourself, the whole country is one big city, and that you have friends everywhere. And then you will be happy. But as soon as you say, "I only have friends in Podunk," and you have to live in Podunk, you are lost. If you want to live in Hanover, I advise you to have friends in White River Junction, in Norwich, in Etna, in Thetford, in White -- in Windsor. That is, neglect the accident that this is called Hanover. It has no meaning any more for your life. It hasn't, I assure you. That's a secret. Most people practiced long ago this. Think of all the people in New York, who -- who have this commuting frenzy. But we all live this way, gentlemen. The old homes, towns, and home-communities are gone. We have to create them in -- betwixt and between. One of your friends may live in Clairemont, and the other may live in Woodstock, and the fourth may live in Thetford, but woe to you if you think -- you must limit yourself to your friends who live actually in the accident of your political community. You can't afford it. These aren't your neighbors. Your neighbors are everywhere, or certainly regardless of the accident of these -- these political boundaries. This is new. That the -- of course, the automobile has enabled us to do this, and the telephone. It's a fact. All the attempts of the ministers to reintegrate the neighborhood, gentlemen, they've all been aborted. It just didn't work.

Now therefore, gentlemen, the clannish, the spiritual tribe, the spirit of -- the groups are of the utmost concern to everybody who wants to educate at this moment in this country. Take the Dartmouth alumni. That is a solidarity which is spiritually created. It has nothing to do with any community. Has nothing to do with any boundary of a state. Out of 48 states these people come, and still they are devoted to some common link.

And next time I'll -- we have then to follow out this: the consequences, gentlemen, of our no longer reviving simply the last stages of antiquity, but the underlying orders of tribes and empires changes our task. And American history therefore has entered a new phase. But it also shows you that we can't escape this. It's a part of the universal tradition of the human race which now has to be re-created on these shores. And I think that's a very honorable task.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Opening remarks missing]

... is the American history the history of something natural, or is it a part of the universal history of mankind? If it is a natural history, it can be understood by itself. If it is a part of the universal history of mankind, it cannot. All the departments of American history are frantic attempts to prove that the American history is something by itself. I don't believe it, because no self has a history. A history, gentlemen, of the human spirit, as I have tried to show you, is a history of speech. From the very first, people tried to name themselves, and be named in the history of all mankind. If you say "Jupiter," or if you say "Jahweh," or if you say "America," it is a name you want to be recognized with by other peoples. So the first thing an American wants to be known for is that a Russian has to call him an American. If you try to write a natural history of America, for whom do you write it? You obviously think that an -- a Russian should say, "This is the real history of the American people." Now if you can force upon the Russians such a thought, then you are -- have existed for that, and they are part of your story and you are part of their story. If you can force down the throat of the Europeans that the American have a history by itself -- no European believes that, for that matter, because they know too well that you all came from Europe. So they -- you -- they just think that we are ramifications of European history, which is probably true. But the naïveté, the selfishness of America comes out today in these frantic -- efforts of having an American history department. This is your decision, gentlemen. History is always an article of faith. Those who -- of you who have heard -- taken Philosophy 57 know that this is the fundamental recognition which a man, who is -- has any mind of his own must make, that history has to do with the future. You only have as much history as you have future. Most people have no future, therefore to them history is a zoological garden, or a museum, or -- or like the history museum in New York City, which is un- -- full of forgeries, as you know. All the good -- allegedly great painters of the world are represented in this museum in New York City, but by forgeries, by imitations. And I'm afraid that the American history, if you treat it as a -- as a past without a future, is all forgery. What you think of the Puritans, for example, is all forgery, because you have written off the Puritans. You think they are not the future of America. You laugh at them. You say, "Oh, the Puritans." But we are real swines. And therefore you say swines, of course, don't have the fu -- the -- Puritans as ancestors, but just as {motto}. And that's how

you { } the Puritans, instead of being proud of them. And if I hear people today talk of the Puritans, I always feel that these people are cutting off the branch on which they themselves are sitting, and have no future, because they deny their past. Very simple.

So this decision, where American history is, has to do of course with {very} much what history is, gentlemen. Anybody who thinks that a part of the events of human life are not natural events but historical events believes in direction, and believes that the whole past is a beginning of your and my future, and that you have to know of the past all those things which are steps into our, and mine, and your children's future. Everything else can be dismissed. For example, you can -- dismiss bathtubs. They don't belong into universal history, because your children may very well do with a rubber tub instead. Bathtubs are not essential. In Harvard, however, they teach a course in universal history in which blacktop in -- in New York street is as essential epoch in American history. That's the degradation which you find in this country at this moment, that something purely casual, accidental and transient is made epochal. How can the invention of blacktop be epochal, gentlemen, since we have every right to forget about it? The next day we fly. And what about blacktop then? There's no blacktop in the sky.

But the brain of this country, you see, has been lowered to below the plumber. And you really think that in things, the epochs of history can be expressed. They cannot.

Because things can be superseded, gentlemen. And in history, only begin -- remain those things which cannot be superseded. That you call your father "Father" cannot be superseded, because otherwise you cannot know what a son and what a father is, or what a mother is or a daughter. Therefore the invention of the tribes, to call each other with lasting names, is an eternal one, and that's epoch. And you remember our first chapter, where therefore the -- the great period where people gave names to places and rivers, and you know, people have a still feeling of the sanctity of this, because we still say, "Connecticut River," that is, we to this day have kept the Indian names of the people who gave these places their first names. We feel we must not destroy this. That's so creative, and so imaginative, that you and I are quite pleased that we live around Winnepesaukee, and Sunapee, and Connecticut, you see. And the White River compared to this, well. Look -- look at White River Junction, you see.

Can you ever -- understood this, gentlemen, that the tribal age is the great heroic age of name-giving, and that neither you or I have the imagination today

to give such wonderful names. I think I told you this terrible story of the governor of -- of course, it was of Texas -- who -- who called hi- -- his name was Hogg, Governor Hogg. And he resented it and so he called his first daughter Ima Hogg and his second daughter Ura Hogg, and degraded, therefore, the art of name-giving and the religion of name-giving into a game. And I'm afraid that's by and large how we treat sex and marriage today: shamelessly and namelessly, because "shame" and "name" go together, gentlemen. Where there is no name, there is no shame. And this is shameless to call your daughter Ura Hogg and Ima Hogg. You shouldn't do that. Well, it isn't so ridiculous. It's the ultimate of degradation. I just received a letter today from a lady on her deathbed. She has a dangerous operation. She is 24 years of age, or 25, and she confessed that in England they had reached that -- state of degradation that -- they were two girls. One was a mistress of her friend, and she was only a girlfriend of this gent- -- so-called gentlemen in { } in one of the houses, and in the presence of this other girl, who was a dancer, this boy began to tell her how the dancer behaved in a most intimate embrace. Now this degradation, you see, that's typical of you and your generation. There's absolutely nothing sacred anymore. Once you can speak in the presence of one girl about the sexual behavior of another girl, gentlemen, you're counted out of history. You have lost all creative powers. I assure you that has nothing to do with any orgies or so. Everything is forgiven, only not shamelessness, because it leads to namelessness. These girls are numbers then, just in a number game. And this boy -- and the two girls, I'm afraid, too -- are out of life. They're just on the dungheap. They cannot be -- I don't think they can be helped. Perhaps the girl, by writing me, and breaking down, and -- and weeping, because I have composed a disk in which these things are mentioned, and she now tells me that she has far exceeded the shamelessness I have mentioned on this disk.

Gentlemen, you can laugh. But I think it concerns you too much. You too are absolute louses. And it begins with Governor Hogg, who probably was a prude, and not at all a swine, by calling his daughter Ura Hogg. That's forbidden. That is forbidden. With names, there's no joking. And in this country, you think you can do as you please. And anybody who thinks he can do as you please, is -- ceases to be interesting. Decent people ask what they have to do. And as soon as a man says, "I'm independent, I am -- can do as I please," forget about him. He's not interesting. I warn -- I mean, I hope you will never have neighbors who think they can do as they please. It is impossible to live with such neighbors. And this is, therefore, your real predicament. If you have a natural history of America, you will only hear of the Colorado gold rush, or the Alaska gold rush,

or -- or the Wild West, and the whole show that is shown you in this country always -- suggests that people did and do as they please. If you think that the 48 states of the union have been built by people who did as they pleased ...

The -- a chief justice of England came one day to Nebraska. And he visited the Chief Justice of Nebraska, in Lincoln. And the son of this chief justice was present. He became later the most im- -- famous professor of law in the United States. And the son has told me this story. And he said the two old gentlemen were debating, and the judge -- justice from England said rather condescendingly, "Now, how did these people in Nebraska find what was just -- now, how could they write a constitution? Really, I'm flabbergasted that here out in the West you were able to know what is right."

And the Chief Justice of Lincoln -- Nebraska rose in all his height, and thundered at this chief justice and said, "Well, maybe that in England, the simple people do not know what is right and what has to be done. But I assure you, in Nebraska, they still pretty well know what has to be done."

And Roscoe Pound, who told me this story, as I said, became the greatest jurist in this country, because he knew that the law is in every man's heart.

And it is in a father's heart not to dishonor his girl by calling her Ura Hogg.

And that is not a joke. That's something to make you weep, over the waste and destruction in this country. This country is degenerate, absolutely degenerate, because of these circumstances.

Ask anybody in this country, gentlemen, "What's your ideal?" If he tells you, "I want to do what I please," say, "You can be a mosquito, but you can't be a human being." And they are mosquitoes, these animals who do as they please. They bite.

And your ideal is this. You want to have the -- much money so that you can buy all the women in the world, all the cars in the world, all the golf sticks -- clubs in the world, all the countries of the world. You call that "power." And you forgive everybody this zest for -- for power. Nothing but criminal.

But there is in every hour of life, gentlemen, that has to be done, gentlemen.

And we are the birth throes of this tremendous change from Greece to Egypt in this country. Now I come back to my -- this strange, miraculous American history which is, so to speak, in reverse order. Beginning with the end of time, with the coming of Christ into this world, and then creating out of nothing, out of a

desert, out of the -- this New England beach, this bleak beach -- it's really not a very attractive country, you know, around Boston -- Plymouth Rock. And you know the people in California say that if the -- California -- they had known there was a California, New England would never have been settled. And there's something in it, with their climate: nine months' winter and three months no summer. But they came here on an errand which was more important than the weather. They didn't come to have the sun and Isis of Egypt. They didn't come for the harvest. But they did come for freedom, and for the rebirth of this freedom. And so we said this was an errand in the wilderness meant for the rest of the world, as a deacon, as a missionary church.

And so in this newest, latest, most refined and most ultimate errand, America was founded, as the non-plus-ultra in Christianity. And then, when the time { } out of this -- out of this, so to speak, how would you call it? This outlook, this out- -- look-out post into Europe, he is just coming into this country as the promised land. And we get the 18th -- 17th -- the 18th century as the promised -- England -- as God's country here. And you know that that's the time of the piety of the revivalists, and of the religious faith of this country. And by 1776, the country goes secular and we said it goes Greek. The free masons are the expression of the Greek character of the United States. And you get the Star-Spangled Banner, and you get the gold -- golden cupola of the classic capitol in -- in every state, and this strange interest in Greek pillars, and Roman senates and expressions of political life. Every word of our political language is Latin and Greek. And every word of our religion is Biblical.

And I said to you, but this is an old story. Democracy is pluralistic, many states. America still was in the 19th century the champion of the small nations. We aren't any longer, as you see in Indochina. We are no longer the champions of the small nations, all of a sudden. What has happened? We have ceased to be Greeks. We have also ceased to be Jews. We have perhaps nearly ceased to be Christians. That's -- I do not believe, because the whole tendency is still fulfillment of the whole revelation of Christianity. But we are -- at this moment trying to get this country into -- into its proper place in the universe. And we said that's orientation, and orientation is the history of the empires. And orientation means to have eternal settlement, a fixed place. And the best argument for this fact that we have now reached a -- quite a different phase is, for example, that practically nobody can emigrate from this country anywhere else. It's equally bad everywhere now. Conscription is everywhere. Taxes are everywhere too high. And so if you want to be a pacifist in this country, you have no other country to go to, you see, to be a pacifist. You better stay here in the -- still the best place to be, even with conscription and the draft. I told you this story about the man who

wanted to -- his son and his congregation to remain able to -- to leave this country in 1936, it's all over now. There is no country to which he could go. And even in Paraguay they have conscription.

But this means, gentlemen, America no longer is Greek, because the Greeks had the sea. The Greeks had the islands. The Greeks had the colonies. And therefore the Greeks had an endless chain of expanse. The world was all before them, where to choose. Where -- where is this from? It's a quotation. "The world was all before them, where to choose ... and providence their guide." No, gentlemen?

Who is a major in English? No dim recollection?

(Keats?)

What?

(Keats?)

The last verse of Milton's Paradise Lost. He certainly is more quoted than read, Mr. Milton. Isn't that true?

Orientation, gentlemen, is the problem of the Egyptian and prosperity, security, and victory over the business cycle. These are our tasks today. And as I -- as I told you, they came about in three great steps. In the Spanish-American War as a prelude, in the First World War, as getting involved with the whole world, and with the Second World War, as getting the whole world around us. In the First World War, we moved into the world. But I'm afraid in the Second World War, by our own astute inventing of the right bombs, we -- the world moved in upon us. As you know, we are -- have now the whole world around us. I think it's a joke, that this lady who wrote the book, The Sea Around Us. That's small comfort. The sea may still be around us, but there are other things are also around us. And that's much more pertinent.

And we are now surrounded by something that is neither continent nor sea, but aggression, and {neighborhood} and enemy. And we cannot be defended. I don't think any country is so vulnerable than the United States. You see, nobody is going to destroy Europe, because both -- sides want to have it. The Russians will never bomb Germany, because they want to inherit the Ruhr. So the Germans have -- at this moment a privileged situation. There will be no atomic bomb ever loosened on Europe. But you may be sure it will be loosened on Detroit and Pittsburg, because there's no mercy. With the Russians, they have no feelings. They can't inherit it, so let's destroy it, they will say. But about Europe,

if you -- if I were you I would -- I would buy a little castle in France. That's the safest. And Germany is still safer, because the Russians are quite sure that one day they'll get it. So they won't destroy it.

But we are absolutely -- you see, we thought the world around us -- and now I'm very serious, gentlemen. The Americans had the idea they went into the World War. And that's why the -- Dresden was destroyed. As you know, in Dresden there were twice as many people killed as in Hiroshima. Well, everybody in this country only speaks of the atom bomb on Hiroshima, but he doesn't speak of the completely senseless destruction of Dresden, when one night 160,000 people were killed and which is every day, in every Russian broadcast, the great point of attack against America. They say we'll never have done this. This is mad- -- was madness, insanity, arrogance, cruelty, what-not. And you must know this, that these -- in -- every European knows about these Russian broadcasts against our destruction of Dresden, which has never been justified, which was probably just the English air marshal Tedder's bloodthirstiness. Nobody quite knows why it was done. Absolutely meaningless. Much more meaningless than the atom bomb over Hiroshima, because at least Hiroshima frightened the Japanese in -- we could think into immediate surrender. It isn't true, because they had surrendered before, as you know -- offered their surrender before, and we just threw it for technical curiosity to see how it works. Yes, I'm afraid so. The technicians wanted to know what it -- what it does, so they thought they had to destroy these cities. It wasn't necessary. The Japanese had announced their con- -- unconditional surrender before.

So we are so wonderful people, you see. We are the great humanitarians, and we are so good. We are wonderfully good while we are in school. And outside school, we are so wonderfully bad. But if you hear the Americans talk, they are the good -- most good-natured people in the world. Are they? I think they are the most panicky people in the world, and that they do more -- any -- many stupid things like Hiroshima or Dresden. But you can prove it to yourself, gentlemen. There was something that we hadn't foreseen. America went into the world wars, as though it went out into the world. And the result is that the war came home, and now we feel that the world is coming to us. And this is the tremendous transition. If you think of the Spanish-American War and the noise Mr. Theodore Roosevelt then made with his Rough Riders. It was just going out, you see, for a nice little campaign, out -- away from America. And then you get the World Wars, the crusade of the Star-Spangled Banner. And then you get the second crusade of Eisenhower, "crusade in Europe," he called it, in which term it is clearly said, "We at home have nothing to do with this. That's a crusade in Europe."

And what's the result, gentlemen? That this far world, 3,000 miles from here, 8,000 miles from here, in the Pacific and across the Atlantic, to which we went for justice, and for mercy, and for many good reasons, by the way, that this world suddenly declared, "Well, if you come to us, we -- must turn the tables on you and say, may we not come to you." This is the nervousness of America. This is Mr. McCarthy in a nutshell. What he really has to complain of, and what -- why the people, I mean, fell for him was there was a sudden feeling that this whole situation of the United States now is totally changed. The United States are inside the world. And before, the world was all before us. We had to choose, and providence as our guide.

So Milton's Paradise Lost, you see, and -- is now in reverse. The -- let's -- there our Paradise Lost ends, I don't think that we can say "paradise gained." Or "regained." It's very bitter. The -- it's the one situation for which this -- this country, gentlemen, is utterly unprepared, to be inside of the world. We have called this country the New World. We have allowed the rest of the world to emigrate to the United States. I have come to this country as the New World far from Europe, you see, to protect myself and my family. And you all -- your ancestors have all come in the same idea: to get out. And now, I'm afraid we are in. We are very much inside. We are betwixt -- between the North Pole and the Panama Canal, and obviously both are the first points of attack in any war. And inside we are.

And this is what I would say the -- new application, gentlemen, of the ancient experience of the eternal settlement, of just being there, where we are. And we can't escape it. Everybody knows that there is no escape from these new bombs. You're just there, and have to sit it out, as a very lame duck. Of course, we here are still relatively -- relatively safe, you might think. Go to Dartmouth. I mean, if you want to escape, we are so insignificant, they won't waste the bomb on us. What I cannot help admiring in this great plan of providence, gentlemen, is this rediscovery of all the ways of creation in America, and from America. I have tried to -- tell you that first Israel was re-discovered, and then Greece was re-discovered. And now we discover all the problems of a big empire. We don't call it this way, because we don't like to be reminded of the British Empire. Don't call it this way, but certainly Mr. Eisenhower is a big feeder, a large feeder, a great feeder, however he turns out to be. Prosperity fits. The farmers and the workers look to him for money, for wages. The other for business. Gentlemen, that has nothing to do with a Greek -- a Greek governor, or king, or mayor of Athens, where they -- I told you, the citizens were responsible for the business cycle, and

not the government. But that's new. And as you know, the Republicans tried to get out of this responsibility and liberalize the farmers, and they just couldn't do it. And now they are saddled, as you know, with the stores of Egypt of 1 billion bushels' wheat in surplus. It has never happened in the history of the world, that a whole billion bushels of wheat are just there to be stored. It cannot be used next year. It's just reserve. So we are really repeating the great pharaonic experiment. I wonder what we are going to do, whether we are going to feed the hungry, or whether we going to spoil the stomachs of the satiated.

When Hitler and Lenin appeared on the scene 20 years ago, the world seemed to plunge into tribalism, into clans, into the prehistoric interest of the classless society. You may know that the Marxians proclaimed that they were going back to prehistoric man, to the times before the classes appeared in history, and they wanted to give back to men this wonderful all-roundness of primitive man. You don't know this, perhaps, but in the Marxian program of the parties in the various countries, all the research on clans, and tribes, and early anthropology have played a decisive part. I myself was the victim of one such battle, being a reactionary all the time, by the ultra-socialists in Germany who deposed me, because in my -- in the -- in the institution which I headed, I would not pay lip-service to this necessary return of primitive tribalism. At that time, they were putting in their party program of the left wing of the Marxian party in Germany the newest discoveries on primitive man, on a time -- you see, of the times when there were not classes in society, no exploitation.

So this is Hitler, as you know, with his race ideas, it's the same: purity of race, every group secluded, completely separate by itself, primitive man, and he said that the interims in between were abolished. And all over the world, gentlemen, the entrance -- the last 40 years have been celebrated by eager scribes and stump-speakers as a return to the common man, to classless society, and to the early days of -- well, natural man, maybe { }.

I myself have attended a strange scene in this country, gentlemen. I went to the congress of the historians. I had been asked to deliver there an evening address, stood there in long tailcoat and white tie, and my only -- the speaker -- there was one more man invited, Benedetto Croce, but he couldn't come -- from Italy -- and his address was read. And then came James Breasted. Who has heard of James Breasted in this country? Only one? The Egyptologist, a charming man. He has founded the Oriental Institute in Chicago, and has written this famous book, *The Dawn of Consciousness*, you see. Don't you know that? Who has heard of *The Dawn of Consciousness*? {Three}. I thought that was generally known. Now, as all liberal, modern scholars in this country, he was a great fool,

and he said -- about history. And he said, "Gentlemen, we can forgot -- forget the 4,000 years of revelation, and we can link Franklin D. Roosevelt and his social idealism directly with the Egyptian pharaohs and their social idealism 4,000 years back." He literally told the historians that they should extrapolate 4,000 years of history. Now he did nothing more in his {gibberish} than what the Marxians said in more -- greater fanaticism and say that man must get before the class society -- into the classless society as it was in the beginning of history. And here you have then Hitler. You have Lenin, Marx, and you have Mr. Breasted for America, all in the beginning of this crisis in which we live, advocating, and a return before Greece, before Christianity, and before Israel. You may be sure that that's something -- some point in this. I have neglected this story, this picture, this strange going-backward in order to go forward. You remember what we said in this course? That man, in order to go forward, kept his head turned backward.

Now, the decision you and I have to make is now the following: there is no doubt that we go from Israel and from Homer to prehistoric -- pre-Homeric man. We go back to Egypt. The exodus of Egypt and the Trojan War, gentlemen, were the limits of life with which people reckoned in the 19th century. Your great-grandfathers were perfectly satisfied when they read the Bible and Homer. That was all they wanted to know about prehistoric -- beginnings of man on this earth. We are not satisfied. We want to go back a whole thousand, or 2- or 3,000 years before Homer and before the Bible. And as I told you, there is unanimous consent in -- on this, between the fascists, the liberals, and the Communists. Now, if you get such a -- a three-fold agreement, you have to prick up your ears and say this is irresistible. And this little number of decent people in the mid- -- middle, called the Church of Christ, or the living believers is hard-put by these three tremendous heresies. The liberal heresy, the fascist heresy, and the Communist heresy all at this moment say the last 4,000 years are superfluous, or they are bad, or they are class war, or they are dark -- like the Dark Ages -- or they are dogmatic, or ecclesiastic, and prejudiced and superstitious, and we must go -- get out of religion, and get out of revelation, get out of dogma, and get out of classes -- however they formulate it: they want to cancel 4,000 years of human life on this earth. And if it is -- here -- go exactly right, the Trojan War is 1184 B.C., the -- Moses obviously is around 1200 A.D. -- 1300 A.D. The fall of Jericho can quite -- well be dated. Abraham may be 1700 B.C. Now if you then put together 1954 and 1500 B.C., where do we get? We get 3,500 years at least that are extrapolated and declared to be rotten, so to speak, and these -- all these three want to go back to these, you see, fleshpots of Egypt, or to the tribes. Now today, I want to apply all this, gentlemen. You hear this in the papers.

You never think -- take this seriously, but you are made by these slogans. This is why we have the SEC. That is why the stock exchange from a nice Greek stock exchange on which you can make money now, is absolutely controlled by the government, you see. All the nice joke is out of it, you see. You can't become now a billionaire overnight now anymore, because you have -- need to have the cash to trade on the -- stock exchange. Greece is over. The whole speculation is over. It's very tiresome, now. You can't make more than 12 percent. But in 1880, you could become rich, fabulously, overnight. Fortuna, the wheel of fortune, was God, and that's Greece. That's the trade-off, you see. And that was hailed. And that was considered great. I -- the robber-barons, you know all these -- this is very Greek.

The heroes in Homer, they were all great speculators in war booty, you know. They also said, "Let us have war if we cannot have prosperity," like the people in New York now say, as stragglers of the 19th century. "We must have war, because otherwise we can't earn money." I attended a meeting in Greenfield, here, down the Connecticut River, where there were three honorable businessmen from New York City. This was two years ago, it's hard to believe. And they sat there and told the citizens of Greenfield that of course we have to have war, because otherwise our economy would collapse.

I said, "Aren't you ashamed of yourself?"

They weren't. They say -- didn't know better. Everybody in New York had at that time had this stupidity, this crazy. We have some stupidity every half year in New York. At that time, it was that. You wouldn't believe it, it's forgotten. But two years ago, any man who came from New York said that we must have war, because otherwise we would have a depression. And of course, the Russians knew this and feared us, and thought we would go to war. And that's where the whole war scare comes from, for all the world, because they heard these people at the stock exchange trying to prolong the liberal Greek era of pre-war days, you see. Now we must live quite different. The Egyptians didn't have to go to war in order to have prosperity. And that's why this new empire-building is very serious for us. It means you have to arrange things in such a way that we can have prosperity without war. It hasn't been solved, yet. But we have to do it, you see. We have to have now a { } economy, and the armaments cannot finance this country obviously, because we have to finance the armaments.

But if you hear these silly people talk, they really think that the armaments should finance the economy. You see how bad they are. They stand on their head. "The fi- -- the armaments are going to finance the economy." If you don't

see the -- the craziness of this, I can't help you, you see. But that is, once you are obsessed by one-way -- one-way-street mind, that trading is the basis of prosperity. So whatever you sell, whether it's -- it's debts of the government, bonds of the government, you still trade, you see. And if a broker at the stock exchange sells 2 million bonds -- of the government bonds, he still thinks that he's going to be rich. Perhaps he is, but the government is going to be poor, because it has sold -- what has it sold? Debt, you see. And it has signed up for more debts and more debts.

Well, all this is only -- these are little, little, examples. You know many more yourself. But you never apply them to the fact that at -- in this country at this moment, the Greek mind, or the Republican mind is at war with the new mind, which is the mind of permanent settlement, which is -- cuts out the unexpected gains of new-discovered lands, of new-discovered oil -- oil drills, gold mines, and so. And says, we can't live by gold rushes in Alaska, or oil wells in Texas, or even in Aramco. We must live on a basis where we may -- make an honest living year-in, year-out. That's our problem. It's not an expanding economy. It's very naïve. An expanding economy is only possible if you think that part of the world is not known. If you think that you can -- moving into infinite space. Once you are pinned down in a corner, and nowhere else but where you are, life's very different. And that's our problem at this moment. And that's why you get the absolute insanity in -- in the intellectual and political circles of this country, because they don't know where they live. They are torn between their -- their 18th century background of revival Methodism, and their Greek tradition of liberalism, you see, and the real demands of the hour today, of quite a new stage in history. And you hear these people talk, and they go on Sunday to the cathedral in Washington and hear one thing, you see. And then they go to the stock exchange and read what's happening there. And then they -- there they hear -- learn Greek. And then they hear what Mr. John Lewis says -- tell them the next day and the farmers of America; and then in their despair, they have a Senate hearing, just to idle away the time, because they don't want to talk, any of the three serious businesses: what religion they have, and what politics they have, and what economy they have. They prefer instead to have some -- some fun, clear fun, but not clean.

And that's the McCarthy hearings, gentlemen. That's escapism. They're dealing with absolutely nothing, with fraud, because people don't know how serious the -- the adaptation is to which they will have to come. They will have to digest a new epoch in American history. And that's very {true}, and very painful, gentlemen. And you have to believe in God in order to digest. And you have to believe that nobody can do as he pleases, that there is a world created by our

maker which waits to be fulfilled. And the United States, who -- where only so far are -- had only been required to re- -- reciprocate with the Christian Church, and Jerusalem, and Athens, now are required suddenly to reproduce the empires of old, and the tribes of old, and to build the great society. And you remember, we said, the Church has been built in the first thousand years, and the states have been built in the second thousand years, and in the third thousand years there must be built the society.

Now one thing, however, can I give you as our comfort. The United States have done a very good job in preventing the relapse in -- direct -- the relapse into tribalism. Hitler has been defeated. And I still think that's highly meritorious. If you have been listening to Mr. McCarthy, you'd have -- think it is very much to be regretted that Hitler was defeated, because his inspiration is certainly Hitler's Mein Kampf, Hitler is -- you see, that is Mr. McCarthy's textbook. I know it, from the p- -- person in his own hometown, who told us that he shut himself up for a fortnight with Hitler's book and then came out and said, "That is it."

Now tribalism, gentlemen, seemed to the Russians as well as to Hitler, the immediate issue that is, from liberalism, from Grecism, from humanism, which is all Greek and Roman, you see, they wanted to go back to primitive man. I have quoted you this before. We have forced the world first to consider some -- the Egyptian issue of a division of labor of which the tribes are -- completely untouched. As you know, the Russians to their own dismay also could not free labor, but have to enslave it. There is more class in Russia than anywhere else at this moment, because the division of labor is their problem. And the division of labor is the Egyptian problem, as you'll remember. It is not the tribal problem. The tribe has only organized marriage and war. Egypt has organized caste, and classes, and vocations, and professions, and specializations. Now, you say -- take down this one thing, gentlemen: the two world wars have forced the world not back into tribalism, but into a more complex division of labor than ever before. There is more -- there are more sharper class lines than ever before in the world. The opposite has happened from what the Russians wanted to do. Why? Because at this moment, the complications of production make it more necessary than ever to particularize and to group in such a way that we form teams in which one man does something quite different from the other. And the more you have to distinguish what one man does and the other, the more you move into Egypt, and the less you are in a tribe -- at home in a tribe. In any clan, in any tribe every warrior can be a singer, and a dancer, and a warrior, and a father, and a son, and a medicine man, and everything. But in a -- in an economy of the settlement type, one is a builder, and one is a priest, and a stargazer, and the other is a scientist, and the other is a jeweler, and everybody does something

different. You remember.

Therefore, gentlemen, the two world wars, by interpolating the United States into the suicide of Europe, have prevented Europe from going tribal. They have said, "Slowly, please, slowly. There is some other phase which we have to build in first. In your Marxian theory, you have forgotten that. You wanted to go on from capitalism straight away into tribalism." They call it socialism, or -- Communism. There is something in between. You can't go from Greece to the -- Iroquois or the Algonquin Indians. You have to go from Greece into Egypt. Now I think that's very practicable -- you and me. You see at this moment the destiny of America is retardation. We have to delay the wild dances by which the peoples of the Marxian demon -- demonism. So they want to dance that into primitivism right away. And by our very existence, we prove to them that the problem of economy comes first, and the problem of integration is still far away, at this moment, you see, of integration in the warrior sense of the tribe, where everybody, you see, is everything and everybody. You aren't going to be everybody, but be very pleased if you have a job.

[tape interruption]

... all around men. And you will have to find at least 73 different hobbies in order to make up for that.

So far away are we from the dream of 1914, gentlemen, of the common man, that the time of the total revival of the dawn of life on this earth, of primitive man, was around the corner. We still have plenty of time. We have obviously still 1,000 years of revival of the old empires. Perhaps not a thousand years, I don't know the time. But this then makes you perhaps feel that this is a religious issue, gentlemen. If you have faith in America's place in the world, you will suddenly understand that America now for the first time in her consciousness is {burdened} { } with a strangely conservative mission. The other nations, gentlemen, are hurrying quicker to the beginning of time, back in their consciousness, than we are allowed to do. You must be satisfied at this moment to build Boulder Dam, the modern pyramid, so to speak, and Empire State Building. And you have to tell the Russians that they'd better build things instead of dancing frantically around a Maypole. It isn't the shouting today and the enthusiasm that is needed, but it is the patient division of labor all over the world; a checkerboard, so to speak, of countries which support each other. We'll have to find out which is best done where. And then I think we quite ruthlessly must say to each other that the country that -- not every country should probably be industrialized. You see it in -- in the Argentina business. The Argentinians have said every country

must be like everybody -- every other country. We must not produce meat for England, but machinery for Argentina. You know that's a big issue in Argentina. There you have a very clear problem of the -- which has to be decided. I don't know the decision, but you and I will have to make the decision, as every one of us will contribute to this, you see. Is the whole world going to be equally industrialized and agricultural, you see? Or can there be a specification? Can a prairie produce something else than a garden? And can a garden produce something else than a desert? And can a desert produce something else than a mountain range -- range, you see. These are the real problems today. If you talk to the fascists, they want -- they want to have it everywhere alive, you see. They want to have a factory and the garden and the cornfield -- wheat field, you see, in every patch of the globe. That's the Egyptian issue. Because the Egyptian issue makes a decision in which part of the globe this and this has to be grown. And in which part something else. So at this moment, gentlemen, if I were st- -- young, I would study economy, but on a much larger scale than the so-called economists of the 19th century. They were just the apologeti and the apologetics of the robber barons, the economists of the 19th century. Who are these people, I mean, whom you learn? Mr. Taussig, and the Mr. Ricardo, and the Mr. -- Adam Smith? Really, the defendants of the robber barons. But it's much more serious, gentlemen. Economy is a great science, because economy is the science of the necessary division of labor in mankind. And we are far from knowing all about it. For example, gentlemen, in our enthusiasm, we have given up the division of labor between women and men. Except that we pay the women less, we think they can do everything. And it won't be long that we'll think that the men can bring the children into the world and the women can -- I won't say what. Everything is topsy-turvy today, because the first division of labor, between the sexes, has been given up. The second division of labor, between the ages, has been given up. The people here treat you as though you were -- you -- I was just a slot machine and you were doing the teaching as well as the learning. That's the idea of progressive education, as you know. And so we have no division of labor at this moment. It is forgotten, because the first division of labor is between the sexes, the second is between the ages. Then the third is between the talents, you see. But this is all denied in this country, and yet, if you have not a basis, a deep insight into what God meant to do when He created us men and women, we probably cannot understand why He created prairies and mountains. This has all to do with a certain respect, not for the decent opinion of mankind, you see, but for the decent reality of the earth. Are the women the same as the men? Is it desirable that every woman makes a living of her own, you see, leaves the home and dumps the children in a nurs-

ery? Is -- have these poor children to be educated by psychologists and teachers, and the -- have the grownups to be educated by psychoanalysts? This is all because we have no division of labor, gentlemen. You have a magician for -- in every year -- 10 years ago, it was the dietician who told you how to live. Now it's the psychoanalyst who tells you how to live. I don't know what in 10 years will be the latest fad to whom you carry your money. But you have no division of labor. If you look around today, the psychoanalyst tells the judge, the psychoanalyst tells the minister, the psychoanalyst tells everybody, that is, he's the only clergy we have at this moment. Just the medicine man of the tribe. That's what he is. And the other div- -- the division of labor is not believed in, because nobody goes to the minister for his sins. He goes to psychoanalyst. And I'm afraid the minister goes, too.

Yes, there is no divided authority, gentlemen, but there is only at every one moment a fad, which means there is no division of labor. I want to -- only to point out to you, gentlemen, in the division of labor, we believe in God's creation, or we don't believe in God's creation. That is, the division of labor, as the Egyptians saw it and discovered it for the first time, is one of the elementary secrets of our existence on this earth. I want to exalt it into something; you must not treat this as a superstition. If you hear of "Egyptian darkness" or "fleshpots of Egypt," you think I disparage this. But we are marching into this, as a profound secret. We wouldn't have Mr. Peron in Argentina if this wasn't the problem today. Mr. Peron is our enemy. He hates the United States, because he says, "You have treated Argentina like a -- just in a rural, you see, a raw material-producing country. We are your equals. We have just as much the knowhow of engineers and workers as you have in the United States." Now that's a serious problem. You cannot brush it aside and say you aren't concerned. We may lose all of South America to Mr. Peron in the next 30 years. Some of these states are just getting ready. They don't want us, as you know. We are not very liked in South America. And certainly the fact that there are 23 independent states is purely Greek and purely accidental. And that will only be an attitude of the 19th century in South America. It will vanish.

There was a boy in this college 10 years ago who had a stipend, a fellowship for study in South America, and he -- as a senior fellow. He did, what he called this way. He had a wonderful time, and very joyfully at the end he read a paper to us on South America in which he took it for granted that there would -- were these 23 democracies, how he called these despotic tryannies in Peru, et cetera. And he said there we were, and we had to protect them, and we had to love them. And we had to lend them money.

Well, one of my colleagues very wisely objected and said, "Do you think that money-lenders are very much liked by the people who borrow the money?"

Well, he was a little embarrassed. And then I asked a question: "Do you really believe that God meant South America to consist of 23 states?"

And he said, "Of course. They must be there forever."

That's the Greek mind. It's idiotic. Absolutely idiotic, you see. The sooner Paraguay ceases to exist, the better it is. It's a terrible state. Most tragic state perhaps on the whole globe. If you read the history of Paraguay, you really wonder why people live in states. Has anybody ever heard something about the history of Paraguay? You know there were -- at one time there were I think 40 male people left in Paraguay in 1840 or 1845. Everybody else was slaughtered. Just women and children left.

Well, what I'm going to say is, you see, this change of the whole map of the world from Greek free city-states into vast empires is going on under our noses. And as I said, if we do not take this seriously and find the language of beauty and believe in this new order of things, we'll lose South America. And we'll lose Middle America. And we'll lose Mexico. And then where will we be? We will be a tiny spot in the universe exposed to all the cobalt bombs from where they may come. They'll come from South America, too -- at that time, when we are completely isolated. Because, you see, it's so wonderful, all these words come always home to roost. We are now isolationists, you see. Mr. McCormick in Chicago is. But the man -- the poor man. I wouldn't like to be the successor of Mr. McCormick, in the -- in editing the Herald -- Chicago Herald-Tribune. He'll be haunted and visited by the fact that we'll be isolated, you see. It's very nice to be intentionally an isolationist, because that means we can do as we please. But how about being isolated against our will from the rest of the world as a tiny speck on the globe? Now if Mexico goes, gentlemen, and if Middle America goes, and South America goes, because they must unite, and we prevent them because we believe stoically into -- in the anarchy of 23 eternally warring South American republics. They must unite. The question is only whether they unite with us or with Mr. Peron. And we are obsolete at this moment. We have no policy to explain this to them or to ourselves. You people don't learn it. You don't think about it. You have absolutely obsolete slogans in politics at this moment, I'm afraid to say.

I'm sorry if I exaggerate. This is no attack. I want to wake you up to the fact that you have still to digest the two world wars. This coming into the world, you

see, and the world coming to us, and all of a sudden everything being less important than the fact, how do we divide our labors? That's involved in the Marshall Plan. It's involved in the 4-H program. All these things are gropings, you see, in this direction. What is the whole of the globe, you see, meant to develop in division of labor? We have -- just begin to think about this. You read such things as -- in the papers -- that there will 4 billion people in 2000, you see, and we won't be able to feed them. That's some such starting point to make us think in terms of territories, settlement, harvests, prosperity, you see, for the whole world. And no longer in free- -- independence, and independent little states and nations, you see, everybody to himself. You see what happens to the Viet Minh. They are -- certainly in their good right in asking 19th century independence. The very moment they ask independence, they have to fight -- line up with the Communists, you see, in order to be integrated into a bigger whole. And so there you have the idealism of the 19th century, telescoped, you see, with the facts of the times after this world war. In 1890, the Viet Minh could still -- could have defended themselves against the French and become a small nation like Belgium, or Korea, you see. And now it doesn't help them. I think they are right against the French and they are wrong, because they are -- depend on the Communists. It's a very tragic situation. It's a double situation and you see time doesn't stand still. History is something that has to be fulfilled. You have just to close one chapter and the next is already -- has been opened. That doesn't mean that one is meaningless. They all have to be told, and all have to be written. And the pages of history form one complete book.

So I suggest, gentlemen, that we shall perhaps this year -- it's arbitrary -- or this period, should be called in our textbooks a transition from Greece to the empire building, to the eternal settlement, to the fact that the earth is the Lord's, and that we have to speak of the earth, from now on, you see, instead of speaking of independence, and of our country. Meaningless today to speak of one's country. If one has to throw atom bombs on one's neighbors, it's a very doubtful proposition to speak anymore of God's country. But God's country is very meaningful for the people who came here, you see, out of this world, as it was at that time.

So we have here a third period of -- a fourth period. We have the 17th century, gentlemen, the Church. The 18th century, Jerusalem. The 19th century, Greece. Now the 20th century, I call it "Egypt." It's the clearest, and it has the greatest amount of authority on its side. But make this, of course, the same as China or any of these empires. And we may expect that we have only delayed the dream of primitive men. Certainly already we feel that under the impact of the machine age, gentlemen, you and I have to become more complete people, or we will be

just cogs on the wheel. So the next issue, the tribal issue, will be as simultaneous to Egypt as the Methodists have been to the Free Masons. That is, as Jerusalem and Greece have competed in fact, and have not been just one after the other, so in the same sense the Egyptian issue, the division of labor all over the globe, and the integration of man into his ecstatic and fiery existence of a poet, and a seer, and a prophet of all the great arts of primitive man, will go hand in hand. Still I think it is wise at this moment for me to go slow and to say that although both issues, the imperial and the tribal, are simultaneous, we first of all are still saddled with the division of labor problem, more than with the other. You see, in 1776, you can say that religion and the religious life of the people in this country, and the Greek forms of thinking -- politics, forming a democracy -- were perhaps 50-50. Yet you will admit that the spirit was then at the first moment being strictly secular. The Fourth of July, is a secular holiday. The Continental Congress was good Greek rhetorics and politics, you see. The Declaration of Independence. These were all secular political documents. But in 17 hundred- -- 30 years before, you still have religious documents, a revival. John Wesley -- Charles Wesley and so on, and the great Jonathan Edwards, the great religious tradition in this country revived and in -- re-strengthened. So yet, you -- if you ask me what leads in the 18th century in this country, Greece or Jerusalem, it's very hard to answer. There are the Methodists very strong. And there are the Free Masons very strong. And the Free Masons stand for, as I said, for the secular spirit, and the Methodists for the Jewish spirit.

The same is true today. You will have two parties in this country, gentlemen. The people who care for the prosperity and thereby for the Egyptian issue and feel responsible. And at this moment, as you know, they are in the forefront. The whole Cabinet is nothing but ministers of Pharaoh, for prosperity. And that's a great responsibility, our financing our budget, re-economizing the whole energies of the globe. And the tribal, socialistic issue is obviously at this moment second -- in the second rank. But is there. And I want you to understand, gentlemen, that if you formulate capital and labor, you are trying with some rather superficial terms to define "Egypt" and "tribe." The social trend is the tribal one. And the capitalistic one is the Egyptian one. And I have used these clear, historical parallels in order to shake you up out of your complacency to thinking that capital and labor are 19th century problems, or 20th century problems. They are of course eternal problems, you see. And they -- God didn't create capital and labor. But He did create countries, and harvests, and seeding time. And He did create the division of labor, because He did create the division of the sexes, and of His talents, and of His gifts on mankind. And I think that the words "capital" and "labor" are blinding you to the historical situation of this country. They are very short-sighted, and very short of breath, as though capital and labor was the

invention of the American people. Sometimes you really think that you have to take an oath of capitalism in this country. You don't have to take an oath of capitalism because God created the necessity of great enterprise. This has nothing to do with men's will, men's intentions. The Americans have not invented capitalism. It comes from elsewhere. And they haven't created capitalism, because it's a part of the way in which we have to use God's energies. And so nobody can ideologically promise to be a lover of capitalism, just as little as you can be condemned to love your belly, or you love your -- your part of your body. That's just what you have. It's -- nothing so special to love about it, only to respect it, and recognize it, and work with it.

So that's the end of my story today, gentlemen, that capital and labor were the sh- -- foreshortenings in perspective from the Greek point of view of this great background of our existence on this earth, that we have to amass energies, that we have to group the energies, the raw materials, and the human forces, our own energies, in tremendous agglomerations, and also dissolve them again. And capital and labor are, so to speak, transient labels of the essential problem of the settlement of the globe. Much more permanent, and goes much more through history than this question of capital and labor seems to insinuate. And please don't believe that capital and labor are modern. They are -- mean that we have to go back to something that has dominated human existence when the castes and the classes were invented, when the division of labor was invented. And I accuse -- the liberal thinkers by -- that they have obscured this whole res- -- reverent situa- -- attitude towards the world in which we have to move, by thinking it was a construction of the human mind, capital and labor. That isn't so. Can you now understand that capital and labor are really the two forms in which Egypt and the tribes knocked at our door? Labor, that's the team, that's the integrated group of one spirit, of one faith. And capital, that is the power to build pyramids, to administer harvests, to prepare stones in the desert of Nubia to be used 4,000 miles away at the other end of the country for building temples to the heavens, who are -- which are the same everywhere. That's capital.

So have I succeeded? I doubt it, gentlemen, but it was my great ambition to fill you with some more reverence for American history. American history is not an accident. And American history is not American history. But American history is the continuation of man's tremendous effort to do justice to the constellations under which he has been created. He has been created to be the same man at all times. He has been created to be the same man in all places. Everywhere and all the time, that's your human problem. He has to be cre- -- he has -- created to know of each other, and to speak to each other in one religion and one faith in all times and over all places. That's the Jewish problem. And he has been created

to be patient about the transient and temporary divisions that still obtain. That's the Greek problem. The Greek problem says we are many, and we aren't yet one. The Jews -- Jewish problem is, we must be one. Terrible that we are still many. Now the Americans are saddled with this whole heritage, gentlemen, of these four attitudes. We are many, and we have to be patient that we still are many. They are so different. There are so many races here, and so many religions. And that's Greek to say, "Well, a little Methodist, and a little Baptist, and a little Catholic, and a little Episcopates, all right." You see. Still, on the other hand, you must be impatient and say, "At one time all these partitions should fall." In our heart of hearts, we cannot believe in them -- that they'll last to the judgment day. Isn't that true? That's the messianic hope. That's the impatience. The third thing is: we do live as part of the whole economy of the earth. That's the Egyptian problem. And the last is: we must, every one of us, feel the whole energy and genius of man above us and in us. We must dance and shout with joy like the morning star. And we cannot be satisfied with having just a job and for the rest having hobbies. That's very impossible, too.

Now, gentlemen, the Christian solution in all these four is very different from the Egyptian, very different from the Jewish, and very different from the Greek, and very different from the red Indian one. Our economy must be able one day to come up to the whole globe. The Egyptians thought if they had their country, they hadn't to care for the rest, and they could build a Chinese wall around it. You cannot believe in a Chinese wall for American economy. That's the Christian element in the new economy to come. It must be in some form or other -- include the backward nations, must it not? We talked about South America, for example. You cannot omit them from the picture. You cannot build an American economy. So gentlemen, here you have the difference of American history from ancient history. In the economic picture, America cannot be a world of its own. But our economic thinking must come up to the earth as created by the Lord. We must be global. Economically, you c- -- we st- -- already do it with the oil coming from Arabia, which just means that we do it. The Russians scraped together all the uranium they can find in German Saxony. Because they too are forced to have an economy which is much larger than their political unit.

What is Christian, gentlemen, in the three other fields of human endeavor? Why is this not just Jerusalem rebuilt? Why is it not Greek rebuilt? Well, the Greeks had 158 states, as you know, and 158 wars per annum. We have 48 states in eternal peace. Our Greek solution is one of a peaceful, side by side. That is, we have absorbed the Greek problem of equality of units of nations, but we have also this Christian dream that it hasn't to be eternal war that is raging between

them. There again, gentlemen, an ancient element, a way of life of antiquity has been reopened by the Christian way of life and totally transformed; just as our economy is not the Egyptian economy, yet it is economy! But the changes that our economic thinking must encompass the real world as created by the Lord and not invented by Egyptian priests and limes. In the same sense, the Greek free cities perish by constant war between Sparta and Athens, and Athens and Thebes, and so on. This is not true today, gentlemen. It's not only the 48 states, gentlemen, that gives you hope that a different solution is possible. But the world wars themselves have reduced the number of belligerents to two. That's a very hopeful situation. Everybody stresses the terrible arms situation. But I would tell you first of all that it is very nice to know that all these little entities, you see, are just out of the running. Don't you think that's a tremendous step forward? I think it is. It's the abolition of the anarchy of Greece. In Ireland, too, you know every spring every Irish prince had to go and steal some cows from the neighboring tribe and go to war with the neighboring tribe. And it was just a ritual. War was eternal. The warpath. I don't think we believe that. I will next time then show you finally what the transformation of the four pre-Christian forms is in our era. We have -- in America, gentlemen, are faced with this very grave solution. You can either relapse now into antiquity and have an isolated American economy for example. Then we go Egypt. Or you can affirm the double standard that you are reviving Egypt in the Christian era. Then you have to keep the Christian element and the Egyptian element and blend them into something that hasn't existed before on this earth. And I'll try -- am going to try to tell you this next time.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Opening remarks missing]

... in America, since 1620, there is an Anno Domini in every year. That is, something is brought under Christian control of the world at large, of the created forms. It is as if you had a garden and you first planted just some vegetables, and later you planted some flowers, and later you planted shrubs, and finally trees. And at the end, you had the ambition to have every one plant in your arboretum, because you wanted to be complete. In the same sense, the seed that was brought -- stopped down in this country was first very simple, a minimum. And it has become more and more of the created forms of life, the ways of life of -- antiquity. Now, that's all against your idea of life, because you do not believe that just as there are moose, and buffaloes, and doves, and eagles. There are ways of life that have the same honor of being created. That is, man, when he had the right spirit, gentlemen -- the Church calls this the Holy Spirit -- has always continued creation. If you are -- come out right, you are a new creature. If you come out wrong, you are degenerate, decadent. In one case, you are the next form in creation that's needed. That has never dawned on you that perhaps the history of creation goes right on un- -- not under your noses, sondern with your noses. Your noses look it. But we are cre- -- creatures, and I can assure you, gentlemen, that a man who is as old as I has -- seen the destruction of wrong creatures, and the attempts to form the new hotbeds, the new molds of new creation right around him. And that's the meaning of these so-called world wars and revolutions. That you call them "war" and "revolution" doesn't alter the fact that they have a much deeper meaning.

Now, today, as I said, the people in the comprehensives compel me to change a little bit, but I think it's a blessing in disguise, because you'll see that the American scene and the universal scene dovetail very beautifully.

If we now give some more vivid names to the ancient forms of life, we can call the tribes the "seven-generation" situation. You remember, three generations backward and three generations forward, a tribe -- a chieftain of a tribe can tell his people. So instead of saying "tribe," just for the fun of it, I propose that we here say, the "seven-generation" situation, which is the eternal family situation, with your great-grandfather still entering the picture, and with your great-grandchildren possibly to be expected in your own lifetime. Then we have the 365 eras -- days and years, as well. You remember the Great Year of the Egyptians being composed of 4 times 365 years equals 1460, and I -- you all know of

the Olympic Games, which is 4 times 365 days. So if you have "Y" years here, you have Egypt. If you have -- want to have Greece, you put it here, and you see why Greece is a telescoped Egypt, on a short -- shorter basis. Then we have the timeless, other world of the academic mind, where the arts and the sciences make you time { }. You remember the in-between world, the leisure world. And we had finally the people of the messianic hope, of the coming of the Lord.

Now in these four, which I have now, as you see, stated in terms of time-sense, of awareness of time -- you can also call this the seven generations' recurrence, because a grandfather gives a name to his grandson, so that all the time, there should be again seven generations living on this time-raft, so that you, at each point in time, have the same perspective: three generations back and three forward. Then you have here the cycle. Every four years, you again have this vain effort to get all the championships of the Olympic Games for America. And here you have the straight line of history. The creation of history in Judaism. And here in the other world, you have the denial of death; the platonic idealist says, "It doesn't matter, my mind lives forever and the whole physical world is just corrupt and in a cave," and however they express their contempt for the changing physical universe.

If we now go over to the {events} of the last 1954 years, it is obvious, gentlemen, that we are basing ourselves between something, and we are after and before. Otherwise we have no history. It is stupidity -- I think it obstinacy when the historian denies to say what future he expects. And that's my objection to modern history teaching. These people have no common future -- who teach you history -- and therefore they have -- cannot agree on the past. How can they? If you and I have the same future, you see -- if you get engaged to a girl, you can look back at your different family histories, with a meaning that finally the two lines were expected -- meant to meet. That's the meaning of these -- prehistory of your two families, you see. At one point, they met, against all expectation. No one knew it, and that makes it such great fun to get married, you see, because you re-write the whole history of their two families in retrospect. Don't look so amazed, sir. Every generation has a new history, because it has a different future. Can you understand this?

So gentlemen, there is from the year -- to be very careful -- from the years 4 B.C. to the year 70 A.D. is laid the new foundation of a group of men, the Apostles and their Lord, who are indifferent to who is new and who is old. The { } of the Church is that it is eternal. It can only be eternal if the sensation of tomorrow is not any better than the antiquity of old and vice versa. In Christianity, gentlemen, nothing is better because it is old, and nothing is better because it is

new. It's called the "good news." The good news is that news, you see, which is eternally so for old people and young people. It's perhaps dangerous to call it even the "good news." In the word "Gospel," as you know, the word "news" is -- is not there. It's -- in Greek, it is "the good message." And I think the translation of the American genius in this "good news" is typical of the total misunderstanding of Christianity in this country. When it is taught by secular minds, they really think it's -- it's news. But it is the victory over news, and the victory over tradition, which is the good news. Because, as I have -- you remember, we said Christ -- the Christian is enthroned on the -- at the crossroads and he can choose freely any one of those four ways of the Greeks, and the Jews, and the cyclists, and the time-rafters, the tradition people.

Now, this group, seems to -- the Lord on the -- and His Apostles -- or I think at -- from your point of view, gentlemen, you should get acquainted with the fact, if you wish to understand Christianity, begin with the Apostles, and then look back to their experience. It's better for our time. The so-called "life of Jesus" is such a stumbling block in your way of understanding Christianity, that you'd better drop this idea. There have been books on Jesus the Playboy, and Jesus the Child, and Jesus the Baby, and Jesus the Adolescent and -- that has nothing to do with Christianity, of course, because He didn't belong to His own time, and He was indifferent to His own life. And if you then try to read Selma Lagerlöf or The Robe, or any of this nonsense, modern books, you get lost in the un- -- absolutely unimportant. That's all -- absolutely unimportant. The problem of Jesus was to establish a situation which was victorious over past and future, because otherwise you can't judge the quick and the dead. And that's the meaning of this situation. The Church is beyond the quick and the dead. It's indifferent whether somebody has died long ago or whether {it's} somebody born. They are all still with us, inasfar as they have triumphed, as Athanasius, or St. Augustine, or the Gospel writers, or the Lord and the Apostles themselves. They are beyond these features which today in the Sunday school seem to be meant to make up the secret of Christianity. But they destroy Christianity. Who can have respect for a nice, young man who looks like Mr. {Fiske}? Here we had a minister, Mr. {Fiske}. He allegedly was very pretty, so the children always said they knew how Christ had looked. They -- He looked like Mr. {Fiske}. We don't know Christ after the flesh. And He certainly did not look like Mr. {Fiske}. And He doesn't look like a Nordic hero. He probably looked very Jewish. And that was one of the stumbling blocks. He had no beauty, and no comeliness, the Bible says explicitly. And you cannot understand this, because you have all these wonderful pictures in your mind, of -- live in -- the life of Christ, of Jesus. But that's not interesting. His death is interesting. And the unity with which He knitted together the times, the Apostles and He Himself are one body of time, I tried to tell

you.

Now this, therefore gen- -- is recommendable to you, gentlemen, to begin the life of the Church, as far as you ought to know it, backward. It's rather { }. But I wanted to get you out of your thin-blooded individualism. Christianity is the victory over man's loneliness in his own generation. Christianity tells us that there is one task for all generations of -- at all times, that we are in a campaign which is not broken up because one man dies and the other is born. It's one. Now, how do we rise above your own time-consciousness? How do we suddenly reach that level of behavior in which it doesn't matter at what time we live? That's the whole problem of Christianity. Otherwise everything -- that 2,000 years people have preached is all nonsense. You have only this choice. The cynic says, "There never has been a Christianity." I like that. He is really true to form. I mean, he thinks it only matters what he thinks, what he does, what he loves, what he hates, what he eats, and what he digests. If his bowel movement is all-important, let him be cynic -- a cynic. He's at least logical. Now there's only a cynic and Christian. Nothing is in between. Idealists are idiots, compared to the real task of mankind, because an idealist cannot make sure that his father and his grandfather try to do the same, and that his grandchildren will do the same. This he cannot get by idealism. And he cannot get it by materialism. He can't get it by any philosophy, gentlemen. And -- but he can only get it by hanging on -- in -- onto this one chariot of God's spirit through the ages.

Therefore, this is then the -- the fact that when you look back, your ancestors at one time were converted. They converged to this common task from their own way of life, whether they were Anglo-Saxons, or whether were -- they were Jews, or whether they were from the Roman Empire -- civilized Greeks, or whether they were red Indians, or whether they were Negroes, wherever you come from, whatever your race or your stock is, at one time in the lifeline of your background, there was a conversion, there was a turn at which time these ladies and gentlemen said that their way led them astray, and that they should end up and join the continuous effort of all men from the first day to the last.

This is then, gentlemen, your real experience of Christianity, for which you can vouchsafe. The rest is, at this moment, hot air. Then we begin from scratch, so to speak, and put a human being today before the question: Is Christianity real? I mean, is it real at this moment? Is it -- does it mean anything? The one thing you certainly all can find in your life is that at one time the history of your -- of your -- branch of humanity there entered the scene a cont- -- some -- some conversion. And as far as the Jews live in the whole Christian world, in -- Chi- -- Japan -- in China, as you know, they aren't. They have come un- -- the rest of the

world under the toleration of Christianity. And the -- wherever you have universities and academi- -- academic people, they have come with the permission of Christianity; after heavy battles, but still the society into which they came at one time decided to be a Christian society.

Now this is all said to explain to you why the history of the Church fills -- should fill in your imagination the first thousand years of our era. What happened then was that the width and the length of the earth, to a certain extent at least, was at that time converted. The first date which I recommend to your understanding of the Church is 999 of our era, the conversion of the Icelanders to Christianity. At that time, these famous Northmen, these berserks, these wild creatures -- rather feeble-minded but very bold -- became Christians, baptized. And you have heard of the Edda, and these Nordic songs. They were all composed in the first five Christian monasteries on Iceland. And we have the Edda only because these berserks, these heroes learned from the Christian monks how to write. Very interesting that we owe the Edda to Christianity, exclusively. This again you do not know.

But that's why the year 999 is recommenda- -- recommendable date. The ancestors of Mr. Stefansson were christened at that -- in that year. That is, the -- you know, Iceland in the antiquity was called the Ultima thule -- the last island of the West, the old ultimate. And that's why I mention it, you see, because it is so far away that it took 999 years before this message, you see, of man's continuous belonging reached these Ice- -- the Icelanders. And as you know, they are very decadent people, because they are so shut up. There's more neurotics even than in America, and that's saying quite a bit. They are very degenerate people. Nothing much of the Nordic hero there. The first time I traveled with two -- Icelanders, they got absolutely, dangerously drunk. And I had great trouble to coerce them.

The -- this 999 that I mentioned, gentlemen, as the time at which Western man inescapably, so to speak, caught up with Christianity, or vice versa, where there was no loophole in the Western world, you see, as I said, where writing and reading forced these berserks to put on paper their strange stories of hate, and of greed, and of feud, and of jealousy. The Niebelungen, you know, was -- came from this -- from this contact. And you know, the Niebelungen have still dominated the imagination of Mr. Hitler in this World War. In January of '45, it's quite an historical fact, the children of Berlin and other cities received pamphlets to summon them to die for the Führer, the children from 14 to 18, to die for the Führer and to come -- make come true the history of the Niebelungen in which nobody was allowed to survive. You may know of -- that much of the Niebelun-

gen that it ends in total slaughter, in total self-destruction, as Hitler has ended. And so long, gentlemen, then the spirit of the pagan -- paganism, of self-destruction, instead of reconciliation, has lingered on. And so you get a very beautiful two-millennia correspondence. The first 990 years the message takes to reach everybody. It takes another 950 years to dissolve the other message, the pagan message, of the feud, of the vendetta of the tribe. That's how the -- in this conflict, you see, how slow it works. The first missionary comes to Iceland in 999 successfully. But the last time that the old pagan ferocity, you see, obstructs the possibility of making peace, of giving in, in your self-centeredness, in is 1945. And very few people understand, gentlemen, that this be- -- coming of Christianity into any one country means the beginning of the struggle with the non-Christian forces. You always say how poor Christianity is because the people, after they become Christians, behave very badly. Well of course they do. They all try to escape again. They all are mad under this yoke of the Cross. And every one of these groups -- the Greeks, in their academic philosophies, try to escape. Look at Mr. William James, what a dance he d- -- makes around a religion. It's the last attempt of the philosopher, you see, to prove that he doesn't have to believe anything. And it does- -- it's completely abortive. He can't do it. As you know, he comes out with these strange, I think rather silly, {lines} of religious experience, because he is impressed by his father -- who was in 57? You remember our story, this constant tension between father and son? You remember that? No?

(I -- I took it last year and ...)

Well, it's always the same.

(It skipped my mind).

It's still true. It's still true.

Gentlemen, the first millennium then compares like the Mother Church to the -- and to the second millennium, to the daughter-nations. And that is William James, compared to his father. The father, Henry James, Sr., in this country once more represents the message of Christianity. And William James, the typical behavior of the man who hears the message, tries to get out from under it and can't. And that's your situation. It's everybody's situation, gentlemen, since the world has been created. And in -- in bland letters, it is written over the first 2,000 years of our race. The first thousand years, the -- it is offered. And the missionaries are mar- -- made martyrs, and they are killed, and burned at stake. And the people say, "We won't even listen." And the second thou- -- thousand years

consists of the answer given by the nations to an official acceptance of Christianity, but not a true one. An attempt to say, "Yes, all right. We'll count Anno Domini. We'll say -- call -- count the years after Christ. We will admit that we have a Church. But we have a state, too. And we have economics. And we have progress. And we have -- the athletic field. And we have brothels. And we have all kind of nicer things, still, and therefore, we must make a compromise, as they did in the Middle Ages, when you had in every city on one side of the street the nunnery, and at the other side, the brothel." And nothing was done about it. It was just natural, you see. The -- the Christian Church was quite happy to have some people saved and the other had the pleasure.

So gentlemen, I off- -- offer you this as a great picture. First thousand years, the bringing of the message to the nations. The second thousand years, the assimilation of the message by the d- -- nations. And if you want to have this as a family story, say that the first thousand years belong to the Mother Church, and the second thousand years belong to the daughters -- the nations; France, and Italy, and England, and America. And I have written, as you -- some of you may know, the history of the Western world as this response of the daughter-nations to the message of Christianity in the first thousand years. And I think that is the true story. It is a dialogue.

In this first thousand years, gentlemen, then, all important events of which you read in the textbooks on history are events in the life of the Church. All the important events in the last thousand years of world history are events of national history, of war, of revolution. The first thousand years, gentlemen, are just filled with records of dogmatic quarrels, of council meetings, of the -- of whole nations turning towards Christianity, of some martyr crucified, of some bishop writing a wonderful book, like St. Augustine of which -- whom we have spoken. So gentlemen, will you take this down: the important events in the first thousand years of our era, are all events in the history of the Church.

And that suddenly changes. At the end of the first thousand years, we begin to care less and less for the purely ecclesiastical history until today we would think it very funny if the election of a new minister in this town would be meant to compare to the election of President Eisenhower. Yet, in the beginning of Church history, that's just what the people thought, that the election of the right bishop in Hippo, as St. Augustine's case was, and that was as tricky a place as Hanover, that this was much more important than who this beast on the imperial throne was, in Rome, or Byzantium. And probably it was more important who became bishop in Hippo.

So don't -- think this through, gentlemen, in various ages of mankind, various -- a different class of events is important. It isn't true that in 325 it was important that some Frankish tribes knocked at the gates of the empire. But it was terribly important that Athanasius wrote his Nicene Creed, and that we -- ever since say that the only God-equal man is Christ, because He had no power, and He was a failure. And therefore the will of God could appear in Him pure and simple, not intermixed with the will of men.

Now that's a very simple -- again, an ABC yardstick, gentlemen. I offer you here something which you can use in exams, which you can use in your private life, which you can use in the education of your children, and which you can use for the orientation in the world at large, that we live in an era which has shifted interest in the events that are important -- for the human race. Nobody is an educated man, gentlemen, who does not know the important events of the Church of the first thousand years. And that's why you are uninstructed and blind. And nobody is instructed, if he is the highest scholastic theologian in the Catholic Church, who wouldn't know the greatest political events of the last 900 years.

So in order to understand life, you don't -- don't dabble with Church and state in the abstract, but deal with what is for you important. Now for you it is important how your ancestors were reached by Christianity. And that is settled in the Western world at least in the first 999 years. And then, in your own life, you have to say to yourself, "I am in a secular story with elections and draft, and building a business, and mar- -- getting married, and having property, and making inventions, and traveling, and writing books, and going to school and getting degrees, and having a professional training and all this comes from the last 900 years or thousand years of humanity, and therefore I must know the antecedents," as I try to give them to you in Philosophy 10.

So gentlemen, Church and state are not contemporaries, are not contemporaries. The Church is, as in America, older in her importance on your lives than the state. You remember, that coincides with the American platform which I uphold, that in America the Church is older than the state. Poor little Europe, when it ceased to be a province of -- Christianity, lost sight of this and tried to sell to its people the idea that France is as old as Christianity, or Germany is as -- even older than Christianity, that they went pagan. And then they collapsed. Then they got Hitler, and Boulanger, and the Dreyfus affair -- in every country in Europe you have the same malaise, the same disease of turning history topsy-turvy, and trying to have a political history of your own nation, without the background of the Church history, out of which this nation came, and to which

the nation gave a specific answer.

This has very practical results. Gentlemen, if you try to read the history of the Church backward, and the history of the nations backward, and if you say "Iceland" -- let's begin there -- you will understand that the Church always has four elements by which it is recognizable as the Church. It must have mission, because that's the first event which makes you turn to the Church. It must have mission. A church that has no missions, gentlemen, is at the -- its ends -- wit's end. Therefore, in the -- when they make doctors out of our missionaries, and schoolteachers and architects -- and are very proud that Mr. Schweitzer is a doctor in Africa, it means just that the Church is at an end. That's Greek, to be a doctor. That's a Greek -- doctors { } too. They have very good doctors. But there is nothing to be preached, obviously. May be. But that means that the Church then -- I'm all against this humanistic attempt that it's nicer to have doctors in China than missionaries. The only people who can resist Communism there are the missionaries, not the doctors. That's the absolute oversight, but the missions must be there or there is no Church. A church that has no mission, gentlemen, is as stupid as you are, because you don't know that we have coming to us now Whitsunday. As you know this word is the word for the -- mission, for the pouring out of the Holy Spirit, or it's also called Pentecost. And the fact that this has gone out of existence in this country is a very serious business. You can go to church, and church, and church, and mistake it completely as a tradition or something elegant, or something fashionable, or something that is good for the FBI to know, that you are regular in church, so that nothing will be held against you. Gentlemen, but that's all cowardice. The Church begins when you say, "Even Mr. {Crouch} of the FBI should be missionarized, should be converted. Even Mr. Edgar Hoover should become a Christian." Then I talk to you, because then you think of your church in the proper terms. You know it. It's always the hardest to convert Constantine. And Edgar Hoover is today our Constantine. But who thinks of this? Who thinks that the people in government need conversion? As long as you do not believe this, gentlemen, you don't know what the Church is. The Church says the most tempted people are those who have power. Therefore they must be preached the Gospel more than anybody else. To the weak, you don't have to preach the Gospel, but to the powerful, and to the strong. And that's why Christianity here is a joke, because it's just pleasant. And you have a rummage sale, and you have a -- an auction, and you have a fair, a summer fair just to make the -- church {go}. Gentlemen, that's not the Church. It should be closed down. It's a scandal. It's displeasing to the Lord, because He is the Lord of the opening of all the side-tracked, blind avenues of mankind. And this can only be done if He comes with might and with a storm, and blows open

the gates and says, "This here stinks." And that's mission. An objection, a strong objection to the way people live, without objection, no mission. Mission is nothing pleasant, and that's why it's a mistake to be nice to the people in a mission, and say, "I come as a doctor." You can come in this disguise, gentlemen. You can come as a technician. But that isn't the -- the Church, if you say there, if you just want to be pleasant, then why don't you take a ticket and travel there, and don't call it a mission.

Now the second point, gentlemen, is the inner brotherhood of the believers.

There must be communion between them. Without the people who ...

[tape interruption]

... that present of the body of Christ is not {Christianity}. That is, inside the people who go to church there is something formed that doesn't exist outside, the Communion. And that's why you do not go as an individual to church, or at least in the hope to drop that -- the fact that you are an individual. That's why most people don't go to church, but sleep through church, or criticize through church, or whatever -- study through church. That's why you all Unitarians who think you go to church for your private information, or edification. Of course not, gentlemen. If you go to the -- the church of {George's} in Massachusetts, where John Quincy Adams worshiped with the whole Adams family, there you see still the deep feeling that the people who come into this hall form at that moment under the impact of the word upon their {life however} the body of Christ. If you can't do this, gentlemen, you have not yet made your entrée into this necessity that at every one moment, you must conquer your own time. And you can only conquer your own time if you completely forget your own self. And you can only forget yourself if the forming of this body, this Communion body, is more important than you yourself. But as long as you take your Communion supper as a medicine, like aspirin, you are quite mistaken. It is not for your stomach that you eat this. It is not for your digestion. It is so that there may be no skin separating you and the other fellow, that this may be one body. This is very practical, and it has nothing to do with mysticism, gentlemen, but I have to say this. It seems that nobody else tells you this. The outer form of the Church, gentlemen, which must exist, is that the Church is not of this one time in which it happens to be formed. That is, the Church will always need some renunciation of a part of the world { }, whether the Methodists do not smoke and dance, whether the Catholic priests do not marry -- in some form, I must be able to point to you and say, "He is not identical with this time. He shows somewhere that he wants to express his getting out of his time, his standing here

on his time." Therefore you cannot identify yourself totally with the {latest} man about town. Whaler -- Grodon -- what's his name?

{{Grover Wale.}}

{Grover Wale} is the opposite from the Church. The opposite in his whole existence as a man about town. And do you know this, The Man Who Came to Dinner, you know this play?

(No.)

That's another example, or the snob, or the gentleman, or the joiner, { }, or so. That's always the same type. You can -- in him you say, "This is it. This is America as of today." Or "These are the Gay '90s," or "This is the --" we'll see "-- the dizzy '20s." That is, the time is left to its own devices runs away. That is, put on trial. Now the Christians, gentlemen, are always that party in any nation, in any land that are not found in the bipartisan issues as the extreme leaders. It's always the third group. If you don't like this, if you would like to be either a McCarthy man or a Truman man, it's all right. You are a secular. It's your choice. It isn't very important, I think, because the continuity of life in this nation has only been secured by the people who did not -- were not vitally interested in this, but were vitally interested in raising their families and following out the commands of the ancestors.

So gentlemen, the outer behavior of any -- each member of any church and the Church itself, is that it must be less fashionable than the fashionable. The degree may change. Today I may be a Christian by not buying a television. Yesterday I might have been a Christian by not smoking. The day before by not dancing, or by pro- -- by something. It isn't -- doesn't matter what you do, gentlemen. Each time has a special phenomenon, and each time needs people who disdain this -- special fashion, because it is only of the day and time. And -- and since you do not want this, you m- -- abuse the Church. It's another fashion today, to go to church. The whole numbers of the Church are very scandalous. In the last year, as you know, allegedly 25 more million people have joined the Church. Poor Church.

The fourth thing, gentlemen, is you can have no church without the name of the founder. That is, the continuity of this campaign -- and now comes the point which is very difficult for you, gentlemen, but around which this whole course has been built -- that which has been started 1900 years ago cannot be started again by ethical culture, or by association of good people today, or yesterday, or

tomorrow. You destroy the meaning of Christianity if you say, "I can be a Christian" without mentioning your Lord, the beginner. It's not so important perhaps that you -- you stress this word "Lord." It will come natural to you later, but that you must say, "He has started."

The anti-Christ, gentlemen, is the man who does the things Christ did, without saying that he follows in His wake. That's the real anti-Christ. You have heard very wrong notions of the anti-Christ. Everybody of guts feels the temptation to be the anti-Christ, because that means, "instead of Christ." You know who's -- is the first who talks most about the anti-Christ in the New Testament? That's John the Evangelist, because he was closest to the Lord and knew best the temptation. He was the natural friend of the Lord. He didn't have any conversion, and he said, "And that is why I know that the greatest temptation of the human heart is to say, 'I can be as splendid and perfect without the Lord.'" Of course you can be splendid and perfect, but Christianity is not anything that has to do with your own perfection, or with your splendor. It has to do with the unity of all time, with the connection of all ways of life. { } remember, with -- making it possible that all races, all peoples, all individuals, or -- can recognize each other as being with the same, although one is a Jew, and one is a Greek, and the other an Iroquois. And we still can know that we are all moving in one spirit. This you cannot start over again. Anybody who says that this can be repeated destroys the whole story of mankind. And that is today the greatest temptation. All the people I know think, "Oh, why not? We are wonderful people. And we -- of course, we -- we -- { } and we -- Jesus is one of the nice people, and some of the teachers are quite {agreeable}." Gentlemen, it isn't that you have to like Jesus. It's not very important. But you have to follow Him, which is something quite different.

Because you come afterwards. The whole enterprise, which begins with the -- with the Apostles leaving Juda- -- Jerusalem, and going to Rome and writing the New Testament in Greek, so that the Greek philosophers -- you see, {could} suddenly hear something that has nothing to do with Greek thinking, where a man is God's poem, where the creation is open and still happening. All these things you cannot redress, you cannot retro-act. If you say, "All matters is that we are good people," you destroy the meaning of your becoming good people in -- within the context of the whole human race. Now that's the hardest, I think, in this country for people to accept. Here they are idealists: be good and ask for nobody else. And that's very nice. Gentlemen, the Church -- and I still think the Jews have to share this, and I think there is no dissent really, in this respect. As a Jewish friend of mine once said, "Of course, everybody except the Jews must be Christians. Otherwise we can't live together," which shows you that the Jews

share this -- this intelligence, so to speak, that the Christian era is their own salvation. Once you give up this salvation, you get Mr. Hitler, who said, "Christian era, not for me. That's all over." He literally said this.

So gentlemen, we have four points for the first thousand years of the Church.

There -- where you find the Christian Church, there have to be:

- The memory of the founder; it must be preached in his name.
- Communion of the believers to form one body through all times. The old and the young must be united: the dead and the living, and future generations. If you have not such a service, gentlemen, in which the founder, and the saints, and your parents, and grandparents, and your grandchildren are united through you in one body of time, you have no church. You have a club. You have Unitarianism. You have lectures. Most churches are lectures today, lecture-committees. But that's not the Church, because the Church goes against the lectures, and says, "Lectures stress the current events." And the Church says, "Current events, very nice, but you can only give a little part of your energy to current events, because it's so -- more important to keep the continuity."

It is to all these, gentlemen, modern people, it is perfectly mysterious why they should raise children, and why anybody raised them. Why do your parents go to all this nonsense of sending you to this college at such expense, gentlemen? Because the light of the spirit is between the generations. It's neither your parents nor you. The problem is to hand it over from one to the other, so that the spirit can be found between you two. You cannot explain why you ever marry a girl, for fun perhaps? And that she has an automobile accident and -- and two wrong dentures. You don't marry a girl for fun, because -- but you love her, because you must enter this secret mission of mankind to form one body through all times. It's inexplicable that anybody should raise a child and go to all that trouble if there wasn't something that had absolutely nothing to do with your will, your intent, your fun, your pleasure, your plan, anything.

- So the third thing is some withholding tax on your own life. You cannot be a member of the Church if your minister is a man about town and yourself are. At least the people in the congregation usually want that their minister and his wife look sour. Now it's much better if they are allowed to dance and be happy and if the congregation looks a little sour. That is, if he's a little withdrawn and little indifferent to the latest news, or to speculation on the stock exchange, or whatever the issue is. That's the meaning of the tithe.

I perhaps have told this story. It always touches me to the quick. I knew who a lady who was 87 years of age. And I was a young man. And she told me of the little village from which she came. Have I told you the story? And there was -- it was a very fruitful region in the south of Germany. Doctor Heil comes from the same village, his family. You know the doctor who here so brave fighting his -- his paralysis. And that's near -- in {Badinia,} near Karlsruhe, near the Alsace. And she said, "We would never harvest any cherry tree or apple tree unless we kept one branch untouched." That's the tithe. "It would -- be considered a terrible sin if we would touch and harvest every little bit."

You can hardly understand this, gentlemen. You take the -- more than there is out of the soil in this country, You exploit it, you rob it. As you know, the founders of New England have robbed this soil instead of leaving something, you see, { } we seem to be there. That's a typical withholding of something I can do, but I may not do. Now you have the same with Prohibition. No -- no European country can understand why people shouldn't drink wine as Jesus did. So we have here this terrible strawberry juice or raspberry juice at Communion supper. And well, it's very hard for any man to believe that one can go to Heaven without wine. For me, it is. But it is not certainly more rational than this woman's respect for this branch, this good gift of God, which she would not commercialize, which she would not harvest, which she would not use, but in which, in her devotion, she would acknowledge to be miraculously -- a miraculous gift which, for everybody to see, they would let stand, they would not touch, because it isn't in their power to make a tree, you see. No human being has ever made a tree. Now all these things which you find classified in the textbooks of the last hundred years as superstitions, or as folklore, are of course the opposite. They are the salvation of the human race. That we have nothing yet of this type, it is { } all over the country is terrible. Just terrible. That is, that this country is in terrible danger of living to its bitter end at this moment, because you actually think that when something new is produced, everybody has to live on the installment plan. And what do we do, gentlemen, if we don't have this external renunciation, this withholding, this not going with your own time, gentlemen? That you carry over into a later phase the debts incurred on the installment plan today. Anybody who is a man about town incurs more obligations for today than he likes to have incurred tomorrow. That's a very simple reasoning, gentlemen, very rational. In order to be -- have a free future, gentlemen, you must not plan this future on the installment plan, because the installment plan means that the decisions of today make you tom- -- as of tomorrow the slave of your will as of today. You can't improve on your own will. You can't become a newborn man. You are not free. That's what Christianity came into the world to say: "Tomorrow

you must be reborn as you are today. So let no decision as of today encroach on your tomorrow." But how do most American families live? For the next 24 months, 60 percent of their income is mortgaged. Do you think that -- that doesn't lead to nervous breakdowns? That's one of the deepest reasons of the nervous breakdown. Anybody breaks down who has sold out his free future. You are all slaves. Everybody here lives beyond his present day. And you call this -- I mean, do -- you think that's your right. Gentlemen, it is your right in the legal sense, but it isn't the right with regard to that strange thing which is the human soul. The human soul receives her time every day anew, and has always to club down this damned own will which tries to tell you you should mortgage your will as of tomorrow.

- So -- and the fourth is this strange thing of conversion, or mission, or preaching the Cross, or being -- going to the martyr -- to martyrdom, because people to whom you preach the Cross usually respond with some very disagreeable action. From Jeanne d'Arc to Saint Stephen, the history of progress is only possible by people who stick their neck out and receive in answer to that a stone-throw, or a pyre, or something similar. Now don't think that this has changed, gentlemen. You actually are outside the Church, because you have the vain hope that nowadays we are such wonderful people that progress is possible without martyrdom. And therefore there is no progress. And you don't even know what progress is. You think progress is the next invention sent into the patent office. But it is only something that comes in the form of mission, that somebody says, "You can take my life, but you must listen to me." That is, these are people who love their enemy more than themselves.

Gentlemen, that's a very practical thing. You always think that's something wonderful. Mission is based on this principle, because obviously the person to whom the missionary comes hates him. He destroys his ancestral gods. That's why the Communists in China now hate and rage against the Christian missionaries. Rightly so, from their point of view. The -- Christianity only begins at this impossible level where you say, "This poor man, because he hates me, has to be converted." That's rather a strange story, isn't it?

Before you have -- do not understand this, you are down on missions. It is terrible in this country as you are down on the Puritans, so everybody here speaks despicably of the missionaries. It's terrible. It's { } fashion, especially in the liberal arts college. "Oh, missionaries are funny people. And you can't do it. And we should leave these heathen. And look, they are so nice, and why do you bother? And it's just an intrusion on their privacy." Gentlemen, if it was your truth and their privacy, this -- of course, there would be no mission. But if the --

these people and you have a common task, then it's very different. As long as you think you sell your wares, when you be -- are a missionary, you are all mistaken. But you try to make it possible that this campaign, which makes one out of all men who have ever lived from the beginning of time to the end of time, that this campaign { }. That is, as the only meaning of life I can understand. I don't wish to do anything that is just -- ends with my own short existence today. This is too -- too cheap for me. It has -- is meaningless. I can do any- -- enjoy life here today, in the light of my certainty that it is within the frame of the total. But if this frame is not established, if I can't get a hold of the people in Malaya to share this deep conviction, then all what I can do is lost -- I'm lost. The whole of America is lost. As this is today, people say, "The black man gets the upper hand, then out goes the white man." Gentlemen, in Christianity, this isn't so. But without Christianity, it must be so, obviously. Why have we -- do we -- could we have the Supreme Court decision on segregation, gentlemen, without a bloody war? Because there were some Christians in the South who remembered the Gospel.

Imagine. It took 90 years to -- to emancipate the Negro. It's quite a story -- 90 years. And that's the way of the spirit. That's mission. And it -- we need some such bull like Mr. Talmadge to find out what it's all about. He's a wonderful example of the, you see, die-hard, whom you have to have in every crisis, in order to understand the resistance that has to be broken down. One always has to last a little longer, you know.

Now, the second millennium, gentlemen, is not class- -- characterized by this preponderance of the Church, because from -- beginning 999, the nations of Europe consider themselves as listeners to the Gospel. Every man born from a woman in this second thousand years in the Western world has received some tradition on the Church. He has found himself exposed to these four problems: sacrifice, communion, mission, and remembrance. He has read the Bible, for example, you see. He has sung the Psalms. He has gone to the sacraments. And he has perhaps sent his child to the priesthood, or himself become a monk, or has done something in the way of mission. And the greatest sign of this -- and the laity now is responding, gentlemen -- is the fact the first event in the history of the next -- second thousand years are the crusades. And the word "crusade" means the laity responds. So Eisenhower is the la- -- the last member of the second millennium of our era, because he has written a book, Crusade in Europe. And the first book on this was, as you know, intoned in the 11th century, that is, 900 years back. And in this sense, whether you like it or not, Mr. Eisenhower is a man of the 11th century, because his {key} word was coined at that time, and the word you use -- that is your birthright, your birth certificate. If you have to say,

"What I do is a crusade," you are a crusader. If you are a crusader, you are contemporary of the year 1099, in which the first Crusader marched into Jerusalem.

This you do not know, gentlemen.

But I hope I have tried -- or at least I have tried through this whole course to make you see that what we speak is what we are. You remember, where the tribe says "Uncle," the man is a nephew, because he says, "Uncle." And when you say "Crusader," then you are Christian. Can't get out of it. That is, what you say you do, is also making you backward. Puts you under obligation -- that's why Mr. Eisenhower had to come out against segregation in this country. He couldn't have trusted himself if he had written a book, Crusade in Europe, and then be a Democratic president from the South and said, "Oh well, that has time." So you such a word gets you. Because you write Crusade in Europe, suddenly at home, you have to do something that has consequence.

Gentlemen, every word we say places us in a certain time. It places us in a time at which this one word was born and received its name. That's why we are still, by speaking English, members of the families, as of old. As long as you say "Father" and "Mother," you still have a relation to the old seven-generation order of things, to this time-raft of the tribes.

Now "crusade in Europe," and "crusade in -- in Palestine," and "crusade against the Turks," and "crusade against Constantinople" -- crusade, crusade, crusade is the watchword then of 900 years of national histories. The nations of Europe found in the Crusade the first response. Think of a tremendous oratorium in music in which the Church first bounces forward with it -- her Psalms, and her songs of triumph, and her praises of God; and then the nations begin and try to formulate a responsorium, which must contain similar, and yet secular elements of response. The word "crusade" is the first of such words. That -- that's a great story: 900 years of crusade. Not always very glorious. Don't look down on it, gentlemen. Today again, if I read books, people say, "Oh these alleged crusades, they were very cruel, and they were very meaningless, and they were just forgeries of Christianity," it isn't that simple. Mr. Eisenhower is not a forger of Christianity. He is a very noble soul. And he is a very simple soul. He's a layman. And that is all in his book. And that is all in his presidency. And that's all in the Supreme Court decision. And he is not a single individual. You and I are in it. We are all in the same boat. We belong to the second millennium of our era, in other words, gentlemen. If you want to know why, if somebody doubts it, you say, "Because we have still lived through a crusade." It may be -- have worn thin. It may be the last crusade. This you can say. You can even work for it, that it should be the last crusade. That doesn't alter the fact that it is one.

The second word, gentlemen, of a secular character, of this era, is the word "reform," "reformation." Everybody can be a reformer. Even Roman Catholics can reform today. They couldn't in the first thousand years. There was nothing to reform. The word "reform," gentlemen, means the discovery that the Church has a secular side, which has to be broken off. That is, the first thousand years, gentlemen, we look at the sanctity of the Church, at the Saints. In the second thousand years of the millennium, we become aware -- of the second millennium -- we become aware of its mortality. The word "reformation" means that there are bay windows in the Church, and side pantries, and kitchens, and cellars which need to be broken off. They are abuses. The word "reform" is not a -- a privilege of Mr. Martin Luther, or of the Calvinists. The word "reform," a reform on head and -- in head and limbs, head and members is the term that the Church herself has used in the Middle Ages for cutting out the secular excrescences, the eczemas, so to speak, you see, of her being in this world, her own danger of becoming of -- just a part of the world.

So reform -- reform, gentlemen, is a new invention, a -- term that has not existed, and you can't live without it. You are all reformers in a small way. And you know that there have to be reformers, as there have to be crusaders. Reform, then gentlemen, is an attempt to apply to the Church the yardstick of secular decency. And there the pope, and the Protestants, and the free-thinkers, and the free masons are all one. Again, very important, gentlemen. Crusade and reform, I only give you names that are unanimous in this world today.

The third term, which the Church has implanted into the laity, is the word "progress." You all believe in it. And it is nonsense to say that anybody does not, to a certain extent, believe in it. The word "progress" -- we all think that beyond being just Christians, we can become civilized, educated, instructed, objective, skillful, progressive, modern, whatever you say. That is, the strange use of the word "progress" is that membership of the nations and the individuals within their church is not enough. Progress must transcend church membership. That's very strange. You have never known this, gentlemen, how much the second millennium depends on the first. When you say "progress," you mean progress beyond the first millennium, beyond mission, beyond the lip-service of the Icelanders which said, "Now we are Christians." Progress means where do you go from there, you have to go places. Progress then means a strange relation, that we must go on from being -- being allegedly Christians in a passive membership. We must contribute something creative. And we must therefore progress into what has been called so far usually "civilization." We must all become civilized, we -- in addition to be Christians.

Now the greatest heresy of your time is that you have separated the basic Christian situation from the second outcropping of this progress in civilization. You think today progress is a secular term, gentlemen. You'll never get anywhere if you think that. Progress is the relation of Church and the world. The Church is older than the state, I told you. Now in the second millennium, the practice had been to say, "Well, here is this child, baptized in the cradle. Now he becomes an inventor. He becomes a discoverer. He becomes an engineer. He becomes a great painter." Think of Leonardo da Vinci. Of course, he was brought up a -- a Christian, you see. So what of it, that's very little compared to the fact that he goes on from there. He's the first man who builds secular paintings. You may know that Leonardo da Vinci was the first man who painted a landscape without a Madonna in it. That is, who said, "The world without religious topics is -- deserves to be painted." It was in 1472. And you -- have here a clear line of progress. Perhaps you take down this date, gentlemen. It's an important date: 1472, the first secular landscape, painted by Leonardo da Vinci. Or is it '74? It's one of the two years.

This means that progress in the Western world, gentlemen, means adding a par- -- a conquest of the world to your membership in the Church. If you do not understand this, you do not understand the march of the West. And it is not in any secular textbook, because the so-called secular textbook must not mention the Church. It is not in any religious book, because the religious textbook must not mention the secular history, the political history. It's terrible. They have found a trickery of cheating your heritage by separating these two stories. It is one story, gentlemen. The first thousand years made sure that everybody in this Western world would begin as a Christian. And the second thousand years, built institutions, and preached to every hum- -- son of women that they should progress beyond that, that they should re- -- reform the Church backward, and that they should discover God's creation, God's wide world.

And this creative effort, gentlemen, is called "progress" in our language today. If you -- find a better word, you may use it, but I offer you this great secret. You cannot today be satisfied with the theologians, and the people in the church, and you cannot be satisfied with the philosophers and the hist- -- humanists in the world, because they cut into two, without ever reconnecting them, which is the secret of your own existence, to go on from one to the other. My friend Tillich is one of these funny creatures who has tried to find a way out. He's always ch- -- alternating between philosophy and theology for this reason. He doesn't quite know where he stands. And he always dances around { } all these people, and just goes {chasing} from one end to the other. Because he has this great merit to

himself, that he knows that man lives between the Church and the world. The world is only in the -- and you cannot become a {perfect} churchman if you do not wish to redeem the world. And you cannot -- be on -- be - be a complete child of the world if you do not belong to the Church, because the two always tell each other off. The creative side of life is not in the Church. It's not her business. The Church unites the times. But inasfar as you must create within your own time, and be progressive, you are, of course, a grateful member of your own -- of your own time. A painter who paints the first secular painting is obviously doing something also in his own time creative. And we mark 1472 as the year in which the secular profession of painting got a foothold in Europe.

So I -- I really have tried to offer you a deep secret, gentlemen, the true history which is not taught in America at all, and by whose abandonment, or whose lack we are today so anemic in this country, is the story which President Tucker used to teach his -- not President Tucker, President Bartlett, and the previous Dartmouth president used to teach the senior students in this country -- in this college -- every senior did at that time go to the president of the college for a course in universal history. And this universal history was just exactly what -- although in a -- in a previous form, of course, with different facts selected, an attempt to encourage you to be creative on the background of your church membership, to combine progress and mission, to provide for combined motherhood and daughterhood your membership in your church, and your daughter- -- your membership in the daughter-nation. And this course was abolished in 1890 unfortunately, and I have tried to restore it in this course here in 58.

But in the meantime, you have lost your soul, because you actually believe that either you are pious, bigot churchgoer, or that you are a child of the world, and a professional man, and an inventor and what-not. Of course, you are only an inventor because you are a child of God, and you are only a child of God if you are an inventor. You are all castrated, gentlemen. And that's why you are so unimportant, so boring. Every one of you has genius. And every one of you has the Holy Spirit. But you say either-or. Either an atheist and have genius, or talent, or -- or an IQ, or -- or psychological statement what profession I must choose for handling some -- some pieces of wood. Ja. That's what you really believe, that you have a right to choose a profession from such silly things! Scandalous! Or you think, "Oh, I go to Church. I go to confession. I join. I find a better church. I go through three denominations, or four denominations. And I chastise myself, and I keep the fast days. And so I go to Heaven, and it doesn't matter that I am a very poor clerk in an office." Gentlemen, it matters very much if you are a good clerk or a poor clerk in an office. And it matters very much whether you praise the Lord in doing so or not. Only if you combine the two things are you a man.

Otherwise you are just silly. But you all try to have it one way or the other. And the beauty of the way is just -- didn't I try to tell you this? The way of Christianity is, of course, only when you combine two ways or more.

So we have this third term, gentlemen, "progress," I hope elucidated.

So for every man born after the first Crusade, he has the Church in back of him. He has progress of a secular or creative time in front of him. He has the whole world as a field of his discoveries. And he has the nation as his home, as his inner -- not the -- the people with whom he takes Communion, but the whole big nation: France, or England, in which -- from which he thinks he has his inner solidarity. It's the second millennium is -- is -- is the nations give an answer.

So every human being, gentlemen, has these four relations to his own nation, to the world at large as a field of progressive discovery, secular painting, and discovery of America, discovery of the nova, in the moon, or what-not. The comets -- the whole world has been discovered in the last 500 years, has it not? So you see, the Church has another cross. Compare the two. The remembrance of the name of the founder, so that we don't become anti-Christ -- Christs. We have -- re- -- well, how do you call this -- renunciation, of something that belongs to the world today, and which we judge to be so unimportant that we do not wish, you see, to -- to be sunk. Communion, or they call it Mass in the Church, it's the same. And mission.

Gentlemen, I have tried once to play with the word "mission." You can put it instead of "renunciation" the word "omission." You can here put Mass, which of course comes from missa est, the same root as, you see, to be sent together, to be --. And then you can say, instead of remembrance, if you think of the gnashing of teeth of the modern philosopher or rationalist, you can say "admission," because he won't admit that he -- what he knows, he knows because of Christ. He won't admit it. He won't put this admission in front of his thinking that he knows more about man, because this one man died, you see. Admission -- Christianity is the admission that things are different after A.D. This the -- the -- the, you see, the natural man says, "I know everything as a caveman. I am born today and so there is nothing in between that I must know in order to be different." You and I, however, I hope, know that because of Christ, we know that everything has to be kept going. Because with Christ's coming, the times were fulfilled, the four ways were laid open, and you know exactly where you stand. You can know what you have to do. So this is the great admission. That's the hardest for modern man to perform. They don't want to admit that because of the life of

Christ, you and I live in a different time.

I had a talk with mini- -- a group of ministers the other days in which I tried to tell them the one onslaught on Christianity today was the abolition of the Christian era. Wherever you hear people talk today who are -- mean business, they say the Christian era is a figment of the imagination. There never has been a Christian era. They have -- don't -- won't make this admission, that everything looks different.

So for the gentlemen in the comprehensives, I have done my best.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Opening remarks missing]

"It is his death which is important to us, rather than His life. Christ Himself considered His life as unimportant, and was not as beautiful as was popularly believed. Christianity is the picture of one man's loneliness in His own generation. One point in our background, there took place a conversion which was the turning point in the history of the Church. This date, 999, was the year of the conversion of the Icelanders, a horde of barbarian degenerates" -- now I haven't said that -- "to Christianity." He didn't believe it. "A horde," I see { }. "A horde of barbarians. It's called the `Ultima -- Ultima Thule' of the Church marked a time when Christianity had caught up with the Western world. But this was only the beginning of the {story}.

"It has taken 950 years more to dissolve the pagan message and way of life. Even today, we must combat -- -bat abortive attempts to prove that man doesn't need to believe in anything. Therefore, we may divide the story of Christianity into two periods: the first millennium would represent the Mother Church; the second is the story of her daughter-nations. The history of the world -- Western world might be called the dialogue of the daughters of the response to the message. The first millennium then is the chronicle of events in the life of the Church, such as her council meeting and dogmatic quarrels. The second is the story of national wars and revolutions. We live in an era which has shifted its interest away from Church history. An educated man should know the story of the first and second millenniums without merely abstracting Church and state as concepts.

"The Church had earlier beginnings of this country than did the state as the essential reasons for the immigration to this country were religious, rather than political. They are four basic elements essential to any Church. They are: mission; a feeling of inner" -- not a feeling of inner brotherhood -- "the realization of the inner brotherhood by Communion; remembrance of the founder; and the renunciation, denying some part of our daily environment as unimportant. We have been given three watchwords for the second millennium. They are: crusade, reformation, and progress."

Who knows { }? Nobody? They unknown? Who? Mr. J. M. Deaver. Does he exist?

[unintelligible]

We have this one week without the seniors. { } is a senior here? We have a senior here? Nice. Very much. And how does it happen that you are here? (I just thought I would come.)

Wonderful. Gives me back my belief in mankind. That is already beyond progress. You'll see that he already belongs to the third millennium.

As a matter of fact, I have been asked this simple question: What now lies beyond our own time? And since I believe that we only know of the past, because we believe in the future, obviously, gentlemen, the picture I have drawn up for you in all this course and last time, especially, makes only sense, because I firmly believe that with my thought I have tried to take you beyond this dialogue between the Church and the nations. Obviously the story of nationalism is at an end. The story of progress is at an end. Once you have jet planes and the atom bomb, we may invent still a better refrigerator and more television, but it's not very important. It's a principle. We know that we can invent. As a matter of fact, gentlemen, the second millennium of progress ends in a century which we call the last century, the 19th century, in which we have invented inventions. Formerly people invented things. But today we have invented how to invent. So that is the -- the non-plus-ultra of inventing, you see. We have invented a system by which daily inventions are made. That's something quite different from the accidental invention of the wheel in antiquity. We invent inventions.

I was told of a dean of a faculty, who told a professor of chemistry -- of physics, who had been 30 years in that college, that if he came now, he wouldn't be appointed. The physicist was rather taken aback, and said, "Why not?"

"Well, today we need nuclear physicists. And you are a classical physicist."

And so this dean had caught up with the spirit of the times, you see, of eternal progress. And he thought that if he only would be on the -- on the last, extreme branch of the tree of physics, he would serve his college better than if he grafted anybody on the main stem. I think the dean was quite mistaken, but it only shows you how people think only in terms of eternal technological progress, so this -- the nuclear physicist seems to him the -- the only physicist who still counts. Even the older physicists are already superseded in -- inside physics. Let me now do two things this week. Today I would like to give you the vision

in terms of what has to be done of the third thousand years of our era. How long they may last, we do not know. Thousand years, it stands here for future. It doesn't matter whether you give it 500 years, or a thousand years, or 5,000 years. But you should give it more time than you usually think about. You only think about the next generation. Now in terms of man's place on this earth, the next generation is too little. That's too short. If I could only talk to you about your future, gentlemen, your career, and what you have to expect up to the year 2000, I would not fulfill my promise that all the history of the past we know is only understandable as long as we believe in the future. Belief in the future means always believe in a time which neither you nor I can see. The future must lie beyond the limitations of your own timespan, or it would just be present. Your life, as it -- you stand -- sit here today, is already in the main planned, endowed, directed. Very few of you will be to jump and to take a new direction. By going to Dartmouth, you already have sold your birthright for {soup of nettles}. Certain features of your life are no longer possible, because you are educated. And education means pre-determination, filling you with certain concepts, you see, which -- which you can never forget. Like the -- your sep- -- your belief in nature, your belief in science, your belief in the -- division of mind and body. You have learned so many false doctrines already in your life that you will -- at best, you can get rid of them at your 30 -- at your 70th birthday and be declared healthy at that time. But you are already rather -- rather -- very much of a mortgage to history, because you believe naïvely in the second millennium, and tho- -- are great di- -- make great trouble for me and others to get it -- the whole of mankind into the third millennium.

You don't believe this. You think automatically, by your just living longer than I, you will be ahead of me. You are quite mistaken. You will finish the second millennium to the bitter end, probably. Some of you perhaps may understand that this isn't all you have to do. You have to believe in a time beyond your own life. And let me s- -- tell you what I foresee as the task which is given us, because we are now doomed to technological progress; doomed to live in the wide world of the whole planet, and even of the stratosphere; doomed by nationalism, that the Frenchmen really tells you, "But I'm a Frenchman, therefore I cannot do such-and-such. I cannot use my reason, except for French nationalism," and all this -- types of -- stuff you hear every day in politics. If I were Mr. Dulles, I would go crazy now in Geneva, because he hears all these prejudices -- prejudices, these foregone judgments that Mr. Bidault tells him, or Mr. Eden tells him: "Because I'm an Englishman, I cannot think freely, but I have to depend on these and these chains in my makeup."

Think of this whole problem for us Americans that we now have to stand in

with the French against the free nations of Asia. It's tragic. Why should we? Because the French cannot do anything but be -- think of themselves in- -- as inside their nation.

A friend of mine talked the other day in Paris with the French, and they said, "Well, it doesn't matter. The Russians can march in and take France. Paris will always be the center of the intellectual life of the world." Now that's this kind of dead superstition, you see, which is much worse than the belief in witches, or the belief in the -- in the wrong piece of wood from the Cross of Christ, worshiped in some Spanish church. These -- French are much more superstitious at this moment than the worst early believer in witchcraft. They believe that these stones on the Seine River will always harbor the spirit. That's blasphemy. But they believe it. And they act upon it. And if a -- a man isn't in Paris, or his book isn't in Paris, or his play isn't in Paris, or the fashion doesn't come from Paris, they won't look at it. They say it doesn't exist.

So what I -- put on your -- this blackboard, gentlemen, you remember, was that all men who live in the second millennium have said, "We come out of Christendom ..." or "Christianity," let's put it "Christendom," "... and we are in a nation, inside a nation, and we are facing the world with our discoveries, and we take in the North Pole, and the Antarctic, and {little} America, and what-not, wherever we go, or the stratosphere or the jet planes, and the whole thing leads to eternal progress." That's by and large the American idea, too. In France, it is only so bad because this isn't as wicked with us as it is with the French. Nobody believes that reason is -- is seated in Washington. But the -- the French actually believe that it has its seat in Paris.

So we already -- and I come to this -- we'll come to this, I hope, on Thursday once more, the American situation is not quite as this European situation because America is not a nation, fortunately. It's a little better. It's a world. So the average European however, and even the aver- -- average Iraqi, or Pakistani, or Hindu at this moment, you see, or Indochinese certainly thinks that he is a part of a nation, and that he -- when he says "we," he always means the Indochinese, or the Cambodians, or whoever else these Viet Minh or Viet Nam people, you see, consider to be their nation. This womb of a man, this inner space of a man today is not the Communion supper, but is the nation. Even the Churches, as you know, in all these countries are nationalized. It's such a form that when the Christians in a nation get together sing the national anthem.

I told you my experience here of a { }, didn't I? Where they did just that, and thereby nullified their Christian belonging in preference to their national

belonging.

Now you go back to the second -- the other Cross of Reality, in the first thousand years, where the remembrance of the founder was the admission ticket. Without admitting that Christ came first, no Christianity. Then we said mission as the -- the goal that leads to the Church as a whole, all over the globe. Then omission, some sacrifice, some asceticism, some renunciation, and inside what the Catholics call Mass and what the Protestants would call Communion, inside. Now compare these two crosses. And you can see one thing at one glance, that what leads from the admission that Christ is the beginner of our faith, leads to the Church in the first thousand years all over the globe until the Icelanders become also, you see, admitted, and admit and omit, and are united in the Mass and receive -- send out their own missionaries now. You know, Nordic people send their missionaries to -- to Russia. { }. The whole Western world has gone on missions in -- the rest of the world. Compare this, and you will see that the Church is inherited by those Christian nations as something that's there. The Church is a part of nature of Western man today. You find that Christianity is what has been, long ago. And what has surrounded you: these Puritans, or take Christmas. That's there. And when -- when it is there, we have to be -- have a reason to change Church, which still means "membership" or "action" into Christendom, as a state of fact, as a state of climate or civilization. And in addition to having all become -- belonging to the Christendom, or the -- as we even call it today, the civilized nations, which is a secular terminology for the same thing, we say, "But in addition, we must become better people."

So we can say, gentlemen, the -- the world of the first millennium goes from one to all, so that all may become one. That's the -- that's the slogan of the Church, thousand years, "that all may become one." The way of your life is that all become -- may become better. You always speak of a better world, which is only meaningful, you see, if not every one of us makes his own better world, but we all make together -- can make the world better. Therefore you first must be one in spirit.

So the world of the second millennium leads from "all men are already one, all are one," and now "all can become better." Therefore, gentlemen, if we now go to the third millennium, obviously the condition of any third millennium will be that we again shall have the cross of the second millennium in back of us. That must be stabilized as some background from which we all emerge for the next 16, 20, 32 generations, so that everyone born in the third millennium will -- may be able to look back to the second millenium as achievement, as something we have. Otherwise, we would have all lost -- lose it again and have lived in vain. Just as

every American thinks that he is beyond Europe, beyond the religious wars, beyond the squabbles of the denominations, and is therefore the heir of Christendom, so I would suggest, gentlemen, that your grandchildren should be brought up with the conviction that they're the heirs of progress. Their background must be civilization. This whole talk today about civilizations that come and go, gentlemen, have this very reason: that we try to ci- -- look back on civilization as something we had, as something we can be sure of, to go onto something -- to better things. And we'll see that civilization can just as well be an aim as a beg- -- as a basis. And the problem of the third millennium then is, gentlemen, to make the goal of the second millennium the starting point of the third millennium.

What does this mean, gentlemen? We must transform the end into the beginning. The final goal into the basis. And since this has happened before, that the Church for progressive secular nations became that which they had, and on which they could build the discovery of America, and the invention of the automobile, so in the same sense, we today -- I suggest -- take it for granted that we can invent. Progress is there, not going to stay, but to go on. But what of it? If you allow me to make the same change as I did when I said, instead of "Church" as a goal, we say "Christendom" as a background. Can you understand what I'm driving at? In the same sense, I would suggest that you say progress as a goal has to become civilization as a basis. We assume that we are civilized. It may be wrong, but let's assume this for the moment. Then we would have two heritages. We would have the heritage of some -- some form of Christendom, in the -- great mass, and we would have the other background, which belonged to the civilized people. And the civilized people would have the three criteria: that they had discovered the world, that they could invent, and that they consisted of national groups. This would be the story of the third -- the second millennium in concentrated form. It would ins- -- include the power to reform. It would include the power to progress. It would include the power to go on a crusade against the barbarians, who threaten to forget the two first millennia. The crusader would be the one who re-establishes the acquisition of the first millennium. The reformer would be he who would look at the Church for its degeneration, you see, and take it to task to bring it back to its original purity. And the progressive man would be the -- he who can make things better and, you see, work for a better world to come.

But gentlemen, you and I live then by daily inventions, by { } national groups, and by the crusading spirit, and that -- that is, we would have to live as we live today, gentlemen. And we can't live the way we live today, because once

you invent invention, gentlemen -- you must take this now down dogmatically, because in this course I cannot deal with it at greater length: the law of the end -- of the era in inven- -- of invention -- in inventing inventions, of technological progress, as you know it, entails that man loses his home, his allegiances, his loyalties every day, because the law of invention runs as follows, gentlemen: every technological invention -- I don't know if I mentioned it here -- accelerates -- yes, did we? Wie? -- accelerates the time. You can drive in a car quicker than you can in a horse and buggy. So there is some speed, the advantage of any invention. You turn on the electric light instead of drilling fire out of a stick and a stone. And therefore you save time. All our technological devices are time-saving devices in some form or other, otherwise they wouldn't be made. Then gentlemen, you make space larger on which you depend. Any invention connects you with the oil in Arabia now, or with the uranium in Saxony, or with electric power at the Boulder Dam. That is, any invention lengthens the space, or widens the space on which you depend. Can't be helped. Any invention makes you more dependent on manufacturing, on raw materials, on energies that are found some other place in the world. You can eat oranges now, fresh from California; but therefore, California is nearer to you now than the next town in Vermont. The farmer, as you know, even today eats his but- -- gets his butter from Boston here in New Hampshire, back, because he doesn't make the butter. He has no time for this. He just sends away the milk. And he buys his apples on a truck that comes from the next big city, because he has no time to spray his own apple trees anymore, and all the apple trees in -- in Vermont and New Hampshire go to seed as you know, and have their tent caterpillars.

In other words, gentlemen, the law of invention means for human beings that they live in a wider area in geographical sense, that they save time, and that therefore the group in which they could live before the invention was made is destroyed. Where you had neighbors in your neighborhood, before with whom you worked together and whose fruit and whose produces you bought, like the eggs from your neighbor, today you buy your store eggs from the -- which come from a wide area whose -- whose extent perhaps you don't even know. And you have nothing to do with your neighbor. You get your electricity from the Green Mountain Power pl- -- or the New England Power. And therefore you don't get it from the woodlot of your neighbor, where he cuts his wood, so that you can fire your -- your oven, because now you have an electric range, and you don't depend on his wood, anymore.

So will you take down this law, gentlemen? The end of the second millennium leaves man under the law that every invention speeds up his life, widens the space and destroys the group -- any group, all the time. So poor Dartmouth at

one time had its students from New Hampshire and Vermont. Now it has its -- then it had its students from New England. And now we have a nationwide college registration. So the consequence is that yesterday a gentleman of -- who is your colleague came over to my house and stated that after three years in Dartmouth, it was the first time that he had crossed the Connecticut River into Norwich, which is to say that the group was destroyed on which Dartmouth College was founded, because it was founded, as you must remember, on the unity of Vermont and New Hampshire. And they were always treated equally, so to speak, in the membership of this college. Now if you have two students from New Hampshire, and two students from Vermont and vice versa, it's much. Who is from New Hampshire, in this class? Who is from Vermont? Interesting. Not one. So the group is destroyed.

This is -- you live in a vacuum, in a total vacuum in Dartmouth College. It's a suburb of New York, and the other 47 states. That's what Hanover is at -- for you. It's a suburb. And suburb is nowhere. It's groupless. Any suburb -- what is a suburb? A suburb is a community which has no center of gravity inside itself. And a community is a place which has a center of gravity inside itself. So you live in a -- in no community when you come here to Da- -- to Hanover. You live in a suburb. And it is accidental that this is 7 hours from -- from -- sub- -- from -- from New York. It could be half an hour; it could be 20 hours from New York. It would still have the same indefinite character of a destroyed community. Gentlemen, that's very serious, because it could, if you take it seriously, give you the clue to the third millennium. Only you have to realize it. All your sentimentality of Dart- -- about Dartmouth prevents you from understanding what you -- are missing compared to the boys who had to split their winter wood themselves 80 years ago, and who therefore depended on the fruitfulness of the -- of the -- the wealth of the woods, of the timber of this state. They had a natural relation to the wood that grew around them, because they made their own firewood. You get the oil. You have no relation to anything that goes on in this -- in this state.

But that's all over the globe, gentlemen. It's in Tokyo. It's in Yokohama, It's in Buenos Aires. There was a man, a Mr. {Kahn}, in Paris 50 years ago. He made his money because he foresaw that these big st- -- cities all over the world would have the same fate. And he bought the suburban land, the suburban real estate around Buenos Aires, around Rio de Janeiro, around Montevideo, around Yokohama, around Tokyo. And he became immensely rich. And in order to pay back for his wealth, he made an endowment. He created traveling fellowships for scholars in Europe, and they were allowed to travel two or three years all

over the world and get acquainted, and make their studies. And one of these people I happen to know, who got this fellowship. He's a professor in Geneva, Switzerland, at this moment. And he said to me, "Well, I have taken this trip around the world. And I am very grateful to Mr. {Kahn}, but to tell you frankly, what I saw was very depressing, because it was -- what I found was ..." he's an economist, "... that it was everywhere exactly the same life which the people are going to lead in the future. There is no distinction between Tokyo and Buenos Aires. No distinction between New York and Montevideo. They are equally stupid. They are equally hang -- hung up and it's the same human vacuum. They are all without a center of gravity within the community in which they allegedly live, they are all suburbs, of suburbs, of suburbs. Everything seems to be just a big real estate development." That was the impression this man had, when I met him. And that must have been in 1929, or '28. It's even worse, now.

So gentlemen, the world offers the same conditions, as you have it here, everywhere now, because of technological progress. Because this law prevails. And you must take this law as the sum of the wisdom of the last thousand years. The world has become one. Space is conquered. That's perhaps the dogma which you have to accept for the second millennium. Space is conquered. Anybody who takes space seriously today is a fool. You cannot base your politics on national differences or local differences. You have to think as though space is already one, because you can telephone around the globe, you can fly around the globe within one day, practically -- I mean, theoretically not only, but nearly practically. You know, this nurse went around in 96 hours, which is not much less than -- than one day. It means -- it makes no difference, really. It was 96? What was it? Do you remember? She had the record -- holds the record for the last year -- in the last year she -- she went around. Of course, she never left the airport, you see. She just had to stay. And that was the condition. She got it as a premium, you see; but the poor girl, she had to stay and eat sandwiches all the time.

Now, this is then man's situation. He lives on the whole globe. He has no partitions between the cold one world and himself. Therefore, gentlemen, to this man who comes out of civilization, who has civilization as his background, who says, "Well that's behind me. Civilized -- I'm civilized. I'm progressive," or you can say it passively, "I'm progressed." Because technology progresses for you and me. We don't progress ourselves. But with television, you have progressed without doing anything. Can you understand? We are made to progress very much against our will. There is a centrifugal movement going on in human society. Man is centrifugally thrown off his native groups. His family, his friends, his neighbors, he has to change, because he is shifting his work to another place. He

goes to a factory somewhere out West, and he has to go -- move this man to wake up, yes. What can we do for you? I have no coffee.

(I'm sorry.)

I thought I could -- wie?

And therefore, gentlemen, this -- the third millennium has to combat the centrifugal tendencies of life. Centrifugal, that you have no center of gravity, and therefore we'll pay anything to be re-integrated. The centrifugal power then we'll put here. And we'll say, "Man is threatened by disintegration." The world has become so strong, we have discovered it so totally, that where you have the world as -- to be discovered -- you remember here, in this cross, we had the world as the world to be discovered, the world to be discovered. We have now the world to get out, because this world is swallowing it up, totally. We become so -- pieces of the world, pieces of statistics, pieces of science, pieces of some observed psychology, objects, guinea pigs, whatever you think of yourself, but centrifugally. Marx has said of capitalism that it estranges men from himself -- themselves. So this estrangement you find in all ways of life. Invention estranges you from yourself, because as soon as you serve an automat, as soon as you use an electric power plant, as soon as you drive a car, you have to follow abstract rules of driving this car. You cannot tame the car as you could tame your own horse to do a trick. This car is the same for everybody, therefore you have to become objective to yourself. You can no longer be subjective and follow your own tastes. You buy a Ford car, you have to comply with the rules of the Ford car. And so with all the -- other machinery, gentlemen, take it down: the bigger the machinery, the less you can be at variance with any of the rules of the game. Is this clear? The bigger the machinery, the less deviation is possible in a personal way. If you -- if you move a -- a dog-cart, you can go in zig-zag on the road. If you could do this with a Ford at 90 miles, or with a Cadillac, you see, the police would take away your license.

The larger the world in which we move and the bigger the machinery, the less can we deviate from the objective rules of the world, from the natural laws, the technological laws. Therefore, more and more do we become cogs on the wheel, as we say, or numbers that are exchangeable. Or we become expendables in a large army. And all -- all these modern expressions go to prove that man is less and less able to assert his differences, because the bigger the natural powers which you try to master, the more inexorable are their demands on your objective {handling}. You see, you can abuse your cat, but you cannot abuse the Boulder Dam. You see that?

So gentlemen, the danger from the outer world is that this world impinges on us, encroaches on us. Before, we said in the Church you have to renounce a part of the world, voluntarily. You have to omit certain things. In the -- century of progress, you went out into this wonderful unknown world and discovered the dark continent like Stanley, who died 50 years ago, as you may have seen in the papers, and in whose memory the English and the Belgians had a great celebration. I wonder why the -- Americans didn't have. He's a -- was a great man, this man Stanley, who crossed the -- Africa from -- from east to west.

Well, that's far away. There is nothing much to be discovered anymore, in Africa. They have the Mau Mau instead. Now the Mau Mau are an effort to integration. They're quite serious, gentlemen. You have -- everywhere in the world you have these fascist movements who promise people warmth and integration, with different means. But don't be betrayed, gentlemen. The Mau Mau are highly { } -- modern. We have here the same thing in several forms in this country. I won't give any names. It means that there is a tremendous zest for integration. You hear this word. Instead of converting people, or -- which nobody believes anymore, people promise you integration, participation. Even the modern psychologist has to promise you some kind of participation, as they call it, which is integration, membership.

Gentlemen, the best way -- word, however, which we have to use according to the laws of our wider historical understanding is "initiation," "entrée." Put the word "entrance" and put then for this the Latin word, "initiation." Man begins today with not belonging, and therefore he wants to end up with belonging. That's so very strange. When you are conscious at 20, you do not belong; but you feel rather cold and you want to be- -- begin to belong. Therefore, gentlemen, we find ourselves in a very strange, topsy-turvy world. And therefore we have to revive the old tribes, because the tribes understood one thing: initiation. That's what they -- were they founded for. They were, as you remember, founded for initiating people into families. Therefore, today initiation, or if you prefer the simple word, entrance, entrée -- give you -- give a man an entrée, an entrance, you see, somewhere is the -- in demand. Many forms this takes today. But you have to look through all the var- -- var- -- varieties of this experience. The great experience a man wants to make today is to be made a member of something, where he really belongs, because there is so very little things to which he can belong. The family is a bundle of people who don't belong to each other, under the modern psychoanalytical system. They are just getting -- they cramp each other's style. There was a very nice article the other day in the paper, "My Family Cramps My Style." It's true, it does. And as I said, the family can be defined as a

group of people who don't belong to each other. And certainly families are not there for -- to stay. They are not eternal. And if you try to sentimentalize the family and say it's something eternal, you are dead wrong. The family is there to be dissolved. You have to grow up. If you do not cut the strings of your mother's apron, you will make her miserable, and yourself, and your wife and the rest of it. And you'll get a divorce. In order to stay married, you have to cut the -- your mother's apron strings very radically, which you do not like to do. That's why you get the divorce. You see, coward first, doesn't help. You then have to be the coward later. The -- insolent later and get the divorce where you shouldn't, because you hadn't had the courage to emancipate yourself from your mother first. And vice versa. The daughter has to emancipate herself from her father in order to get married to her husband, which she also doesn't like to do. So gentlemen, families are not eternal. That's why we today cannot simply be initiated into families. We have to be -- however acquire the power of being initiated at all. The group, which group, how many groups, that's a later question. But the first thing is that out of your -- the cold world of Buenos Aires, New York, Cincinnati, and even Chicago and Detroit, people must learn to initiate others and themselves into warm groups, where people belong. We are lost if we can't do this. Nobody can live as a human being on the whole of the planet without going crazy.

I advise you to read this early -- early experience of an American, in Henry James' book, *The American*. Has anybody read it? You remember Mr. Newman? You see? Mr. Newman is such a man who desperately looks for an entrée, you see, and he misses it. He understands. He is -- he is absolutely alone, so he hovers then in -- in Paris, because no entrée, no entrance, you see, no initiation. And that is -- stands written over all of your lives -- my life, too, gentlemen -- this problem of -- of having an entrée. I advise you all to read this book. It's so old, gentlemen, that it is most modern. Never read a modern book if you can help it. The only books at your age you should read are the very old books. And this isn't even old enough, quite. But it has discovered the problem of the future man. *The American* was written after the Civil War, and it is the most modern American book you can read. It's much more modern than Hemingway, much more modern than -- than Thornton Wilder, because it's great art. And a whole life has been absorbed in it. It is not a bestseller. But it's a -- it's real literature, gentlemen. And literature is prophetic. And the literature of this -- of Henry James, although he was certainly not a very great poet, has this very noble quality of still being prophetic. By the way, his -- his -- there came out his book on America, his journeys in this country when he returned here from England. I advise you to read this, too, it's a very fine book on the American scene. Has anybody read that?

Who has read Henry James, anyway? What did -- what have you read?

(The Ambassadors.)

Wie?

(The Ambassadors.)

Well. I don't know that. So that's still before me. What have you read?

(The Ambassadors.)

Why does one read that?

(I -- well, I don't know. I just happened to -- I was coming back from Europe, and I wanted a book to read. And the -- I went into the bookstore and the only book I could find in English was *The Ambassadors* by Henry James, you know.)

Now, you promise me to read *The American*, will you?

(Yes, Sir. I will.)

Good. Because I think that in a -- in this poignant way in which literature can condense a worldwide problem into one person, one soul, you see, and one little life -- that is the grandeur of literature, that you can see in the chalice of one flower, in the life of one man the whole destiny of mankind. You can see in this *American*, if you read it with elucidated and illuminated eyes, you can see your own fate, your own problem, your own destiny. It's very strange that the book, you see, when I read it first, didn't have this impact on me. Now I more and more -- s- -- can see, you see, the clear- -- clarity of the perception. That the *American*, you see, is uprooted and begins where the European ends, so to speak. The European is uprooted now, but he always thought he had roots, you see. The *American* always knew that he was a pioneer and had -- was -- had been uprooted, and always knew that his problem was to get -- put roots down.

It has been said that all Europeans, gentlemen, have a fatherland or a motherland, patrie, you see, or "motherland," that all Americans treat the -- this country, America, as their daughter. They endow it. That's the word from "dowry," you see, as you treat your daughter. That's very beautiful. Stick to that, gentlemen, and you will find an explanation of the distinction of America from the rest of the world. This country begins with man alone and allows him to found a coun-

try and to endow it, so that the country is younger than the man. My -- your country is your daughter-land. It is much better to call America "the daughter of the Americans" in the same sense as the French call their -- France their "father-land," you see, than to try to call America the fatherland, which it isn't. It's just funny, if you try to make it into that.

That's very important because it shows you already that America belongs to the third millennium by this one change, you see, legerdemain, by this one transformation. Here already civilization is so much the beginning of your and my existence and technological progress that we already are faced with this problem of integration, and it is a slogan here much more than any other part of the world. And I only offer you this word "initiation" as a step forward, because nobody knows what integration means, really. It could be something mechanical. But initiation is quite clear, because it means to be the member of a group of equals. You are not integrated into buildings. You can be integrated into an environment which is dead, but initiated you can only be into a living group, you see, in which you make a beginning and speak to living people. I warn you against the term "integration." Use "disintegration" as freely as you can, because we disintegrate, because we are surrounded by dead -- dead forms and dead matter. But this whole slogan today of being integrated I do not believe in at all, because, gentlemen, initiated we are only where we can speak to each other. And integration is too mechanical, too naturalistic, too technological -- a concept. Integration is -- can be mute and can be deaf. And that is now no good.

Mr. McCarthy wants to integrate you, but that isn't good enough. You have to be initiated. And for this you have to use your own word, and your own judgment, and your own initiative. The word "initiative" and "initiation" fortunately goes together. But you cannot -- integrated you could be by the baking process. The raisins in the -- in the pie, they are all integrated in the -- into the pie. But these unfortunate raisins, you see, have nothing to say in the matter.

Now, gentlemen, what is the general direction then of the third millennium? A man who begins to be initiated again, to enter upon his own path of life, under his own steam, is on the way of becoming complete again. The re-integration, or the re-completing, the re-fulfillment of the man means that from now on you and I are striving for being the total. Totality is the great category of the third millennium. It isn't enough that you are a cog on the wheel. That's where we begin. Every one of us has a job. Every one of us is only a little fraction of the whole process of -- on the technological process of the world. But you and I must be striving all the time of becoming more complete. You begin with one job, but you must write poetry, and you must be in politics, and you must compose

music, and you must dance with your children, and you must run the race in your athletics. That is, you must become more and more complete. Totality or completeness is the -- for the individual member of this new world the great problem. It isn't enough to be initiated into a -- for your own group of clerks, or junior executives of the Chamber of Commerce. You must be initiated into the Marine corps. You must be initiated into friendship, into politics, into church life, and the more you do this, the more complete you become, the more you represent mankind. And it is this representation that one man must be able to stand for the whole which today is the demand.

Otherwise the individual becomes worthless, thin, anemic, nervous, neurotic. All the modern neuroses are schizophrenia. Now what is schizophrenia, gentlemen? That part of you isn't taken up by society. They only know a little part of you, and you can only show to the world, you see, one part of yourself. And you become schizoid, because the part you believe in as important of yours, can never be shown to the rest of the world. That's schizophrenia. Very simple. The more -- division of labor, the more uprootedness you get, the more schizophrenia you get, because nine-tenths of your real being is never spoken to by the community. And they only talk to you as though you were somebody you are not interested in, yourself, you see. They think you are Mr. Smith. In fact, you are the greatest poet of the century, but you have no occasion to use it.

Schizophrenia, gentlemen, is not a physical disease, and it is not an individual disease. It's a social disease. And that's why America today is -- has more mental diseases than any other country of the world. This is mentally the most diseased country, because it is socially more disintegrated. All your mental illnesses, gentlemen, all the cases that go to Mr. McKenna that are not individual cases, that's American society.

And therefore, I think you go to the wrong man, when you go to the psychiatrist. The poor man cannot alter the social conditions under -- you have to live, and to love, and to marry, and to bring up your children.

Well, that is one of the chapters that will have to be re-written. This con- -- total, you see today you -- we apply to the social diseases of disintegration the little means of the second millennium of natural science. And the people take -- you -- you -- talk to you when you are mentally sick and go down to Brattleboro with your nervous breakdown, as though your machinery was out of order; whereas in reality, society has not been able to make you enter it, which is something totally different. It's a living process of a whole living body of mankind, and they try to pin you down with your cardiogram, and your blood test,

and waste \$1500 on all the tests of your liver and your bladder and they find nothing. Absolutely nothing, except that you are schizoid. But the doctor is schizoid, too. Why should he not? It's the fashion today.

Gentlemen, if you do not take this step into the third millennium, that is what happens to you, that the diseases produced by the second millennium will then be cured by the instruments of the second millennium. That is, the disease is used then as a cure. And that's why -- how we have to live at this moment, you, and your children, and your d- -- your sisters, that the remedies offered you are the poisons -- that have poisoned you, because you are disintegrated. So they say, "Analyze yourself," so they get you more disintegrated, for example, and so on and so forth.

Therefore, to take you over into the third millennium means to allow the remedies to grow where they must be plucked from, from trees -- from the tree of everlasting life, of reproduction, of the totality of man, and not from this tree of more machinery in investigating your little toe. Your little toe is all right, but your belonging is not all right. You belong nowhere, so you fall sick.

Now we have now nearly completed the Cross of Reality of the third millennium. We can call it negatively, or positively. It is more cautious in the beginning of any period to say what is -- does not exist. Then we do not mortgage the future with our own prejudices and illusions. Now, what does not exist is -- initiation. So the lack of initiation, the lack of initiative, the lack of en- -- entrée, and the lack of belonging is generally felt. You have here -- as I said, you have lost your own center of gravity. That is the best -- better definition, I think, than "disintegration," but I won't quarrel about the term. We have lost -- and we lose every day again our re-acquired group. As soon as you reproduce a new invention -- take television. Suddenly you will depend on Mount Washington. Mount Washington, except for skiing or summer trips did not exist for you. But at this moment, when you have television in Hanover, or will have, you see, the fact that television must function on Mount Washington makes Mount Washington suddenly a part of the universe in which you live. And the little power station here, down in -- in your -- in the college plays a lesser part, because you no longer { } radio, but you want to have your power -- your television station for which you now depend on Manchester, New Hampshire, but then you will on -- on Mount Washington.

Now the financing of Mount Washington television station is a much bigger thing again than the financing of the Manchester station. It's much more expensive. Therefore it draws capital from larger parts of the world, and so the anony-

mous relations of that instrumentality on which you belong is vastly expanded and much more over your head and less under your control than when you had the house organ and played your morning chorale, you see, yourself. Or if you fiddled it -- when you have your own violin, you see, in your house; or better still, the days -- the good days when you sang and used your own voice and didn't depend on any instrument whatsoever for praising your creator.

The human voice is still our best equipment. And you will find that whenever people today over the world want to re-integrate and initiate something, they try to rebuild a capella singing. Just instinctively they try to get away from the big orchestra and from Mr. Stokowski and his fabulous "Fantasia," you see, this great nonsense of our time. Who has heard "Fantasia"? It's a scandal, you see. That's second millennium. Complete uprootedness. Complete disintegration for the listener. Ev- -- a cocktail -- of everything. That's what it is, a cocktail party. A complete waste of all the genius of all times. There was only one columnist who protested this in this country. I now hold it very much in her honor, because she risked her whole reputation. It was Dorothy Thompson who said, "That's the end of civilization." And it is. And we are through with civilization, because civilization is killing your and my taste. And therefore we have -- you have to begin with a capella singing. And even the Dartmouth Glee Club is good for something. They sing very well now. Remarkable, because a cap- -- the human voice is the first beginning again of belonging, of membership. We belong where we sing together. That's very simple, gentlemen. It's the law. We don't belong by tickets and -- and registrations and subscriptions, and so on. We belong where we can sing together.

Now what is the general direction? I said the direction is to the completeness of the single man. The "whole man," President Hopkins used to call it. The old Christians said that the end of time would be fulfilled if all of Christ would be seen dancing, instead of just on the Cross. That would be the total man. If you all could dance through life, and go through the Cross and suffer, this wide combination, that was the vision of the old fathers of the Church. Christ in His dance, the cosmic dance of great joy and great delight; and yet, the willingness to suffer for His brothers. That's { } absurdity. But gentlemen, just think that the old tribes had this enchantment. The word "enchantment" is a very good word. "Enchantment" means to be chanted into the total life. Enchantment, you see. And you should sing yourself and dance yourself into enthusiasm, and if you -- if you don't, gentlemen, you remain cold. Nobody can be initiated by sending three dollars' -- subscription fee to a -- to a club or to an association. There has to be a little more fire in your initiation. You have to do something about it. At least have a square dance.

So don't mistake it. Initiation does not mean the usual, lukewarm participation of the modern psychology department. It means much more. It means that something gets hold of you, and shakes you up, so that you feel that you are more whole now than you were {made} before. Something must be added to your stature by initiation. You must be somebody who had not been before. You see, your whole ambition is now to sit back and never do -- be surprised by yourself and to do only what you want to do. You want to do what you please, gentlemen. So you never can change and be bigger than you have been before. Anybody who can only do what he wills, and plans, and wants to do, remains exactly the same idiotic bore he has been before. If you only do what you want to do, gentlemen, then you had better not do anything, because what you want to do, you see, what you already know that you can do isn't worth doing. That's dead. Anybody who only wants to do what he can do, gentlemen, has ceased living, because life means to be transformed into forms which -- of which you before you did not know that you could ever attain.

Do you think I ever knew in my -- the beginning of my life that I would be able to deliver this lecture? Of course not. I'm very much surprised that I can. Everybody must do better than he knew he could. That's initiation. Initiation, gentlemen, is entering upon that form of yourself of which you alone were not capable. You can -- must be initiated into this form which only friends, only love, only another group, a new country, a new party, a new religion can -- how do you say? can -- impart to you. To be initiated means to be -- how do you say? to -- yes -- to be imparted? No, we couldn't say this, to have imparted to oneself qualities, you see, which we by our own will can not produce. Is that possible English? Yes. To have imparted to yourself that which your own nature cannot give you. That is the formula of baptism in the -- in the Church. That this, what nature cannot give you, be imparted to you by this blessing in the name of the Trinity. That's a very profound thing. Most people don't understand christening. They think it's a ceremony. Gentlemen, it is not. It is a fundamental rule for all initiations, that is only condensed and expressed there in the first initiation. A child is christened so that it may from now own know how to be initiated. That is, christening, baptism is that universal formula under which you know what it means ever to be initiated into your marriage, into your friendship, into your fraternity. It always means that you will see what nature cannot give, your { }, you see, what has not yet been inside of you before you became a member, participating in a -- in a metabolism, in a bloodstream, in a circulation of thought, without which you could never learn who you were, because you were before this so much poorer, so much the narrower, so much ...

[tape interruption]

... you're not sitting here in this class except by initiation. You couldn't understand one word of mine, if you hadn't been slowly and -- initiated into all this, by which you are more than you were born when you came out of your mother's womb. To that self, I couldn't say anything.

So gentlemen, this is then the -- the new Cross of Reality: the whole man, by constant acts of initiation, constantly saved from disintegration, and constantly pushed forward by technological progress. The technological progress precipitates my time, because it is -- speeds up. I have more time, and therefore more reason to commit crimes since -- and foolishnesses. Having too much time is a -- is a curse. And it is a curse for most people today.

To live today a hundred years, gentlemen, with your life insurance expectation, you see, is more difficult than to die at 30. What do you do with the other 70 years? You really don't know. You are bored stiff. Don't think that the prolong-- elongation, the extension of the life expectation of modern man is not a terrible thing. Think of all the old people who now live on the old-age insurance plan. They'll become the slaves of the young. One day the young, they who have waited on us will say, "That's too much for us." And they'll cancel old-age insurance. We have no savings. We have no fund. It's a great swindle in this country as you know, what it goes on. We have an old-age insurance which is just drawn on -- on the annual budget. All the money I pay in for old-age insurance, or my -- the employer does, is just spent by Uncle Sam in the -- in the current year. We live under such a bubble, that the South Sea Bubble of 1721, and the -- Law of -- you know, of John Law in Scotland, this great bubble there of the finance -- the financiers of the 18th century, it's just small fry against what we are committing at this moment in this country. There is no reserves for paying the people who now have to live 40 years longer than before. And it is an incredible swindle. And that's called democracy. It's the greatest demagoguery I know. It's a shame. And it's against the law, because the idea was, of course, originally that this would be built up to a fund. And there would be some reserves somewhere. It's very difficult, I know, to build up these reserves outside of the daily -- the daily business cycle. But what we have done in this country, is simply cheating ourselves. We have said, "Oh, we don't put anything aside." We -- you see, we take every cent, that by the -- a whole generation is now paid in annually, you see, from their savings, and use it up every day. Do you think that's such a -- that is progress? That is the -- that is the -- the misunderstanding of the acceleration of {the} invention to the liv- -- life -- sphere of life. I mean, the government spends

every year at a terrific speed, which should really serve 30 or 40 years. There you see what the application of this misunderstanding of the law of technology means.

If you do not understand that when life is accelerated, time-saving devices are {invented}, and when space is widened and the group is destroyed, you have immediately to re-build small groups, at slow pace, and intimate homeliness, coziness -- you mistake life. Gentlemen, you and I need homes. We need intimacy. We need small groups. We need slow pace. We need patience. And the two things are today -- absolutely -- how would I say -- poked fun at, just poked fun at. The government does this by treating -- our savings, not as something sacred and belonging to you and me, but by putting it in the big pot and using it up as it goes. Will there be a government of the United States in 30 years? Very doubtful. The Russians { }. There is then no right, no claim, of any one of us to his private property. And yet, it's my own money, and later it will be your own money which you have paid in for this { }. It's all -- and then this -- we are against Communism. Gentlemen, this country is much more communistic than Russia. What do you think? Our economy is absolutely living from day to day on a mad basis. That is, with the idea that there will be an Uncle Sam in the center of the world in Washington for the next 70 years, and he'll take care of you when you are 70. Isn't this dependent on a plan? Isn't this Communism? Don't be betrayed by all these slogans. Mr. Priestley, the author of the beautiful book, *So Green Is My Valley* -- who knows it? *So Green Is My Valley*. It's {already been -- it's just five years old}, so you didn't see it. Have you seen the movie, *So Green Is My Valley*? Well, he wrote a wonderful article and said he couldn't discover the distinction between America and Russia, for the life of him. Both were so big, that man was lost in them. And I -- he didn't see why we should choose between Communism and capitalism -- it meant Russia and America. Because for an Englishmen, they both {were the Devil}. And they were equally believers in technology. And technology meant that man had, you see, no prospects of initiation, no prospects of re-integration, no prospects of re-inspiration. Certainly nobody would dance, either in Russia or in America, in the streets -- or the sidewalks of New York.

Gentlemen, be very serious. Don't be betrayed by these slogans of the day. America and Russia are at this moment both trying to uproot the individual, to steal his intimacy. They are driven to this, by their large size of their country, by the bigness of our inventions. It's a good -- bad of the good. I don't disclaim the greatness of this country, gentlemen, but you must understand the need to build into this bigness something intimate and small is more {crying} than ever. Can you understand this?

And I -- I assure you, in the -- in the old-age problem, we'll have a tremendous catastrophe. And you will live to solve this problem, you see. Will you then -- let { }, will you not say that there are too many old people? We'll just have to have them down. We can't afford it. We are the wage earners. We are making the living. We are doing the work. And here are these people over 70. And you suddenly then will draw a trench sep- -- separating Florida from the rest of the United States, and let the people in Florida fend for themselves with their oranges. Well, it's a solution. But I mean, you must not think that human cruelty will stop when it comes to a crisis, and the age groups in this country will all be put up against each other. Ten years ago, there was already the Ham and Eggs Plan. Have you heard of Townsend Plan? It is forgotten. But that was an old-age movement, you see, trying to -- to salvage the rights of the old age, you see, to protect them against their { }.

The problem of the dependents of people who now will reach these tremendous ages, you see, on the -- on the -- on the earning power of the younger isn't solved, yet. It could only be solved if we would build up funds that would express the independence of these rights. But as long as you make the old people completely dependent on the daily election, gentlemen, in the { }, you see, the tyranny. You will have four years from now already the slogan, you see, of one party saying, "We will -- we will free all the fathers of families, you see, from half of the income tax, by no longer paying the old insurance." Very tempting. You all have four or five children during the next five years, as it goes now, you see, and these fathers of the large families can say, "Well, we have to support four children. Shall we otherwise also support -- maintain the luxury of great-, great-, great-grandparents?" You know what they have written, "As old as Methuselah." They have proclaimed that men can now live to be 150. Shocking. Idiotic. Complete disintegration. You -- you cannot live alone at 150. Your whole question is then: How are you then initiated into the life of the younger generation? Because what a curse it would be, to have to live up to 150, you see, and having no other dealings with the fourth generation away from you, except money. Because then the money would very soon be taken from you. And you have no teeth, and you {have your third} denture, and you wouldn't be able to do anything about it. You couldn't fight back.

No, gentlemen, the future of mankind is very dark. Not very agreeable, to -- to meditate about. If you ever { } the individual family, the individual family can love the grandparents, and even the great-grandparents, and if you can distribute the society in such a way again that an old man and an old woman belong to their grandchildren, you see, or to their -- the friends, the personal, spiritual

grandchildren, so to speak, then you are safe. But if you make them depend on the election issue, and what the gov- -- {Congress} decides, they are not safe. Do you see the difference? Therefore you need an intimate group again. You need the intimate group for bringing up the young. You need the intimate group for protecting the old. Because if they -- belong somewhere in a small way, they may feel safe. But as long as the old man at 90 will depend on the next election issue and on the budget plans of the next president -- oooh!

Think if Jim Roosevelt has to decide whether his grandmother gets a pension. This is all very serious, gentlemen. The small group is the only protection you and I have, you see, that our lives' record totally lost, that we haven't lived in vain. You and I cannot impregnate the large society of 2 billion men with your virtues, and your record, and your memories, and your -- any respect. You have to belong somewhere that people remember you and love you. Isn't this obvious? Otherwise, it's just like water. Everything is forgotten. There is no indelible pencil then in the record of your life.

John Quincy Adams, gentlemen -- let me close today with this -- John Quincy Adams had been the President of the United States. He had been the inventor of the Monroe Doctrine. He had -- claimed Florida for the United States. He has many other merits. He had saved the Louisiana Purchase from being turned down. He was -- had been secretary of state. He had been ambassador to -- to London. He had signed the peace treaty in 1815 with England. And when he was in -- as a representative of -- in Congress, in the House of Representatives, in 1836, '37, a newspaper wrote: "What a spectacle. He is treated in this Congress as a man who has no record whatsoever, who's unknown. Just Mr. -- Mr. John Quincy Adams from Quincy, Massachusetts. And I -- he -- they ask, isn't it anomalous? Isn't it -- is it thinkable in any other country that the former President of the United States is here treated in this Congress of newcomers, of no -- man without a memory, as an absolute nobody?"

So you see, gentlemen, in this country through the immigrants, and the total change of the constituency of the country, we have had this problem of uprootedness and forgetfulness all the time. Things are just forgotten. And that happened in 1837. And technological progress, gentlemen, has this quality of obliterating anything that is only impressive within a smaller group. You cannot leave a record in a country of 160 million dollars -- dollars, {I'm sorry} -- 160 million people, you see, on the whole. Too many people every day crowd the newspapers. So you have to be a big stinker before you get the -- you make the headlines, you see. Public enemy Number 1, or some such thing may get the public

sympathy. But as individual, you just can't do it.

So gentlemen, the initiation problem is the tribal problem. And we are back to the original beginnings of the human race. The tribal group gave man this intimacy -- there -- where he was totally known, and where he could exact -- enact all his faculties. He could be dancer, and chieftain, and warrior, and sorcerer, and hunter, and planter, and husband, and -- and son, and father to the full. And it is not accidental, gentlemen, that we are interested in -- today in anthropology, and ethnology, and prehistory, because in this vast, modern technological world, the great society must be replenished, and re-braced by small groups. Soci- -- that is, gentlemen, we have now the formula with which I want to conclude today. Our third millennium must be the -- a worldwide society renewed by the most intimate small groups. That's a paradox, but if we can't solve this, that is not a world in which it is -- would be, you see, would be -- good to live. So this large world which we are building must be revived by small groups. That's not a contradiction in terms, but it is the taking-up of the heritage of the first millennium and before our era. So at the beginning of time, man grew up because of the warmth of this womb of his tribe. And today where we have the world, gentlemen, you have to put -- build into this world the little groups. And we will call then -- say then this, gentlemen, "group" of the third millennium must be understood in the light of the tribe, of the first beginnings of history. That is, the future groups must have features of initiation, and of solidarity, and of enthusiasm, and of sacrifice which relate this group to the beginnings of our group life on earth, because the problem -- the ending word -- the goal, gentlemen, is not, as I said, completeness only. It is not totality. It is not wholeness. It is re-vivification, because what we are -- have to lose is our vitality. And the tribes vivified, enthused -- deified, even -- men. And therefore put at the point -- pointing forward for the whole third millennium the one problem by which everything else will be measured is -- is it vivified? Is it champagne? You see, the campaign into the future is the campaign of champagne.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

[Opening remarks missing]

... thinks Christian -- Christ came into this world and changed everything -- how there is the -- where is the place of Greek, the Greek mind, the Greek reflecting mind. I can only do this -- deal with this in passing. But we have in the schools, of course, the universities, in the academic world, in your own college education, in what we call "education," we have given the Greek mind its humanistic place. You remember that we defined humanism as the going-between orders that for the time being still are separate. That's an important definition of humanism, gentlemen, which you find nowhere among the humanists, because the humanists, as all sects, deify themselves, and say humanism is the only true answer to life. So they cannot be satisfied with something that is obviously only a little element of life. We have however seen that the Greek contribution obviously can only be called a contribution.

Now the contribution, gentlemen, of education is -- at this moment, while you are seated here, your mind can wander. Your mind can look into your own parents' home and compare it to other parents' and people's customs and ways, and you can, like the -- Odysseus, in *The Odyssey*, where Homer begins, "Tell me the story of the man who saw the ways of many cities of man, and of many countries," you can hear here of many civilizations, of many ages, of many different ways of life. And gentlemen, therefore, humanism is always a half-way house between that civilization from which we come and the civilization which we have to found, and in between, you get oriented by looking at -- peeping through a keyhole of many other civilizations. That's why Mr. Spengler and Mr. Toynbee will always have a tremendous success in the academic world and will not move anybody who is -- really living, because you can't do anything with these people in life, but you can talk about them at the bull session and at the cocktail party in a college. A great advantage. They have no significance for real life, gentlemen. They have tremendous significance for the training of your minds, because they tell you of 23 different civilizations, and before you make up your mind what kind of a civilization you better found yourself, it is very interesting to hear of 23 others. But it is only before you make your own plunge. If it leads, as it does you pe- -- people in this country at this moment, to take no plunge, then humanism is doomed, or is damnable, because then it means that it mistakes itself as a deity, as a religion.

And many people in this country think that -- if you ask them, and they

answer you, "I am a humanist." Gentlemen, no one can be a humanist. You can only be a humanist in the {tempor- --} movements in between. In -- for the rest of your life, you have to be a Gentile, or a Jew, or a Christian. There are no other men. The humanist says, "I am a natural man." And I have tried to tell you that Gre- -- the Greek man is not a natural man, but a mental man. That is, a highly de-naturalized man, a man who has separated his mind from his body, and who can look into -- with his mind into other people's ways of life without any inner commitment himself.

The curse of you is that you think you are natural people, whereas you are mentally deracinated people, uprooted people. You allow your mind at the same time to think of Jews, and Christians, and Greeks, and pagans, and primitive man. But gentlemen, who are you? Do you kill? Do you make human sacrifices? Are you on Hitler's side? Are you on Stalin's side? Are you on Eisenhower's side? That's the question. Who are you? That doesn't depend on your mind. That depends on your actions. Are you going in -- to Korea and fight? You are. It doesn't matter what philosophy you have. The Greek mind is perfectly incapable of telling you whether you should fight or not fight.

So we have all these split, schizophrenic people in this country who say, "I'm a humanist," and then actually they are Ameri- -- good Americans. And to be an American has nothing to do with humanism, because humanism is the consideration how an American, a Frenchman, a Russian, and a German in their different ways behave, and how we can be understanding to each other while we still all the time remain in our various different apartments, shut in. A humanist is a man who can understand that a physicist must say this, and a minister must say this, and a judge must say this. But that doesn't help the judge, doesn't help the minister, and doesn't help the mathematician or the physicist, you see, because the physicist would like to know how he can be a better physicist; and the judge would like to know how he is a better judge; and the minister would like to know how he is a better minister. Whereas this { } of humanist says, "Oh, you are a minister. I know you always must defend the Virgin Birth." But perhaps the minister is just at that moment struggling -- trying to define -- re-define the Virgin Birth. The humanist prevents it, because he says, "Oh, I have learned this in my textbook. Ministers always have to say this. They have just always to say this. Frenchmen have always to like -- like good cooking. Englishmen never must like good cooking." Now here is an Englishmen who begins to cook well. He is doomed by the humanists, because humanists say, "All my understanding is based here -- on the assumption that -- that Englishmen only eat cold mutton and cheddar cheese."

No, gentlemen. Nobody can be a humanist except in his mind. And therefore, you can see at this moment that the fourth force of the Christian era is education. Because, gentlemen, since children go to school in a Christian school, they were allowed to study a foreign tongue, and to read texts of other peoples, as classics. It is the essence of the Christian era as compared to China, or Greece. That in Greece itself nobody ever was allowed to read a non-Greek text. Take this down, gentlemen. The difference between Greece itself and our renaissance of the Greek spirit is that in Greece, you only could read Greek text. The rest was barbarous. You know, the Greeks called all -- everybody a barbarian who did not speak Greek. We call anybody a barbarian who only speaks English. We assume that any man of education knows at least one other tongue. And gentlemen, as you know, at this moment, education is in bad shape, because for all practical purposes, the colleges have given up this language requirement. And as soon as there is no language requirement, and no Shakespeare, and no Bible in this college, the privileges of a college must go. You must work 12 months a day -- a year like anybody else, because the whole excessive privilege, which you enjoy at this moment, is based on the assumption that education takes you into a world which differs from your native world, because that's humanism. That's academic. To be steeped into another world, and therefore to become, you see, superior to the prejudices of your own jungle, of your own flock. And at this moment, Dartmouth College is just good for football. And the people outside the college play just as good football as you do. And there's no reason why you should only work eight months a year, {34} years. Why don't -- aren't you a mechanic? Why don't you work hard? It is much more reasonable, gentlemen, to go into business right away, instead of going to college today, because you learn neither Greek nor Latin, nor French, nor German, nor Russian. And what you learn in these languages allegedly, as you know, isn't worth anything. After one year you have forgotten it.

I always talk to people who said, "Oh yes, I had German, but that's two years ago." You don't learn anything. You no longer go -- are real college students. Now it's quite serious, gentlemen. In the year of our Lord 1954, I tried to show you, we live at -- in the evening-hour of the second thousand years of our era. That's quite serious. It is so. And that is the reason why this special chap- -- Greek chapter of education today drives to a close. Education has been the immersion into a non-native climate. And it has been based either on the reading of the Bible in the original tongue. A minister in the Protestant faith had to learn Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. A minister of the Catholic, Roman tradition, had to learn Latin, and even every layman had to learn some Latin for the Mass, and every monk, as you know, and they still do.

Therefore, the second tongue is the criterion of the humanistic study. At least the second. When Pontius Pilate crucified Jesus, he wrote on the Cross the word "Inri," as you know, "Inri," in three tongues. And he wrote it in the language of the Romans as -- the Greek text says -- doesn't say Latin. He says -- he wrote it in Roman, Greek, and Hebrew. And for this reason, for the last 1954 years, the token of a Greek, of an educated man has been the knowledge of these three languages: the language of prayer, of the religion; the language of philosophy; and the language of rule. That is, of world power, of mental power, and of divine power. And that's very serious, gentlemen. Hebrew, Latin, and Greek are not three arbitrary languages. But now you can understand that in these three languages, there has come upon you the heritage of antiquity, because with Israel there has come what we have called -- told, the creation of the messianic spirit, of the future. With Latin, there has come to you the empire sense, the power of the consuls, and of the Caesars, and of domination, and of justice, and of law. The power of Egypt, of the pharaohs. Caesar, not accidentally married Cleopatra. And Antony followed his example. And if you read Antony and Cleopatra -- Cleopatra, you must know that thereby you inherit antiquity in this special chapter of the wedding of East and West, of the unity of the global -- empire, and dominion. And in Greek, you have the spirit of humanism, of the schools. And in your own tradition, and your native tongue, you have your own family, your mother tongue, your clan.

And so, gentlemen, in the fact that down to 1900 anybody who went to Dartmouth College practically learned English. In that fact he inherited the traditions of the Germanic tribes and of his family life. In learning Latin, he inherited the whole tradition of the empires, of star-lore, of the palace and the throne of the right of kings, of authority; but also of professional skills of office, of civil service, of courts, of written law, of all these tremendous hierarchies of -- which are described in Troilus and Cressid in the great speech by Ulysses on what? What is the great -- greatest -- high point of Troilus and Cressid? Who has read it?

Oh. As I said, by -- at that moment, this is also my explanation of why this has been the most shoddy and shabby class in 58 which I have ever had since I've taught at this college. I've never seen such an idiotic behavior as yours. Such an indifference, such a lack of understanding, and such a -- not -- not feeling that to -- your own business was was enacted here. Never seen any -- any such thing. I have taught this course now 19 times, and so I think I have some judgment in the matter.

So you haven't read the -- the speech on degree, by Odysseus? Does no- -- has nobody read the -- the speech on degree? Really not? Not one? That describes Caesar's position as a pharaoh, in a marvelous way. Very strange, that Shakespeare, who was haunted by the problem of royalty and of government, of statehood and Elizabeth, you see, the founding of the new -- of the new empire that he created this tremendous vision of the hierarchy of Egypt. That's the speech on degree. Go and read it. It's a very wonderful speech. And he's -- has the same picture as the old- -- ancients for the -- for the {Heron gammus}, for the famous sacred wedding between heaven and earth. He calls it with the Christian expression, the wedded calm of states. And that -- it means the peace of states that is only produced by marriage, that is, by a passionate embrace.

Gentlemen, the two-party system in our modern state is the application of the holy wedding of contrast. One party declares the other to be very earthly, and the own party as heavenly. But they must embrace each other. That is, you have -- can have only a community in which both parties still love each other sufficiently to tolerate each other. The essence of -- you see, of party, is that they are not factions, that they do not murder each other, but that they inter-penetrate each other. And you will -- may be surprised to hear this, gentlemen, but it is true, that the Church has lived for the last 400 years only by the two parties of Protestants and Catholics. There would be no Christianity in the West without the two parties, because life must split, in order to propagate. You must marry a woman in order to have a child. You can't have a child by yourself. Homosexuality -- the Greek idea of the mind, you see -- is out, because the Greek mind can o- -- not beget children. They are all homosexuals. And at this moment, again, gentlemen, the college is so totally homosexual, so totally Greek, that it has no relation -- education -- to real life. It doesn't disgorge into society. That's why you don't learn those things which would make you fruitful for the rest of your community, because you are maximist, and the -- alleged maxim of your {educator} says you should get out -- something out of your education.

Gentlemen, the meaning of education in a Christian era has always been that education is subservient to that which the community needs. And the community needs you as Greek spirits, as educated people who know something of the world outside America. That's your contribution. It's nothing you get yourself. But it is your contribution to the uneducated world. You have never thought of this relation. You never think that an educated man serves -- can -- must serve 10 uneducated people or he is not educated. You seem to be educated for your own private pleasure, because you pay 1500 bucks. Nobody gets an education that way.

Well, the wedded calm of states -- you can read up on this in Troilus and Cressid in this speech on degree. That was my starting point. But I wanted to show you, gentlemen, that in our Christian era, we have transformed the Greek spirit from a spirit of separation of the Greeks from the rest of the world, and of pride, into one of humility, because we have said that everything must be translated in our educational system. The Greeks did not translate. We translate. And therefore, gentlemen, the baptism, the Christian form of the Greek spirit in our era, is this constant translating. An educated man is a man who can translate. An uneducated man is a man who reads translations. You are uneducated men, because you read translations, but you cannot make one. That's the difference between education and non-education, gentlemen. You depend on education and any -- on a -- translations made by others, and any such man, gentlemen, is a layman compared to clergy. Your clergy today are the people who make the translations. And to give you an example of how bad translations today immediately become, because there are so few educated people: a Catholic firm has published a few weeks ago a translation of the "Hymn to the Sun" by St. Francis of Assisi. Who has heard of this "Hymn to the Sun"? You haven't? Only hope that they read it { } -- course, my hope was that they read it in the -- in the { }. Do you know?

Well, the "Hymn to the Sun" by St. Francis is the greatest poetical document of the Middle Ages. I think it's much greater, certainly, than the "Niebelunglied," but I think it is also greater than the -- Dante's Divine Comedy. It's very short. It is really a trans- -- an enlargement of the 146th Psalm. In the 146th Psalm, all the creatures praise the Lord. The sun and the moon, and the stars, and the fields, and the animals of the field, and man himself. Now the only change, the little change that St. Francis made was that he appealed or addressed these creatures as his own brother and sisters and says, "My sister the moon, my brother the sun, praise ye the Lord." And you see at that moment man has become the equals of all the other creatures, but not in your way, of Darwinism, where you step down to the creatures who cannot speak. But Fran- -- Francis in the true method has lifted up these beings to his own degree of articulatedness. If you have to treat the other creatures like men, and you don't have to treat men like animals, you -- that's the only way you have found to understand man, that you say, "Oh, he's just a -- a clever animal." But gentlemen, how would it be if you say that an animal is a potential man? I think it would be much nearer to the truth.

This has very practical results, gentlemen. You see, you as pure, raw Greeks, of the pagan type, for example, are now all calling for eugenics. You say we must breed men as we breed animals. If you take St. Francis' line, however, it follows that we select our mate by love. Since we do not know how animals love, we

must do the best second-rate in -- in having them mate, according to that what we can discover comes nearest to love. But love is a better selective task-master than anything the veterinary can find. Real love. It's -- as soon as you deviate from this, that the upper explains the lower, you have left this Christian era and have gone Gentile, have gone pagan. Take { }. He said we must make the people of our race according to the standards of the veterinarian. He made the head of every university in Germany -- became -- became a veterinarian, because that's -- was typical of Hitler. He could have taken a dentist, too. But the typical attitude just is that the animals explain man. You believe this, too. You are not any better than Hitler in this respect. And you actually will have very little resistance when people say, "You must marry according to the judgment of the psychologists or the { } of biologists." It has something so convincing for you. You have no other instinct. You say, "Well, by what other cri- -- criteria shall we go?"

Well, gentlemen, a free man says that his heart speaks much louder than all -- louder and better than all science. And as I said, St. Francis has put down this law in this translation of the Psalms that the sun must be treated as our brother, and the moon as our sister. That doesn't mean that you have to treat yourself as a horse, or as a pig, or as a cow. It's the other way around.

Well, that's not the whole story. The story is that this Catholic publisher made the translation, or put it out, bibliographically very well done, nicely bound. And he wanted, of course, to make a profit. But he didn't care any more for the translation and the terrible thing is he could rely on an uneducated public that did no longer know Italian or Latin, the hymn is { } -- we have it in Italian and in Latin as well. So the English translation said, "Our Mother earth, we praise ye the Lord -- praise the Lord." "Our Mother earth" is good paganism. That's the Greek, or the Roman, you see. In antiquity they pa- -- heathen said that the earth was a goddess and was the mother. I looked up the text once more and said, "Am I totally blind? This can never have been written by a Franciscan monk, by a saint of the Catholic Church, by the creator of the spirit of the Middle Ages, of -- " and true enough. The real text of St. Francis says, and you -- perhaps you take this down, as a -- as a seal under the barbarism of this moment in American history. The real trans- -- text runs: "My sis- -- Our sister, the Mother earth, praise the Lord." Our sister. She -- he kept the motherly quality for all the creatures which the earth had, for anybody who's sensitive. But he was very careful to say that we are -- is the equals of this mother, you see. And so he said, "Our sister, the Mother earth." You see how -- what -- miraculous this paradox is? And how he protected the human soul? Can you see this point? Is it perfectly clear to everybody?

Now gentlemen, a translator who cuts out the creation of 1500 years of martyrs, and crucifixions, and persecutions by omitting this one word should be spanked. He certainly should be laughed out of court. There certainly shouldn't be a -- a publisher who dares to publish this as a translation. But gentlemen, that's by and large the translation you read today. When you read the Bible, or the old -- The Iliad, or the -- or the tragedies, or Goethe, or Schiller, or anything for that matter, it's incredible! And the King James Version is so obsolete that you no longer understand it, anyway. You have not the faintest idea what it means. You are uneducated, my dear people, because you can no longer free yourself from these accidental, and arbitrary, and uncontrolled translations. Imagine what it means that St. Francis is made into simply a pagan of the year 300 B.C. And no protest. And he sells, because the -- the page -- the printing looks good. You live in a pig sty, gentlemen, but not in an educated world, today. And you don't know it, because all the paraphernalia, all the curtains are -- bear the inscription, "Education," et cetera. But are you educated? Can you make a translation yourself? Can you come before the American public and say, "I vouchsafe for the correctness of this translation, because I have made it myself"? And that's why you cannot even read the Constitution of the United States, gentlemen. You can only understand the Constitution of the United States if you know what Montesquieu has said, from whom it was copied; and if you know what Aristotle said, from whom Montesquieu copied, his idea on politics. This is not an independent text. Do you think that the American language just came up in 1776 by a virgin birth? This is a translation. Everything you say in America is translation. I tried to show you this about the "pursuit of happiness," that this is -- was just the translation of salvation. And you cannot understand the "pursuit of happiness" when you think it meant the frivolousness of being happy every minute. Salvation means that you have to put up with much suffering before you can be saved. And that they didn't want to give up by pursuit of happiness at all, that life is one story, you see. But modern man thinks that he pursues happiness every day and so he can never be saved. So he denies the translation character of the "pursuit of happiness" and lives on the installment plan, which is -- certainly is the Hell -- Hell itself.

Nobody, gentlemen, who pursues salvation can live on an installment plan. He knows that he must always pay in more than he receives. He must invest. The problem of "pursuit of happiness" is investment. And the problem of hellfire is the installment plan, which means you try to get something now before you have { }, before you have paid for it.

So everything is topsy-turvy, because you don't even read your texts, your -- your own sacred texts with any understanding. Gentlemen, acquire a language, and acquire it regardless of the requirements of the college. Acquire a language and pursue it. Subscribe to a paper in that other language -- be it Spanish -- and don't learn Spanish for commercial correspondence. Learn Spanish to check your own understanding of life. I'm now subscribing to help me on -- for the past three years to a strange paper. Comes out in Brussels. It's edited by Negroes in Africa. But the Ne- -- col- -- Belgians had this tremendous colonial empire, you see. And so I -- it's called L'Afrique Et Le Monde, Africa and the world. And I read on Eleanor Roosevelt, and I read on Justice Douglas, and I read on -- on McCarthy, and I read on everybody in a -- through the eyes of a French Negro, you see -- French-speaking Negro, I should say, a Belgian Negro -- somebody. And I read on these -- this terrible movie they made in -- in -- in Ann Arbor, you know, we had to see it here. You remember, it was shown a few months ago. "Macbeth," or what was the other one? Oh, it was so { }. It's -- did you go? It was shown in -- in Man- -- in Dartmouth Hall.

("Julius Caesar"?)

Wie?

("Julius Caesar"?)

"Julius Caesar." "Julius Caesar," wasn't it? Ja. I wrote a review -- read a review in this African paper, and I learned a lot about the -- about American movies. But gentlemen, that's -- I mean by translation. Having an {just} many other resources, I find that this African paper translates me, transports me out of my own world, this Western world, you see, and its shortsightedness. It wouldn't -- I wouldn't get this by reading a British, or a French publication. This is fresh, you see. This is really -- are -- give me a different { }. And that's an education. And you have to do something similar. You have to subscribe to Ukrainian paper, or a Georgian paper from the Caucasus. And you must do something. Otherwise you are so parochial that you -- that you correspond to the famous picture -- the leading Parisian newspaper used to bring of the Middle West. For one whole year after the economic crisis in '29, they were so insulted by us -- felt so insulted that they always said, "The Americans have treated us like Nicaragua." And in order to express their -- their hatred of America, they published a map of the Middle West, with Chicago and McCormick in the middle. And it read, "Ces cent mille kilometres -- what is it? Carré -- Carré -- kilometres carrés d'ignorance," these hundred thousand square miles of ignorance.

And gentlemen, you see, it isn't that you don't know the facts. You -- this country is well-informed, but it is totally uneducated, because you classify the -- facts in your own frame of reference. Education, humanism, the great element in our tradition must give you another frame of reference, not other facts. You think that facts educate a mind. They don't. They cram your mind. Since your mind is parochial, and Mississippi or Missouri -- everything you come to know you put in this frame of reference called Missouri. You can only -- acquire an education by learning what I try to tell you about the Greeks. They did not look at other facts, but an Athenian looked at Troy and understood that Hector and Priamus had to be loyal to Troy. That wasn't a fact in the Greek system of thinking, or the Athenian dictionary of facts, you see, that Priam went to have Troy -- Hector extradited, but it was a Trojan fact, within a Trojan universe of discourse, and that is the difference that you must understand, gentlemen, that humanism deals with two frames of reference which are equally valid. And you only know that education means to cram and to crowd many facts into one frame of reference. That's not education. Can you see the difference?

Don't forget this, gentlemen. Don't -- please don't forget it, because nobody tells you in this country. They really think that when you read this new book which came out in Chicago, the -- this still wrongly called the British Encyclopedia, the Encyclopaedia Britannica, but it is for all practical purposes a very low-brow put -- output of the five lakes there, that you then get an education. Gentlemen, the Encyclopaedia Britannica as it stands today in this new edition is uneducated, because it crams all the facts under the frame of reference of Mr. Hutchins and his staff in Chicago. That's not an education. Read the Encyclopaedia Italiana. That was the last work of education in Europe. It came out under Mussolini between 1933 and 1940. It's in this library. It's the last word of the old West, yes, the real tra- -- tradition before it totally broke down in these world wars. The staff is universal. There are American writers of Yale and of Harvard. There are English writers. There are Russian writers, German, French, Spanish, no difference. Of course, one-half of -- of the writers may be Italian. But the first men. And when you read these articles, they are all written unbiased, and uncontrolled, and checked. Mussolini had this generosity, still to scholarship. And he didn't have all the editing witchcraft recipes of the modern American editor, who mutilates and castrates every thinker in every journal. If you read Harper, if you read Atlantic, you read the editor. You never read the author. The editor in this country first tells the author what he can write about. And then he tells them how he writes about it. And then he cuts out three-quarters, then he pays the man for sitting quiet for accepting all these castrations, and mutilations, and operations. A man who is -- lives by his pen in this country -- a quite famous man, you would be surprised if I gave his name -- told me that he is unable to

write and publish anything in an American magazine without being asked by the editor, and without corresponding to this editor's command on what to write. Now -- is this creative? The editor, this idiot, this administrator, this clerk, or this financial wizard -- whatever he is, not a creative man, has to -- undertakes in this country to tell everybody what to write about. And then he comes with his scissors and says how to write.

Have a friend who -- who taught the -- the school of -- the educators -- the so-called re-educators of Germany after the war. Well, he became very miserable in the process, because the whole thing, of course, wasn't such a great success. But he trained at least 500 of the leading officers and educators for the occupied countries. So he was the expert, obviously. And after a few years, the book which he had edited was exhausted and there was a new edition to be made. And he had -- again, he collected all the facts once more, and he had these students come back and report on the success of his teaching, and they corrected what had been wrong. And -- he's a professor at Harvard -- and he went to his publisher and said, "We must re-publish this book. The second edition is due."

And the publisher said, "Oh, oh. Yes. Delighted. But obviously, we must make a new new arrangement in your contract."

"What's that?" my friend said.

"Well, my secretary is going to re-write this book, and you must tell -- give us a free hand, and must abdicate -- renounce any right of making corrections. Then I'm willing to allow the second edition. But we must be in control. And I will pay you a good sum. Give your name."

He declined. But the book wasn't to be published. So he was ruined, as far as this branch of his career was {correct}, because he couldn't publish this book in any other house, because he held this copyright with this -- these people, and -- the leading firm in New York. And that is the arrogance, gentlemen, and the tyranny under which we live in this country. There has never been such a tyranny as large as here in America now, exercised by the editors. Nobody speaks about these -- these things, gentlemen, but nobody in the rest of the world understands that.

So -- because they -- we don't know what education is. Education means that an educated man can translate himself, in his own language. And that, if you -- there -- if we still had these two and-a-half million college boys educated, do you think these editors could play this game? You would all be in control. You would

all be able to check such a translation of St. Francis. And it isn't that everybody has to check. That you could check is enough, of course, to coerce these people, you see, to discipline. It isn't that we exercise our vote at any election, but that we can exercise it, that checks our politicians, doesn't it?

So we have placed the Greek role, gentlemen. Education, insofar as it allows men to translate themselves, another frame of reference, {saved} the humanistic contribution of the ancient Greeks, and that's an eternal problem, gentlemen. So you understand why education is a great power, if rightly understood, and is no power, if understood as of today. If you think that education means to make somebody happy, you omit the pursuit in this happiness. It has to be pursued. Then it is only translation of salvation. And if it is pursued, gentlemen, you have to do something as a contribution for the rest of the community. The happiness of the community will only come about if you pursue happiness by looking up its sources in other civilizations, under other frames of reference, and translate under your own name what others have said. You see how important it is. We will become totally uneducated, because nobody is allowed to advocate Communism. Gentlemen, this is -- I am unfortunately not a Communist. Otherwise I would go quickly and invoke it. It hasn't to -- doesn't mean that we have to sell out to Moscow. But in a country of 160 million people, nobody can represent Communism, obviously your universe of discourse is too narrow, because among the heresies which you indulge in, like capitalism, nationalism, free-thinking, liberalism, they are all heresies. They are all as great heresies as Communism. I don't give a damn for any one of these heresies, gentlemen. I want to be orthodox. Well, I'm tempted at one time by one, and one time by another. If you cannot teach Communism in this college, then you can't teach anything, because you are out of proportion.

Communism, obviously, occupies a certain part of the spectrum of the human mind. Plato was a Communist, if ever there was one. So -- it isn't necessary to teach Communism. Just read enough Plato, you see, and -- and you will be instilled with this spirit. That's why I'm against Plato. I'm not a Platonist, because I think if you really read Plato outside the Christian era, without the glasses of the churchman, you must become a Communist. He was a Communist. He was nothing else. And the people in Moscow are Platonists. But that's disagreeable to hear in -- for people in this -- in this country who -- who wisely say, "Oh, we read Plato. It's quite innocuous. Here we have the Constitution of the United States, and that is a Christian translation of the Greek text," you see. And they still remember that Plato has to be translated and has to be compared. You see, to translate also means not to exaggerate the value of the translated, because you put this frame of reference, your own, against the other. And you know that you

have one to defend, and there is another to compare with.

But you are so helpless, gentlemen. Now you have -- because you no longer can translate, you have to defend bigot- -- a kind of bigotry -- this system under which we live and say, "I mustn't even hear of another system." That's not a solution, you see. With illusions, you defend your own system knowingly, by being able to look at it from the outside and the inside, against a system which you can also freely handle as another system, and a different one.

Well, I have no time to go into all this, although it would be quite exciting.

Let's have the second point which I have to make today, gentlemen.

I have now said that we have, in the Christian era, gentlemen, the millennium of the Church, the millennium of the world, and its nations, and now the millennium of the re-vivification of society in -- by initiation, by creating small groups, inspired groups inside a disintegrating planet. You remember these three crosses. How do they now relate to antiquity? That's my second task. Gentlemen, if you -- I wish to change the --

Oh, oh, oh. Could not somebody -- is there any other classroom here? Yes.

You go and -- back and get some -- some chalk.

Gentlemen, if you think of the whole world, as a disk -- as the ancients did, instead of a globe, it's just for repre- -- geometric representation, we could say that man, in the first stages of his life, went to the periphery. And all these points, which I make here as dots, would be the tribes of humanity. And we said there are -- there have at least been 100 and thousand -- hundred thousand such tribes. So gentlemen, the first layer of life on this earth, down to 3000 B.C., and then continued by the further migrations, wherever a tribe was formed -- the Eskimos or here the American Indians obviously were formed only much later; many of these Indians came only over 1000 B.C. or about the birth of Christ, or even 1000 A.D., as you know, across the Bering Strait -- and the sects of the modern churches, as we have them in this country, 287 different denominations, which continue the tribal idea. The Mormons are a typical example of a tribe -- tribal organization. These people are peripheric. The reason why they -- are to be called peripheric is that they stopped short, turned back to the rest of humanity and say, "I -- we don't know you. We come from nowhere. Our ancestor is not your ancestor. We have our own ancestor." And you remember, the heros, who give the name to the tribe, always represents a break between the tribe and the previous traditions of the human race. It is always com- -- impossible for the tribe to keep open the path that le- -- led from the previous tribe into this tribe,

because otherwise the people would not be loyal to the new leadership, to the new language. And as we said, these 100,000 languages have been created. They have been hammered into the people, and the price was the break of continuity, the break of -- of knowledge, of what went on before those seven generations, of which any tribe has a clear memory.

So that's why I put these tribes to the periphery. Not meaning this in a geographical sense, but in a logical sense, gentlemen. Any tribe must face about, and look at the rest of the world as not being my own tree, my own pedigree, but saying, "This is warpath. This is jungle. This is not me." And therefore the rest of mankind for any tribe in antiquity has the position of other-ness, and the break occurs then in this facing-about. "I begin my story with my own first word, and name, my own hero who gives the name to my tribe," you see. And Iroquois, therefore must say, "I begin my story with the first Iroquois." Because otherwise he would fear that his people -- lest his people desert to the enemy, discovering that the non-Iroquois are just as real people as the Iroquois.

You get this family spirit today for every child, it's -- very first -- difficult for a -- at first for a child, not to feel that the home and the own family is far -- vastly superior to everybody outside. That is, however, a facing-about by 180 degrees. And we all commit it, insofar as we are tribal. Now gentlemen, then we said, there is a second phase.

Wonderful. Thank you.

There is a second phase on this same map of the globe in which these empires cut out a quadrilateral. And we said it is not accidental that it is a quadrilateral, because it must be oriented to the four sides of the compass. You remember what we said about the discovery of human power to go north from the south. And thereby we become divine, and to add to the powers in the -- universe that which no star has under his own. We can go from the -- south to north and thereby supply the one movement which the heavens do not contain in themselves. And therefore, the oriented life, gentlemen, of settlement, comes in here, in these quadrilaterals. And as I said, don't think this pedantic. It must be quadrilateral. It cannot be triangular. It cannot even be circular. The world, as understood by these people who cut out a temple, a segment -- "temple" means to cut -- a temple on earth -- anywhere where you have temples and priests, you have the quadrilateral idea of life, because you have orientation in space, and you have the equation of Heaven and earth. And where you have the observation of the heavens, you have this problem of connecting the south and the north. And only man can go from south to north.

Now gentlemen, when the Romans came at the end of antiquity, they called their own empire orbis terrarum. The orb, the circle around these empires. They were the sum of all the empires. And so antiquity comes to an end wherever the empire goes 'round, so to speak, around more than one other, older empire. That is already the empire of empires. That is why Caesar married the Egyptian princess, and yet was more than an Egyptian king. Now you take the Jews, gentlemen. They marched out of these empires. They face about in a double sense. They face about from this vendetta of the tribe at the periphery, to the unified origin of Adam, and they say, "All men go." You may now at this moment understand the wisdom of the history of the original sin, because by being members of one clan, one family, one blood-group, we are -- have faced about and have assumed that our living as twig of this branch is more important than our belonging to the whole stem. And so the fall of man, gentlemen, is nothing in your makeup or my makeup as a single individual; but it follows from our group life, that this group faces about and looks at the others, you see, as other groups; and at this very moment, it falls from grace. It falls down from the whole tree of mankind. It cannot help doing this, you see. That's Cain. And that's Abel. And that's the whole story of the fall of man. It's a very great story. And if I had to rewrite the Old Testament today, I certainly wouldn't have the sublimity of saying it so briefly and so truthfully.

Gentlemen, please learn one thing in this course, that the Bible is nothing primitive. The Bible is far ahead of you. You are primitive. And you should understand that the wisdom of the history of creation is unexcelled, that you have a hard time to come up to it and understand why all men have inherited from Abra- -- Abraham this curse of having eaten -- of having fallen from grace. Because we belong to one group. And we have faced about. And we have gone peripheric. And we murder our brother, like Abel -- Ca- -- Abel murdered Cain. We go to war, because we say he's less our brother, because he belongs to this other frame of reference.

The Jews went -- go out, gentlemen. The technical term for the existence of Judaism, as you know, is the so-called exodus. That's the title of the second book of the five books of Moses, in the Old Testament. And "exodus" means to go out. But in my picture, you learn something interesting: that the walk out -- of Israel -- by which it is constituted every day again, this fence of the law, that they do not eat ham and bacon with -- with the Gentiles, in order to show the Gentiles that they are still waiting for the coming of the Lord, that this exodus goes inside humanity. My picture here, gentlemen, which I can only make understandable now to you is that the exodus of Israel goes to the heart of the matter. It is in this

direction that you must place the exodus of Judaism. It is officially into the desert. But logically, rationally, it goes into the center of humanity.

If you understand this, gentlemen, you understand the whole history of mankind, Israel at the end of antiquity, because it's rather late in the game. It begins 1500 B.C., after 4-, 5,000 years of settling the whole earth with tribes and empires. And that -- they make a desperate attempt for the last 4,000 -- 3,500 years, which again is not so long -- to point out the center of gravity from which we all come. As man leaves Egypt, and -- the fleshpots of Egypt, and as he leaves human sacrifice behind, as Abraham did, when he did not sacrifice Isaac, the Jews go to the heart of the tree of mankind. They are between the stem and the roots of a tree -- how do you call this point, in the -- in the growth of a plant? Does anybody know? Through the -- where the transition between the stem that is up above the ground, and the roots that go down into the earth go -- how would you call this place? Where -- ?

(The trunk of the tree.)

Wie?

(The trunk.)

Well, no. Sir. Trunk is when you mutilate the tree. That's the trunk. But the decision has to be made. In one part you go underground, you see, and the other you shoot up. And every sap, every cell, so to speak, has now to be, you see directed. And at one point definitely the things go one way or the other. In German this is called the -- I don't know how to translate it. Herztrieb. The sprout that is at the heart. That would be the most literal translation.

(The hypocotyl.)

Wie? What?

(Hypocotyl, I think.)

How do you spell that?

(H-y-p-o- --)

Go on.

(Cor. C-o-r?)

(No.)

Hypocor?

(Hyporcotyl. H-y-p-o-r-c-o-t-y-l. Hyporcotyl.)

C-o-r- -- ?

(Yeah. H-y-p-o-r-c-o-t-y-l.)

(No, no. There's no -r-.)

No. No. That couldn't be it. There would have to be the word c-o-r-d in it.

With that, it means "heart," you see. "Concord." "Discord." "Cordial." That's all it -- no. It's a very important idea, you see, that the tree has a heart from which everything is either above or below. And that would be the problem of Judaism, you see, that it tries to be, as on a tree, that point which cannot forget the unity of the whole. You see, that point which -- simply blocks the path of eccentric, peripheric living, where a tribe says, "I am a man, and nobody else." It's like the German tribe under Hitler which says, "We are the only race that has to be saved. All the other races can be just burned in a stove or gassed, because they are not men. We are men." That is the temptation, gentlemen, of every eccentric human being, of every eccentric nationalistic group, that we are the salt of the earth, and the other are nothing.

Now gentlemen, then you understand the triumphant reply of our era to this picture. I can also give you now a picture of humanism. Humanism is the standing-between -- at least two of these groups, empires and tribes. A humanist is a man who understands the life of one tribe, of one empire; of two tribes and two empires; of X tribes and X empires, the more you become the humanist. I am a man -- human, therefore nothing human I consider -- foreign. That's the great sentence of humanism. You may have heard this sentence. "I am a human, therefore nothing human is foreign to me." That's found in the Latin poet Terentius, and it's -- makes him a great, great poet, and this was -- the poet didn't write it himself, but as little as Shakespeare wrote his own plays, Terentius wrote -- dictated -- under the dictation of the leading generals and consuls of Rome. And probably this line was probably written by Scipio, the great head of the Roman state, at -- in his day. Scipio Africanus. And it's a great sentence. "I am a human being; nothing human I consider foreign." Homo sum, ni humani {a me} alie-

num puto. I think "alien" -- Nothing human I think to be alien.

Now gentlemen, so we have a fourth place for the humanist. Humanism is between these orders, which I put here. Judaism marches to the center and settles as a point of heart, at the heart of the matter, at the heart of the pedigree of the tree of nations. But the Greeks are the in-betweens: between spatial orders; between Troy, and Athens, and Sparta, and Corinth, and {Mittelania}, and Rome. That's the humanistic spirit, re-admitted. It's nowhere, isn't it? Because it looks at everything. But it's nowhere itself. It has no way of raising families. It has all the perversions, all the sterility, you see, of a Greek mind, who looks at the rest of the world and amuses itself this way.

So you see, my -- my little easel here is complete. It has these four forms and four directions. One eccentric, the tribes, marching to the periphery. One centripetal, the Jews marching to the heart of the matter. The empires finding intermediary quietness, a part of the globe already is totally settled, totally stated. That's why the word "state" is appropriate for the empires, because they are stabilized. They are fixed. They have boundaries. And the Greek mind restlessly searching, comparing notes, as you say so truthfully, you see. But he who compares notes certainly cannot claim that he has any frame of reference of his own. He borrows these frames of reference from the objects which he observes. Now we come to the Church, gentlemen. The Church is a triumphant eishodos, the Greeks would say, the entrance from the heart again into the world once more. It is the mission, the going-out to the Gentiles and proclaiming the good news which the Jews had harbored in the heart of the matter, of the unity of the children of God, and the one-ness of our creator, and the one-ness of our history, and the one-ness of our destiny. And therefore, gentlemen, this picture of the exodus from Egypt, has now to be supplemented. I have tried to preserve this word by the word eishodos. In the Greek tragedy, when the choir enters the scene, it's called eishodos, the marching-in. Eis- is in, ex- is out. So "exodus" means the marching out of the world of the Gentiles. And eishodos of the Church means the triumphant entry. Take the word "entry" and that's the correct translation. But you put in brackets, please, in parenthesis, that entry is -- the Latin translation, or French translation, or English translation of eishodos, because only this way do you get the correspondence between Judaism and Christianity, and it's the only by which you can explain why the Church still has to read the Old Testament to this day, because that's the relation: the exodus from Egypt, you see, and the triumphant un- -- entry into Rome, and England, and France by missionaries, you see, they -- who come back and bring the good news to all these tribes and empires now, back once more. Can you see this?

Christianity is the reunification of a universe that begins out of one-ness and it goes into the dispersion. And it has to be brought back to its reasoning, in the last 2,000 years. And we haven't finished with the job.

So you see the eishodos. Then you'll see, gentlemen, that from the very beginning, these -- these radii are the Church. The way of the Church is the way of mission. That is, the way of the Church always leads from the heart to the {periphery}. That's why you have to have missionaries even in Dartmouth College. It's very hard here to con- -- it's much harder to convert a Dartmouth College student than it is to convert 10,000 Negroes in Africa.

So the Church, gentlemen, is exodus, is entry into the world. If you don't get this, you don't understand why I talked -- talked to you about the coming of Christianity to this country, of the first century, when the Christians here tried to find a new way of life of influencing the people back home, and of original mission. We get out of the country in order to impress on the people, you see; as a prophet is never -- has no honor in his own country, you have to go out of it, to get the honor in your own country, to shine. The second thing, gentlemen, is then, that the nations, which we have as the Christian or civilized nations, they are all -- already embraced by the ways of the Church. The Church -- that doesn't mean that the Church is older than the modern state, because the nations are the daughter-nations who respond to this Church, and they are formed, gentlemen, by missionary ways. What's Russia? Russia is the mission territory of the Eastern Church. And it is cut out because of this mission. The boundaries of Russia are, so to speak, determined by the fact who converted them: that these were Byzantine missionaries, and not Roman missionaries.

Don't have any respect for the boundaries of modern nations, gentlemen. If you investigate them, they are all Christian boundaries. France happens to be the sum of certain archbishoprics, of the Gallic, imperial tradition of Rome, and the same with Germany; and the same, of course, with Italy. And where you don't have them, you have difficulties. The South -- Naples and Sicily -- never belonged quite to Italy, because they had Greek bishoprics and Greek monasteries. Have you been there? Why do you laugh?

(I lived with these people, second generation.)

What?

[tape interruption]

... turn around the face of Gentiles. To become a Christian, gentlemen, for a nation -- like the Papuas, or the Samoans -- means to be able to replace their chieftain by Christ. Now gentlemen, to you that's ridiculous, or unimportant, or quite insignificant. Gentlemen, if you think that the hero of any one tribe is the block by which the free circulation of life and history between this tribe and the rest of mankind was impeded, then you must understand, that putting Christ into the center where the hero stands, makes this tribe immediately a full-fledged member of the human society here, because they are now able to face it. They are able to see that their ancestor is Christ in the spirit, and not Pericles, or Romulus, you see, or Siegfried. It's very, very important, gentlemen, that you should not believe that David Boone created the American nation. But you begin to. David Boone certainly plays a greater part than Christ in this country at this moment. So, gentlemen, these are -- you must begin to be very realistic about this, gentlemen. Any group that has at its back a hero the great man, Charlemagne, or David Bruce of Scotland, as so many illegitimate children in this country boast -- I know at least 15 Americans who say that they sprang from David Bruce. What a life he must have led!

This opening up of the whole unity of mankind, you see, in the midst of history by the -- Christ, is a tremendous feat. It is impossible for you and me to go to the Mau Maus and to say, "We all have a common ancestor."

They say, "Prove it. We look black. You look white. We'll kill you. We just murder you."

Somebody had the kindness of -- of offering me this {shot}. You were the man, yes. Thank you very much. I expect my execution any minute.

Where the -- this was -- where the natives, you see, of this country of the -- of the American continent, you see, executed all white men. Even the Spaniards, which I think was -- rather a raw deal. And so the Mau Mau have just this -- this attitude: "We have no common ancestor. And there is nothing that ever will reconcile us to each other. The only thing we can do is to execute you, exterminate you, like lice," as we did with the -- the red man, by and large, by the way. And they say, "Now we'll do the same." That's your story.

Now gentlemen, what's the answer? Christianity discovered the answer, by saying, "You and I slew our ancestor in one time. We all have -- are Christ-killers. We all murdered the spirit." He who can say this can forgive. The other cannot, because he -- he feels privileged that he depends from nowhere. The nowhere-

ness of -- of most people's dreams of grandeur, you see, is a terrible thing. If you ask the white man what does he come from, he says, he comes from Siegfried, he comes from Balder, he comes from Odin. He always was blue-eyed and blonde. And he always was noble and generous, you see. And there's no talk with anybody to anybody else. He's just shut up in his own -- in his own prison. It is, only if you show him the skeleton in the closet -- cupboard, of his own ancestry, gentlemen. That's the truth about all of this. All the ancestors which you point -- to whom you point, of which you are proud, are all matched by all the ancestors you don't point to. Every one of us has as many minus ancestors as he has plus ancestors. But we don't mention the others. And usually, we don't even know them, because we didn't care to know them. I wonder who in this class is willing to admit that he knows of an ignoble ancestor. Brave people. Brave people, very few. But that's the truth. Of course, that's simply the truth in -- in our generation, too. There are as many ignobles as noble human beings. And gentlemen, the pedigree of nations doesn't look it. The pedigree of nations always tries to say that Remus and Benedict Arnold were not Americans or Romans, you see. So we get rid of Benedict Arnold and live with George Washington hereafter and the cherry tree.

That's very simple, but it isn't the truth. And it does certainly excise and exterminate all hopes of unity between us and the others, whose ancestor we killed, or our ancestor killed, or embezzled, or eloped with, or raped, or what-not. But the truth of the matter is, gentlemen, that we are all obviously wanting in grace, and wanting in {dis-merits} and that we all need a general pardon, very heartily. And this is the story then of Christianity. Christianity tries to break this iron ring around our eyes by which we say we have no skeleton in the cupboard. That's really the story of all the nations in the world. And you see it with France. They cannot forgive the Germans. "No," they said, the French. "You invaded us five times," and they never say that they invaded Germany 10 times, and vice versa. You never hear a Frenchman say that France invaded Germany. But they did this for 300 years in a row.

It's childish. But the -- we are children, of course. We -- we want to have this nice handkerchief around our eyes, by which we can say, you see, that nobody can see us. But the only people who can't see are we ourselves, because we put the handkerchief before our eyes. We blindfold ourselves and we say the rest cannot see us. Now gentlemen, the funny thing that everybody else can see us, except we, you see, because we have this handkerchief when we -- we call this routine blindfolding or idealism, or nationalism, or patriotism, or whatever we call it. Sometimes we even call it religion.

Now the last point, gentlemen. On the American -- the American way obviously, gentlemen, has to do with all of this. From 1600 to 1950, we have an American history. Therefore America becomes conscious at a moment when the nations become part of a universal world. America itself means that the world was completed in a road -- on dis- -- of discoveries, of worldwide discovery. Therefore, America as a nation was -- from the very first beginning -- put into the Christian world, whereas the nations of Europe might still consider themselves as originally, primarily ex- -- in existence before the rest of the world was discovered. America can never believe this. America exists only because the world was discovered. We have been founded inside a discovered world. Can you see the difference? Europe was the country from which the rest of the world then was discovered. After all, Christoph Columbus before he became to America already lived in Genoa, and in Spain. But no American, gentlemen, can say that his country in any sense -- deeper meaning -- existed before people went discovering the whole of the world. We are in within the completing of the crusades. And it is no accident that Columbus just extended the crusading spirit of the Mediterranean to the West. And the Knights of Columbus have a point in saying that in -- the discovery of America, gentlemen, the spirit of the crusades of the Middle Ages was translated into secular geography. We are a translated Christian act of crusading. But a translation. And so is the Constitution of the United States. All America is a secular translation of the Christian tenets of the Christian history, of mission, of crusade, of reform, and of progress. And I tried to show you that these were Christian notions. And in America, they all appear like the pursuit of happiness in this translated form. They are not -- we don't speak an idiomatic tongue like Anglo-Saxon. We speak the translation of the Christian tongue into worldly, geographical terms.

So the language of America, gentlemen, is a translation from the Christiani- -- Christian tongue. That's very important. Don't believe for a minute that you speak English. What is English, gentlemen? English is Anglo-Saxon, plus the language of the Church. What is German? German is the -- language of the Franks and the Saxons, implemented by the language of the Church. This is forgotten today. What we call English, French, Swedish, German, Italian is neither Latin, nor is it tribal. It is not simply Frankish, or Saxon, or Germanic, you see. It is German; it is English; it is French; because instilled into the Anglo-Saxon vocabulary are all the words and verbs and acts of the liturgy, of the Bible, of the daily sacraments, of the prayers, of the Psalms. And as you well know, the King James Version is a part of the English tongue. But long before, in Chaucer, there is a bishop, and there is an abbot, and there is a prayer, and there is matin and there is noonday. These are all words from the monastic life of the Middle Ages. They are all Christian words.

So gentlemen, America, much more than any other country I know, speaks the to- -- Christian tongue in secular translation applied to this country, to this land, as a part of the whole earth, of the whole mission of God in mankind. That's a great story. Keep this.

Also we come at the end of the second millennium. Therefore there is a kind of predominance of the worldly aspects, the geographical aspects of discovery, and the technological aspects of conquering space. Every American drives his car faster and better than any other man in the world. We have more cars, as you know. I think 35 million at this moment. Is that right? Do you know how many cars we drive here in this country? No? Well, enough to drive you crazy.

And -- and what does this mean, gentlemen? That the conquest of space in the -- at the end of the second millennium has gotten priority. I tried to show you that the response of the nations is with regard to making all the empires into one world. Now there are two points, gentlemen, on which I will try to exemplify this. One is, that in America, we have the abstract configuration of space by longitudes and latitudes developed to an extent as no other country. We have a 54th degree of latitude as a boundary with Canada. We have cut Korea into two parts on the -- at the 38th degree of latitude. That is, gentlemen, the idea of the French revolutionaries, that the earth should be con- -- considered as one topic of computation, as one big, arithmetical problem, as a proposition in figuring, we have really taken seriously. You believe, gentlemen, in the longitudes and latitudes as reality, at least our statesmen do, unfortunately. And so, gentlemen, this is the one symbol of what I call "Space is conquered" at the end of the second millennium. The second is, of course, our movement through space. Supersonic flying is an example of our having conquered space.

Gentlemen, don't take this lightly. What does it mean to conquer space? It isn't worth your and my effort anymore to boast of having speeded up relations of man, or treating the community as separate from others. You should treat already the whole world as one community. "Space is conquered" means that we live in one community at this moment, with very many slums, I mean. New York being the largest. But still it's all one city. Now we can go and begin some {clearing} -- cleaning of { }, of course. But "space is conquered" means that man, with regard to external conditions, has to treat the globe as one space. And our driving power, our motorcycles, and the airplanes on the one-hand side, and our figuring in terms of latitudes and longitudes are the signposts of this achievement. Don't take this lightly, gentlemen. You could not speak in Luxembourg of longitude and latitude, because they are hardly on one {different} longitude and

latitude, it's so small. You can only afford this, you see, if America -- because America is so large that it stretches out over quite a considerable number of lines of longitude and meridians.

Now the American situation is, with regard to the second millennium, nearly perfect. That is, we marched at the avant-garde of the conquest of space, and of the response in a secular way to the challenge of the Church: make the earth one. Nobody has done more to doing this than I think this country. We are weak with regard to the first millennium. We have -- Southern Baptists; and we have rattlesnakes; and we have, as you know, a kind of imbecile Christianity here, feeble-minded. That is, the heritage of the Church has been thinned here out to a deplorable degree. And many people think it is a -- just a space-philosophy, just a way of thinking. I had talked about this yesterday, but I have to tell you this, too. Give me these small five minutes at the end of the -- the whole course. Gentlemen, the danger of America is that the first millennium is not taken seriously. That is meant by this present-day Catholic renaissance. If you read *Crosscurrents*, it's quite a good quarterly. They try to emphasize the wealth of heritage of the Church, which this chur- -- country just has to digest to keep alive what has been be done. We can't abandon it. You can't live on the simplicity of the Pentecostal sect in Georgia; and you cannot believe on the primi- -- primitive belief of the rattlesnake cult in Harlan County, Kentucky. You just have to know that Christianity is the sum of all men, whom -- the experience of man with God through all the ages, that Christianity has created one God out of all the real gods, and that it is not sectarian, and doesn't believe in either rattlesnakes, or idols, or in any such special nonsense. It doesn't even believe in Christian Science, because Christianity is more than any one of the sects. It is not tribal. And the sects, gentlemen -- you have to know this in this country -- the sects are under Christian veneer, the re-configuration of the tribal instinct, create spiritual families who invoke one and the same hero, be it Joseph Smith or Brigham Young. And we -- you cannot afford this.

Now for the last hundred years, we have been very indulgent with all the small groups in this country and we have said they can go on with their tribal associations. As you know, this country has simply thought sectarianism is not dangerous. Gentlemen, for -- perhaps the only salvation of education would be that you learn at least one thing: that you have to be -- have a Greek mind, a humanistic mind between your sects. If you don't learn Latin and Greek, if you don't learn French and Russian, perhaps you learn at least Methodism, Mormonism, and -- and Baptism -- or how do you say it -- how do you call it? Baptistry-ism? What is it? What's this -- the noun for the -- for the Baptists? Can't form any.

Well, you understand, gentlemen. Your understanding of more than one sect in this country would be an education. It would amount to something, if you would not appreciate two or three ways of Christian life, with equal sympathy and understanding. Not by rejecting all three will you achieve this, but by appreciating at least three. I think -- I offer you this one upshot of my many, many worries over the future of this country, gentlemen. Perhaps in no other country has the easel of religious variety contained all possible elements of -- of religious worship. And perhaps the idea was to prove that none of them matters, that the spirit must move freely through all these forms. I mean, the one lesson in Americanism is that you must be able to be an American although one is an Episcopalian, the other is a Roman Catholic, the other is a Presbyterian, and the -- so on, down the line. Isn't that true? You can't deny that these religious forms are confusing. On the other hand, they seem to me to contain a tremendous wisdom. It seems to me that for the last 300 years on this continent, every reasonable, or possible, or meaningful form of Church government has been tried -- or is still tried -- and that therefore you can see that Church government is secular, and that behind it, there can be one spirit, that is contained in these great instruments.

In this manner, at this moment, gentlemen, you can fulfill again the task of being Americans of the beginnings again, of the Founding Fathers of the 17th century. You cannot cut loose this country from its Christian moorings. Or it has no history. It doesn't belong in a universal history. I have warned you. But I offer you this as a -- your solution. It is not enough to come to this country as a congregationalist. But since you live in this country, it seems to me that you have to open up to the miraculous story why this country gave hospitality to every form of church government. Now that does not mean, as many of you simply -- do say, "I neglect all this. It doesn't mean anything." And it cannot mean that one -- you have to choose one thing as truthful. It seems to me there is a third solution for you and me, you see: to understand that every one of them contains a real branch of a real tree of life, of a real form of representing the Gospel in one generation and to one group of men. We -- you can see immediately, that we -- for an unsettled people as of today, the congregationalists are an impossible form of Church government. The Presbyterians are, too, because you have to be an independent merchant or a farmer to found and sustain such a Church. If you are an employee who works at General Electric and therefore has to go from one place to another every three years, you have to belong to a stronger church with more clergy, because you can't support it. You can't be the pillar of the Church. You are elsewhere every three years. So you must find a church, ready to worship there, you see. And therefore today, the Episcopal Church and the -- and the

Catholic Church offer for such uprooted people much easier facilities, because they don't have to begin from scratch, you see. All the services serve every Sunday, and they just say to themself- -- say to their wife, "Well, today we go there and there." And next Sunday, they are elsewhere.

This is by and large the American situation today that we have -- you can study that every form of church government is related to a certain class of our population. The strange thing, gentlemen, that we have today a Christian Church in this country which is divisive. It divides the country into classes, as no other institution. The only institution in this country that corresponds to Karl Marx is the Church. Our churches are class churches. And they are terribly class-conscious. So everything is topsy-turvy.

Gentlemen, if you want to become an American, you have to study your own country quite afresh. Forget everything you have heard in political science about European ideals and traditions. In this country the Church divides the people into social strata. And you have to study now why. Every social strata deserves -- or acquires, you see, or -- or is incli- -- prone to have a different form of church government. Artisans, farmers, professional men, merchants, of course will cater to a different form of church government, you see, as employees of journal-men -- journal -- how do you call it? journeymen, you see, or laborers, according to their -- to their drift. You are drifters, so you need a strong church which is petrified, you see. If you are settled, you can keep the Church a little more elastic. You see the difference? Extremes beget each other, you see. The more you drift, the more you are apt to fall on your knees in a stone cathedral, because it's so wonderful that you, the drifter, can have some contact with something so eternal. But if you land, and your grandson will sit on the same farmland, you have absolutely no reason to build anything but a little wooden church, because, you see, you have this feeling of restfulness and quiet yourself.

This is the story, I think, of America's relation to the first millennium. It is a relation of your being able to see the Church in its wider context within the modern empire of our society, and its {production}. And you have to overcome today the classes not in the secular states, but in the Church. That is, the problem of Egypt, of the empires today occurs in this country in the form of the place of worship, which is very strange. But there it is. Cannot be doubted. That in my church, for example, we have no poor. A wonderful church, you see; we have no poor. It's pre-arranged, you know. Some { } predestination.

Now, gentlemen. At least today we had a good class. Thank you.