

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...preamble to the total history of philosophy. And history, as men of you know by their own attitude, in -- if they are honest to themselves, history is despised in this country. History is bunk.

Now there are two -- nations in antiquity who have left in -- as their national history something that is not history. One are the prophets of Israel and the other are the philosophers of Greece. And to call a course "History of Greek Philosophy" is misleading, to say the least, in this environment in which you happen to live, because it is not a history, as a history of ancient Gr- -- ancient Gr- -- Egypt, or of modern United States, or of the art in the modern -- in the United States, which would be a difficult thing to write, anyway. But "philosophy" is another word for "Greek," and "Greek" is another word for "philosophy," in our modern life. When I say, "This man is a Greek," I mean he's a philosophical mind. And when I ma- -- I can turn this around, too. I have often -- used in letters -- written to friends in the correspondence of my life this expression, "Greek" and "philosopher," interchangeably. The Greeks have not only created philosophy, but they have been absorbed by philosophy. The Greeks are philosophers, just as the Jews are the prophets. The Jews are represented by Isaiah and Jeremiah, whether they like it or not. There is nothing more -- Moses was the first prophet, and Malachi was the last. And Ju- -- prophecy is Judaism, and Judaism is prophecy, and if it isn't, then we don't care. Then it's nobody's business to dabble with. The Jews outside the prophetic tradition are as in- -- uninteresting as the Sioux, or the Apaches. They are only interesting fo- -- because they are the prophets. And the Greeks are not interesting except for having been the philosophical nation.

So you see, that to say -- speak of the history of Greek philosophy is really saying twice the same thing. The only thing that interests -- in Greece is philosophy. And what it entails. And it entails much more than you think. It entails, of course, a tragedy. It entails Homer. It is the Greek spirit. That is philosophical. We shall see that this is the real problem of your own day, gentlemen. If you want to survive as Americans, you have to get something you don't have. Something of this Greek philosophical mind. This is the most unphilosophical country in the world today. So it's -- quite foreign to you. You have no access to Greece -- to the Greek mind at this moment, although you think you have. Nobody thinks in this country for himself.

Because philosophy, gentlemen, has two further qualities. And the Greeks had two further qualities. One is that philosophy is for the few and not for all. That's against the American tradition. Everything has to be for everybody. Philosophy isn't. It's not for the slave. It's not for women. It is not for the athlete. It is not for everything you are. It's not for the man who -- wants to make money. You can't be a philosopher and become rich.

It's very disagreeable, gentlemen, to say this from the beginning. I hope that one-half of you will sign out of this course, at the end of this lecture. That would be a triumph. The second thing is that you all try to make life easier. And it is a recommendation if people say that life can be made, by buying a Cadillac, more comfortable, or a refrigerator, or a television. It's nicer. The -- Greek -- philosophy makes things more difficult. If you wound the clock -- make the clock run down, the weights of the clock -- philosophy tries to wind them up. To wind life up, gentlemen, make it more difficult, obviously is hard. It's not easy.

What is sold to you as philosophy on the marketplace, gentlemen, in this country is not philosophy. Of course, the word "philosophy" today is turned into its opposite and it means that every coun- -- -body can think as he pleases, that it is easy, that it makes you win friends, and become rich quick. And not -- don't pay taxes by being clever. That has nothing to do with philosophy. It certainly has nothing to do with the Greek mind. The Greek mind has developed an -- an attitude by which the few try to wind up the clock, which in the process of history always tends to run down. America at this moment is totally run down. It has no future. It has no prophecy. It has no promise. It has no philosophy. It just exists by prosperity, which is the opposite of life. Your whole election here in this country is fought on nothing. No issue. No question. And certainly no future for America. Just the next year. Will the boom go on?

Gentlemen, do you think that a great nation would have such an attitude? It's the total absence of philosophy in the year 5- -- 1956 which I think makes it very questionable whether a course on philosophy, as it was created, is reasonable here. Just as it is very unreasonable to teach about the Jewish prophets in a time when the people do not like to hear that they are doomed. That's -- prophets of doom, again. Doom and prophecy go together. Difficulty and philosophy go together, gentlemen. Well, philosophy has to do with the extraordinary thought, which -- the unusual thought, which -- that which goes against the trend.

I once had dinner here with the then-dean of the college. He grew dependent and took his life later, as is usual today in modern America, middle-

aged people, because they have nothing to live for, so they take their life. And a few years before he did this, he had dinner with us somewhere else. And my wife was next to -- seated next to him, and he said, "How can your husband do and teach these things?"

She said, "Why not? Aren't they true?"

"Yes," he said. "But they are against the trend."

And she said, "That's just why he teaches them."

And he was flabbergasted. Has never forgiven me for that. You cannot say anything in this country which is against the trend. Five years ago there -- everybody here was talking about war against Russia. It was imminent. I s- -- forget. There were three students, like you, standing in the Indian Bowl next to me. And they said, "World war is coming."

And I said, "No. There is no war coming. There won't be a war with Russia."

And they let me stand and fled off -- as though I had -- was pest-ridden, you see. I could infect them with this heresy. Well, there was no war. You mustn't say anything against the trend on this campus.

The strange thing of a philosopher is, gentlemen, certainly that he is the embodiment of saying something against the trend. And he says it as a minority. So I com- -- sum up once more, philosophy is the power of the few to go against the trend.

Now as to the history of Greek philosophy: since the Greeks embody philosophy, and if you speak of a philosopher, you think -- of whom would you think of a philosopher, first place? Give me some names.

(Plato.)

Plato, first.

(Aristotle.)

Aristotle. More?

(Socrates.)

Socrates. More? Anybody else?

(Lucretius.)

Ja. Our friend Lucretius, and -- because it's on the book -- list, yes. Pythagoras, I think you also know from his unfortunate mathematical discovery. Now they are all Greek names. Or they are people who have adopted Greek civilization like Cicero, and Seneca, and Lucretius, the Romans. Or they are Jews like Philon of Alexandria who wrote in Greek and tried to reconcile his Jewish religion with his Greek philosophy. But the contribution of the Greek element in everybody's education is always philosophy. Even in our modern times, gentlemen, every school in America, which tried to rid itself of Greek influence, had a Greek name. The most famous one, which of course in the eyes of a Greek wouldn't be philosophy, is pragmatism. It's a Greek word, you see. Knowing by doing, it means, pragmatism, you see. And only as long as I do something shall I believe it. If I don't do it, I shall not believe it. That's pragmatism. Pragma is Greek. It comes -- has to do with -praxis, -practic, practical. It's a Greek word.

All words which you use in your thinking, gentlemen, are Greek. The word "philosophy" itself, and the word "idea," and on it goes. And where there is -- the word "physics," of course, the word "physiology." And where there is not a Greek word directly, gentlemen, which is helpful -- "theology," for example, is Greek, you see. But instead of "physiology," we unfortunately say today "natural science." So that's a Latin word. But that's cor- -- translated from the Greek, purely, and is a misunderstanding. The Latins were such poor philosophers; whenever they translated a Greek word, they made nonsense. They committed a faux -- mistake.

So w- --- you all, who use the word "nature," as though you understood what it meant, bandy around a word with -- any -- without any meaning. I take it for granted, gentlemen, and you all use the word "nat-" -- "nature" and "natural," but I also know that no -- not one of you knows what he means when he says "nature." Not one of you has any natural or normal meaning for "nature." It's just one of these trite words which you bandy around in order to confuse the issue. You even think that you are natural. You, the most unnatural people in the world. Yes, you think that you are natural. There's nothing natural about a

Dartmouth student. It's the hybrid product of a dying civilization. But even if I say "hybrid," I use a Greek term. All the terms of philosophy are to this day Greek, or as I said, Latin translations of the Greek. There is no English -- Anglo-Saxon root in philosophy. Take the word "object" and "subject." That's Latin misunderstood -- -standing the Greek. Same true about the word "ma-" -- "materialism," or -- which plays such a -- or "economy," you see, "economic materialism," or "historical materialism." All these terrible words which we bandy around when we fight the Cold War, they are all of Greek origin.

For this reason, the history of Greek philosophy was found necessary in modern -- the last 2,000 years to enable us to get behind our own notions, and our own terms. So gentlemen, the history of Greek philosophy is like a -- visit to the tool manufacturer, whose tools we need in making motors. And it is very good to go to Springfield, Vermont, and go to Mis- -- the -- Mr. -- what's the ba- -- big firm there?

(J and L.)

Wie?

(J. and L. J. and L. Jones and Lampson.)

Jones and Lampson, yes. And to -- to see what -- how these machineries which make machines, or -- which work -- in -- in other factories are made. The Greek philosophy -- the history of Greek philosophy then, gentlemen, has a practical purpose: to enable us to free -- yourselves from the accident of your usage in your mind. You use all ter- -- kind of nonsensical words. If I hear an Amer- -- American student anywhere, but especially at Dartmouth, use these terms "object," and "subject," and "concrete," and "abstract" all come from the Greek, and "infinitive," I know you misun- -- that you -- misunderstand them. I mean, you all know that in this college, nine-tenths of the students misunderstand "concrete" and "abstract" and use it in the opposite sense. In the wrong sense, I mean.

You can only understand this by going back to the creators of these -- this terminology. And I treat this course therefore for you as a course of emancipation, a course to get rid of your slogans, of your detritus, of the -- dead words, dead terms, dead notions, dead concepts which you bandy around, because

gentlemen, I think we can't afford any longer to be simply blindly dependent on the Greek usage, on the Greek terminology. And if we want to become the equals of the Greek, as we have to now, for the first time in history, we must free ourselves from the accidental Greek dress which we still wear, you see. But it is so worn out that they have no longer the fresh meaning of the -- in the Greek situation, you see. But they are useless for us.

I think we are in exactly the Greek situation of the beginning when Greek philosophy became necessary. But for this very reason, I recommend to you this history of Greek philosophy as an attempt to replace -- replace the obsolete, merely inherited traditional Greek terminology -- replace it by your own findings, by a terminology which will fit our shoe exactly as philosophy fitted the Greek shoe. Obviously, if we want to have a modern man's philosophy, we must not speak Greek, because the Greeks did not speak Egyptian, but Greek. And it is to me, therefore, as though you would speak Egyptian if you now tried to carry on 3,000 years of -- of -- verbiage. There is such a layer of dust, and patina, and rust on all these terms, you see, that the value -- their value may be shown in the history of Greek philosophy in the -- at the -- but at the same time, we will feel the need of retranslating them, so to speak, into our terms. Can you see this?

Therefore, please accept my definition of this course then, gentlemen, as an effort to emancipate ourselves from the accidental tradition of the Greek thought, or Greek philosophy, and to get at its lasting, original approach, enable us to be as original as the Greeks. That's the attempt that must be made in any such history. If we can equate your and my situation today in the world at large with the Greek situation, we will be as good philosophers as they were. If you, however, just let this hang around, as slogans from grammar school and high school around your neck, you will perish. Because gentlemen, undigested Greek philosophy makes un- -- disenable men to live, because it institutes a separation of mind and body, which -- from onanism to homosexuality, to the enslavement of the other -- other races, to the deprivation of women, and to mob rule, destroys your whole society.

A Greek mind misunderstood, gentlemen, leads to all the perversities that surround us today. The -- there's a strange reason, gentlemen, for this, which the Greek philosophers expressed with this very simple sentence: that the corruption of the best was always the worst. The corruption of the best is the worst. Perhaps you take down this notion. And -- since philosophy is a very good thing, if you corrupt it, it corrupts you totally.

The Latin phrase of this -- who knows -- has -- has anybody in this class learned Latin by any chance? Who has? Not one? Ja, that's one of these notions of -- you had it, so you don't have to have it. Isn't that right?

This is a good maxim, gentlemen. And it is: *Corruptio optimi pessima*.

Gentlemen, if you corrupt a young man, it's bad enough. If you corrupt a virgin, it is terrible. That is, a good girl is a great -- greater masterpiece of nature than a man. If you corrupt her, you see, the corruption is worse.

Now here you have a typical sentence of the great times of Greek philosophy, gentlemen. This sentence, as you can see, applies to all fields of life: to things, to people, to -- to our beliefs, to institutions. The greatness of this sentence, *Corruptio optimi pessima*, the corruption of the best leads always to the worst corruption, you see. If you corrupt here this desk, well, it's just an ugly desk. If you misshape -- misshape Sanborn Hall -- as it is misshaped -- if you enter it, you see, you -- you run against the -- the newel there, but it -- what does it matter? I mean, it's just Sanborn Hall. So a -- an ugly building is -- it's a pity, but not much harm is done, you see. If you are corrupted, gentlemen, very much harm is done. As I said, if a mother of a family is corrupted, the world comes to an end.

Therefore, the greatness of these first philosophical traditions of the human race is that they are valid for what you call "nature," for society, for religion, for law, for art. They have a validity, which your little sentence, 2 and 2 is 4, has not; 2 and 2 is 4 is just true for -- for things, gentlemen, for dead things. In a good company, gentlemen, you cannot number the people, you see. A -- a crowd may be reduced to 2 and 2, maybe, when they are really friendly -- friendly parties, like the Democrats and Republicans, but just -- you see, there are millions, but there are just two. Their numbers just disappear.

Well, you don't know this, but your mind, gentlemen, is cluttered with departmentalization. All the truths which you have are only applying either to buttons, or to people, or to motors, or to one definite little field of life or the other. All philosophical thought, gentlemen, has an infinite number of applications. I only want you -- give you this example to now make a second distinction: what philosophy is not. Philosophy is not a science, because any science divides reality in people, in things, in plants, in animals, in iron -- metals, and minerals, in chemicals or -- or -- or -- or waves. That is, all science deals with subdivisions of reality. Philosophy states which subdivisions of reality are to be made, and which are wrong, or which are limited, or which have to go. Philosophy goes against the trend. Science is the trend.

You are all under the trend. You think psychology, or psychoanalysis today, or biochemistry, or psychosomatics. Oh! You run -- existentialism, you see. Philosophy sits back and said, "What a fad," see? And says it is a fad. And every time has its fad, and you are the victims of this fad.

A philosopher is not the victim of a fashion. This country, however, prides itself that in September that's one philosophy and next October Life will come out with the next philosophy. And if it isn't Life, it's Reader's Digest.

So gentlemen, philosophy is this side of the division of your language, of your inherited little department store of your mind. Your whole mind is subdivided. It's like a desk with innumerable drawers. You think that all plants are -- come under the authority of botanists. Now any poet of course laughs off this and says, about plants, "I, the poet, who give the rose to his sweetheart, know much more than all the botanists of the world put together." But you don't believe this, gentlemen, because you mistake expensive flowers for beautiful flowers. You believe that if you spend more money on flowers, they are prettier. They're only pretty if you have picked them -- yourself. And anything you -- carry to Mr. Porter is just so much wasted money, for your gardenia, because you relate flowers to money.

That's just as bad as relating flowers to the microscope. Both is not -- not important. Flowers have nothing to do with botanists, and they have nothing to do with the -- Mr. Porter on Main Street. But for you, that's the only relation you know about flowers. You know that you have to spend on a weekend so many dollars, otherwise the girl isn't satisfied. Well, she is not a girl, anyway, if she is not satisfied. She should only be satisfied if you have picked the flower. That's the only reason why you should -- she should appreciate it. Not because you pay money for it.

But you are totally corrupt, gentlemen, because you have sub- -- subdivided your life already into the financial department, where you are running into debt, and into the scientific department, where you look up how many -- how many leaves the -- the flower has, and where it is classified away in the system. And that's what you call your relation to -- to plants. You have no normal relation to a plant, gentlemen. Philosophy tries to restore your immediate relation to plant life. And what is this relation -- to a plant, gentlemen, which you may use to express your affection for a young lady? What is this situation, gentlemen, before a man has subdivided his relations to the outer world into these tidy compartments? This is, as I said, science, and this is finance, and this is trade,

and this is business, and that's politi- -- and that's family, and that's society, and that's -- that's news, and so -- et cetera. That's how you live. But the normal person, gentlemen -- that's why I think you are unnatural -- is not satisfied with these divisions. And the -- philosopher thinks he is normal -- or he tries to restore the norm.

There is one quality in the -- in philosophy, gentlemen, which I would like to mention today already to warn you: that in sci- -- in science you can learn something. In philosophy you cannot. Philosophy has nothing to do with things, because we do not even know if there are things. Perhaps all this is just the skin around my body. Perhaps this is all me. There have been philosophers who have said the whole universe is just one big person. That's -- just as reasonable as to deny it, you see. All these nice divisions, because you are sitted -- seated here on your fannies, and don't care for the rest of us, may lead you into total blindness, because a -- a man who cannot identify himself with the rest of the world probably will never understand the world. You cannot understand the world by sitting back. If you are not part and parcel of the universe, you will have no idea what it's all about.

Well, philosophers don't know this. They know nothing. As a matter of fact, we'll see that the first Greek philosophers were very much bent on -- on finding out about nothing. What nothing is. What is nothing? Because before can you say what something is, you better look -- watch out what's the opposite of it. Something -- nothing, you see. What is nothing? You all think you know. You have no idea.

Gentlemen, the sense which the philosopher tries to cultivate in us is the sense of wonder. Now there are three senses of wonder. And you have lost two of them totally. And therefore you do -- can hardly be expected to understand Greek philosophy. There is a sense of wonder about something, out- -- outside of me and you, here. I wonder that I have been admitted to teach at this college. They didn't know what they were doing. I wonder. I wonder: there I wonder about other people and their doings, gentlemen. I can also wonder that this earth is supporting 2 billion people, feeding them, clothing them, and allowing them by and large to coexist for now -- quite a number of thousands of years. Because as I know people, they begrudge each other's existence. They are all full of envy, and greed, and hatred, and jealousy, and mis- -- suspicion especially; and suspicion beg- -- begets anxiety; and anxiety begets murder. Therefore, why don't we kill -- each other all, just for security reasons, like Mr. Stalin at the end of his life, for -- simply because he was so afraid, you see. He had to see somebody die every day to make sure that he himself could still live on. That happens. Persecution

mania is a very, very widespread phobia.

So -- I wonder. I wonder that in the long run we have managed to be at peace. And gentlemen, don't get this talk in -- in the -- in the newspapers wrong. I mean, they talk about war, but we should talk about the miracle that we -- have no -- that we don't -- are -- are not at war. That's much more miraculous. It's -- with a sense of wonder that I see that this overpopulated earth is at peace at this moment. The have-nots have waged the last war. The Germans, the Italians, and Japanese. According to all the laws of Darwinism, they should have won the war, because they have nothing, we have too much. So why didn't they get it? You see, that's Darwinism. See, struggle of -- for existence. No, we put them down. So the Japanese have nothing to eat. And the Germans have prosperity. And the Italians are the best of all because they are very industrious and frugal people, and they have real faith. And they have come out as the moral winners of this war, I feel. They are the only nation which has grown in size over the last 30 years. We have diminished. The Italians have grown. They are great people. Nobody speaks of them, because they are so great that they are overlooked. They are much greater than the Russians; and much greater than the Japanese; and certainly much greater than the Americans. Because they are a poor country, and they have grown, without any assets.

Have you -- who has been to Italy over the last five years? Well, haven't you found them a very splendid people, or not? Wie?

{{ }.)

What?

{{ }.)

Where did you go?

(Rome. { }.)

Well, I only say this because you have -- all clichés from -- inherited, so that the WASPS are no good, you see, and the French are good. This is one of these standardized slogans in this country, but obviously the French are no good and the Ital- -- the WASPS are very good today. And the -- all the American tradition is the other way around. Because you live by cliché, without any sense of wonder, you cannot perceive the world afresh. You have just inherited certain superstitions. Not by your own effort you have, but just that's the cliché in this

country, you see, that all the -- the -- that France has to be supported through thick and thin, through our wrong foreign policy.

Now the sense of wonder can also apply, gentlemen, to the man who says something. In Greece, and in Greek philosophy, the man who is a philosopher is admired, is wondered at, is a cause for astonishment. The most common expression in the dialogues of the philosophers of antiquity is the -- that he is a man who speaks -- who says something, like Socrates, is addressed as "You Astonishing One." And that is very important, because it is exactly the same linguistic root as "wonder for things." Not only is the world a wondrous world, as in Prospero's Tempest, but also the man who says the truth about this world is a cause for wonderment.

And I therefore would like you to note this: the topic of philosophy is wonderment, and it is wonderment in three aspects: wonderment about the man who philosophizes; wonderment about the people to whom he turns for instruction, or for information, or for judgment, or for affection, or for -- social -- intercourse; and the things which are needed for these people to live on, to live with. If you do not understand this threefold sense of wonder, gentlemen, you cannot be a philosopher. And since in America people have -- the only sense they have left out of the sense of wonder is curiosity, and quiz kids, and \$64,000 questions, which excludes wonder, which is just "Information, Please," there is no philosophy in this country, gentlemen. There is just a little bit, factual knowledge. Science is dealing with facts. Philosophy is cultivating our sense of wonder. That is, in this moment, for example, I'm dissatisfied with all the sciences, because I think that they are not dealing with the most wondrous facts. They haven't discovered them, yet. So any philosophy, gentlemen, begets sciences and puts them to work on the next stage of wonderment. When we have -- you see, all the sciences of today taken together, they will not cover your or my real riddle of existence at this moment. Take the racial question. Take this future of -- of the globe. What shall we do with the globe -- with the problem of -- of Mars or moon, with the problem of sex? There are no sciences which really cope with this satisfactory. Any philosophy today therefore will say: this, this, this, sense of wonder hasn't been cultivated. All sciences, gentlemen, turn to a special theme of wonderment of a philosopher, and all philosophers create new senses of wonder. That's why they make life more difficult, because if -- the way you live, you live without wonderment. You think that the Dartmouth Bookstore is a bookstore. I wonder.

For the last 20 years, serious people on this campus have given much

thought to this fact that we have no bookstore. They could sell -- just as well sell herrings. And probably the herrings would be better than the -- the books. We have no bookstore, gentlemen; which is a scandal. We have no horse stable. We have no fencing master. We have many things wh- -- not which we should have. The reason why we don't have a bookstore is because the -- the previous owner of the bookstore lost his fiancée to the president of the college then, and so the president of the college felt he should at least let the poor boy should have his bookstore, because he didn't keep his wife.

So -- well, that's not a good reason for your having no bookstore here. And that's now antiquated, I think; belongs to ancient philosophy. Well, gentlemen, it's a scandal that this town has no bookstore. It's just unbelievable. You -- but of course, you don't read, anyway. This is not a bookstore. If you would, at the end of this course, understand why this is not a bookstore, you would have learned something.

I'll tell you why it isn't a bookstore. A bookstore begins with selling one book to one person, and a book this person wants. This bookstore will not order a book unless 25 people order it. And if I put an order into this bookstore, they say, "Oh, I have to wait till I can order more books from this same publisher." That is, they treat reading as a wholesale business, like steel, or wool, or something, you see -- inanimate. Now books of course are meeting with real, living people, and since they are not -- { } since they are not masters of ceremonies introducing me to -- to Aristotle, you see, they are not a bookstore. They're just funny. And they are really criminals on the college, because they prevent your making this -- these contacts, these social contacts which are much more important than meeting another 2,900 -- I won't say what.

So then, gentlemen, there have be- -- there has been a very fine graduate of this college, an alumni -- alumnus, who came to this town in order to -- to create a bookstore. He was very rich -- he is very rich, and so he could have done it. And he was talked out of this. And he does other nice things for Dartmouth College at this moment. But the one thing he came -- set out to do, he was prevented from doing by the prejudice of this town, which has lost its sense of wonder about bookstores. And just the routine, and the trend have won out and again we have no bookstore.

So will you kindly then -- take this definition of my course, gentlemen?

The Greeks have cultivated the sense of wonder. And they have cultivated the sense of wonder with regard to the world, with regard to God, and with regard to man. What are the -- is fate, war, revolution, famine, death? What are all the

powers that make our lives? I wonder. What are you? What am I? Who speaks, who begins to wonder himself? How wondrous that man can wonder. Even this is a reason for wonderment. And the third: what is all this around us? The earth, and the stars, and the air, you see. How wondrous. And this frontier between Vermont and New Hampshire on the other side of the river: how strange. You know that the frontier between Connecticut -- the -- New Hampshire and Vermont is not the middle of the Connecticut River -- but on the other side. That's unique in -- in all geography, in all history, in all political boundaries. The only case where the river is not separating the two states in its middle, but on one -- on one side. Do you know that? Well, these damned New Hampshire people have done this to us in Vermont.

So we have a definition, gentlemen. The history of Greek philosophy is the history of that institution which cultivates the sense of wonder. And it cultivates the sense of wonder with regard to those who wonder, with regard to the subjects to be wondered at, and with regard to the power which rules that we must wonder, that are the gods. It is our fate to wonder: what's fate? We wonder how strange people we are. And what to be -- is to be wondered at is again, you see, the riddle of the world.

So gentlemen, will you kindly, therefore, see why this course is so very top-heavy, and very difficult to teach? In America, in the last 50 years, the first heresy that has been taught is that philosophy, if it is to be any good, must be a science. Therefore, this country has no philosophy, because if it is a science, it is not philosophy. Science is dealing with something definite, you see. Philosophy is stepping outside all the definitions already given, and finds out, you see, an infinity of causes for wonder which the existing definitions do not cover, or misplace, or misdefine, or -- mutilate, or wrench.

Therefore, the history of philosophy is the sequence of stations of wonderment, and of people who were impressive enough that they forced their contemporaries to give room for a new sense of wonder. And therefore, gentlemen, philosophy is always against the so-called youth of a country. You have this great prejudice that to be young means to be -- come wiser than the old. The old people you discard, and you think that just because you are born in a certain year, you must be more intelligent than the people of the year before, or 10 years earlier. This very -- wholesome prejudice keeps you so stupid, because wisdom, gentlemen, begins where age is of no help. Neither youth nor old age. An old -- man can be an -- an ass and an ox, and a young man can be the same. The -- the birth certificate is no guarantee for your being not obsolete. You can be just as obsolete as a Spaniard is today. America is perhaps already obsolete.

We don't know. But certainly be -- the fact that you have been born, gentlemen, has absolutely nothing to do with your modernity. Because there are whole nations where many young people live, and yet the whole country is just obsolete.

But there is this first superstition, gentlemen, that history is obsolete because it is older than you. That's questionable. That's very questionable. I think that many ways of your mind, gentlemen, are obsolete. If I -- uncover the skull of a -- the average American high school product, I find that your categories -- your ways of thinking are all going back to the year 1750. This country is the product of the Enlightenment. And you are in my -- the Enlightenment to me is as dead as the dodo, is obsolete. And therefore most Americans, I think, are obsolete men, have-been men, as the Russians call them, because the Enlightenment is antiquated.

And it is this thesis, gentlemen, which makes this course so very difficult to teach, because the Enlightenment had recourse to the Greek philosophers, to prove its point that reason, that the human mind could dismiss all taboos, all laws between the generations, that the last generation was always the most intelligent, that progress was automatic, that you couldn't miss it, and that you could not lapse and fall from grace. That's why we lost the First World War. That's why we had to go to the Second World War, because people were quite sure that just by sitting on their fannies, they couldn't miss out on anything. It would just always go on further, better, better and bigger.

You know when the -- when the different nationalities set out to write a book on the elephant, the Englishman wrote the book, How to Hunt the Elephant; and the German wrote a book, System- -- Systematic Place of the Elephant in Zoology, and the American wrote a book, Bigger and Better Elephants.

Because you are so sure that everything can be improved, gentlemen. But this idea, gentlemen, that everything can be improved, leads to the destruction of all the things where we have -- can hardly hope that they exist at all. Family relations cannot be improved. The important thing is that there are any family relations, and not divorce. If you get a divorce, out goes the family, you see. Therefore, the automatic belief in progress means, you see, that you think you all the time can improve the family until there is no family left.

All the things, gentlemen, that are brittle and frail, like a flower, that wither on the stem within five minutes, like my spirit or your spirit, that are endangered by ruin, and death, and illness, and depression, and -- they are so

tender, you see, that your and my belief that they will exist automatically must lead to their destruction, because it takes every effort of our imagination and devotion to keep them alive. {So if you don't} water a plant, a forget-me-not, because you think that it must be more beautiful tomorrow, you will find no forget-me-not tomorrow; it will be dead, you see. You have to cultivate this, to keep it alive just 24 more hours, have you not? If you, instead of watering the plant, think that it will go on and be better tomorrow, there is just no plant left; there's no family left; there's no government left; there is no religion left; and that's how you have treated the human history over the last 50 years, gentlemen. You have taken it for granted that it will exist without your devoting yourself to its -- to its restoration. It will not.

Let us have a break here.

[tape interruption]

...material, so to speak, on which he draws. Then there is a collection called The Pre-Socratic Philosophers, by {Freeman}. Who has all these books already? Well, so these, gentlemen, are perhaps kin- -- do you have these books with you today? Who has? Nobody. Well, I hope -- you will show them to the others. That's very precious. It's just a collection of all the texts of this -- philosophers who preceded Socrates and whom we today think the -- were the greatest of all Greek thinkers. They -- they founded philosophy. They dis- -- they cultivated this sense of wonderment. The Pre-Socratic Philosophers.

Then there is the little booklet, like this, of Plato's five dialogues. Then there's Aristotle, Politics and Poetics in a cheap edition. And finally, there is from the -- end of the Greek antiquity the poem by Lucretius, the materialist, On Nature. Every American is, I think, more or less a Lucretian today. For the last hundred years, Lucretius' philosophy has been more or less the philosophy of America. We'll -- shall start with reading Lucretius. And on this I will spend now the next half hour, to show you why the approach from the later times of Greek philosophy is the more sound approach than the -- to start with the archaic, first philosophers.

The history of Greek philosophy, gentlemen -- it can be divided roughly into 2,000 years, not quite -- from 800 B.C., that's Homer and the Olympian Games, the institution of the Olymp- -- { }. Does anybody know when the Olympian Games allegedly were instituted? One has to know this, because all Greek and Roman time -- chronology, time-tailoring was based on the first Olympian Games. Have you never heard of this? You should be intere- -- I -- {if

you are} not even interested in Olympian Games, in what are you interested? The Olympic Games were instituted in 776 B.C. So there the -- so to speak, rational history of Greece -- the post-mythological history of Greece begins. And it must be more or less contemporary with Homer, because Homer in The Iliad obviously alludes to the Olympic Games in a -- in a kind of snide -- sni- -- how do -- would you say? -- underhanded fashion, I mean. He -- disapproves of them. So 776 is an important date in the history of the human race, gentlemen. It's the awakening of the Greek history -- Greek people to their self-consciousness, to feeling that they have a history of their own. Before, everything is just part of Oriental history.

Now gentlemen, this first part of Greek history goes back -- goes on to 600. And that's the hi- -- prehistory of Greek philosophy. It is there wrestling with the Orient and with myth. From 600 to, by and large, the birth of Christ, or 50 after Christ, we may say, from -- begins this astonishing history of these wondrous people called "philosophers." The first whom we mention is Thales of Miletus. And it goes on to two non-Greeks: Cicero in Rome, and Philo in Alexandria. And -- here is a Latin and a Jew who fall under the spell of Greek thinking, and thereby show its omnipotence, its -- that whoever is a philosopher has to go Greek, so to speak, you see. If he wants to share the wonderment of the Greek mind, he rates -- enters the history of Greek philosophy. Cicero and Philo. And Cicero was -- has -- is said to have ed- -- edited this poem of Lucretius, which you -- we are going to read, because Lucretius died from something very human, from a philter of love, from a -- trying to -- to be either more potent, or -- arousing a lady's affections, we don't know. We have only this one sentence in an old father of the church, that Lucretius perished by drinking a philter of love, which makes your appetite, of course -- arouses your appetite to know a little bit more of this strange man. He died in 55 before Christ. So -- 12 years before Cicero. And Cicero seems to have edited his poem, as a -- because he was overtaken by this death unexpectedly.

Now gentlemen, this is the center part of the history of Greek philosophy, the original part. What we call Greek philosophy was, so to speak, produced in these 600 years. The times from 800 to 600 we have to speak of as preparatory, as putting the problem, that always one man should carry the ball and develop, recultivate this sense of wonder. This -- after all a strange thing. In -- in our times, you find in this country that nobody tries to develop any sense of wonder. From 6- -- from the birth of Christ to 529, gentlemen, we get a third period of the Greek -- history of the Greek philosophy: Greek philosophy competing

with Christianity. Now all this period is the period best known to us, because our source material is very rich for this later part, and most of the doctrines of Greek philosophy have really come to us in this garb of -- of contemporary teaching -- with Christianity. So that's from 50 A.D. to 529. In 529, gentlemen, the Academy in Athens was closed, and that was the end of an independent Greek, philosophical tradition. You have to know this. 529 is a most important year. By and large at the same year was introduced our Greek -- our Christian calendar, the counting of eras. In 534, the first man wrote a book -- A.D. Five hundred years this took, you see, before the Christian era, you see, was established.

I mention this because it is interesting that the Islam -- era came into being shortly afterwards. And the Jewish era, too. The Jews -- the Christian era was created at this time when the Greek mind went out of existence, so to speak. The Jewish era was created in competition with the Christian era, at the end of the 6th century of our -- own era. And then the Mohammedan, as you know, is the third. They were all created about the same time.

So this ver- -- very dark century, gentlemen, from 529 to 622 should become a little more interesting to you when you consider that the -- the reckoning of time was the creation of this era. When you read about the Jewish New Year, this year in the -- when is it, this year? Who knows?

(It was.)

Is already over? When was it?

(The 18th.)

And which year was it?

(5717.)

Well, that's an invention of the 6th century of our era. Nobody ever thought of this -- counting this manner before. And it was done in -- in replica and in antithesis to the Christian counting. First comes the Christian counting, then came the Jewish counting, and then came the Islamic counting. And I think that's quite important for you to know.

Well, at that time, gentlemen, when the people eliminated the pagan antiquity and only had a Christian and a Jewish counting, Greek philosophy fell dead to the ground. That goes together, of course, you see. They wanted to

eliminate the Greek strand of our life. And from 529 to the days of Charlemagne, to the -- take perhaps the year 1800 -- 827, the death of the Scotchman, the greatest philosophy of these early days, first great Scotchman, John the Scotch, or Eriugena, probably born in Ireland, John Scotus, was the last philosopher in Christian garb, of {grave} -- greatness of ancient caliber.

So we have -- Greek philosophy competes with Christianity from 50 of our era. The first man in this line is Seneca. And then comes the so-called neo-Platonists, and the neo-Pythagoreans, all the words with "neo," that is, new, belong into this time -- era from 50 to 529. And from 529 to 877, Greek philosophy has to dress up as Christian in order to live. And we have two great names there, whom you must put down in your -- in your -- in your notes: the famous Areopagite, Dionysius the Areopagite, usually just quoted "the Areopagite," who wrote about 500 -- a little later or a little earlier, we don't know, and who's a forgery. The -- these poor philosophers had to feign that they were written by a Christian author in order to be tolerated at that time, because their schools, you see, had lost their -- their authority, their freedom of teaching. And the same is true of John Scotus. So I put these two names down: John Scotus Eriugena. And Eire, as you know, is the official word for Ireland. And he dies probably at the end of the 9th century, supposedly in 877.

We have four -- periods of this history of Greek philosophy then, gentlemen: a prehistory of at least 200 years from Homer to the first explicit philosopher; then we have the classical period from 600 A -- B.C. to 500 -- 50 A.D. Then 500 years of competition with Christianity, and then 300 years of hiding inside or under the cloak of Christianity.

Now why do I say then that it is useful to go backward? As you see, this Greek philosophy comes out of a Homeric and Oriental age. Then the philosophers get in their -- on their own. They attract even the Jews and the Romans to a certain extent. Then they have to go in hiding. They have to compete with the new force of life, Christianity, the Church, theology. And finally they are not even allowed to call themselves philosophers, you see. They have to pose as though they were themselves Christian thinkers.

So gentlemen, they went underground, so to speak, at the end. And they came from underground. And they were rediscovered, gentlemen, backward. You may know that the first ancient thinker who was rediscovered was St. Augustine, who comes at the end of the competitive {period} where philosophers compete with the Greek -- you see, with the Christian spirit. St. Augustine's pagan, or philosophical, writings were first read in the Middle Ages.

So the story, gentlemen, of your and my relation to this -- to this thing is very strange. Here you have the march of -- in ti- -- through time, in this direction. That's Greek philosophy historically. But if you look backward, this would be then from 1776 to A. -- A.D. -- B.C. to 877 A.D. Now if you look however at the Americans, at the Europeans, at the Renaissance people, at the people who founded colleges like Harvard University or even Dartmouth College in the wilderness, these people looked at Greek philosophy from the end, backward. And first, they only were interested in the latest -- in the latest philosophers. I could -- let me put this name. I could also put of course the name of Areopagite. If you read a book on philosophy, let's say of the year 1500, they all know everything about these people, you see, and know very little of Plato or of Aristotle. Still, as you know, the -- the great revolution in the Middle Ages was dealing with Aristotle. But nobody read Plato at that time. So the -- Plato was only read after 1450. So he was discovered much later than Aristotle, 300 years later he became popular. And in the 19th century, all people began to read the pre-Socratics, and there's a literature now on these pre-Socratics, you see, that you just can't get through, so much ink is spilled now on the Oriental influences on Greek philosophy and the beginnings of the Greek mind here. This book is most modern and fashionable, the pre-Socratic texts: Pythagoras, and Thales, and -- and -- { } Parmenides. The -- the leading propa- -- philosopher of Europe, Mr. Heidegger, is just Parmenides redi- -- redivivus. And Parmenides is much older than Socrates and Plato. And Par- -- Mr. Heidegger thinks that Plato and Aristotle are just obsolete, that the real McCoy is -- is Parmenides, you see, who lived a hundred years earlier.

Now that's very difficult for you to understand, because -- I know a young mathematician who told me that they wouldn't written anything that was written in mathematics and was older than 10 years ago. Of course, this man can never be a mathematician. But he can be a good American, because you also think that nothing that is 10 years old is worth reading, you see. In philosophy, it's the other way around, gentlemen. The history of -- the renewal of the philosophical spirit has gone -- has -- strangely enough been one of going backward. I'll give you the dates. Aristotle in 1230 was such new stuff that the pope forbids its reading. In 1265, the poor pope had to recant. It's one of the great examples, where you see that the Roman church has always changed, but never admitted it. You see, in 1230, no Aristotle allowed to be read in the schools. In 1265, Thomas Aquinas establishes his repu- -- his reputation, you see, by doing exactly the forbidden thing. That's why it's a different story, gentlemen, from

being a Thomas Aquinas and today being a Thomist. Thomas Aquinas was a bold man. And a Thomist today is a timid sheep.

So Plato was read -- in 1448, the pope first asked for a translation of The Republic by Plato. Socrates was celebrated in a famous speech by Erasmus of Rotterdam, in 1550, where he invoked him as a saint. And he said, "Saint Socrates, come to our rescue."

So these figures, whom I -- which I put here -- the pre-Socratics, gentlemen, became famous in 1840. I should put this otherwise. Pre-Socratics. So the Greek spirit has been rediscovered, gentlemen, by going backward. The greatest influence on all our traditions therefore has come from the late Greek thinkers.

And if -- when we read Lucretius first, I want to pay homage to this, our indebtedness, the way we came to be related to the Greeks. We did not beget the Enlightenment because people read Plato, or read the pre-Socratics, you see, but because we read the Stoics. And we read Lucretius. And therefore I told you that today we have to become as original as the Greeks. The Enlightenment, gentlemen, has absorbed the Greek mind in the wrong sequence, from the end backward. And my whole problem in this history is to make you aware of the strange result that must ensue when you absorb a foreign spirit, backward, you see.

And so I think I should open your mind to this strange connection with Greece which we have entertained here in the last 400 years in the Western world by entering upon this, with a -- one example, you see. People -- our ancestors 300 years ago would first be influenced, you see, by the late Greek philosophers first, and not by the early ones. And if I would only now give you now a nice history of the Greek spirit, you would be bored.

I want to show you that we're really dealing with dynamite, that all these thinkers, gentlemen, have exerted a tremendous influence on our thinking. And on this I shall enlarge the next time right away. I shall show you that since we owe our first encounter with the Greeks -- philosophical spirit to a time in which Christianity already was there, the Greek spirit no longer had to be -- cover the whole ground of wonderment. It was a limited affair. It was just in competition with Christianity. Some parts of its own achievement, you see, were now represented by the Christian tradition of the Church. And therefore the -- the Greek, so to speak, was not needed for this.

I may perhaps make the following points, gentlemen. In the last two periods of the Greek spirit, of the Greek philosophy, another power, Christianity, had guaranteed certain truths, which therefore were no longer looked for in and

by the authority of Greek philosophers. One was the equality of men and women, Number 1, as souls. The Greeks had never assumed that. Greek philosophers assumed always that men had an absolute superiority. The injustice of slavery, or the indifference to slavery -- all Greek life was based on slavery. And slaves and free men were just not the same breed of people.

The third thing is, of course, that perversion of the sex was denied by Christianity as necessary for philosophy, or for the spirit, whereas the Greek philosophy was based on -- on homosexuality. All Greek philosophers were embedded in the tradition that the spirit of man could only be aroused sufficiently to think, by homosexuality, by some love relation between men and -- male and male. There are still colleges who believe this to this day, especially rampant -- frequent in England. But I am told there -- exist even here.

However, Christianity said no spirit that is based on such an unnatural relation between teacher and student is worth having. And so gentlemen, there are certain rules, certain truths fundamental to all -- you -- of you and me who are dealing now with Greek philosophy, which the Greeks never knew in their high -- heydays. First, that philosophy cannot be based on slavery. Certainly it cannot be limited -- the highest the knowledge of -- of life cannot be limited to one sex. Third, it cannot be that sexual passion is needed to inflame man to think, to wonder, to get excited, so to speak. And what was Number -- wie? Well, there are -- perhaps I may add that the thinking was not in- -- dependent on any nationality, that the barbarians were just as much entitled to philosophize as the Greeks, that Greek had ceased to be the matrix, the necessary matrix of philosophy. Just as Hebrew ceased to be the necessary language for salvation, you see, so Greek ceased to be the necessary language for thinking. The last point perhaps: all Greek thought acquiesced in war forever.

There can be no world peace. Christianity has never -- said this -- had ac- -- has acknowledged that war exists, but the prophecy of Christianity certainly always has been that peace must ensue.

So gentlemen, from our -- in our own era, Greek philosophy has shrunk in area. Certain fundamental truths debated in Greek philosophy have been taken over in -- and decided by a -- a power which the -- superseded the Greeks and the Jews, by Christianity. The Enlightenment, gentlemen, denied this. It's my distinction -- by -- why I am -- not a member of the Enlightenment, why I do not date myself from Benjamin Franklin as you do, is that Benjamin Franklin didn't know this. He thought that the Greeks had, under their own steam, abolished perversity, homosexuality, slavery, equality of sex, and war -- and -- and peace.

And -- the Enlightenment overlooked the contribution of Christianity and thought that by mere reason, by mere philosophizing, you see, the Greeks had achieved all these wonderful ends themselves. And therefore, the -- all the books on Greek philosophy which you might -- could read today are worthless, because they are all based on this prejudice of journalism -- and secularism, and rationalism, as though the Greek mind had to achieve everything that Christianity has achieved.

If you follow this, gentlemen, we will plunge into the same dark night which is represented by nationalism and by Bolshevism. Bolshevism and Nazi- -- -cism are pure Greek mind, without -- mitigation by Christianity. You can say that Mr. Lenin has tried to realize Plato's Republic. He's a good Platonist. Because if you read The Republic, it is just as tyrannical, just as absolute as the Communist society, the classless society.

For the last 40 years, I have always felt that it is not right that American students are asked to read the laws by Plato, naïvely, because in such an agnostic society as yours, where nobody tells you -- the difference between philosophy and Christianity, and where you even think that Christianity is a philosophy, of which it is the opposite, it is terrible. If you read these books on slavery -- when the Germans and the Russians read these books by Plato, they began to think that slavery after all was a good thing. So they have their slave-labor camps in Siberia. How can you wonder, if you feed yourself on Greek philosophy?

So I say once more, gentlemen, Greek philosophy is dynamite, if you read it out of context. And we cannot afford this. After two world wars, gentlemen, and after the -- all the Jews in Europe have been eradicated under the authority of Plato, and of -- the polis, the city-state, the national spirit, you see, and the greater power for Germany, or of the classless society, you must know that this philosophy is nothing lackadaisical, and it is nothing anemic. What you think, if you think at all, is the truth 30 years later. Where you think at all. This has never been true in America, gentlemen, because the colleges here are just of no importance in the national life. But in Europe, gentlemen, what people have thought and picked out of Greek philosophy in the last 300 years has become the political fact 30 years later in the life of the nations.

And I warn you, this course is not without its dangers. I think it is necessary for us to face up to the fact that all the slogans in our -- all our sciences are of Greek origin. All the political slogans are Greek. The word "politics" is certainly Greek. But my intent is not to make you into Greeks, gentlemen, but to make you into yourself by shaking your -- off the scales, the accidental Greek phrases

which look so innocent, because they are Greek. But in part they aren't innocent at all, gentlemen.

Homosexuality, incest, all the horrible things of -- of Greek tradition, Oedipus complex, they are around us. Whether you take Mr. Mann, or Mr. Freud, or -- or Mr. Gide, you see. We have bred this spirit, you see, of pure Greek life to such an excess in the last 50 years that as you well know, Christianity has just -- has fallen by the wayside. And you cannot cure this by going to church, because most churches are just Greek. They just teach Greek stuff. The churches are no longer orthodox. They teach Aristotle, but not Christ. The Catholics. And the Lutherans teach Plato, the Protestants, but not Christ.

Everywhere in our churches, philosophy has -- acquired the government.

I have heard many debates- -- -bates with good, alleged Roman Catholics where they only knew their Aristotle from Thomas, but they didn't know St. Paul and Christ. And they thought that when they quoted Aristotle to me, that they were good Christians.

You cannot fully understand this, gentlemen, but perhaps the queer story of how the Greek mind has been received by us, going backward, will warn you that today most so-called Roman Catholics are Greek philosophers. They are thinking in terms of Aristotle, and not in terms of Christianity. And in the same way in the Protestant tradition, they are all Platonists. And Bolshevism is, as I said, just another form of Platonism. Socialism.

So to me, therefore, that was the reason why I have never wanted to teach Greek philosophy. But this is the last year here in this college. And I thought, "Once, I would make an attempt to put the Greeks in their place," gentlemen. As I said, the Greeks are a great people. And the corruption of the best is the worst. And they have been corrupted. And I -- we must make an attempt to save their greatness, without their corruption.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...before the human mind. Even before you. It is for few, gentlemen, for the few, and it is an attempt to make life more difficult. Because in the atom age, obviously -- electronics age, the great danger is that life is too -- becoming too easy. That's all unpopular in this country, because in this country it's a recommendation to say that things are getting easier. To me it is not a recommendation. I'm bored by anything that's easy, or I have been all my life. I'm only interested in things that are difficult.

So philosophy goes against the trend. If it doesn't go against the trend, it is not philosophy. Everything that's called philosophy in this country is trash, because it says that everybody can think it. That's impossible, gentlemen. Philosophy is that which not everybody can think. Otherwise it would not be anything but the routine thinking of -- the common sense, you see. So there is a tremendous distinction between philosophy, gentlemen, and what you are accustomed to call "thinking." I defy you to show me one idea of yours which is your own, one thought which you have thought against the resistance of the whole world, and which you have defended by the witness of the -- to the truth under danger of life. Before that, I'm not interested in what you say. It's not interesting, gentlemen. It's just imitation, echo of other people's thought.

Everything worth, gentlemen, has to be personified by a whole man's life.

Now the strange story of Greek philosophy is, gentlemen, that every thought that the human mind can think up about the universe, about man, and about the direction of man's life in the universe, or the treatment of man by the universe have been one -- thought before. And that's Greek philosophy. So the history of Greek philosophy is like going to the system of botany, as you find in -- in a -- in -- botany all the plants, and as you find in zoology all the animals, you find in -- in Greek philosophy all the thoughts, but all the thoughts embodied by philosophers. So not just some flimsy midsummer-night dream thought, what you call a "thought" in a bull session. I mean, "I had an idea." And next minute you say, "I'm sorry. I forgot it." But ideas lived by a whole man's life, and thereby impregnated and able to im- -- make an -- leave an imprint on the history of humanity. Plato stands for the doctrine of ideas, so he's still alive. If he had just played with it in a bull session and then forgotten it next day, nobody would either know the doctrine of ideas nor would he know Plato.

But you all have heard at least the name Plato, and he has become terrible reality in the Bolshevik government in Moscow. They are all Platonists. Because

their ideas are stronger than their practical experience, you see. They can put in concen- -- people in concentration camps because they are enemies, you see, of society, while this is their own relation. And all these real, experienced feelings, you see, do not count. Under the idea, you see, you forget even your empirical contact and feelings. Husband denounces wife; wife denounces husband; children denounce their parents, you see, because the idea is paramount that they are an enemy of society, enemy of the class. That's all Platonism.

Well, once upon a time, this man has lived. Now the strange thing is that the Greeks have exhausted the possibilities of thinking. So the first tremendous impact of this lecture course should be on you that there is no progress in your sense of the word in thought. Man in the Christian era has not been able to invent new things totally. He has entered new combinations. Everything can be combined in a new thing, but the elec- -- theory of the electron, which we hold today about the elements is found in Greek philosophy first. The atom theory and the idea that the whole universe consists of equal -- equal things is the oldest doctrine we find in Greek philosophy, already 500 B.C. We have to talk about this once more.

Today I only make this first point, gentlemen. Greek philosophers have exhausted the possibilities of original thought. That's very much against your idea of automatic progress. You think that because you are born younger than I, you must have better ideas than I. As long as you think this, gentlemen, you can have -- do no thinking. The -- he is the most original man, gentlemen, who tries to be the ordinary, the true man, who tries to think the truth. In order to think the truth, you must forget all catering to originality. You will be the most original thinker under one condition: that you don't try to be original, but veracious. All the philosophers of Greece, gentlemen, tried to be the philosopher, the only one, the only true philosopher. And that's why they are marked out by great originality. If you turn around, go to Broadway, where they have to invent something original, all these people are forgotten the next day. They may have a hit, they may have -- create a sensation. They may tickle your senses. But it's ephemeral, because they try to be original.

Anybody who tries to be original, gentlemen, is an enemy of philosophy. He may be very successful in his own day. And he probably will lure the people, as in a true circus, you see. "Never seen!" "Sensation!" You see. "For the first time!" "Only time in the world!" There was a -- there was a department store in New York 50 years ago with a sign: "The only original cone in the world." It was a good joke, you see. There are many cones in the world, as you know. But he was the only original cone in the world. That's a joke.

Serious people, gentlemen, want to represent the human kind. Therefore, human thought is philosophical only if it is generic. If you say to yourself, "I want to think what every human being wants to think, has to think, should think," you see, "is privileged to think." As soon as you think, "I want to make an impact on the world by making some -- something which nobody else has done," you become like this man who wanted to -- became famous in antiquity and he burned the famous temple of Ephesus -- in Ephesus of Diana. And the people -- said, "We won't fulfill this man's desire. We won't name him. We won't mention his name anymore, so that he may be forgotten, and he may not come to the -- to the goal of his ambition to be a -- renowned for his misdeed." Hitler, all arsons -- arson I think is an -- is an attempt to do something original. You know, there are these firebugs in the world, as there are juvenile delinquents. They want to make a name for themselves by being original. And it is nearly always a destructive act. It is -- you see, you can be original by destroying.

But to be true, gentlemen, you must not try to be original. But you will be -- the funny thing is that Plato is highly original; Aristotle is original. But both people did not want to be original. A good mother, gentlemen, will give birth to the best child -- tries to be just a mother. If she tries to be an original mother, she will end in Hollywood, and she'll have to adopt children.

That's a very strange rule, gentlemen, of truth. Truth demands from us submission, obedience to truth. Anybody who tries to be original doesn't want to obey, but to stay in command. That's why most young men are so highly unoriginal, because in their pride, they want to show what they know, and what they have thought, and it is always borrowed, and it is always plagiarized, and it is always just repetition. Any man who forgets that it is self who speaks or thinks, you see, is on the way to truth. In other words, gentlemen, all truth is selfless. It's -- the relation of philosophy, gentlemen, then is a very queer one. It is the relation of the mind to truth in the form of obedience. Obedience is not popular in this country, but it's the one quality without which any civilization dies. This is a disobedient country, and that's why it is so shallow, and has such a poor prognostication for the future. You cannot talk in this country about the future, because the future can only be reached by obedience and service. It can never be reached by self-seeking or by Cadillacs. It's impossible if you say, "I want this and this," to have any future, gentlemen. The first question toward the future obviously is: what did mean -- God mean as "the end of the world"? If you don't obey this end, you will miss it; you will go astray. If you ask "What do I want?" you -- you provoke a tremendous rebellion in all the cosmic forces,

because obviously you little frog, or you little bee, or you little wasp, and -- and I myself the same way, we are not up against these cosmic forces. We'd better obey; we are so small. We'd better find out what we are meant to do. And that's only to be fo- -- to be found by obedience.

So the first thing that will strike you, gentlemen, is that all Greek philosophy is a great act of obedience. It has been said very simply if you want to -- to s- -- know why you are not philosophers so far, why you are self-seeking individuals and why you therefore are not in contact with truth, but just with opinion, and with editorials, and with broadcasting, and with television, and all these fleeting, floating, indifferent fogs in which you move --. I'm sorry, I -- I slipped on this in my eagerness. The -- I don't -- can't carry -- perhaps it comes back to me.

The -- the quality of obedience then is nothing that distinguishes philosophers, gentlemen, from religious man. But I made an attempt last time to put you on your guard to see that Greek philosophy is not in the same sense religious as the prophets of Israel. The Bible and Greek philosophy obviously form two big streams -- or poo- -- two big avenues to truth, and they are of a very different character. And although I have not completed quite this -- what I meant to say at this moment, my next thing I -- what I would like to stress today is that there is a simple way of defining the distinction between philosophy, the service of truth in obedience and selflessness. There is a -- still a difference between the service of God in the sanctuary, of prayer. Philosophy is not in itself prayer. And prayer is not philosophy. But obviously both are attempts to meet the truth, and to fulfill man's destiny, to find the way -- the direction in which we can fulfill our destiny, and receive the -- the commands under which we want to act.

Well, I'm back now to m- -- now I can make the point. Gentlemen, the modern scientist is perhaps the most in- -- unphilosophical being there is. That's so frightening. I mean, this is a nation of plum- -- plumbers. They call themselves "engineers," and the engineers call themselves "scientists," and the scientists think that they have the secrets of the world. But -- but they do -- usually not know that they obey. What is the command over all science? The imperative. And that is the great achievement of Greek philosophy to bring this out: the imperative that is written in large letters over anybody who enters the science field is, "Let there be science." He does not question the necessity that science has to be. And science is a human creation. There is no science without your and my sacrifice for it.

Now you all, who think -- enough to be scientific, or objective, or enlight-

ened, or rational, or of -- whatever you call it, unemotional, you have this big order written in front of your -- of your skull: science shall be. Instead of the Ten Commandments, which I from -- as a person prefer, you have this one commandment: let there be science. That's very difficult for a scientist to understand that he's obeying. That is, that he -- I -- a scientist is God. But you all, gentlemen, in this country, the one thing you can appeal to -- even to -- by a -- for a -- with a truck driver or -- or with a housewife is that s- -- "Oh, science? Well, we have to have science," they will admit. They will bow to it, and if they it's scientifically necessary, they will have themselves questionnaired, and analyzed, and tested, because it's science. What can you do about it, you see? Even if it is highly destructive, science has to be worshiped, science has to be paid for, science has to be served. So people answer the most obscene questionnaires just from fear that they might desert the cause of science.

Philosophy now, gentlemen, is the knowledge of our commands. And it brings out, among other things, that the imperative, "Let there be science," is a perfectly arbitrary imperative, if you leave it alone. Obviously it cannot be the only imperative. You can also say, "Let there be me," "Let there be the United States," you see. And Hitler said, "Let there be the German race," you see. And if you drive -- push one command, obviously you go crazy. The number of imperatives, as I may call it, or commands to which we owe obedience is the great problem of philosophy. But in order to know what is necessary, the philosopher must themselves act under a necessity.

Anybody, gentlemen, who is in philosophy investigates commands under one condition: that he knows what a command is. And he can only be a co- -- a, you see, an expert in investigating commands that dominate our life: patriotism, law-abid- -- lawfulness, loyalty, you see, reverence, love, friendship, whatever you take -- science, power, vanity, whatever you cultivate -- youth, vitality, dynami- -- dynamism, revolution, democracy -- he can only discuss these big gods, these idols, if he has some experience in worship. And therefore gentlemen, philosophers must obey their sense of wonder. The -- the god which the philosopher serves is his admission that this which he does not understand attracts him, and deserves his -- his investigation, his following it.

What's the difference, gentlemen, then of this obedience of the philosopher to the obedience of a prophet like Isaiah, in the Old Testament? I think today we shall devote a few more -- a little more time to laying down the law why Judaism and Greek thought are eternal approaches to life, to truth, to reality, whatever you call it. They are eternal. There is as much Jews and Greeks today as there were 2,000 years ago. We only know that they both have to co-

exist, whereas the Greeks thought they could do without the Jews, and the Jews thought they could do without the Greeks, you see. We know better. We have to have both elements.

Gentlemen, in -- the prophet speaks of the power which is in back of us.

And the philosopher speaks of the powers which we can face. That's a very simple, I think, division -- distinction. But I tell you, it is a very precious one. You don't find them in textbooks, because unfortunately the Greek textbooks on phil- -- the textbooks about Greek philosophy or modern philosophy are written by people who say that they have na- -- no truck with prophecy. And the Biblical scholars, or theologians, or preachers on Sunday school pulpits, they think they have nothing -- no truck with the Greeks. I think this -- this thinking in water-tight compartments is silly. I have all my life not forgotten that I pray on Sunday when I thought on weekdays. And I have not forgotten on Sundays that I think on weekdays, you see. These are two realities between which anybody has to alternate. You too, gentlemen, whether you know it or not.

We always pray, gentlemen, between the beginning of an enterprise and its end, because nobody else believes us in this time. So we need some reinforcement. You are secretly in love with a girl. It takes you a year before you convince your parents that you should marry her. During this year you have a religion. You see, you pray to some power that may keep you afloat. You cannot prove your point to anybody. You don't even know if you are right. You are testing it. What keeps you going, this time? Why don't you shoot yourself the first day you have this unhappy idea that you should get married? Why do you brave the storms?

Anybody -- take an author. Who has written a short story in his life? Not one of you? Now, that's an honest man. All right. Well, gentlemen, any author who conceives of a little opus he wants to write, and finishes it, is -- held -- going -- kept going, while this is working in him, by his faith. Because before he has finished the story, he cannot even prove to himself that it's worth writing. It must be there. Any more -- mother who carries a child for nine months in her womb, can only do this by faith. She doesn't know how it -- come out. It may be a -- ter- -- monster that is born. As you know, the people tell us today how many dangers there are in our genes. And so they try to frighten us. And all these poor women, if they really fall into the hands of these modern crypto-scientists, they -- they are terrified by all the dangers they run into, you see. Blood groups are not right, and so on, and so on. And they are all quite sure that they must die. But they don't.

Now gentlemen, in any process which you cannot see, you are on the side of prayer, and on the side of the prophets, and the side of mere faith, because this has to do with the things in back of us, that -- pushing us on. A woman in love takes the consequences. She is pushed forward by her love until the child is born. She hardly know how -- knows how she gets through all this. But she does. She cannot see the god who makes her bear the child. That's the invisible part of life, gentlemen. She can only know that she should obey such great urge.

So gentlemen, the Bible has to do, as you know, with the invisible part of God, because God is in back of the believer. He pushes you and me forward. But if you turn around, you don't see anything. You can hear God's voice, but you can never see God. Again, it's so funny; this isn't mentioned today.

The Greek story is the opposite, gentlemen. The Greeks say this: "What is behind you, you cannot see; but you see what is before you." I've found this in an old Greek text -- this morning, by accident. I'm very glad I did. It's a very good definition of philosophy. Will you take it down: what is behind you, you cannot see; but you see what is before you.

Now all Greek philosophy says and tries to say, "Make everything visible, then you will know what it is." The Jews neglect the eye, and the Greeks emphasize it. All Greeks' words of knowledge are connected with the visual sense. The word "insight," as you use it yourself, you see, is taken from "sight." And it's a very important word. The word "idea" means by and large the same: that what appears before the inner eye. An idea is that which I do not have to see outside, physically, but I -- I still can see with the inner eye.

Now if you try to see God with the inner or the outer eye, you are pagan.

The Jews would reject this. God must be listened to. You cannot see God. When Moses tried to see God, God said, "It cannot be done. I'm sorry. You are my favorites, but you cannot see me."

And I think the whole story of you and me is this -- this knowledge that we are moved by two different tendencies: by the attempt of making things visible, and therefore knowing them; and by our understanding that we ourselves cannot live by sight. But we are pushed forward by -- by forces that are -- push us forward to the -- famous, unknown destiny. As you know, this country is so Greek that it even called the Pacific "Manifest Destiny." First it stopped at the Mississippi, then at the Rockies, and finally in -- in California. But you know, if you overextend the idea of Manifest Destiny, you end in Saipan, and in -- in the teahouse under the moon. And that's very bad, because obviously there is no

manifest destiny for Americans right there and then.

And so the manifest destiny, the attempt to see the future of America in terms of visibility, I think is in tatters, is in ruin. And the sooner the American people would understand that you can no longer see the destiny of America, the sooner perhaps you may find what the destiny could be. At this moment, as you know, since 1890, this country is torn between Puerto Rico and the Philippines, and a decent respect for humanity on the other hand. And we haven't solved it -- as you see from our treatment of the Suez Canal and the Panama Canal. In the Panama Canal, it's -- you see, it's manifest destiny that the United States should own Panama, the Panama Canal Zone, you see. But in the Suez Canal, we aren't so sure, because it is outside our direction of our seeing. So we suddenly invent new principles for the other international -- waterway. And this we call our idealism.

It's a very poor policy, gentlemen, and it comes all in America from its preponderant Greek attitude in the last 150 years, gentlemen. America wanted to see the whole truth. And my history of Greek philosophy therefore is bound to collide with your illusions that it is enough to see everything, or to make it visible. The Greek way of -- to -- to -- towards truth, gentlemen, is one-half of the way to truth. And not more. And I think any history of philosophy that tries to sell you philosophy as -- enabling a man to be just a philosopher and nothing else is a great cheat today. It leads into dis- -- it leads into Communism; it leads into fascism; it leads into any monism, into the idea that if I see things, you see, I already know what to do.

As you know, nobody is more cri- -- cruel than the voyeur, as the French call him, the man who sits at a burlesque show and looks at a stripteaser. If he has any humanity, he would go to the stage and go home with this girl. Ja, that's a human action. To be sensuously excited is not bad, gentlemen, but to be not excited enough to go home with this girl -- that's cruelty. That's staring at things that must not be looked at. That's obscenity. What is obscene, gentlemen? That you are not passionate. That's obscene. That you play, joke, laugh about something that should excite you to the roots of your being. So a reasonable person doesn't expose himself to {sexual} excitement unless he can follow it up. But to go wantonly to this, this is for old people, gentlemen, or for scoundrels, because seeing there runs away with you, you see, into realms where seeing is no good. Love is not to be seen, gentlemen. Love is unseen. Invisible. If you don't remain -- leave it invisible and at night, you will -- fall very sick. Now the whole country, as you know, America, is sick by this, what is called by the French, the

voyeur pe- -- . Gentlemen, the voy- -- "voyeur" means the people -- the people who peep through keyholes. "Voyeur" means trying to s- -- look where you -- there is nothing to see, you see. Where you either have to be in love yourself, you see, or leave things alone.

So -- gentlemen, the first rule about philosophy is: what can be achieved by philosophy? And there is a limitation. Philosophy can never deal with those things which are never to be seen. Prayer neglects the world and says, "If I have you, my God," the famous prayer runs, you see, "What do I care for Heaven and earth?" That is, all the visible things. You know this from the psalm. That's very true, gentlemen. But still it's very nice to have 10 acres of land, and a garden, and a tree. That's all visible, you see, you -- there's very much about -- to be known about it. So I think neither the Jewish nor the Greek way are -- are enough. The Israelites too have now land; they have a country; they have a city; they have railroads; they have citrus fruit. They have all kind of visible things, you see. A nation needs this.

So the -- the paradox between Greek philosophy, gentlemen, and Jewish prophecy is that both are educators of the rest of humanity, and both are -- have sacrificed their own happiness, and their own -- you may say their own fulfillment to this service for all of us. The Greeks represent an extreme. And Israel represents an extreme. In Is- -- in Greece, a whole nation has been sacrificed with, and for, and in the direction of, an attempt to teach all mankind what can be made visible, and what can be learned by looking at things.

Gentlemen, the Greeks are sacrifices. And the -- Israel is sacrifice. The chosen people certainly are sacrificed, and the chosen minds are sacrificed for your and my sake. If we today can look back at the Bible, we are very glad that we don't have to be I- -- Jeremiah, obviously, you see. But with the help of Jeremiah, we may prevent the fall of America. Jeremiah couldn't prevent the fall of Jerusalem. If you read the Bible right, you must be grateful that in one great case, you see, you know all the consequences when people do not obey orders from the invisible. And in Greek tradition, you can see what happens when people neglect reason, neglect the search for nature, and causes, and science, you see, because the Greek philosophers have founded all the sciences we enjoy today. This was then my first thesis today, gentlemen. I think it is important for you to understand this from the very beginning, that to be a philosopher today is never something exclusive. The wise philosophers have known this. The stupid philosophers do not know this today. You can today in America distinguish the philosophers who know that philosophy is only one-half of the powers that lead

us to truth; and the idiots who think, like the Free Masons, that philosophy can replace everything else.

We have then two roads. Prophecy, dealing with the powers that we cannot hope to make visible; and Greek philosophy, dealing with the powers that we can hope to make visible. Anybody who only thinks of one of these roads, gentlemen, is already impoverished. Does not make use, so to speak, of a great help, of a great aid on the other side.

Now, I give you a great modern example, gentlemen, of this admission of philosopher -- a philosopher that he's only entitled to one-half of authority and leadership in matters of truth. You may have heard the name of Schopenhauer. This is a little difficult, the man's spelling, Schopenhauer, one of the few independent thinkers of the 19th century. Most thinkers in -- in the 19th century were taken in by the bourgeois class and were, like Daniel Webster, for sale. Corrupt. Daniel Webster is this outstanding example of this corruption by money. Was a great lawyer, and a great mind. But I think the play, *The Devil and Daniel Webster*, could be rewritten, you see, because Dan -- the -- Webster was in the grip of the devil. And you know that's why Whittier wrote this terrible accusation against Webster. Has anybody re- -- read Greenleaf Whittier's poem against Wibs- -- Webster? Who has? Ja. It's a g- -- it's a great -- I mean I'm always proud to think that in New England this poem was written in the lifetime of Webster, de- -- debunking him and denouncing him as a corrupt thinker.

Well, Webster would have said, "Oh, I'm a philosopher, and of course I'm better than even a Christian, because philosophy can explain Christianity, even, you see, so my philosophy is all-comprehensive."

Gentlemen, this man Schopenhauer was a contemporary of Webster, by and large. He lived from 178- -- -88 to 1860. Perhaps you take his dates even down. It's quite interesting, because it is the Greek -- the Greek phase of Europe. That is, the renaissance of Greek philosophy which was at -- then at its high point. It's hard to understand how much at that time Greek set the standard for everything, every the -- the -- the model, the style, you see, of -- was Greek classicism, you see, the would -- you would imitate the pillars of the Acropolis. It was the time when the Elgin Marbles were sent from Athens to the British Museum, where they still are the pride of the British Museum. This is, you see, worship of Greek spirit.

Well, this man Schopenhauer wrote his famous philosophy, *The World as*

Will and as Representation. Die Welt als Wille und Forstellung. And he exercises an influence as great as Emerson on the world. I mean, Richard Wagner's operas were written around Schopenhauer's philosophy. And when he died, he made a testament in honor of the soldiers' widows and orphans -- of those soldiers' widows and orphans who had died in throwing down the rebellion of '48 in Europe. This man was so aware that he, as a philosopher, was in great danger of neglecting obedience, that he wanted to honor the obedience of those soldiers who, in a most difficult position, you see, against their own countrymen, had obeyed the law and laid down their life for order. For an American, hard to understand, the sympathy of the philosopher with people who shoot against rioters in the -- and you know, Mac- -- MacArthur could never run for president, because he had commanded a march against rioters in Washington in 1932. That's General MacArthur's tragedy. That finished him politically. Because in this country, you always side with rebels. And you always think that a soldier who shoots at a striker is less good than the rebel who is shot at. Now obviously, the two -- thing has two sides. If you have no social order and if you have nobody who defends the order, you see, then there is no order. And the obedience of the soldier may be a blind and naïve one, but as long as this mortar and cement is there, you can live in peace and study at Dartmouth College. And as soon as you people stand for anarchy, and independence of everybody, and mere philosophy -- "Wait till I have thought it out" -- there would be no -- no order in which you could follow up your thinking. Isn't that clear? And Schopenhauer, in this very strange testament, which of course became quite famous, wanted to express his indebtedness to the opposite way of life, which is one of strict obedience, you see, without questioning. And it shows you perhaps from the very beginning the paradox of philosophy. All philosophers rely on other people not being philosophers. Philosophy can never be the exclusive nourishment of the human mind, for the simple reason that it comes too late. If we would have to wait always for any order of our actions, and all the actions of our sisters, mothers, brothers, you see, until we have found our final system, we'd all be starved to death, by that time. Can you see this? Philosophy takes time, gentlemen. And during that time, somebody else has to rule. And it's one of the amazing stories of America, gentlemen, that during the last 30 years, a -- a -- a heresy called pragmatism could be believed, where people lived in a fools' paradise, and everybody had thought -- time enough to think up for himself all the truth, and could sit back and wait until he had found the truth; and allegedly nothing had to be done in the meantime. In the meantime, the people have to obey. And they have to fight wars. And you

cannot go to the battlefield with the ridiculous comfort of Mr. John Dewey that pragmatism will one day tell me what I might think right.

Gentlemen, this country is very sick, because this dualism of prophecy and philosophy has been tampered with. The great inheritance of America during the last 30 -- 40 years has been thrown away. It has been based on the coalition of Israel, of the Bible, and of Greek philosophy. That's Christianity: the synthesis between the {two}. And during the last 40 years, you have been fed on the absolute fallacy that you could wait for the results of philosophy to live.

Gentlemen, while I am indulging in philosophy here, and you are here in this course, we are indebted to all those people who, while we are thinking, obey the existing order and law. And if you do not see this interaction, gentlemen, between philosophy and prophecy, and the Ten Commandments, so to speak, then every step into philosophy will be a misunderstanding, as it largely is in America. What is called in America "philosophy" is nothing but game, a game of the human mind. What you do in bull sessions, where you abolish God at random and -- and -- enthrone Him again, occasionally.

Once you have understood, gentlemen, that in thought, too, there are two sexes, two genders: male and female, receptive and active, prophecy and philosophy. And philosophy is purely the male gender, you see, the one that says, "I think," then you live in reality again. Then the brown study of philosophy will not overtake you. As long as you think, "I think what I think," and that's the whole story -- your whole story, you see, you are not a real human being, because you forget that you are only one-half of humanity. You don't have to call it even "male" and "female," gentlemen. The male and female in the flesh is only a subdivision of the truth that all truth comes to us and is begotten by us. It is received, and it is uttered. You im- -- are impressed by the truth, and you express truth. Where you are sitting here, I am trying to impress the truth on you.

Obviously you go out, you have to say something, it will be your truth, and it will seem active, you see. Now if you think that only the active operations of your mind are the whole story, you see, you deny your true experience, because the -- you couldn't think if nobody had thought into you. You couldn't speak if I hadn't spoken to you, or if your mother hadn't spoken to you, you see. You are only the -- the throughfare between receiving and between giving out. You are never the source of any truth.

Gentlemen, nobody is the source of truth. We are all only in the metabolism. And -- and you can -- may say that you are one of those posts on a power line through which the electric cable is strung, you see. But that's the most you

can boast of, to be one of the pillars of the power line. But you do not -- you are not the power station. You do not beget the electricity.

And it is strange, gentlemen, that all the great philosophers who have come nearest to being their own power station, people like Plato or Schopenhauer, any really creative thinker has been most convinced of the fact that he is not really the power station himself, that he also has received in order to give, you see.

So we also will respect this dualism, gentlemen. Man's mind then is:

"Gentlemen, bi-sexual, bisexual." And that is our honor. That's why we -- I am immersed in reality. If you really thought that your mind was against the whole universe, there -- it would be highly improbable that anything good would come out of this mind. You would be too estranged from this world, would you not? You wouldn't -- rootless, you would be just like a plant trying to grow on black-top. It can't be done.

But that's by and large the American -- the American id- -- superstition, that here is man and there is the universe. You look at the universe and this you call your philosophy. Because you think seeing is believing, you mis- -- confuse the two things. We want to abolish believing, and you want to have only seeing. So gentlemen, the mind is bisexual, and the Greek philosophy is one sex of the mental process. Let us put it this drastical way, because it's a great fact that the world is not just physically sex. It is spiritually sex, too. The creative process is the marriage of two minds. And Shakespeare knew this. That's why you need a friend in -- even as a philosopher, so that your truth can be reflected in him and in the opposite sequence. Take Engels and Marx. Take Montaigne and Boétie. Who has read Montaigne?

Well, the whole Greek experience of philosophical friendship is summed up in Montaigne's Chapter 28 of the first book of his Essays. Anybody who wants to give a treat to his girlfriend should read this essay. It's very simple, because he s- -- even says there, it's like a marriage, a marriage of minds. It's very -- something very chaste. It has nothing to -- with -- to do with your idiotic treatment of sex, but it has to do with the deep cosmic sequence that the higher we come up in the scale of creative life, gentlemen, the more polarity is needed to have life. As you know, the most primitive -- the stones have -- do not have to divide to subsist. They are just there, you see. Then you get the algae, they have already to -- the division of the cell. When it comes to men and -- mammals, you have to have female and male. Now if it comes to spirit, you see, the embrace, the

mutual polarization is even more needed.

You need -- for the greatest truth, gentlemen, you need enmity. Not just love. That's why Christianity, who was after the Holy Spirit, had to say, "Love thine enemy," because if you do not love thine enemy, you omit part of the truth.

This, your enemy, has also -- represents also part of the truth, you see.

Now, physical love, gentlemen, sexual being, that's going by attraction.

So you marry, you love, you go with the person you like. The philosopher, gentlemen, must love the man who thinks the opposite. That's much more difficult, but it's a greater result. If I do not think the truth that is opposed to my truth, I cannot grow -- grow into the full truth. Isn't that obvious? Any truth that I hold is partial as long as somebody can oppose my truth. You understand this?

Here we come, of course, to the second discovery of the Greek mind. Since the Greek mind tried to see everything, and make everything visible -- that is, act upon the truth as an agent, and not submit to the truth as a victim or as an obedient servant -- since the servant in Isaiah is the great accomplishment of Judaism, the s- -- servant -- God's servant, you see; and since the philosopher, the thinking, rational master of the universe is the Greek ideal, the Greeks had to place the bisexual element of truth into some other context. And that's called dialectics. All Greek thought knew that you had to have a complement to your truth. Somebody could always say the opposite, you see. And if you do -- didn't listen to this opposition, you hadn't gotten any valid truth, you see.

So the Greeks, by this problem of having more than one speaking up and saying something, created this history of Greek philosophy, gentlemen. The history of Greek -- philosophy is an attempt to have all truth embrace each other. If you have a history of Greek philosophy, and every philosopher says something opposite, you see, and you allow everyone to voice his picture of the world, you have a tremendous act of symphonic love, of mutual embrace, you see. One philosopher can only be a Platonist, or an Aristotelian, you see, or a Stoic, or an Epicurean, or whatever you -- a cynic, you see. But the history of Greek philosophy is the concert, the symphony of all these minds.

So the mystery of this idea, that we teach a course in the history of Greek philosophy is an attempt to cure the monopolistic attitude of philosophers that their active mind is the one approach to truth.

We have then two dogmas in this course, gentlemen. One is that the Greeks represent all the attempts of the human mind to act, to react upon the

universe by thought, by their own mind's systematic capacity of conceiving, of seeing, of gaining insight. This is balanced by the fact that we do not teach here a course on Plato alone, or on Aristotle alone, but the story of the dialectics of these minds, how one begot his opponent, his enemy, you see, so that the history of Greek philosophy in itself transcends -- goes beyond any individual's action, you see, because it has this tolerance that includes this man's opposite number. Can you see this strange paradox of the philosophy -- his philosophy -- history of Greek philosophy? We cannot say that Plato is right, that Aristotle is right. But we simply state what they have seen, you see. And we may hope that the panorama, you see, is truer than what everybody has seen. Can you see this? So the history of Greek philosophy, gentlemen, and we need this term. I wanted to introduce it in a kind of human fashion. One of the most difficult words of the English language -- and I hate to use it, but you have to learn these terms -- is "transcendent," as you know. There -- you read in many books what Transcendentalism is, and we had the Concord Transcendentalists. You have -- may have heard of Emerson, and -- and Alcott, and so on.

Now, take it very simply, gentlemen. The history of Greek philosophy transcends, obviously, the system of any one philosopher. It's the most primitive way in which I want to introduce this difficult term, so that it becomes quite familiar to you in a harmless manner. We will have to use it, unfortunately perhaps, again. And you'll run into -- in the literature always into these terms: Kant is a transcendental philosopher, Emerson is -- idealism is transcendent -- dental, and then there is a difference between "transcending" and "transcendental." To hell with all this! I have -- however I have tried to avoid this term. I can live without using the term at all. But in our connection, I think it will make sense to you if you remember that any one system of a Greek philosopher tries to give his total insight. Ja? And the remarkable thing is that after the man has tried to be very explicit and very complete, you see, up pops another man and says, "Here is my world view," you see. And the history of Greek philosophy tries then to be a view of views. That's transcendence, you see. Any one of these views is transcended by a view of views which does not reduce any one of these views to another view, which doesn't say, "Oh, Platon has to be expressed -- explained in terms of Aristotle, and Aristotle in terms of Heraclitus," and so on. No. We -- we try to have a panorama in which we move on from one system to the next system, you see, but always learning to our amazement, you see, that they see different things, you see. And that one is not refuted by the other. But you and I know more after we have looked through these different glasses.

Let's have a break here.

[tape interruption]

...idea of full knowledge, and that we know each other, as the Apostle then says in the New Testament, fully. It means that we move as one body, that

--
.

I have several time -- periods in my life had this great fortune of really living with another person so that we could at long distance still know that the other person was living in exactly the same rhythm. These are very rare periods, even with your -- own wife, that you are in such full harmony that over long distances you respond, and you act, and you correspond, you see, over 3,000 miles of water as though you were one body. But the whole tradition of the Church, of the body of Christ, and the whole tradition of the marriage vows, that any husband and wife become one body, is of course -- we talked about it yesterday night -- the condition of true love. Gentlemen, in this country where marriage is a contract, where people give each other rights and pocket money, and think that A is A and B is B, you can never get married. Most people in this country are not married. I know mothers of 12 children in this country who never got married, because they have always kept to themselves.

Self is in the way of marriage, gentlemen. It is in the way of friendship. It's in -- certainly in the way of philosophy, because it means that you remain an individual. And that's too small to encompass any reality. Life begins only of -- humanity where both sexes are -- get together, because the full man is male and female. You are not complete human beings, gentlemen. You are just one-half of it. But you all pose as -- as, of course, as he-men, and think that's all.

Now, I give you an example of the pure Greek mind, to -- perhaps to convince even my interlocutor of the intermission -- who was it? Ja -- that they -- I have a poi- -- an important point. I have a colleague who came at the same time to this country as I did, from Germany. And he was professor of philosophy at the University of Berlin. But he really was only a psychologist. He -- he acquired fame as an -- investigating on the Canary Islands in Madeira the gorillas. And he knows all about them. And he came to Harvard, and he delivered a lecture which to me always has been the high point of Greek arrogance, of philosophical superstition, of what I try to eliminate from the very beginning, as an super, super, super, you see, superlative claim of philosophy.

This man said, "What is my --" his name is Wolfgang Köhler. He said, "What is my ideal? My ideal is to be able to lay on a -- on a couch in the surgical

-- operating room of a hospital under the knife of a surgeon who operates my brain, and to be able to see my brain at the same time." He wanted to be object and subject in the same person. He wanted to see it all.

Now I -- you can't have a clearer statement of the Greek obsession, you see, to make everything visible. I certainly would try to close my eyes and forget all about it, if I had to be operated on my brain. I'm not interested in seeing this at all. I just -- don't have this -- this curiosity of the voyeur. I think it's perversity -- a perversity. But he thought it was an ideal. And he -- the funny thing is that he expected that everybody would share his desire, and that -- it was acceptable to all his American listeners as tremendous vision. Here is the man under the knife, un- -- the scalpel of the surgeon, and he is able to see his own brain while it is operated on, this brain; with the powers of the brain, he can see the brain. Now I call this schizophrenic.

It has been uttered, gentlemen. This was in the year of the Lord 1933. And therefore the Second World War was inevitable, because when nations deviate from their power to love, and become so aggressive mentally that they want to see the rest of the world only, you see, without embracing it and without obeying common orders, the -- war is just the expression of this total split. This man, you see, trying to be male and female inside himself in one, being just a philosopher, you see, cannot pay any attention to the upkeep of the world as -- as a loving and -- and embracing body, obedient to the orders of our maker. Can -- can't you see that Mr. Wolfgang Köhler is responsible for the World War? Mere Greek thinking, gentlemen, leads to war. All philosophy ends in war, because it eternalizes the separation of what we see -- the object; and who sees -- the subject. The separation of subject and object, you see, if you want to see your wife, you can. But you can't love her then, because to love a person is to forget the distinction of object and subject and to become one.

It's very important that we m- -- make this point. And I'm glad for your question, but you must see that you have raised a very stupendous question. You understand? If you can see God, He will always remain outside of you, because gentlemen, the gist of the matter is: the eye-sense is given us for the outside. You see what is outside the skin. And if you look with an electric lamp, you still don't see the inside, with the -- with these modern instruments. I know everybody thinks we should all become diaphanous and see each other's intestines. First, I don't want to see them, and then -- nothing would be achieved if I could see the intestines of President Eisenhower. That's -- if you read the newspapers, that's all the people try to do: see his intestines and then decide whether they should vote

for him.

Well, it has all happened. The old Etruscans, they looked into the intestines of the animals, and -- in their sacrifices and they thereby ran their politics. We have now such an Etruscan { }. Is called {Paul White}.

This is a superstitious country as any. But it's Greek superstition: make things visible and we think we'll know them. You know nothing by seeing things. As soon -- long as you do not see this paradox, you see, that what you see sometimes is not worth seeing, it doesn't prove anything, you have not reached the point of modern wonderment, you see. Today all philosophers -- all thinking, gentlemen, must include Greek philosophy, but it isn't enough to imitate the Greeks. After all, we live 2,000 years later.

I introduce you into the history of Greek philosophy then with the hope, gentlemen, that you can rise above it. All the people who just try to be philosophers again today, without this one earmarking our own period as being different from the Greek, I think are monsters. They plunge the -- certainly the war in the -- the -- mankind into the Third World War. And America is riddled of these people who say that seeing is believing.

I want to make one more point. The -- the example of Wolfgang Köhler is I think an outstanding example. If I could make you shudder over the presumption of this, gentlemen, that he wants -- that he thinks it's the ideal of the philosopher -- that's what he said -- to see himself under the knife of a surgeon, while his brain is operated on, when you see the absurdity of this desire, you will understand the opposite. We have here a great man on this campus, that's Mr. Steffansson, the Arctic explorer. And when the war broke out, the Second -- so-called Second World War, the "unnecessary war" of 1941, then -- who said so? The "unnecessary war"? Wie? Who has called the Second World War the "unnecessary war"? It's not my invention.

(Didn't he call that -- I mean, there was that big argument about whether that one battle was necessary? Thought people that { } something { } -- didn't he say that?)

Oh no. Mr. Truman is not capable of such profound utterances.

No, it was Winston Churchill. Winston Churchill has said this, the Second World War was unnecessary. And you have -- but gentlemen, it will take you a whole life to -- if he's -- the sooner you will understand that it was unnecessary

because it was a Greek ment- -- only necessary because of the wrong mentality of America -- that America has produced the Second World War single-handed, single-handed in 1919, then you will finally have understood Woodrow Wilson who said exactly that before he died. He had the students come to his house in 1923 on his deathbed and said, "There will be a terrible war in 20 years. And the sacrifice of the First World War will look ridiculous compared to the blood, and devastation, and destruction of the Second World War. And it's all because you do not understand, because you want to see things."

He ended as a fundamentalist, Woodrow Wilson, because he knew that Greek -- the Greeks' mind had destroyed America. And it still does. And they -- I'm not joking, Sir. This -- the war is the unnecessary war if this course -- on the history of -- of Greek philosophy is understood.

Now Mr. Steffansson knew something about these things. He's -- he's an independent mind, and -- although he's born in Dakota. And he went to Washington and said, "People," -- in the Pentagon, he said, "Boys, what's the matter with you?"

"What have you, Mr. Steffansson?" they asked quite politely.

And they -- he said, "Haven't you known that the world is round for 400 years now?"

"Oh, yes," they said. "We have always known that."

"Yes," he said. "But why haven't you believed it?"

"What do you mean?" They were very irritated.

And he said, "Well, you may have known it, but you have not believed it, because then you would have put your observation planes into the Aleutians, and not to Hawa- -- into Hawaii, because you have gone to the -- to the place which is -- is the longest distance from Japan, on the Equator. And since the earth is a ball -- is a globe, you see, therefore obviously it's a shorter way via the Aleutians. Less mileage."

They had of course to admit it. And they corrected their mistake.

Gentlemen, one of the opening shots, then, of my history of Greek philosophy is that any intellectual act has two sides to it: faith and reason. You can

know something and not believe it. Now, you have been brought up in this absolutely silly dichotomy, which even your ministers seem to believe, that people believe certain things, and know other things. That is not the problem, gentlemen. Dismiss it. The problem of true philosophy is that knowledge may stifle belief, and belief may stifle knowledge -- of the same thing, the very same thing. If you know that the world is round, you don't have to act upon it for -- you see, you can store it somewhere in your brain, you see, and not do anything with it. Everybody in this country could know -- and does know, in a way -- that a Third World War is impossible. But nobody acts on it. They don't believe it. The president tries to act on this assumption, but you don't even talk about -- {maybe} about the next war. There can't be any next war. If you would know this, we would -- behave differently. But the war industry and the one-third of the American budget would go to pieces, so -- so of course, you don't like the idea. It might interfere with your prosperity. So there might be a Third World War perfectly abortive, and lead to the -- the end of your civilization, because you don't believe what you know, or what you -- perhaps you are too young, but what the people in Washington already know very well. War is impossible. It hasn't to be tried a third time. And the question is not to know this, but to believe it.

Will you kindly then take down -- one more result, gentlemen, of this discussion of prophecy and philosophy? The same man must believe what he knows, and know what he believes, you see. It is no longer interesting to say, "I believe in the Virgin Mary -- in the virgin birth, and I know that it is impossible," you see. The problem is to know that the earth is round, and one, and a very small speck, a planet, and to act on this assumption in your political bearings, and your thought, you see. That's much more difficult. The people in Alabama show you that it is nearly impossible. You know that man is born equal, but you don't act upon it. You don't believe it.

Gentlemen, faith and knowledge are the old bugaboos, so to speak, the old -- in the conflict between science and religion. Gentlemen, science and religion are both dead. Faith and philosophy are something quite different. The living faith of a person, gentlemen, may be stifled by dead knowledge. And mere faith may be lazy to implement it by communication in philosophical terms. What I believe I've tried to express reasonably, so that you can know what I believe, you see. And what you know, you have to believe. You know that you shall -- honor a hoary head, and shall get up, and sh- -- shall honor your parents. You know this, but do you believe it? It's the only interesting question, you see. And you

know that you must leave your parents and cleave to the wife of your choosing. But do these apron-string students of Dartmouth know that their -- their girl must be more than just a substitute for -- for -- for sex? Do they break away from their mother? When does it happen?

I -- again I -- the last day I ran into this -- into this story. A young Dartmouth boy got married. His mother, one of these possessive, wonderful mothers, all-loving, all-powerful, omnipotent. She built a little s- -- tiny department -- apartment on top of their own cottage -- of the parents' cottage, and forced this daughter-in-law, who came from abroad, by the way, to live with them. Well, the poor girl, for a fortnight after the wedding day, had gray hair. I would get gray hair, too, in such a condition. You see, because the boy did not know that he had no right to bring this young woman from Europe into her mother-in-law's house, that this was a -- a crime against the -- the -- he didn't -- he hadn't hurt -- he thinks -- he goes to church even, this boy. And he had himself carefully baptized before they got married so that they could have a religious ceremony. But it didn't help, because he didn't believe anything of wha- -- the ceremony he had gone through with. So he brought his -- this poor woman, who -- who accepted this, and is now victimized. And she looks -- all the light has gone out of her face, of course. How else could it be? He broke the law. He didn't believe what he knew.

A man who cannot stop loving his mother for 24 hours has no right to marry. He must forget his mother. Then she'll -- the love to his mother will come back another time. When she -- he has grandchildren, she will be very glad to -- you see, to have grandchildren. But she can only have real grandchildren if he can forget his father and his mother from love for his wife, because otherwise he has no -- he's impotent. He has no power to select. Selection means to forget everything else -- everything else.

When your mother says, "I'll die from a broken heart," if you really love the wife of your choosing, you must say to your mother, "I'm very sorry, but I can't change that." She never dies from a broken heart. She knows that she has overstepped her mark. She has no right to complain when the boy finally gets a man. If she says this, she just -- hasn't been spanked enough in life. They all have a broken heart at random, you see, over the telephone, long-distance. But that's all done in this country because, gentlemen, there is a total distinction between faith and knowledge, and seeing, I mean, and -- and -- and this is important. But it's a different kind, you see. The two things, the prophetic insight, that comes from obedience, that is, actualization of the truth, you see,

application of the truth, where the truth is not doubted, and the philosophical way in which we find the truth, and therefore has to be doubted before we settle on the final truth, you see, they are, of course, in opposition as two parts of the same way.

Any truth, gentlemen, like the one, "The earth is round," has one road in which we acquire the knowledge of this truth, you see, and it has another way into our system by which with this truth then permeates every act of our being. We call this permeation by the truth, being permeated by the truth "faith." And we call the acquisition of the truth -- we call "philosophy."

But these are correlative. Can you see that one is nothing without the other. And -- I think this country is sick, and by the way the whole Western world, and that's why the Russians laugh at us, and feel that we are all decadent, because the -- both schools, the philosophers and the ministers, have built themselves up as if they were owners of the total road, you see. The road towards truth, and the permeation by truth obviously, you see, cannot be separated, ever. Can you see this?

So the result of all this for today, gentlemen, is something I think quite fruitful. In the history of philosophy, we must hold onto the real problem of truth in our own life, gentlemen, that it has to be at the same time known and believed. Known and believed. The same truth has -- and you think that is not so. Gentlemen, if the United States sacrificed \$3 billion for the Groves project in -- and the -- the -- the atomic bomb, that's faith, isn't it? Because it's actualization. You see, you go ahead and you -- you give everything you have for producing it. That's not knowledge. That's faith. As I said, in every -- anybody who writes a short story, while he's writing it, acts on faith, because he doesn't know how he makes out, you see. Nobody can tell him. And he can only prove later that he knew all the time, you see. But he -- hardly knows all the time, because he's sleepless, and -- and he doesn't know. Of course, he is wavering, himself. But it permeates his system until it's out, this -- this little child of his imagination. The same as a pregnancy of a woman. She goes through with the nine months on faith.

Could you see this then, gentlemen? Faith and knowledge pertain to the same content. Once you know this, you are highly superior human beings, because nine-tenths of the Americans don't wish to know this. They think knowledge is for one thing, and faith is for another thing. And the -- so what has happened is, gentlemen, since you are all little scientists, you only have faith in

scientific things. And therefore you think you must buy all these things that are produced, conscientiously, you see. If you would know that all knowledge, and all faith, you see, are always concerned with the same things, you might also care to know about things that are -- deserve to be believed in, like love, or hope, or faith itself, or -- or peace, and all the good things of the spiritual life. But it has very much to do with your strange Greek upbringing, that you have despised things of mere faith, you have said. "Oh," you see, "we want to know." But gentlemen, where you know, you also believe. So you can turn it around, too: perhaps where we believe, we also ought to know.

You know many more things, gentlemen, by faith that are worth knowing -- for example, friendship, and love, and loyalty. They'll never be commodities. They'll never be scientifically so. But one can know many things. My course itself is an attempt to show you that this very wonderful -- spectrum of the human spirit first is believed. It is -- you must believe that it is worthwhile knowing philosophy before you understand a thing about it. Don't you -- here why you are, just by word of mouth? Somebody has told you it's a worthwhile thing to study philosophy. You don't know this now. I try to make you know why you love philosophy. Understand this?

Gentlemen, all invisible things must be believed first and known later. All visible things -- you see, the opposite is true. You can first know them, you see, and love them later. First you see a mountain, and finally it took the people of this world, as you know, 5,000 years before they dared to climb the Alps. They were hated. They were feared. They saw them all the time. They knew they were there. But they wouldn't climb them. Today we climb them, you see. The love has come later to the visible things. It's always this way, you see. And the invisible things we love first, and later we come to know them.

So the relation of faith and -- of knowledge and faith is itself a problem of philosophy. And I promise you, when we read Lucretius next time, you will -- may be surprised to find that the ancient Greeks were not half as impotent in their thinking as modern pragmatists are, and modern American scientists. They had this great passion of reconciling faith and knowledge for the same thing, you see. The -- the thing that has happened in the last centuries is really very terrifying, gentlemen. If I speak of belief here, today, in this country, or faith, they say it's a luxury for Sundays. And they do not know that the World War II was only won because Mr. Steffansson went down in time to Washington and told them that they should believe that the earth was round, you see, and not just know it for their geology courses, you see. They hadn't done anything about it, so they hadn't believed it.

As you see, one-half of all your political knowledge is dead-letter -- because you don't believe it. You will -- you -- pay lip service to democracy, but you worship Hollywood and rich men. Anybody who does this certainly doesn't believe what he says.

So faith and knowledge are Greek problems. And we'll see when we read Lucretius a very exciting thing follows, gentlemen. The -- the Jews and the Greeks had the same theme, only they arranged it in opposite order. The -- the Jews wh- -- didn't want to forget what man believed. And then they said, "As far as possible, we must know this," you see. The Greeks didn't want to forget what they could see -- you see, the world, the earth, the water around them, the things, you see. Then they wanted to get as far as they could in their love of this, in their belief in it. And -- both in a way are therefore two great experiments carried out over a thousand years for us. You can learn from Judaism, and from Greek -- the Greek philosophy, you see, how far can -- man can get by one starting -- from one starting point. The Greeks begin with the visible, gentlemen, so they begin with knowledge. But they never, never, never have given up the path of believing in it, too.

That is, gentlemen, in other words -- now comes the secret of this -- of this meeting today, gentlemen: the relation of knowledge and faith is: the treatment of reality as world or as God. When we believe, we have a relation to a power that is superior to us, you see. We must. When the earth is round, she can give us order. If you only know it, you see, it's a world. We look at it, it's nature.

Now the Greeks begin with seeing, but they always worship the gods. In antiquity, there has always been the problem: how much worship besides {knowledge}? So any Greek philosopher will -- down -- this is the formula I want you to take down very carefully, gentlemen -- any Greek philosopher also remains and is a theologian. The ancient notion of philosophy is richer than ours. In modern philosophy, the philosophers are nothing but philosophers. In all ancient philosophers, you find a -- equally strong streak of theology. The great name of Plato in antiquity was The Theologian. And the best book on Greek philosophy written in the last 10 years is written by Mr. Jaeger, Werner Jaeger at Harvard. You may have heard of his book, *Paideia*. It's used quite much in *Classical Civilization* -- Mr. Jaeger has written his best book on the theology of Greek philosophers. The theology of the Greek philosophers, because they made clear that all these people tried to believe also what they knew, and tried to make us believe, you see, in these powers, as regula- -- the regulating principles to which we should owe obedience. Not just knowledge.

The world doesn't command, gentlemen. God commands. Now the same power I can treat as the world by looking at it. I can treat it as God by bowing to it.

So gentlemen, the Greeks are all philosophers and theologians. The history of Greek philosophy treats theology and philosophy before they are divided. And you plunge not only into philosophy when you go into antiquity, but you cannot distinguish in any of the great people of antiquity whether they are theologians or philosophers. They are both.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...with you children, what you understand of philosophy. I can teach you philosophy here. That's all. But that's not philosophy. Philosophy is a -- deadly and earnest thing. You are not earnest. It would be waste to -- to go before you as -- as a -- in my quality as a philosopher. I'm just here pro- -- a college professor of philosophy. It's a very misshapen situation.

Well, really now. -- I'm not joking, gentlemen. I -- I want you -- I have asked you to buy a number of texts -- all original texts. They are as difficult as all original life is, gentlemen. All secondhand life, all derivative live, all retail store life, all commodities are easily of access. They're enticing in their wrappings. They are easy to carry away. And everything is made painless, you see. Greek Without Tears is a famous book for schoolchildren. How to learn Greek without weeping, you see. Grecque with -- sans larme, the Frenchman who wrote it called it.

Gentlemen, I told you in the beginning, any philosophy that is genuine is difficult. And it is not for everybody all the time. And the first thing, gentlemen, you ought to confess in one -- if you want to come to life with your mind, which you haven't, yet -- you are just an automat. The first thing you -- that you do not always understand: great things that occasionally we do, and occasionally we don't. That is, gentlemen, it is not possible in philosophy to advance steadily, and to understand more tomorrow. If you open the Bible today, you may not understand one word. And you open it another day, when you are in the right despair with -- about yourself, you see, and you say, "How could I ever miss the point? How could I not feed on this," you see, "all my life?"

The great sin in America is the idea that the mind, gentlemen, is a machine, which you can build up in such a way that it performs better and better every day. It's nonsense, gentlemen. If you had cultivated your mind, it would probably work at this moment in your life much better than it works with me.

The mind, you see, is an organ that is developed in -- during the age from 15 to 25. I need character more than I need mind, you see. My mind is pretty good, but it's going. I don't have to plant it. You have -- your mind, you see, has now at this moment to be developed. And therefore it's at its finest. I have written things in their cleverness at your age, or a little later, which I hardly can understand now, because they are so subtle. They are so intricate, you see. I express myself today much simpler. And -- the -- the truth is not so angular, and so conceited, and so circumscribed, or circumventing, I should -- more say, the point.

So the mind, gentlemen, is alive. Therefore, it's -- time -- times of your life, it's asleep. Anything living must sleep and wake up again. It's very simple. You sleep every night, don't you? That's the mind -- that is the mind that needs sleep. Well, most of the day you -- half asleep, you see. And we'll find that the first great Greek philosopher, Heraclitus of Ephesus, distinguished in man the few who are awake, whom he called philosophers and people able to understand his philosophy, and the majority of people who are asleep.

Therefore, the first thing with an original text in philosophy, gentlemen, is that it is not always speaking to you. You have to wait. It has to be in your library. Philosophy books, gentlemen, you must own. You can't borrow them from Howe Library, or from Baker, assigned reading three times -- three days, and then give it back and you have read it. You haven't, because it isn't sure at all, you see, that you got it in those three days, that you were ready for it.

A philosopher, gentlemen, or -- and {anybody} who studies philosophy, must have his original companions, his phil- -- original philosophers with him all the time, because it will take you a lifetime to get acquainted with them. And that's the beauty of it. Anybody who has ever entered this field of philosophy, gentlemen, is not in a hurry. You cannot say, "I have read Plato."

My dear people, I read this morning -- in order to comfort myself for this meeting here, I read Plato. Well, it is exactly -- I have read him now for exactly 63 -- 53 years. And it's as though I never had read him. It's all new -- totally new. So I was so in- -- intrigued, I got a -- here one volume of Plato just this minute out of the library to read a commentary, to convince myself that I had understood him rightly this morning.

Original things, gentlemen, are exactly like the sunrise. Every sunrise is original. And again, a Greek philosopher, the same Heraclitus, my favorite Greek philosopher, said that every sunrise differs from every other, that there are as many sunrises as there are days, which anybody who has any sentiment, and any realism, knows is true. But you don't know it, because you have learned physics. And in physics, the mind is treated, you see, as a machine, as mechanics, because in physics, you only want to know those things that are always the same, you see. That's why physics is so boring to me. It's not a science. It's for plumbers. Yes, it's a -- for plumbers. That's what it is. But the -- plumbers know nothing of life. They know something about water toilets -- to get rid of the remnants of life.

Philosophy, however, gentlemen, is as fresh as sunsets, and violets, and roses. Two people who look at a rose see something different. It is nonsense to pretend that the rose is the same to you today, you see, and to- -- tomorrow. Tomorrow, you may be totally indifferent. Today you are enthusiastic. So here is the text. Let's start right in. We'll read -- down to -- 101. That's the famous verse. I -- I don't know even which translation you have. I had to choose the one that was cheap. I have another text here, the Latin text. Lucretius. And I want to get going. So will you kindly read it? Will you read it? (Which place?)

The beginning of Lucretius.

("Mother of Aeneas and his race, delight of men and gods, life-giving Venus, it is your doing that under the wheeling constellations of the sky all nature teems with life, both the sea that buoys up our ships and the -- earth that yields our food. Through you all living creatures are conceived and come forth to look upon the sunlight. Before you the winds flee, and at your coming the clouds forsake the sky. For you the inventive earth flings up sweet flowers. For you the ocean levels laugh, the sky is calmed and glows with diffused radiance. When first the day puts on the aspect of spring, when in all its force the fertilizing breath of Zephyr is unleashed, then, great goddess, the birds of the air give the first intimation of your entry; for yours is the power that has pierced them to the heart. Next the cattle run wild, frisk through the lush pastures and swim the swift-flowing streams. Spellbound by your charm, they follow your lead with fierce desire. So throughout seas and uplands, rushing torrents, verdurous meadows and the leafy shelters of the birds, into the breasts of one and all you -- you instill alluring love, so that with passionate longing they reproduce their several breeds.

("Since you alone are the guiding power of the universe and without you nothing emerges into the shining sunlit world to grow in joy and loveliness, yours is the partnership I seek in striving to compose these lines One the Nature of the Universe for my noble Memmius. For him, great goddess, you have willed outstanding excellence in every field and everlasting fame. For his sake, therefore, endow my verse with everla- -- -lasting charm.")

Now let's -- ja. Now let me go on from there myself. We have here the dedication there, and the invocation.

Every word -- word of antiquity, gentlemen, to- -- shows you its humanity and its rootedness, and that it is not arbitrary as your writing, in short- -- in novels and magazines. They had no magazines. It has to have an invocation and a dedication. And it -- then it has to give its scene. They had no book titles. They had no covers. They had no bookbinding. They had only the style. And therefore, what I tried to show -- tell you last time was that there was no separation between philosophy and theology. And I also had told you that -- at our meeting before that we have three reasons to wonder: the things around us are wondrous, astonishing; my own mind is to be wondered at; and the person from whom I hear, that he speaks to me that he likes me -- that she likes me, that's even more important -- or that he has something to tell me, to im- -- to impose on me is wondrous.

So there are three reasons for wonder. Somebody to be admired, as we say now in English unfortunately, you see; something to be astonished by; and yourself, as a riddle. Man is a riddle to himself. We use then three different stems -- etymological stems for this tripartition, gentlemen, of the human philosophical activity. A man who is in wonderment, you see, is a wonder to himself. He is wondering about things, and he is wondering about already traditions about truth already coming to him. That he can speak Greek, or English, is a -- you should fill -- be with a sense of wonder, that your mother was able to teach you to speak. She is a reason for wonder. Why did she do it? Did she do it for selfish reasons, so that you might care for her? Or did she really love you? Or what -- did she impart truth to you? Did she impart the wrong language to you? Should she have taken you to Bolshevik Russia, preferably?

All these three situations, gentlemen, kehr- -- return in the invocation, the dedication, and the scene. The scene here is -- what is he going to sing? Has he already told us? He has told us. In the last sentence which you read. Where is the -- we have no manuscript in which they -- that the -- there is that the -- what is -- what is in top of your book? What does it say?

("Matter and Space.")

Wie?

("Matter and Space.")

Matter or --?

("Matter and Space.")

Oh no. The whole book, I mean. We are here in the preface of the whole book, are we not?

("On the Nature of the Universe.")

Ja. now the nature of the universe is not -- nothing Mr. Lucretius knew anything about. He doesn't say so. That's an English expression. But he says in the last sentence which you read to us. What does he say?

"Thee I crave as partner --" I have a different translation. The Latin is {"Te sociam studeo scribendis { } esse quos ego de rerum natura pangere { }"}
Thee, Venus, I wish to have as my companion -- and as my associate for the writing of the {verbs} which I try to pronounce on the nature of things." So what you call "The Nature of the Universe" for the poet is still very indefinite, things.

What are things, gentlemen? Is -- are they infinite in number? Are they finite in number? First question, for example, you see. "Things" is a plural. Very indefinite. Nothing of the universe. That's already an antiq- -- a -- very modern forgery. Most translations, of course, which you read of -- ancient texts are forgeries, because the modern man is too lazy to shed his skin -- his modern skin and to enter really the world of the ancient mind. So don't think that the "nature of the universe" is -- is Lucretius' idea at all.

{ } on the nature of the universe. I mean, this translation? The Latin use of { }.)

Well, I said three-quarters -- it's like food, gentlemen. The things you buy in translations, and in textbooks, it's all falsified. Everything is diluted, because -- the market is only to the stupid one, here. You see, the -- you go to the publisher and offer him a genuine translation, which is noble and sticks to the original. He says, "I won't sell this. I have to cater to the last -- so-called last common denominator." That is -- that is, the people who shouldn't read and write, you see. They get it. So the oth- -- all the others get nonsense. And they -- the man for whom this is done you -- by the publisher, this universe business, you see, against things, he doesn't even read it. The man -- the concentration is quite wrong. -- To this idiot, it wouldn't matter what he said. He wouldn't understand Lucretius, anyway.

You live in a absolutely, gentlemen -- bewitched world. Nothing which

you get on Broadway, or in New York at a bookstore, or here at Dartmouth, is of first rate. It's all third-, fourth-, fifth-rate. It's all toned down and diluted, because -- I told you, the truth is difficult. Now, if a man's -- in this country says, "I will make it difficult," he's laughed at. And says, "You can't do it. The people want to have it -- made it easy." Isn't that true? But a man who wants to win the mile, gentlemen, he has to run 3 minutes and 58 seconds, and that's difficult. In sports, you all agree that it has to be made difficult. But in the mind, you all think it has to be made easy.

I have never seen this illogic in the -- carried in any other situ- -- time or country to such nonsensical lengths, you see. In all physical exercises, you know that if it isn't difficult, the result is nil. And in all mental exercises, to use the recommendation, if the book says on its title page, "Easy Reading," throw it away. It's worth nothing, "Easy Reading."

But "universe," you see. Well, that's just, you see -- goes over. "Things," or any- -- "rerum" is not even quite "things," you see. It is a little -- makes it more difficult because it is disorderly -- you see. Things are all the objects for the mind. Topics, you see, that may arise. "Res" is anything that come -- can come under consideration of two people in a discussion. That's a "res" in -- in Eng- -- in -- in Latin. A reus, a man accused, is a man who is said to have taken one thing, or committed a crime, a res, you see. The thing is that which comes under argument. That's a res, you see.

So all the res -- the nature of all the things we can argue about, you see, that's -- would be the -- so to speak, the -- the true translation, you see. Not "the universe." It's a -- quite a different conception. The ancient, you see -- look at these words. The ancients still were musical. They did not read silently. If Lucretius wrote this poem, there was nobody who could -- buy the book and read it. It was copied, and the slave -- or the owner himself would read it out loud. Before St. Augustine, that is, before the end of the -- antiquity, gentlemen, before 350 of our era, nobody could read without lifting his voice, without speaking. "To read" meant always to read out loud. Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, the Stoics, here -- Lucretius, they could never take a sheet of paper without getting going, so to speak, without uttering, you see. This -- this was nothing but a mem- -- held for memorizing. You had the manuscript so that you could intone, you see, and not miss out. You understand? A book in antiquity was something totally different from us. It was like a record, and you were the needle, you see. Understand? And you had to hear it. That's why they have -- were such great stylists, because every sentence written was meant to be heard, not to be reproduced by eyesight.

So we have: what is the invocation? what is the dedication? and what the scene? Well, you have just said -- seen it. How many lines have you read? What -- where did we stop? Line 27. In 27 lines, the poet has done three things. That's quite an achievement. These are only three times nine lines. And in the greatest concentration, he has said what he is going to treat, for whom he is going to treat it, and who is authorizing him to treat it.

Now, when a man here in this country writes something, he -- in a dissertation to get a doctor's degree, he says -- who is his doctor father. And he says, "Mr. {Kluckhorn} has in- -- en- -- authorized me to write a -- this dissertation on anthropology or Russian studies in Cambridge -- Harvard" -- or what-not. Any dissertation today, and any doctor's thesis invokes the good will of the master who passes judgment. If you write a term paper, you invoke, of course, me, you see. You don't know it. But you polish the apple.

Now the modern -- slang translation of "polish the apple" -- of "invocation" is "polish the apple," because you deal with mortals. If I, however, write an original book, gentlemen, I invoke certainly the spirit that enables me to think in the line and the great tradition of truth. Any man who wants to sell the truth must be aware that for thousands of years people have tried to tell the truth. And I hope to be read by people who also are eager to know the truth. Is this not? I mean, if I write a book, I hope that it will be still read in 100 years, at least. And I don't care whether you read it, because I don't c- -- think that you are critics of the truth. But I do care that somebody might read it a hundred years from now who is as anxious to know the truth as I am.

Now gentlemen, for this I need an invocation, because it is to- -- -erfectly a sense of wonder that there should be somebody 500 years back and hundred years from now who would have the same interest at heart. Isn't that -- we can't do anything about it. And all the world -- the -- in as far as we can't do anything about it, gentlemen, is divine. We call "divinity," whether it's the devil or God Almighty, good or bad, evil spirits or good spirits -- all those powers on which we depend for our -- the meaning of our action, and we are unable to do anything about it.

You must understand, gentlemen, that with all your cleverness and all your conceit as modern men, for the great actions of your life, like marriage, you totally are in the hands of the gods. Whether your offspring will be blessed, or whether you make the right choice, or whether you can break through the wall of your in-laws, and free your wife from it, that's all unknown to you. You can't do -- can do very little about it. It's just, as we said last time, an act of faith.

The invocation, gentlemen, stresses this part of our action, which is based purely on the credit we take, the right to act in freedom and risk. Modern man, I mean, you people don't know so little what faith is, that I prefer the word "risk," or "daring," because it's a poorer word. The true word is "faith." But you don't know what faith is. You have polluted it with all your prejudices, pro and con by the Church, or Christianity, or Judaism, or what-not. This the ancients, gentlemen, had never the full division of paganism, Judaism, and Christianity. You could not, before the coming of Christ, either be a pagan or a Christian. You were a mixture of all of all these three, you see. Therefore, all Greek philosophers invoke the gods, even when this man here is an atheist in your sense of the word he's an Epicurean. And the whole problem of Mr. Epicure and his disciple Lucretius in this poem is to prove that there are no gods. Isn't that a queer thing? It's hard for you to understand that all people before the Christian era were mixed. That is, the radicalism, the polarity, the opposition, the dialectics between "yes" and "no," between God and the devil, didn't exist. There were no devils the devil didn't exist in antiquity to the full. The devil only exists in the Christian era, because only in the Christian era can a man be so wicked as Mr. Hitler. That's the new thing. The goodness of man and the wickedness of man is constantly increasing. Life is much more dangerous today as it was 2,000 years ago. The death of souls, gentlemen, is nobody could be so dead as you are and try to be made in our college education. So superfluous, so silly, so worthless, so only out for the stomach and for sex and such things. I mean, such a man humanity has not been tolerated before. That's only in the Christian era, because the extremes of goodness, and the extremes of wickedness have much increased. The invocation, the dedication, and the theme were closer in each other. As I said, the whole remnant of an invocation today is you dedicate it to your parents a book; or you dedicate it to your wife; or you say that your teacher gave you the theme of this book, and that you are therefore trying to get a degree, or promotion, or be made a professor, or one of these external things.

A man who writes an original book cannot turn to any teacher, gentlemen. If I write I am just publishing a big book in several volumes well, since I oppose, transcend, and reject many of the teachings which I have received, in this book, I cannot invoke these carnal authorities, you see. The professor in Harvard, or the Nobel Prize people who distribute the Nobel Prize. What do I give to these Nobel Prize people? I think they are very stupid.

That's not very agreeable to me. I would like to -- to be in -- in cahoots with them. But I can't. I think they are wrong. So -- what's -- who is my -- who can I invoke? The great philosopher Schopenhauer, who also was an atheist, like Lucretius, was in a quandary of the same kind. He didn't believe in God. Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, as you know, both atheists. And Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, the modern pagans, so to speak, like Lucretius, chose two -- very interesting ways out.

Schopenhauer invoked the spirit of his father. "Oh, my father" he has in his preface, "who gave me the means for an independent life, so that I do not have to cater to the marketplace, that I do not have to solicit the favors of the authorities of universities, or of foundations, O dear father, who has not been a philosopher thyself -- thouself -- thyself, thanks to you, I now can put this book before mankind," you see, "which is only dedicated to the truth."

So even this atheist felt that he should invoke a higher spirit, in whom he -- he could -- with whom he could coincide, so to speak, in -- in his endeavor for freedom, for independence, you see, of mind. For this incorruptibility that he wouldn't -- could be bought.

In America, every mind can be bought. That's why there is no truth and no -- no -- you all have only opinions, gentlemen. And you -- it's even said. When Chesterton, the great American -- English humorist came to this country 20 years ago, 30 years ago, he made a discovery. The -- he said, "The people here tell me, all with great glee, that they have -- now a new science. They call it psychology. And this psychology enables a man who produces a worthless commodity to sell it, just the same. They all buy it, if he uses the right means, the right tricks, this psychology. Now," he said, "it's very interesting. In England, we call -- don't call this psychology. We call it cheating."

Psychology in this country is not -- nothing but another expression for saying "how to cheat people." That's what they teach you. And you are very proud of it, and you think you are very smart. There's only one obligation, you see, in mankind. -- I can cheat you. But I may not. I must not, you see. It's forbidden. That's so very painful, you see.

When Mr. Butler -- Murray Butler, the great president of Columbia, was asked why he had loaned money to Mr. Harriman, the banker -- the father of -- I think it's uncle or father of Mr. Harriman, isn't it? -- governor of New York?

(Father.)

Wie?

({ } the father.)

It is the father. Well, I'm sorry to say.

The -- and they got into -- they never called it back. He said it is the embarrassment of an -- in a gentleman, Mr. Butler said -- very English -- "It is the embarrassment of a gentleman that he can do things which he may not do." See? He -- "I could have asked Mr. Harriman to pay me back, or to tell me what the matter was, and what was wrong. But it is the embarrassment of an -- a gentleman that he can do things which he may not do."

You -- you don't understand this, gentlemen. Your whole idea is -- and that's why you don't know what philosophy is -- that if you can do something, you also may do someth- -- do it, and get away with it. The on- -- your only question is that you -- don't want to be found out. The perfect crime is your ideal. That's called "psychology." Psychology is the idea of a perfect crime. That is, how to cheat somebody else in -- to such an extent that he thanks you profusely for being taken in. See? All the products which you buy on the market are of this kind, you see. You buy worthless things, and you thank the producer profusely, because you are allowed to keep up with the Joneses. Go home and discount all the things which you do not need. You will be surprised.

Now the invocation then, gentlemen, is today out of order because we don't pray anymore. All ancient men prayed, all Greek philosophers prayed, including the atheists. Why did they? Gentlemen, when a man is standing in some space here, as I do here, I must -- cannot help being aware that this is wood, and this is my flesh, because if I -- am not aware, I'll be -- get hurt. In space, gentlemen, the body must distinguish itself from another body. In the -- thinking process, gentlemen, a philosopher can only be a man who can set himself off against his opposite number, who says, as in the flesh, "This is my body and this is this chair," you see, this -- this piece of wood, this desk. That's to you quite normal. And you never give it a thought. But the invocation means to make sure that my mind is not polluted with your mind, that I'm not speaking, you see, in the way of a boy, or in the way of a solicitor, for -- or canvassing, or a politician. The invocation here, this man tries to say, in whose spirit, realm, or territory, or area, you see, or eon does he want to move?

When you invoke, in the "Our Father," or in a psalm, the name of your maker, the reason is not that God needs to be named by you -- we certainly may give Him even the wrong name -- but the reason is gentlemen, that we know ourselves only as correspondents to the other -- opposite name. We become always only conscious in relation to somebody else. Now if I write a letter, "Dear Elizabeth," to my girl, I become aware by this address who I'm -- who I am. This is completely lost on you, because you all are taught this nonsense that you -- "I" is I and "myself" is myself. That doesn't exist. That's why most people in the country are so unhappy, and schizophrenic, because nobody can really say to himself who he is. We are -- only know -- find out who we are in relation to other people, you see. You are a Dartmouth student, because I am a Dartmouth professor. That's the only reason. If there were no Dartmouth professors, you couldn't be a Dartmouth student. You have never thought of that. But you can bring 3,000 people together, and in Dartmouth, and in Hanover, and if there was no faculty, there would be no Dartmouth College, and you would not be Dartmouth students, but just a mob, or football players, or what-not, but not -- have the honor of being a Dartmouth student. We give you this veneer, you see, of some -- of some education. Of course, I know it's a lie, but you live on it, on this credit which we give you, as though you were our students.

The invocation then, gentlemen, places the man who invokes. When Homer says -- how does The Iliad begin? Who knows it? Wie? Please. Nobody? Who know -- how does -- does nobody know how The Iliad or The Odyssey begin? Miller.

(I know it. I just can't think of it.)

Well, you ask the girls in Bennington.

(I think the --)

No. Not "I think." That's always the wrong answer. Never say, "I think."

Nobody will believe it.

(Is it -- "O heavenly Muse"?)

Ja.

("I sing -- I sing the { } Achilles.")

Ja. Very good. Ja. There you are. Now why does he say this, gentlemen?

The Muse is the mind of Zeus. "Muse" and "mind" is the same root, by the way. Quite interesting for you to know. The Muses in antiquity are the powers by which we participate in the divine mind. I think we haven't reached any further insight. That's simply true. Nobody can think for himself and find the truth. The truth must be imparted. I impart to you the truth as I have received it. As I have -- it dawned on me. As we say, "It dawns on me." Very true, the -- the -- the -- in the mind, the divine light dawns just as -- much as the sun does. And sometimes it doesn't, as you know. It's very dusky.

So -- since there is darkness in the mind, off and on, there must be dawn. And the invocation then tries to make the -- this piece of flesh that -- 100 cells o- -- that it should melt, you see, because it's a hindrance to the spirit. This -- here, this container, this poor rec- -- receptacle of clay, as St. Paul calls it, our body, you see, by the invocation, turns toward that source of which he wants to be filled and s- -- fed. And nobody in his five senses, gentlemen, who has -- knows what -- how difficult it is to know the truth will ever imagine that he can find the truth cut off from this great current of light and truth, this stream of water.

Do you think Mr. Einstein could have found the -- the law of relativity if he hadn't first studied very carefully Mr. Newton? That is, if he had not been in the great tradition of mathematics through the ages? Impossible, you see. That's -- but you always mistake this, gentlemen. In this country, the man who has an idea, as you call it, is always thought of as of equal rank of a philosopher. But a philosopher is a man who has listened to all there is to know, and then has suddenly turned to the Muse and said, "Let me hear something better. This is stale. This is not -- what I have learned is not all. We must start afresh."

A philosopher, gentlemen, makes a fresh start after he has been in the great tradition. This is very important in the case of Epicurus and Lucretius here, because the great experience of Epicurus, the Epicureans, and Lucretius is that if we go to school, we may miss out on the most original influence, the most original experience: our five senses. Epicure and Lucretius are famous as sensualists, as people who worship the five senses again, who want to get man, you see, to break away from the school tradition and add again his own experience of the beauty of life, the power of love, of hunger, of fear, directly -- by drawing on his own sensations. They have also been called "sensationalists," in the sense that they are sensualists. That is, that is nothing to be connected with any sentiment pro and con. It is simply a -- their method to say, "Yes, you have { }; now refresh your memory by drawing on your sense experiences directly," you see. You have heard the interpretation of the sense experience. There is great

danger that you then miss out on the sense experience itself -- itself. You can talk about love, you see, but before you haven't fallen in love, you don't know what all the talk about love really is.

So this is the invocation then, of Lucretius, gent- -- of Venus. Venus, who guarantees your direct experience of the senses, that's what this first 23 lines try to impose on you, you see. In getting out of the school, getting out -- away from books, and refreshing your voice, and your speech, and your mind by this direct, immediate contact. But never forget, gentlemen, it's the second choice. This same Lucretius has already learned Roman and Greek. He has already read books. And this is a protest. Epicureanism, gentlemen, is a protest against mental tradition. A recourse to the body. But a recourse to the body. Can you see this? It's not naïve. It's not the same as a pig that always is just a pig, you see. But it is the problem of getting a man out of his brown study back into the green pastures, again, you see.

This is the interesting thing about Epicure and the Epicureans, gentlemen, that they are reacting against too much bookishness, against too much idealism, against too much theory, you see. But you must not misunderstand them. They are not low-brow. And Venus is this recourse to that spirit that is with man before he goes to school, that makes him turn to nice girls, and beautiful flowers, and sunsets, because he's out for beauty, you see, he's out for vigor, he's out for health, he's out for procreation. And that's why Venus appears here. It's very strange. Homer, who is not high-brow, but is full of enthusiasm to become high-brow, so to speak, to create poetry, turns to the Muse, you see, the stream of reflection, the stream of poetry. Luc- -- Epicure and Lucretius come after Plato, Aristotle, Homer all have written, you see. They are in great anxiety to become too high-brow, you see. And they want to refresh their mind by bringing in the body again, a second time, you see, so to speak. Can you understand this difference? And that's why this invocation is so very strange, that -- that Venus here is invoked by a man who tries to prove that there are no gods, you see, there are no ideas, everything is physical. It's a paradox.

But if you think of it biographically, here are 20 years lived by a man in -- in physical growth and in the schools. And then 10 years perhaps in meditating his theory of philosophy, and then in the third -- fourth decennium, the Epicureans would jump back to their sense experience and say, "I must not go astray. I must stick, so to speak, to what I really can test every day by my palette, and by my skin, and by my hands. That's all I really know. All the rest is dangerous abstraction."

It is very difficult for you to distinguish, gentlemen, the doctrine of materialism or sensualism from mere sensuous living. The doctrine of sensualism is a very hybrid doctrine, because it is the third step, you see, after you have used your senses, after you have tried to make sense of it. Then the memor- -- but let me not forget my starting point, the senses. But it's a return to the senses, you see. And therefore it always entails a break away from the senses. If you have returned, you also { } outside of it.

Now the invocation then places the Epicureans, and especially here Lucretius, outside the idealistic tradition of the Platonists and the Aristotelians, the mental tradition. He wants to say that the mental tradition is less important than the physical. Otherwise he would have invoked the Muses, or the ideas, or the truth. He invokes Venus.

Potency. And of course, that's eternally true. Even for Plato and Homer. If you have no power, you can't become a great poet just by going into a brown study and thinking, you see. Potency is something that has to be applied to poetry and philosophy, too.

So I would like to say a word, gentlemen. Never believe that materialism and idealism are absolute opposites. If you hear it now today discussed -- Americans are supposedly idealists. I have never seen an idealist so far in this country. They all -- I have only people -- known people who either have Cadillacs, or want to have Cadillacs. So I think this is a materialistic country, if ever there was one. And -- in this moment, we say the Ameri- -- the -- the wicked Bolsheviks are materialists, as you know, and we are idealists. It isn't so simple, obviously. And one thing then we can learn from this invocation of Venus, in this preamble -- and I think it's a very great gain for our days, gentlemen: materialism and idealism are points of emphasis, but not points of mutual exclusiveness. Would you take this down? It's quite important. The way of saying that the senses matter first, materialism, and the other: the mind matters first, the idealism, are not mutually exclusive. They are relative. Much, much nonsense would be avoided in this country, much nonthinking, if you wouldn't use these slogans. If -- when man speaks of idealism and materialism, shtop him -- stop him short. And -- don't listen to him. It's no use talking to such a man today. These are stale words. And they don't ex- -- contain today an important truth anymore, because today we must understand that they beget each other. When you are an idealist, somebody has to be the materialist. The father is the idealist, the mother has to be the materialist. The mother is the materialist in the family, the father has to be the -- be the opposite, you see, because these are two sides of the same thing. We

are in a world of the senses, and it must -- we must make sense. Now if you forget one -- you see, you are an idealist, and when you forget the other, you are materialist.

Please don't -- these are dead words. And I think -- I hope this invocation will show you that a materialist, invoking the goddess to inspire him, you see, is still in antiquity in a much healthier balance. The people in antiquity had no absolute contrarities, contradictions, but only relative, you see. They -- they could go, so to speak, to one side of the fork of the crossroads into the other, but they never left the power -- lost the power to return to the middle and start again, you see, from this total experience of reality of life, you see.

And only -- to speak, gentlemen, is to emphasize. But it is never to say anything absolute. The absolute is not for man. Man cannot say anything absolute. He can only say something in relation to something else. And he can only emphasize one thing. And at a time, we have to emphasize one thing against the other. I have to emphasize certain things at this moment, toward -- to you, obviously, you see. But at another time, I may find a man against whom I have to emphasize the opposite, you see. And I must feel free to do this. I cannot be the victim of my having told you, at this moment, this. Can't you see this? I must keep my freedom -- retain my freedom to emphasize something very different to somebody else. You understand this?

And -- so idealism and materialism, gentlemen, in antiquity are no absolutes as they are treated today and they have -- today have even become political slogans, as you know. And that's very bad. They never should. There is not a country that is materialistic. And there is not a country that is idealistic. And -- and Russia certainly is the most idealistic country in the world at this moment. You will understand this. These poor people who -- who are not even getting razor blades from Mr. Gillette, because he can't export them. And they -- they -- they have buttons, and they have no sausages, and they have no cars, and you call them materialistic. For 50 years they are starving to death to build up their country as a great na- -- as a great country. Now if any- -- anybody was ever an idealist, the -- all the Russians are. What -- all this nonsense we talked about -- materialism. Fifty million Russians were killed in the First World War; 25 million by and large were perhaps killed and executed and -- in the Second World War. This country has lost 155,000 dead in the First World War, and 100,000 in the Second World War; and we en- -- and we speak of our idealism and their materialism.

But that's the terrible thing about which Lucretius at the end of the Chris-

tian er- -- the -- philosophic era is concerned. He wants to be back to brass tacks, to -- to grass roots, so to speak. And that's why he praises the five senses where such pretentious nonsense cannot be preached.

The last line to which I would -- wanted to come today is 101. And why?

Because, just as I have to speak with the voice of Lucretius, "Come back to your senses! Don't make these ghosts out of Russia and America," or Germany and France, I don't care which country you take -- or Japan, he says, "So potent was religion in persuading to evil deeds."

Now I would say that in this moment, in this country, phil- -- these philosophical slogans are so potent as to persuade us to evil deeds. That's the famous line of Lucretius. You shou- -- ought to learn it by heart. And it's really very beautiful in Latin, much more beautiful than in English. {Tantum religio fortuit suadere valorem.} The translation is -- is not right in -- in your -- how -- what do you -- in my text. What is your text saying, the English?

("Such are the heights of wickedness to which men are driven by superstition.")

Ja. That's -- you see, not right. Oh, he means it really -- literally. To such extent of evil deeds -- or, such an extent of evil deeds religion has been able to suggest -- "suadere" I think is the best -- is "to suggest." And what an ancient man calls "religio," gentlemen, is his philosophy of the gods, what we would call -- his philosophy of religion, much more. That is, "religio" is in the antiquity a -- combination of thinking and cult. That is not without theory, so to speak, you see. It's -- the ancients did not separate, as they invoke still the gods, although they call themselves philosophers, they never quite separated prayer and systematic thinking.

So the first -- last thing experienced I want you to take with this verses -- is that here is the great atheist of antiquity, the Nietzsche of antiquity. That's -- as Lucretius deserves to be called. He ends, at the same age as Nietzsche, in 44 -- in insanity, at the age of 44, probably in the year 55 B.C. He's madly in love, the -- tradition says, and he drinks a cup which is poisoned, and goes insane first, and then dies from the consequences of this potion. As you know, Nietzsche broke down at the end of our era, before the world wars, prophesied the two world wars and the downfall of civilization. And the same, that is, Lucretius and Nietzsche are very parallel figures. That's why I wanted you to start with Lucretius, so that you can see that Nietzsche wasn't quite wrong when he said, "There is an eternal recurrence, and I have been before." That's the -- as you know, the

strange doctrine of Nietzsche, of the eternal recurrence.

Lucretius and Nietzsche come at the end of 700 years of philosophizing.

The story of the -- our era is -- in philosophy from Abélard and Anselm of Canterbury, via Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura, to Spinoza, and Leibniz, and Descartes, and Hegel. And Nietzsche quits it all, tries to -- he didn't go back to the five senses. He also was a sensualist. And Lucretius is very parallel. And th- -- the reason is probably the same: the deep feeling that the cycle is closed, that nothing new can be done in this method, and by this manner of using your mind.

The era of philosophy we have renovated in our era, built it into our civilization. But with Nietzsche, it breaks off. There is no philosophy after Nietzsche, in the old sense, possible. 55 before -- before Christ, Lucretius -- dies. This book, which you have there, is probably edited, or I think in all truth it is -- has been edited by the famous Cicero, who -- who was a great stylist, and took a look at the manuscript and made it ready for -- for what could be done with it. And he hasn't done a perfect job. He has mishandled a number of places here, and -- but he -- at least owe him that we have it at all.

Now the theme I already said to you is nature. The nature of things. And the dedication, gentlemen, is to a man of whom we know that he was a very successful po- -- politician, but -- not an Epicurean, but a skeptic. The dedication is not to a man, Memmius, whom the poet tries to convince so much, but to confront with an opposite speech. Very typical philosophical attitude. I told you, the history of philosophy consists of independent views, but there -- there is a panorama. The two views together must be known before you really, you see, are fully aware of the -- the growth of truth. Because although one view is here, and the other is there, you have the history of these views, you see, you know more, as a panorama does, you see, than one vision, or one insight.

Now the strange story about this man, Memmius, is that we happen to know that he was not an Epicurean. He was a skeptic. And therefore the dedication means always the admission, gentlemen, of man that he is a mortal, that he is not God Almighty. A God Almighty could not dedicate his book to a man of a different opinion. You can understand this. He would have -- can under -- dedicated then to dis- -- disciples, you see, or students, or sub- -- I mean, obedient citizens, so to speak, of his community. Plato could not dedicate his book, as long as he be- -- if he believed that he was divine. It is our humanity which dedicates, because we need friends.

In philosophy, gentlemen, I told you, the outstanding remnant of the political order in which we all live is, that the man, the philosopher has no regent over him. He has no king; he has no law; he has no judges; he has no electorate; he is not a candidate for office. He doesn't have to be popular. He even can't be popular. But he must have a friend. The friend stands for the whole polis. Can you understand this? With one friend, you can challenge the universe. Without one friend, they put you in a straitjacket and declare you to be insane. I mean this, gentlemen. If a man has not one friend, he cannot defy the universe of mankind. It's impossible. But with one friend, he can. As long as your wife says, "He's all right," they can't take you and carry you off.

I'm quite excited. A -- a young woman in our acquaintance here in town, in Han- -- went to see the doctor. She -- the doctor took her and said, "You are schizophrenic" -- "She is schizophrenic; send her to Boston." The husband doesn't know anything about it. Everybody is frantic. She has disappeared. Now I think it's a terrible situation. Something that must not be. The -- the husband doe- -- doesn't think his wife is sick. But of course in America, the doctors are the high priests today. They can do as they please, and he bows to the grea- -- larger authority. I think he is wrong. I think he should run after this doctor, shoot him, and get his wife back. That has happened two days ago. It's very exciting, gentlemen. Very terrifying.

I -- the end of the story obviously isn't -- isn't there in this. But you see there is a real problem. A person, all alone, you see, the object of medical care only, cannot live in this universe, you see. You have to have friends. One person has to vouchsafe that -- that you are all right, you see, that you -- that you li- -- you -- she -- what -- who is a friend? Somebody who says, "I'll -- in correspondence with this. I'm exchange. I'm -- he's part of me. I'm part of him." Something goes over and on, you see.

This identification, gentlemen, as you know, is lacking in this country to a horrible degree. Everybody is friendly with everybody, but nobody has a friend. And that this happened to a -- between husband and wife just staggers my imagination. This is a nice man, this man. And he's absolutely out of his wits. He's des- -- despondent. He's desperate. But he doesn't dare to go against the authority of the doctor.

So gentlemen, the dedication limits the divine assumption of the inspired phil- -- thinker, or poet, or whoever it is, who -- of course, everybody who is inspired thinks at this moment that the whole world needs him, you see. This is important, is it not? So dedication, gentlemen, humanizes our sense of impor-

tance, our sense of conceit. It is our descent. The invocation lifts us up to the gods. The dedication puts us down on earth in human society.

I think it's very important that you should see these three different usages of human speech, gentlemen. You don't know this. For you, all speech has only one application: to call a spade a spade, and to say, "This shirt costs \$3.00," or \$2.99. You think only in terms of what I call in grammar the indicative. "This is blue." "An acre is so many square feet." That to you is language. That to you is truth. That to you is thinking. Gentlemen, I never think in this one-sided manner as you do. I have three -- three attitudes in my mind. And all the Greek philosophers had three attitudes. And as long as I cannot reinvoke, re-voke, I should say, in you these three attitudes, you do not understand Lucretius, and you do not understand Plato, and you do not understand Aristotle. You think that a man who thinks, wants to state something in so many words: that the universe is round; or that there are no gods. Gentlemen, if the world would consist of these ridiculous statements -- by themselves they are quite wanton and ridiculous, there would be no philosophy, and there would be no education, there would be no life of the mind. No, gentlemen.

There are -- the -- the invocation, the dedication, and the theme are our constant, three mental attitudes which must balance. I want to be given a task. The philosopher is given a mental task. The legislator is given a vocal task. The polis- -- the strategist is given a military task. The mother is given -- well, a task to beget children. The philosopher has to state for his time the truth in -- no uncertain terms. For this he needs an authority. Therefore, he has to be emphatic. That is, he has to be authorized. We are all authorized versions. There is not just the King James Version, you see. Every one of you should be an authorized version of the divine spirit. I mean this. You want to know that you are right in becoming a doctor or a businessman. And therefore, gentlemen, in this I -- you are excited, because you can go astray. You may be all wrong in your vocation, can you not? The invocation gives man his vocation, his calling, his duty. But much more his duty, because duty -- oh! -- duties follow after I have known in which realm my duties should lie. To become a doctor is not a duty. That's -- a vocation, is it not? Because -- my duties as a doctor are only the little consequences of this big decision.

Now gentlemen, to make this decision every day -- yes, despite e- -- all, and everything, I want to teach these brats here -- that is a vocation which I can only go not by being authorized by you. I must be authorized against you, because I have to tell you the truth whether you like it or not. I cannot depend for your ap- -- on your approval for my vocation. Is that not obvious? I want to

make things difficult for you. The authority for this cannot come from any understanding of yours which you cannot have. It's too early for you. At the end you may, but not now.

Therefore, the invocation, gentlemen, is a -- a constant fear and trembling, as Kierkegaard has called it. All philosophers work out their salvation in fear and trembling. You can't help it, because we don't know before the end whether we have been right. This is the invocation, gentlemen. The pacification, the appeasement, the tranquility we get without pills, gentlemen. We don't need tranquilizer pills. A philosopher has a friend. Before, he will not settle on philosophy. It's too dangerous.

My awakening to philosophy was possible because we had a wonderful group of friends who -- all of us became something in our own right. And we left, so to speak, the -- the material world all embarking on this great adventure of -- of new truth. And one thing that will always stay with me, and I mean for what I will be known, is that I have embarked on certain human relations by correspondence and by publication, together with others, which are highly original. I have published one series of books with a Catholic priest, another with a Jewish -- great Jewish scholar and devoted Jew, and a third with a worker. Now these three relations are myself, you see. They are my dedication by which I have stayed normal. And by which my truth has not been my private truth, you see, but truth shared. And since it has been shared by three so different people, it is hoped that it is a consistent truth.

Now gentlemen, then the dedication has a soothing effect. And if I turn to grammar, some of you have -- may have read some of my writings on this, you know that invocation speaks to the power that can give orders to a man. That is imperative. And there is in every language, therefore, you see, an exchange, as in Homer's first line, "Tell me, O Muse," you see -- "Tell me, O Muse," that's a prayer, and then when the Muse tells, I have to obey. She commands. She's in command. I have to write down what she s- -- tells me. The indicative then, gentlemen, "This universe is green," or "Everything is water," these statements of fact cannot be understood unless they are balanced by imperative, by which the philosopher admits that he is under orders to say this.

You understand then, that there is quite a different mental process going on, one by which I am moved. When I say, "The earth is round," I state something. That is, I stabilize a fact, that I -- not. That can be repeated. I put things at rest. When I, however -- Copernicus, or Galilei, hears this command, "You must come forward now and teach this doctrine," you see, this is not a statement.

That's not a stabilizing force. That's a revolutionary force. That's a force upsetting the apple cart. That interrupts the tranquility of his existence. It's very dangerous, and it usually leads to disaster. Yet, he has to do it. So you can formulate the most static principle -- if you formulate it, you do something, you see, that is quite unstatic, you see. That's very dynamic.

This is overlooked today, totally, gentlemen, in this country, because you all mistake philosophy for science. Philosophy is giving in to the sense of wonder. The sense of wonder then is always threefold. What I'm wondering at, I state in terms of an indicative. "This is so." What makes me wonder, throws me down on the ground, and forces me to do something very disagreeable, very dangerous, highly -- inconveniencing my career, because all truth is against the Carnegie Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation. Foundations with big money cannot stand the truth. You must know this, gentlemen. Power corrupts. And old saying, as you know. And nothing corrupts as much as absolute power. Money corrupts. Much money corrupts very much.

Therefore, gentlemen, it is just as dangerous to tell the truth today as it has always been, and will always be -- it must be, because only those shall be allowed to say another truth who are brave enough to say it against the powers that be. And all the powers that be are against the truth. They haven't learned it. They have learned old ways. It isn't their business to administer anything but the old ways. We elect a president of the United States so that we may have a United States. You cannot expect Mr. Eisenhower to abolish the United States. But the day may come very soon, I have to abolish the United States. Then we'll all be sent -- put to -- in prison here in the United States, will we not? By the president of the United States, you see, because he is elected to administer the old way, you see, but we are {wondrous}. And you'd like to abolish this. You don't want to have suffering. You don't want to have excitement. You don't want to have anything new happen, and you always boast that you are -- yet, the truth is admitted to this country. It is not, gentlemen. The truth is admitted to any country only to that extent as people are willing to suffer for it, to -- large extent. As soon as you want to be paid for the truth, it ceases to be the truth. Can be sure of that. That's just habit. To repeat an old formula, you see, that's not the truth itself. That's the inherited truth. That's the old -- you see, the -- the vestment of the truth, the garb of the truth, the eggshell. But the egg is, you see -- is blown out in the meantime.

So gentlemen, then the dedication is our humanity. Even Karl Marx had to have a friend, Friedrich Engels, as you know. He kept him sane. And he had a wife, and he had children. And therefore, the -- if you want to know a man's

right to be listened to, ask whether he is of God, whether he is of man, and whether he is of the world. As -- with regard to the world, he must have knowledge; he must have insight; he must have research; he must have discoveries. With regard to humanity, some people must find him unselfish, and loving, and affectionate, you see, and must have found it worth suffering with him, because he will have suffered if he is a great person. And all these are very disagreeable things to you. You always think that philosophy can be had in a textbook without tears, and without bravery. Only a brave man can learn how -- to think for himself. And the third thing is: he must have had an encounter with the infinite, with the new truth, with truth yet unshaped, with truth trying to get down to earth through his mind and through his heart.

And it is, I think, a great story that the materialist of antiquity, the man who went mad because he only wanted to -- treat only of atoms and things, dead matter, in his first 27 lines, gives you the full width of the human relations that are making a philosopher. He must have an encounter with the divine spirit; he must have an equality, a family, so to speak, of friends, some kinship, you see; and he must have something to speak about, some -- some discovery to make, you see, some new -- aspect of the universe.

What's the result, gentlemen? We today say that the invocation belongs to the realm of theology. The dedication would real- -- belong to the realm of sociology, because it's a sociological fact that men have friends, or that they are academic- -- professors, or what-not, write in a group. And the theme that would be what we call today, of course, the philo- -- philosophy, the realm of the natural sciences.

So again, what I tried to say last time returns. I tel- -- told you last time that the Greeks couldn't separate philosophy and -- and theology, you see. In these three things, you have the -- the nucleus. If I invoke Venus, the consequence is that I must have some theology, must I not? Because I have goddesses and gods, and I have different gods. I can invoke here Venus. But perhaps Plato would invoke the truth, would he not? And Homer did invoke the Muse. How are they related, these different forces that make us speak? What is then, gentlemen, theology? Theology is the doctrine of the powers that make men speak. Would you take that down? You nowhere find this d- -- definition. It's an excellent definition. Theology deals with the powers that make men speak. Philosophy deals with the things about which we want to speak. That's something very different. And sociology creates the environment within which we speak.

So here is Memmius, you see, who must take the place of the whole Roman republic. The Romans cared as little for philosophy as Americans, you know. They are -- Roma- -- Romans and Americans are the two most unphilosophical people that have ever lived. But here and there, there is one, and he is then very good.

I think it is interesting that in these 27 lines of an ancient philosopher, you find all three brackets: the social sciences, the natural sciences, and the humanities, so to speak, you see, of today, in a -- in a nutshell. You cannot open your mouth, according to anyone who has met with original inspiration, gentlemen. Anybody who really speaks out from the bottom of his own heart, after an experience, knows that there are always three ways of truth: the theological, the sociological, and the philosophical -- or you call it "scientific." I mean, I don't -- it's -- it's all right at this moment, the naturalistic, you see. We speak about the nature of things. That what makes us think -- speak, you see, is always the power that overthrows us, that -- that commands. Any power that is stronger than me is not nature, gentlemen, but is divine, is Nature with a capital N, at least. And nature is my god -- divinity, as it was for Emerson, or for Thoreau. If you write "Nature" with a capital N, then she is a goddess.

And sociology is also necessary. Man cannot speak without going insane if nobody listens. You need one listener and one man who replies, and has the right to tell you, "This is not so. Be quiet," you see. "Shut up." Or contradicts me, or corrects me. You understand it? I think this is the best thing I can give you in this whole course, gentlemen, to make you see that in antiquity, the dividedness had not yet reached the point it has reached today. Today you can meet people who believe that they can be scientists all by themselves, never invoke the true -- god of truth. Most physicists in this country are so -- so far removed from the s- -- fountain of inspiration, that they are just plumbers and they do their routines. And if you tell them that they also serve God, they laugh, and say "Never heard of Him." Poor people. They are just so far away from that fountain, you see, which feeds their -- their stream, that they just do not know what happens inside them.

Anybody who speaks, gentlemen, believes in God, believes in the world, and believes in society. Perhaps you take this down, too, gentlemen. And in this example of Lucretius, you find this revealed. Anybody who speaks or writes, gentlemen, believes in God; believes in an order of the world, of things; and believes in society -- that is, in human relations within which he is allowed to speak without going mad.

And I think that's the importance of studying philosophy at all, gentlemen, that you are constantly reminded, although you will be lawyers or businessmen, that anybody who opens his mouth admits that there are three experiences -- of God -- gods; of men; and of the world, of things. You can't help this. It's always with you. God, man, and world can never be reduced to each other. Perhaps -- this is another formula which you may use. God, man, and world are never reducible to each other. You can never say, "All is world," or "All is God," or "All is man." It's nonsense, because anybody who speaks needs a listener. That's his equal. Anybody who speaks needs an authority by which he makes a man listen. If -- you tell a wife -- a woman, "I love you," heavens! She must believe you, must she not? So there must be a way of expressing the truth. These three words, "I love you" must make sense to her. You must -- she must understand them in the same sense as you do. That's divine. No -- you can't do anything for this, and she cannot. It's there. A common truth is always divine, because at this moment it's too late to create language. You have to use it, you see. Otherwise, she runs away.

Since -- American -- most Americans, gentlemen, have never reached this point in the mountains of our experience, where these three great paths meet. The path toward things in a Macy's; and the path towards the family, get married, to found a family, or friends, friendship, or school, or whatever you call it, a camp, you see; and the path to worship, where you find your -- that you're doing something that has had to be done in every generation since man has lived and died, you see, to find the truth. You pronounce it. You proclaim it from the hill-tops.

And so, at the end of antiquity you have in full blossom the great unity of these three truths in these first 27 lines, that I thought is important enough for starting you out with Lucretius. Because if the mat- -- so-called materialist and -- atheist is still spellbound by this invocation, dedication, you see, and naming of the theme, we may be quite sure that it is inherent in the hu- -- character of humanity. You and I can only speak to each other because there are gods. He thought there were many gods, you see, the -- but there were gods. And you are so much poorer, because your -- question is always, "Is there God? or "Is there no God?" No Greek was ever hampered by this very much. His question was, "How many gods?"

Well, will you kindly bring all the books of assigned reading next time, because I think we -- I should show you their use then -- we shall go over this. There is the Homer, there is the -- the Ancilla -- how do- -- is it called Ancilla,

isn't it? -- and the Platonic dialogues and the Aristotelian writings. I thi- -- hope it will not be too much. Bring this little library with you. And we'll go on with a little bit of Lucretius next time.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...by expression of the divinity of physical love. For pigs, of course, it isn't, because you think that -- when intercourse is described, it must always be sex. It cannot be the apotheosis of mankind. But that's what it is here, where the goddess is good enough to bend over the {lying in years}. And I told you it's one of the oldest traditions of the human race, that in the greatest harmony, it is the goddess that bends over the god, and not as in the animal kingdom.

After this, a man comes and asks me, was he obliged to read more of this poem, or could he drop it now? There's nothing more to be said. I'm very sorry that this man is taking the course. If -- if you think that philosophy can be studied by assignments, gentlemen, you are quite wrong. It cannot. It can only -- done by some voluntary act. I can lead the horse to the water. I can't make him drink. If you don't read more than I assign, gentlemen, the whole course is absolute nonsense. Obviously, any assignment is ridiculous in philosophy, because it means that you don't -- are n- -- have no sense of wonder. Now I tried to sell to you this very simple idea that philosophy is a sense of wonder about the gods, about man, and about the world. -- If you cannot develop any one of these senses of wonder, gentlemen, just don't try to study any course in philosophy. Because philosophy is not a science, and philosophy is not gymnastics. And -- it is only the cultivation of your sense of wonder. Nothing else.

Now the sense of wonder knows of no time limits. And it knows -- knows of no assignment, because a sense of wonder takes you out of the commercial, and out of the scheduled, and out of the measurable reality. Obviously the sense of wonder means that -- are perplexed, and that therefore you do not know whether you sink or swim, as the famous English love song says. "I know not if I sink or swim." That's philosophy.

Now I -- I quite understand to -- that you cannot share this sense of wonder from the beginning. I have tried to introduce you to it, and to show you that it is in every man's life who opens his mouth and has the boldness to say anything, that he must be surprised over his boldness, that he does say something. That's the first sense of wonder about his own logos, that there is by the grace of God in him a power that vitalizes this idiot, which every one of us is, and this dirt, which we are, and this mass of clay, and that we, in our receptacle there suddenly lights up, as in an electric bulb, a current that is not of our making, because it has to do with the truth. And neither you nor I know anything of the truth by ourselves. Absolutely nothing.

So I say it is difficult for you to follow me, except perhaps by the shock that even you yourself have already something to -- we -- you can cultivate. You have made remarks at home and elsewhere. What are they worth? Were they yourself? Were they just passing remarks? Do you want them to be held against you? Then were they true? Are they good enough to be held against you? You -- what I can demand from the beginning of this course, gentlemen: that you should not make it impossible for you to get into the sense of wonder. Anybody who asks, however, "Must I read more of this stuff?" has already made up his mind that he will not get into this, obviously, you see. Because, we shall go on from the last time, where I tried -- I hoped I had made clear, that we are all surrounded by this deep secret which lies between the three divisions of this college. What is the unifying point, the center from which three divisions, as we have them -- humanities, social science, and natural science -- divide? Show me this point, and there is where the real man stands. A man is always more than a man in the social sciences. And he is always more than a man in the humanities. And he's always more than a man, you see, in the natural sciences. Well, he can create all these three, has he not? Who is this strange animal who can go in for nature, in for society, and in for authority or inspiration, or truth? That's our won- -- sense of wonder. And we s- -- call this point in which the philosopher tries to ren- -- render himself the point of -- from which any moment a new distribution must be made between the forces of the logos, the forces of our ethos, and the energies of our phusis. And I also tried to tell you that what we use today, logic, ethics -- funny enough, here is the plural -- and physics, is already second-rate, and it's limited today to the much more comprehensive, original nouns of logos, phusis, and ethos. All philosophy, we said, has these three topics, these three themes. They can be mixed in a different way. I can say, "My stomach speaks out of me." Then I am what you would call a clumsy materialist, you see. I would then try to reduce the logos to an appearance of the phusis. I can say the opposite, as the idealist, and say, "All physical things are just appearances, semblances, you -- the true thing is -- the meaning of it is in the mind." And I can say that I know nothing of all these things. I only know of neighborly love, and I only know of my duties as a citizen in the polis. Then I am an ethicist, you see, like a good Stoic. Today I have to make an attempt to bring this same truth home to you from the other end of the history of the Greek mind, from its very beginnings, so

that you can understand why these strange three abstract things, logos, ethic, and physics, today still shake men. This country is today only interested in physics. It cries out for physicists. And it asks physicists whether they believe in God, as though they knew anything about that. Mr. Einstein was -- is put in a window in the interna- -- inter- -- in Riverside Church. Remarkable ineptitude. What the fel- -- poor physicist who invents atom bombs know about God Almighty, who tells him whether he -- one can throw the atom bomb, or not throw the atom bomb? That's a very different proposition. We all produce nonsense, gentlemen. But what to do with nonsense, that's the problem. And so I asked you to bring to class the books that go before Lucretius. Lucretius, as I said, is the Nietzsche of antiquity. He goes mad. And in a -- in an ending revolt, you may say, and also lyricism, he -- he's the quintessence of the whole march of -- ancient philosophy from the traditional gods to their explanation by one man's mind, Lucretius himself. And that's the same god Nietzsche tried: abolish the gods by making himself into a god. And that's a good formula, gentlemen, that the philosopher tries the apotheosis of the philosopher, bec- -- by explaining away the pre-philosophical powers, especially the gods, or the authorities in the city, the kings, the tyr- -- tyrants, everybody, you see. He becomes the king and the priest in his own right. And the -- and anybody in this country who says, "I'm independent, and I think for myself," is the -- same kind of atrocious ass who says that he is god to himself. Now Lucretius was not such an ass. He went at least mad over this issue, gentlemen. He paid with his whole -- own life, as Nietzsche did. And that's the greatness of these people, that they went to the end of the road, into the dead-end street, and -- warned you and me that if we follow there, that must be the result. These great people, gentlemen, serve a great purpose, as any criminal does. Any murderer spares you -- to have -- you have to become a murderer. Any crime is there to deter you. -- I'm sure that all great sinners are mighty useful in the kingdom of -- of ends, because without the criminals, you see, we would commit all the crimes. So without philosophy of antiquity, gentlemen, many impassés and many dead-end streets would be traveled again. But how did it all begin? I asked you to read Homer. Every Greek philosopher down to Lucretius is shot through with Homer. And Homer's poetry, gentlemen, then is that nourishment out of which a philosopher tried to make philosophy. Homer deals with the logos, the ethos, and the physis not as a philosopher. His sense of wonder is there. Any poet has a sense of wonder. But the answer which he gives, gentlemen, is not a philosophi-

cal answer. And if he can now, by reading Homer, define his sense of wonder, in contrast to the philosophical sense of wonder, we'll know better what philosophy is.

So my second voyage, so to speak, into philosophy will come from the times when there was no philosophy. Homer is not a philosopher. But he was treated by all the Greeks from -- who came after him, down to the days of St. Augustine, to the end of the -- of antiquity, as their teacher. Homer is in Greek not th- -- a poet. He is the poet.

As a matter of fact, I read here a textbook by -- written by an old Greek on the history of Greek philosophy. And the man quoted a list of books written by a famous Stoic. And I read on the right-hand side, in the English translation in the { } edition, on Homer. And I said to myself, "Has he written a book on Homer?" I -- and I looked on the left side, into the Greek text, and it said, "on the poet." So then our translator, you see, in order to be -- make clear what it was, had said "Ho-" -- says, "Homer," where the Greeks just had to say, "the poet." In the Middle ages -- if you read a commentary of St. Thomas on the Bible, and he says "Apostolus," you know who is meant? Wie?

(Paul?)

Always. Paul is never quoted by name. But it's -- Aristotle on the one-hand side, in the Summa of Thomas, and on the hand, Apostolus. "Apostolus" is a different rank, you see. Aristotle is just a philosopher. But Apostolus -- he has authority, you see. He doesn't speak for himself. You treat Paul as Paul, and therefore you have no apostolic church left. If Paul is -- is a man, he is of interest to you and me. He's an apostle.

Well, however this may be, Ho -- Homer was not Homer for the Greeks, but he was the entrance door to Greek, to the -- what made the distinction between a barbarian and a Greek was Homer. And therefore, what enabled a Greek to be a philosopher and to claim, and they did claim this, that only in the Greek language could you philosophize, and that the word "philosophy" therefore had to exist -- in 1956 in Dartmouth College, because you can't translate it. And I'm still in -- a member of the department of philosophy here to this day. That comes all from Homer, because Homer set apart the Greek language from any other language in the world.

We will then read a little bit of Homer in the next weeks. Some decisive

books, the second book of The Iliad for example, and the 24th book of The Iliad, must suffice. I'm sorry, I would re- -- like to read it all. Especially if you understand the second book of The Iliad, which the liberals of the 19th centuries called spurious, and which we now again think to be the heart of the matter. The center part. They have done with all the important books, as you know, of antiquity -- in 19th century they have declared the Gospel of St. John to be spurious. And they have declared the Gospel of Matthew to be spurious, and Genesis to be spurious. And now we think that the critics were spurious.

We'll see why it is not spurious, because we will -- I can prove to you, gentlemen, that without the second book of The Iliad, there would be no Greek philosophy, because it would not have been necessary. We'll come to this in -- after the recess. Now I want to go to the rest of the literature. We then will have to read some of the parallels in The Odyssey to show you that Homer was so powerful, because he wrote one poem on p- -- war, and another on peace. It's a little bit like the two world wars. As you know, the First World War was not -- unable to shake America out of its deep sleep. And there had to be a second destruction of the world, with perhaps 20 more million people killed, because in this country, the people wanted to go home, and not mix and not meddle with entangling alliances. They had to go again. Now the world, however, is destroyed. It was too late.

The same way, Homer is invincible, and is permanent, because he has written two poems -- in my conviction, it's the same man who wrote them. As a young man he wrote The Iliad, and as an old man he wrote The Odyssey. And people are very strange in the modern world, since they all want to be boys -- up to the age of 85. They insist that a man of 85 must have the same tastes, and the same convictions as a man of 30. Now that's impossible. So Homer is a true human being, because he writes two poems with two different moods. And that seems to be -- a man changes in his own life much more than two different people. But that's -- you see, according to modern animal psychology, rats do not change. But Homer is not a rat. He is a person who has sweated out his o- -- one poem, and therefore became free to write the second. Otherwise we would never be able to explain how Shakespeare could write The Taming of the Shrew and Hamlet. If you go by psychology, it just couldn't happen, you see. But that's the -- the essence of man, you see, that you can write Timon of Ath- -- Athens as a disappointed old man. If you know Timon of Athens or the -- the Winter Tale, and you can write Love's Labours Lost as a young man, you see, because it's still great fun to live, and you have still all your teeth, which in Shakespeare's days, you know, was the decisive break between youth and old age, because they -- had no dentist. They couldn't eat in old age.

Well, that's Homer. Homer is the full life of two generations, youth and old age, hovering over the mind of every Greek schoolboy, of anybody who learned to greet -- and write Greek. I have asked you then to look in -- to buy this book here, which contains the awakening of the necessity to replace Homer by something different. The essence of the pre-Socratic philosophers is their struggle for a non-Homeric truth, and a non-Homeric sense of wonder. Poetry Is Not Enough, you may also entitle this book. You all have it, I suppose. Poetry is not enough. You may say it's a negative statement at first, but if we can understand it, then we also have learned the method of philo- -- of philosophy, gentlemen. Any sense of wonder must make clear what it does not wonder at. That is, negation. To say "no" to something is a condition of philosophy. Poetry doesn't have to deny anything. You just sing, you see. It's purely positive. But philosophy always is a second voyage. It is always the denial of something that has gone before in my or your mind, and which we dismiss as not philosophical enough, as not-yet philosophy.

So all sense of wonder in philosophy, gentlemen, contains an element. It has been called a "dialectics." It has been called critic- -- criticism. You have several expressions -- it's very important for you to know it today, the American mind in general is pre-philosophical, because it is purely positive. Keep up with the Joneses. It's a very good feature. This country is positive. It is not critical. The Russians, as you know, labor terribly under what they call "dialectics," because they can enjoy nothing what they do un- -- until they have proved that the wicked capitalists don't do it, you see. It's a very hard, searching performance. They are only satisfied if their thinking is evidently critical. That is, if there is something to which they have said "no," before they are allowed to say "yes." And therefore it's very foreign to our manner of thinking. We -- the sun rises. We jump out of bed. We say, "It's wonderful." That's poet- -- poetical thinking. You aren't surprised that I call you poets. But -- in a way, anybody who is satisfied with the positive statement is still in the poetical mood. To be poetic means to say -- affirm, to say "yes" to your first impression.

Philosophy, gentlemen, then deals with second impressions. Very important. Homer is still first impression. The philosophers deal with second impressions. And we find there this painful road to second impressions traveled in this book. And it's a story -- gentlemen, if you travel with me, you will, I think, rise to greater heights than you could -- personally, because these very great men -- from Thales of Miletus, the first philosopher of Greece, about 600 B.C., to Plato or to Socrates, to 400 -- they traveled this road which you think you don't have to travel, but which has opened to you as -- as a college student. You are all the heirs to this pre-Socratic stammering, to search for second impressions. And you

all are sophisticated, because you are college students. To -- you don't want to be taken in, you see.

I have such a hard time to -- understood by you, gentlemen, because I love to be taken in. I still side with the people who lived be- -- who you were 10 years ago, you see. Because then you were geniuses. You still lived by first impressions. All -- any genius in this country is wiped out by 11 years, or 12 years of age. Of course, there are as many geniuses in this country as in any other country. Only after 12, we don't find them anymore. They are carefully wiped out and destroyed, because everybody is afraid to be taken in, to be called naïve. And as soon as you go to school, you meet -- mix with other people. You must be -- look sophisticated, and you must have a poker face. And poker is against -- is unpoetic, as all games -- card games are, you know. That's for very old and cunning people, card games. Play bridge at the age of 95.

Young people shouldn't play card games. I think it is melancholic -- a melancholic business. You can run; you can play tennis. Don't play cards, gentlemen. I had to play cards in the ditch -- trenches of the First World War for years, because we had wet feet, and we couldn't get out. And there was no light, except a candle. And it's a very, very bad business, to play cards. Ruins your character. You have a sour taste afterwards in your mouth. In -- in an emergency, I don't mind. I -- these are not very serious things. I say it in passing. But card games are nothing -- nothing for young people, except for those -- well, there are young people who play golf, too. I can't help that.

Second impressions, gentlemen, and the road through these sev- -- second impressions, that's the road of this book. And then we come to the great pe- -- men, Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, and Epicurus, who have no longer to grope, to search for the -- what a second impression is, how it should be formulated, what a philosophy is, that it is a second impression, and it begins with a bang! You know, the first of these philosophers is Plato. Socrates never wrote a book, so we have no idea what he really was like. He is like a nightmare. You can't catch -- it's a ghost. There are as many Socrateses as there have been people who have lived after him. And we shall see that Socrates is more a dream of our own times than of old Athens, because we don't know who he was. We know so very little. We know his caricatures. We know his disciples. But we don't know him, because he was -- intelligent man, so he didn't write.

But Plato was less intelligent. He was not intelligent as you think "intelligent" is. He was a poet who brought poetry into the shape of philosophy. That's very important, gentlemen, that in Plato, the whole preamble of philosophy --Homer,

becomes subservient to the representation -- to the presentation of philosophy. The -- the dialogues of Plato are great poetry in disguise. And therefore Plato turns against Homer and says, "In my future estates, and states, and families, and cities, Homer must not be read."

And you have there -- the first man is always the most radical, gentlemen. Christ is much more radical than a modern cardinal, or a modern Methodist minister. And in the same sense, the first independent philosopher, Plato, was much more radical against Homer than my friend Lucretius, you see, who -- again admitted him, you see. But the first man has to be absolutely adamant that a new s- -- day has begun, and he cannot admit, you see, this. In the days of Moses, no temple -- could be built in Israel. Four hundred years -- years later, Solomon was allowed to build a temple, you see. It was no harm done by that time, they thought. Because you could again t- -- build temples as the Egyptian pharaohs, after you had established yourself.

The same is true, gentlemen, of Plato. If you want to know the story of Greek philosophy, always remember that it begins with Homer. That then people tried to struggle against the Homeric world of first impressions, of poetry; and tried to create a school, a tradition, a world view of second impressions, of getting behind things, you see, of knowing better, of not being taken in. Plato is the first who feels he has the recipe, how to get -- people together who will be independent of first impressions. And the symptom, the seal under this new discovery, or under this completeness, this fulfillment of the march of philosophy through the Greek ages is that he exclaims, "No Homer for me. And no Homer for my academy. And no Homer for anybody who wants to be a philosopher." You understand? That's the radicalism that is as radical as the command in the Ten Commandments that thou shalt have no other gods, and make yourself no graven image.

Homer is the graven image of the Greek mind. Very important for you to know. We all have, I am afraid, graven images. If you don't know yours, gentlemen, you will be an idolater. And I'm afraid we have as -- just as much idolatry today as we have in any century. Your idolatry is not Homer. And your idolatry are not the graven images, gentlemen. I leave it to your own ins- -- self inspection -- introspection to say what your i- -- idols are. But you certainly have them. And I know.

The graven image is in everybody's mind, because it hasn't to be graven on a wall, you see. You are unfortunately the -- the wax on which this -- this thing -- these things are engraved. And the -- clean slate, which the Ten Com-

mandments try to make, so that the man can start as a new creature, they always have to go against the graven images.

Now in -- in Greece, the graven image is -- the first image that befalls every human being as a Greek is Homer. And therefore Plato says, "No Homer." And he hides the poetical power in his dialogues in the beautiful form of his own writings. That is, gentlemen, from Plato on, poetry takes second seat to prose. And you can now reformulate our whole story, as I tried to give it at this moment by saying: in the first 400 years, from 800 to 400, poetry leads, prose follows; from 400 on, prose leads, poetry follows. You compare the age of Shakespeare, and Milton, and Spenser, and your age of the Marx Brothers, and you will know that we have the same story to tell. Down to 1700, poetry leads, and prose follows. And from 1700 down today, prose leads, and there as admitted in *The New Yorker*, auf and an -- doggerel, which they call "poetry."

Poetry to- -- in -- is enslaved in this country. There is -- are still poet- -- poetical natures. And there are people who write into their prose something poetical. A nice story, or -- read the editorial in *The New York Times* on the weather, you know. That is poetry, very often. Clean-cut poetry, but has to hide in the form of a prose editorial. Who knows these editorials in *The New York Times*? They are really great stuff.

But today, we -- we must -- you must know this, gentlemen. In an -- today prose leads, and poetry you think comes afterwards. It's a -- it's a second thought. Now I told you that poetry is formulating first impressions. And philosophy is formulating second impressions. So you can imagine that in a normal nation, poetry should come first and philosophy should come second. And this is such a prosaic country, gentlemen, that the boys have told me that they stop writing poetry at the age of 12. That's why I say, then they stop to be geniuses, because any genius is a man who believes in his first impressions. But in a Rotary Club, you'd better not do this, because that's bad business. Because my first impression of many of my fellow Rotarians would be such that I wouldn't come again.

So from Plato to Aristotle, gentlemen, and to the -- Epicure, and Zeno -- the founder of the Stoic school -- we have prose leading poetry. But now something more happens. At this moment, I have only to say -- you have texts here to read from Plato and from Aristotle. And they are so plentiful that I advise, especially this gentleman who was so anxious about not reading even the first book of Lucretius, that he better starts reading Aristotle and Plato now right away. I shall not make them an assignment, gentlemen. It is a privilege to read philoso-

phy. It is not an assignment. And I'll -- I tell you, I am not treating you as children. You are 20 years of age. You could command a battleship. You'd -- 150 years, people of 20 did command battleships. I do not see why you could not command your own mind and read something on your own steam.

I'm not interested in any assignment. I repeat this, gentlemen, it's a -- just up to you whether you afterward will blush and say, "I have wasted my time." You are 20 years of age, as I said -- once more, so -- I have to repeat this, gentlemen, and you will never be 20 years again. It's such a glorious moment in your life, gentlemen, that I wouldn't -- shouldn't have to say anything more.

But now comes my problem, gentlemen. The Greek philosophy is a -- very much an American problem, because we also have 48 states. Greek philosophy has to deal with the plurality of the human states, and governments, and religions. In -- in The Odyssey and in The Iliad, gentlemen, the first impressions which the poet makes so tyrannical, so overwhelming that nobody who reads poetry -- Homer is a barbarian afterwards, for one simple reason: that he takes all the Greeks together on one single expedition. And he shows them in a situation in which they have never lived in fact, together.

If you look however, we have no map here, but I think that much geography may stick in your minds. If you look -- please don't smoke, gentlemen. It's -- it's too hard on my throat. I shall plead just partial, I mean. I'm terribly sensitive at this moment with my throat. So I'm -- should be very grateful if you wouldn't smoke.

The situation of the Homeric poems is that perhaps 271 Greek entities, the city of Sparta, and the city of Athens, and the island of Euboea, and the city of Thebes, and all the various 70 different cities of Crete unite in one campaign, on one purpose: to get back the goddess of beauty, Helen, which the Easterners have -- have robbed. The unity, gentlemen, of purpose, beyond the religious and political unit of one church or one state, is in our world war an experience that has been repeated. Something like the Trojan War happened to this country twice in the 20th century. Don't forget that even the -- the Eng- -- the British, whom the Irish in Boston hate so much, were our allies at that time, and that we were allies of the Russians, not to speak of the Italians and the French. Now gentlemen, you overlook that in peacetime, as you have now lived through the last 10 years more or less with some consciousness, is -- is much more normal to think of a man who lives under another constitution as an enemy. The -- Russians have been treated as enemies, simply by the fact that they

live under another constitution. In antiquity, such a constitution was not called just another constitution, but another religion. And the -- our newspaper writers, and our agitators, and all the people who want to make money out of opinions have tried to tell us here too that Bolshevism was not a political thing, but a religion. Because then they could say, "That's a crusade, and we must throw the atomic bomb on Moscow." And the Catholic bishops went to Mr. Truman and said, "We have no objection against your throwing the atomic bomb on the antichrist, in Moscow."

If you can build up -- even the Russians, who have the same Christian tradition as all Western men, against the Chinese and against the Hindus, who are much nearer to us than any Japanese, certainly -- if you can sell the people of this country at least for three years the ridiculous notion that they are the enemies of the human race, then you can imagine how normal it was in antiquity that Jupiter, as worshiped in Athens, and Jupiter as worshiped on -- on Crete, you see, had around them people who could only fight each other, and could only cut their throats.

Now the Greeks in -- in discrimination, or in distinction, I should say, from the Egyptians, and the Babylonians, and the Jews, and the Phoenicians, no perhaps -- not so much the Phoenicians, but certainly from these people in -- in Asia, lived as you know, on little promontories, on little peninsulas, by the hundreds. Every of these so-called city-states, as we call them, were called a polis. Now the Greek word "polis" has something to do with {polymos}, with war. A polis is an entity that can wage war independently. I won't go at the moment into the details of this etymology. There is debate about this. But it is a good definition that a Greek polis is an entity that can wage war.

Any entity that can wage war against the rest of the world, gentlemen, must have its own religion. It's impossible not to have a religion, because you -- religion is the power to estimate things higher than your own life. And if you go to war, there must be values that -- transcend your own life. Otherwise there can be no war. War is always a religious fact. A purely -- a really materialistic society could not wage war. From this you see that the Russians are not materialists, because they have waged war, and they still are going to. War is always a religious thing -- because you cannot bring any soldier to enter the Marines, except if he knows that it is more important that there are Marines than there is my own life, and that's why it's correct that the sergeant was pardoned.

That has also in the -- talked out in this last 30 years, where everything has been abandoned in this country. It is a very simple thing, gentlemen. Any

entity that wants to wage war must have a religion. Because religion is the power to conquer death. That's all what religion is. You and I die -- if we have no religion, it is perfectly meaningless. There must be something that ties us to reality, whether we are -- happen to be -- be -- out the grave, or in the grave. It makes no difference. A good man is not killed when he dies. If there is no such thing, then there is no religion. And religion therefore is not a luxury, gentlemen. It is the only point in your own life by which your own existence does not depend on the accident of an idiotic truck driver, or a drunken other student who kills you. Is this all you are? Just his own, arbitrary victim? You don't believe this for a minute.

But it -- everybody of course in Dartmouth College is obliged to believe it officially, because we are under the domination of all these crackpots who say that man is just an animal. But all these gentlemen in psychology, and all these other nice departments, are quite sure that -- there were -- would be soldiers to defend the United States against Hitler 10 years ago. And they all have their nice salaries and their nice houses on the basis of the fact that 100,000 boys were willing to die for their country, which makes all this talk absolutely absurd, what these people tell you what man is. They tell you that man is, I don't know, how many electrons.

So gentlemen, religion is pre-philosophical. And if every city in Greece had its own religion, then there cannot be philosophy. Because the strongest impressions on any child are the loyalties to his family, and on any citizen are the impressions made in his own city and his own country. Now in -- in Greece, people lived so tight-knit in these little harbor cities, like -- like Athens, or like -- like Argos, or Corinth, that they were quite overwhelmed with the fact that they were members of this one society. And there was the goddess of Venus perhaps worshiped in Corinth, and the goddess Hera -- Juno worshiped in -- in Argos; and Zeus worshiped in Olympia, and Athene worshiped in Athens, you see. And nobody knew any better, but this was their religion for which, for whom, and for whose gods it was the great privilege of a citizen to die. And to beget children, to educate them, and to dedicate them in the honor of the gods of the city.

So gentlemen, first impressions are always religious. Would you take this down? Again, this is today wiped out. And people give -- gave you -- give you sex enlightenment instead. They don't tell -- teach the children to pray, but they -- teach the children who are not interested in it at all where their genitals sit. They know this, by the way, all -- very well themselves. It is very terrifying today, gentlemen. We have abolished all -- power to be Americans, to be citizens, because you think that citizenry has some -- something to do with life. Unfortu-

nately it has something to do with death, with the meaning of death. You can't be a citizen through a good life, gentlemen. You can only be the citizen if you are willing to give your life for your country. It hasn't to be in war, by the way. But in some form. If a child drowns, somebody has to jump into the river, get it out. That's enough to show that your -- your life is very little compared to the continuity of the entity to which you belong.

This is then the first impression, gentlemen, which Homer has dinned into the ears and hearts of every Greek, that they belong to one religious community. The first impression is not what you think, sense impressions. If -- if this were so, of course, you and I would not be human beings, but just animals, you see. But the first word which you have learned to say -- speak, the first -- the -- your own name, that's your first impression. Now you all believe that this is your real name, you see.

I came at the age of 45 to this country, gentlemen. It's quite a shock when people then suddenly do not pronounce your first name as you have heard it pronounced for 45 years at home, because every -- even a first name, as you know, is pronounced in an -- in another language very differently. It isn't -- it isn't Pe- -- Peter when you go to France. It's Pierre. So you wake up one day and you have lost your name. That is a shock, because your own name is the one religious foundation on which your soul rests. If your name is denied you, you can just as well be shipped -- shipped to a concentration camp, where they took away all names, and made people into numbers, and then gassed them, because they had ceased to be human beings.

The first step always, gentlemen, is that we are numbered when people want to deny us our religious status as children of God. As you know that -- when -- at every birth now, we are given a name, Arkansas Number 2,400. Very dangerous procedure. Then you are fingerprinted, you see. Then that's the end. Man is not a number, gentlemen, because man must hear by what he is called, and he must agree to that. And this secret agreement between what people have done to him, and what he knows about himself, is our first fixed point in reality, in this great universe which consists of logos, ethos, and phusis. If there is no name inside you, you are crazy. You are insane. You must recognize, identify yourself by a name, and it isn't of your own making. Somebody else called you by this name. Society says, "His name was given to the sheriff, so it is true. It's his name." And you are recognized all over the globe under this name. And if you disappear behind the Iron Curtain, the American consulate will search you, and will insist, "That's his real name."

Very strange thing, underestimated today by -- by modern rationalists, who s- -- do not live by first impressions, and do not admit that everybody has a religion, gentlemen. Your first religion is not the belief in God or Jesus Christ, of who -- Him -- them -- if you haven't been preached this, you know nothing. But you know very well that you have a name.

Now a name, gentlemen, makes you a member, because anybody who has a name knows that somebody else may have another name. And we all share in the -- in Heaven the fact that every one of us has his own name. So one name, gentlemen, allows for all other names. That's very strange, because they are all related. In English, for example, you can relate all names to each other. Where there is a mas- -- male's name, there is also a female's name. You have John and Jean. They are obviously the s- -- or Joan, or Jane. You can, of course, vary this nowadays. It is always the same problem of -- of the feminine to John. And they all take you out of England, and they take you out of New England, because "John" and "Joan" come from the Bible. And therefore in every such name, there is always a -- more than national -- this is always a religious story. And if you have "Harold," even this is a religious name. People today try to em- -- eliminate the biblical names, perhaps, but then they go back to pagan name, which in this country is rather funny.

But what I tried to say, gentlemen, is that first impressions are names. And by everybody's name, he is tied to that society which has given him this name. Now the Greeks had this terrible problem -- and it is terrible, that they were 300 such warring communities giving their own names, but constantly trading, constantly going back and forth to Egypt, to the mouth of the Nile, going back to the Tigris, to Damascus, for example, you see, to the trade routes of the great empires of Persia and Media, and Assyria, and that -- therefore a Greek was a man of more than one country by actual experience. Every Greek who is a Greek cannot be confined to his religious place. When he goes out and -- across the sea from one of the Greek islands -- think of all these islands Del- -- Delos, and Thasos, and {Skiros}, and O- -- Euboea, and who -- give me names of -- of Greek Islands? Who can give me the name of a Greek island? Where is the island of St. John? Which is the island on which St. -- St. John the Evangelist was confined? Nobody ever read the New Testament? It's a -- quite a good book. You don't know where -- where -- St. John spent his old age? What?

{{ }.)

Nearly. Nearly, yes. The first three letters are correct. Patmos, yes. On the island of Patmos. Go there. It's a beautiful little island. They have a special tour

now arranged for 12 interesting islands in the Greek sea. Patmos. My first independent book was published in a publishing firm which we founded for the very fact -- for -- with -- by this very name, Patmos publishing firm, because we wanted to say that the end of the old Europe had happened and the -- after the First World War. And that's a very incisive name for -- in my own life. Patmos. But the Greek arch- -- it's called the archipelago, gentlemen, the -- the -- our fundamental sea, so to speak, this part of the Mediterranean which is now so much in the paper that you don't even know where it lies -- between Mr. Tito and Mr. Nasser. This is today again the struggle for the domination of the world. And we, as you know, have sold out by the nervousness of Mr. Dulles to Mr. Nasser, and to Mr. Khrushchev, because we haven't -- we have allowed Albania to be a submarine base for the Russians. And we have Mr. Tito allowed to go without our planes and get his planes now from Russia. It's very bad, gentlemen. Who has -- Eastern Mediterranean governs the world.

And therefore these islands there are of no small importance -- importance to the history of the human race, gentlemen. On these islands there was bred the spirit of philosophy. We will see that most of these philosophers have something to do with the shores of this Greek archipelago. "Pelagos" means ocean. "Archi-" the -- the -- arch, the sea, the genuine sea, the most important sea. Because gentlemen, on an island, 4 -- 6 square miles big -- take Desert Island here in Maine, you cannot forget that there are people on the other side of the isthmus, on the other side of the water. You see, you see the land, you see. Therefore all attempts of the Greek priesthood, of the Greek religious people, to confine a man's loyalties to his own homeland alone were abortive. You just could not convince a man in Athens that Salamis was not -- also his concern. Now Salamis, gentlemen, is an island in front of Athens. Has anybody been to Greece? Where have you been?

(Athens.)

Where is Salamis?

(It's an -- an island off the -- I haven't been { }.)

Have you seen it?

(No.)

You flew. Oh, of course. Well, the island of Salamis is quite famous, as you know, because it is the battle of free- -- for freedom of -- of Greece, which was

won there against the Persians. So it has -- we, you and I, are the heirs of this battle to this day. And that there is a course in Greek philosophy is only based on this battle of Salamis. When was the battle of Salamis?

Now, you look this up next time, and tell me. Every one of you look this up, gentlemen. You can't enter the kingdom of Heaven without knowing when the battle of Salamis was.

But Salamis is a Phoenician name. "Salamis" means peace, the island of peace, as Solomon. Now in front of the city of Athens then there was an island in which the great victory was fought over the Persian king, in -- and yet the name was not Greek. I think that's terribly important, that the Greeks -- the Athenians had to love an island with a non-Greek name, you see, where their mother tongue came second, came too late to replace it. Just as we here have to put up with "Connecticut" and with all the Indian names, and try to mix "Eleazar Wheelock" in as best we can.

So gentlemen, the problem of Greek philosophy is the unique situation of Greece -- any Greek, that he was faced with a larger universe than his political and religious loyalties explained. Any -- Greek looked beyond his state. That's not normal. An American has so -- places to go, from west to east, you see, that you don't have to go abroad without -- you see, you -- your total -- can be here -- remain immersed in America without -- our -- means of transportation, as you know. Innumerable people, after they had landed here, never got out of this continent again. It was quite impos- -- technically impossible, far too expensive. And communication before 1865, as you know, didn't amount to anything. How could you get out? You were glad that you were here. And you tried -- that's isolationism. You did not look back, because you said, "It was so -- such a costly affair and so terrifying ever to get here, I was so seasick, I shall never go back." Because seasickness for three months on a boat is quite a serious thing. And half of the people on the Mayflower died in the process. And half of the people who made the transcontinental journey, as you know, the -- Oregon Trail -- hit the Oregon Trail, they died.

In a friend's family, the descendants of the first chief justice of California, there's a private print, in which this first chief justice who, at the ripe age of 23 graduated from Yale Law School, made the journey. And he describes how they, from June to October, journeyed west. Well, out of 72 people who went on the Oregon Trail, 26 arrived. The rest had died. That's a -- the real story, gentlemen, of a total confinement to a religious entity called the -- "the West." So the -- you see, the Manifest Destiny. And such an experience is hard enough to create an

American religion. It has created Mormonism, for example, which is an attempt to give America a completely separate religious status, you see. That was the great enthusiasm of the Mormons, that they said the spirit of God hadn't made the detour over -- through Europe, you see. There was an American, original revelation. Quite plausible, gentlemen, for people who had undergone such hardships, to forget the world from which they came.

So the American scene is not quite the same as the Greek scene. We have a tremendous continent. And we have many countries from which the people have come into this continent. In Greece it is the opposite story, gentlemen. You have a tremendous continent surrounding you called Egypt, called the -- African coastline, where Carthage is. Where today you read about Algier, and Tunis, you see, Tripolis. And you have the Phoenician coast. And you have Asia Minor. And you have the big island of Cyprus. And in between comes the -- on their little boats, these Greeks, founding city after city, from Marseille, you know, to the Black Sea, where they have, you see, Byzantium, later our modern Istanbul, Constantinople, and {Cappitsom}, and these innumerable hundreds of cities, religiously found their own temple, bring their sacrifices to their own goddess or god, and try to bring the children up in the worship of the local deity, and try to teach them that their city deserves, you see, to be defended to the last breath, and to the last drop of blood. And at the same time, these people see and live by commerce with other cities, you see, of Barbarians, and of other Greek tribes -- Dorians, and Ionians, and Aeolians, and -- and -- and the -- the people from Boeotia, and Attica who had mixed descent from these various tribes, Macedonians.

And therefore, gentlemen, you will perhaps begin to understand that the Greeks were just as predestined to become philosophers as the Jews were predestined to become prophets. The reason for the Jews was that they found a place at the crossroads of the old world in which they could live by themselves. And therefore, in -- say that all this -- dispersal of many creeds and many religions was nonsense. That was the Jewish situation.

The Greeks were in exactly the opposite geographical situation from the Jews. They were not in one place united, but they were in many hundred places dispersed. So their question was, gentlemen: what about second impressions? Is it really true that we have a god in Athens that differs from the god elsewhere? Is my language -- my Attic- -- Attic dialect really so different from the Egyptian language which these Egyptian priests tell their people?

Gentlemen, second impressions are the necessity for the existence of the

Greek -- many Greek cities. Will you take this down? Because here I give you the material explanation, why the Greeks became predestined to build upon their first religion -- the first impression is always our religion -- on their first impressions, on their religion, you see -- a second one. And we learn something important, gentlemen: all philosophy is second. It is never primary. It cannot be primary. You first have to be told. Then you can wake up and say, "But I say." That's philosophy. That's this dealing with your second impressions.

When you learn by waking up that the world in which you prayed, the world in which you worshiped, the world in which you fought, the world in which you wish to die, in which you are ready to die, the world in which you think it is a privilege to give your life -- as Nathan Hale -- and I'm -- you are only sorry that you have one life to give to your country, then you wake up and say, "But there are more countries. So my sentence -- I wished I had more than one life to give to my country -- must be balanced by the question, but are not there other things to be done outside my country?" You see. That leads you to second values, to second impressions.

And these second impressions, gentlemen, of philosophy then -- now comes the important statement which unfortunately our modern textbooks have -- have embezzled: philosophy always presupposes an existing religious and political order. Law and religion must already have entered your experience before you can become a philosopher. A lawless person and an irreligious person cannot be a philosopher, because he has no experience by which he knows what has to be generalized; what has to be made by your second impression has to be extended to more than your hometown. The whole problem of philosophy is, you see, to extend that which is true in your own family, and in your own home, in your own nation to more. Because your family is not the only family; your nation is not the only nation; the geography and the climate of your own country is not the only climate; and therefore you have this problem in Argentina: when do you celebrate Christmas? Do you celebrate Christmas in the midst of summer? It's a great problem. I don't know how they deal with it. Has anybody been to Argentina? Does anybody know how these poor people do it, with the Christmas tree? Without snow? What do they do? Ja?

(Well, in Australia, they { } the same thing.)

What? What do they do?

({ } lamb chop { }, do the same thing.)

Lamb chop prize?

(Lamb chop { }.)

What do you mean by that?

(Well, it's -- they have trees. They have pine trees. And it's Christmas { } in the middle of the summer.)

They have it in the summer. And what do you say of lamb chops?

(Well, they get a big mess of lamb chops and divide them up, and { }.

But it's Christmas.)

Have you lived there?

(Yeah.)

Now, a philosopher, you see, or good philosophy would enable the Argentineans to have Christmas in their winter, you see. And say, "Our 24th of December is wintertime," because the winter is more important for the celebration than the name of the day, wouldn't you say? So it's just superstition that they must have Christmas on that which in the calendar is called 24th of December. They have no philosophy. They have no power to get out of first impressions. The first impression -- now you see what is the first impression. I told you the names are first impressions. Your own name. All language is a first impression. That something is called 24th of December is such a superstition with these poor people on the southern hemisphere that they cannot look through this name. Can't you see it? They cannot generalize the name December, and look into the meaning of the December, that it is the month in the -- heart of winter. Well, I have my -- my special ideas about the superstitions of the South Americans.

From this example, I'm quite serious, gentlemen, you see the quandary in which the Greeks lived. It wasn't that they had discovered so much the other hemisphere. As you know, they hadn't. But they do -- did live in such a dispersal, and in such a variety of places, and with so many different substrata of population, they were colonials, you see, living with people who talked -- spoke another language around them, as the people in Trieste, who are Italians today, and are surrounded by Yugoslavs. And therefore we Americans, as you know, have

destroyed Istria by carefully dividing it so that it can neither live nor die. But the problem of Istria and Trieste was -- it was the most wonderful harbor founded by Italians, surrounded by Yugoslavs, and serving the Germans in Austria.

That's a typical Greek situation, the -- as a -- matter of fact, the Italians of Trieste, on Venice, you see, are the heirs of the old Greek trade routes, and of the old problem of the city. That's why Venice was such a proud republic in the Middle Ages, because it carried on the Greek tradition, you see, of a city within unlimited territories of other people's government.

So we -- from the problem of Homer, gentlemen, down to the geography of all philosophers after him, you see, that the Homeric poetry was only possible because he showed the -- all the Greeks united at war, and he gave them this one memory which never occurred again, that all the Greeks were of one religion, that all Greeks had the same purpose, that all Greeks died and lived for the same cause, that all Greeks could therefore be on peaceful and friendly terms {with} each other.

But we shall see that this tremendous creation of Homer's passionate imagination, that you could have one religion beyond your own temple, beyond your own priest, which was larger than what you saw in your own hometown, that this even extended to the non-Greeks. When we read the 24th book of -- of Homer, we will see that Homer created humanism. Today, as you know, we have the so-called humanities, and we have rationalism, and that's called "humanism." Gentlemen, the humanism of Greek brand -- the real humanism of antiquity is something much more practical and something much -- I think much greater. Modern humanism means you understand everything and you do nothing. But the problem of an ancient humanism was, as I told you, to see in the man, against whose city you made war, your brother.

It is very easy to love all people outside war. There are many good Americans who are pacifists and therefore think they are very kind to the human race. When it comes to war, they may become conscientious objectors, but it doesn't help anybody. The war goes on just the same. The problem is, gentlemen, to obstruct something like *The Naked and the Dead*, and to see in the man against whom you go to war, your brother, and who is a courageous man on the other side -- chivalry is something quite different from pacifism. It is much more difficult to understand that when two nations go to war, they are the best people -- on -- of both nations who confront each other on the battle lines.

When I was in the -- First World War, I wrote a pamphlet -- I wrote -- I never published it, of course. I would have been arrested -- "Soldiers of All Countries, Unite." And I wanted of course to unite against the profiteers at home. We were disgusted with the -- our people at home. And so were the French disgusted with their peoples at home. But we people in the -- in the trenches -- trenches, we loved each other. And we didn't hate each other. That's only an idea of ladies at home, that soldiers hate. No soldier hates. Newspapermen hate. And a -- and people at home hate. Perhaps women's clubs hate soldiers in war. No soldier who's a good soldier ever hates his enemy. It's unknown. He has respect for his enemy. And he feels a tragedy that he should fight such a good man.

As long as you do not understand this, gentlemen, you cannot be humanists. And I think Americans are pacifists, but they are not humanists, because you think that outside the conflict, you can be of one religion. Gentlemen, obviously if there are gods who send wars, and famines, and earthquakes, and tragedies, and death, and your sick -- polio -- think only of polio. And -- didn't I tell you the story of the lady who ran away from her husband because he had polio? It's the same thing, you see. If she cannot see the same soul in the man after he has polio, she is not a human being. Isn't that true? That's humanism, you see, to see unity despite conflict.

So the Greek problem of humanism -- humanism was to recognize in the enemy on the battlefield, you see, somebody who had at -- the same merit, and the same right as you had. And wars can only be fought as long as you have this faith that on the opposite side, the people are just as good or better as you are. Because a war is not -- fought by people, but for causes, and for important causes. And I think I have been a good soldier, and -- I have been a soldier a very long time. I have been in uniform for six years. But it has never -- I -- I mean, I have -- I -- really tell -- say it to -- this to you because it is simply true, that I have never felt anger, or aversion, or hostility against anybody except -- against the home war -- warriors, the people at home with the big mouth. Those I have despised and hated.

This is then -- is the Greek problem of humanism. "Humanism" is the most general expression for philosophy. Any philosophy will have to bring out in you and me the power to -- not to be confined, you see, to those who already fall in line, you see, who already act in such a way that you can understand.

So gentlemen, the fact that you and I are immersed partly in nature, that people live in Russia and just by the land mass over there happen to be di --

separated from us. For -- any mind who thinks twice, obviously that's no good reason to be very estranged from him, you see. And this must be made relative. Philosophy, gentlemen, makes the religious divisions of mankind relative. But philiso- -- philosophy cannot create religion, gentlemen. And philosophy can never create first impressions. It has been said, and take this down, gentlemen. It's a very important sentence which I only quote from a great Swiss historian, Jakob Burckhardt, who warned men against their glorification of Greek philosophy in the days of Nietzsche, and rightly so. He said, "Not one Greek philosopher has been able to close one Greek temple." That is, one superstitious idolatry of a -- one of the many gods of Greece. Philosophers are unable to replace first impressions.

Once you know this, gentlemen, you will not expect too much from philosophy, you see. Nobody can live by philosophy, except fools. Philosophy can extend your love, and your charity, and your faith, and your hope. But you must first realize this faith and hope in other ways, because you cannot wait till you have second impressions. No way, you see. If you teach your philosophy to your child, it is this child's religion. It is not his -- its philosophy. Parents -- modern par- -- the enlightened people have abolished the fairy tales, and the legends, and the -- Bible, and -- and tell them scientific stuff. As I said, this genital enlightenment, and so on. Well, for the child, it becomes its religion. It's usually then a -- a valueless religion, because religion must be given us in a different manner from philosophy, you see. But -- the modern heresy is that people think philosophy can take first seat. That's impossible. Philosophy is -- after you are committed to certain loyalties, to certain truths, you see, to certain methods of dealing with reality then, is there? -- after you have been made to share the life of truth, and the life of your neighbors, and the life of the earth around you, and the sky around you, that then you can be taught that this isn't the whole story. There is something second. There's something more. Philosophy, gentlemen, generalizes.

The famous story with which I would like to end today: I have a friend in -- in Boston, who is a Congregational minister. Is now a very old man. When he was still in -- in his offi- -- in his -- serving his congregation -- First Congregational Church in -- in Cambridge, he received the visit of a man and his son, and -- who -- and the man was widely known as a free thinker of the first order and is a violent enemy of the Church. And my friend, Mr. {McNair}, was puzzled, because the man brought his son to enter Sunday school. And he -- screwed up his courage and he said to this man, "Sir, isn't that a

joke? What -- how shall I take this? I am hesitant to accept y- -- this child from you, because you have said so often how you feel about us, that you were -- we were just monsters of superstition and obsolescence."

And the man said, "Well, it's funny. I agree. But I mean it. Don't be afraid.

Take the boy. Because after much consideration, I have felt he must have something to liberalize upon." He must have something to liberalize upon.

This is the problem of philosophy. Philosophy generalizes. You can also say it "liberalizes upon." But there is nothing, you see, to liberalize upon, the whole liberalization makes absolutely no sense. And you all are the victims, you see, of a liberalization before you have ever been committed to love, faith, and hope. Or to adoration of the -- God Almighty and His son, and the Holy Spirit. Now that's very pure order. You are just -- you are just emancipated before you are emancipated. It has come too early, you see.

At one -- I have a- -- my doc- -- my son has had a case where the parents had a genius of a baby, very musical child. And showed signs of enth - -- and delight, and enchantment when it heard music. When it was a little baby of 6. So they insisted that this child had immediately to be fed music, and to know all the names of the composers. And by the age of 2 it was a vegetable. They had dared to liberalize upon, before the naïve, quiet growth of the child had taken place.

And the child is destroyed, for good. Nothing can help it.

That's a tragic story. Of course, that the maximum of idiocy and crime, committed by philosophy. And most girls who come from our colleges, of course, are in great danger of doing this, gentlemen. You, as the husbands, must then protect your children against their mothers. They must be kept away from this -- idiocy, gentlemen, of enlightenment, too early. It comes early enough that we wake up and know that our world is limited. But first give them a limited world, as best as you can. Woe to you if you begin with philosophy with your children. They are not to philosophize unless they -- do not come up to the rough corners of their little haven, you see, of certainty and security. You have to -- first give them the certainty. And of course, you have to live it yourself in this manner.

Philosophy is second -- the second voyage through life. It is never the first. It generalizes upon -- and never forget that "to generalize" means you must start with a particular. And the particular is not this stone, and is not this house, and is not a thing. The particular is your commitment, that you are tied to people who tell you the truth. Your parents, for example. That is a first experience, you see.

That's why I say, gentlemen, the first environment of a child is not his soil, or his -- the air, or the weather. It is what he's told. Because upon any child's heart, what he is told falls as a religious revelation. And if he doesn't make this experience, that his name is true as gold -- his own name, that his parents will never give him up, because he is their child and they have named him, then the child has no religion.

Religion is nothing, gentlemen, which we choose. Religion is something that saves us from complete confusion, from the night, that we do not know who we are. Withdraw from a child its name, then it has no parents. That's why it is not the same to be born out of wedlock, or in wedlock. It makes all the difference whether you have a father who has confessed that he is the criminal, or a father who doesn't.

It is very important to have a father, gentlemen. And any adopted child, and any orphan knows this. You have -- there are of course many orphans who make up for the father they don't have, by hook and crook, by being loved by other people. But it has to be made up in some way or the other. This is first commitment. Because -- you can -- {laughter} would say philosophically that all men have one father in Heaven, that we should all be brothers. Gentlemen, the first experience must be that you have a father, poor as he may be. A real father is still better than no father. And then the thought of a father, which would be philosophy.

So I hope I have shown you, gentlemen, that the Greeks were in this unique situation, to fall for second impressions. That is, they could never -- is it clear? -- they could never be satisfied with first impressions. Now gentlemen, there have been the great people, like the Chinese or the Egyptians, who didn't -- or the Incas -- who didn't get outside their own country, and therefore had no need for philosophy. Philosophy is only necessary whenever we go beyond the edge of our own, you see, God-given, so to speak, environment. At that moment, we must enlarge on those loyalties to nature, to men, and to the powers that be, who govern our steps, you see, and must try to find out when we should celebrate Christmas in Argentina.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...we are all s- -- indebted to both of them.

[tape interruption]

(This is Side 2.)

...carrying a burden which -- which certainly made them into a caricature of human beings. You wouldn't like to be a Greek, and you wouldn't like to be a Jew of antiquity. The burden was too heavy. But if they hadn't both lived and offered their prophets and their philosophers, we would be poorer off. They are victims for your and my sake. This is so very hard for you to understand because you think there -- are no victims, gentlemen. But your mother is you -- the victim certainly of your upbringing. There are sacrifices, gentlemen, and all mankind is only dovetailed and held together by such sacrifices. And I can -- cannot assure you strongly enough that if you want to study the history of Greek philosophy or any philosophy, you must understand that the philosopher is functioning for your sake, and therefore is an abnormal being so that you can be normal. The Greeks and the Jews are abnormal so that there might be, between these two extremes, a -- a middle road. -- You look at life just as play and think everybody can be happy. That's nonsense. In fact, I would say nobody can be happy. You can all reach your destiny. You can be blessed. You can be a saint. You can be a hero. You can be a mother. You can be a good man. But you can't be happy. The pursuit of happiness is a chimera.

Goethe, the -- perhaps the happiest man that has lived in the last 150 years, has said if he counted all, he had perhaps six years of -- continuous happiness in his whole life, and he got to be 84. Give that up, gentlemen, that chimera. Happiness is a by-product. You can never aim at happiness. As soon as you aim at happiness, you are a nervous wreck. All the people who want to be happy can't be happy. Happy is a res- -- happiness is a result of right living, but it is never a purpose.

And that's your -- your impoverishment, gentlemen. You try to be happy so very hard. So you are the most stifled and frustrated people. Anybody who wants to be happy, gentlemen, is frustrated, because he doesn't aim at what life is for. He aims at a -- a -- a by-product. It would be, as most of you do, you go for the wrappings. I mean, if you have a sandwich, gentlemen, you can be interested in the wrappings or in the sandwich. I'm interested in the sandwich. That's

living, you see. You are interested in the wrapping. That's happiness.

I warn you, gentlemen. Philosophy is -- and the Greeks are a tragic people. They are as tragic as the Jews. And both are tragic -- and we owe -- to tragedy, voluntary lived, for example, to the people in Valley Forge and to the people who died in the Battle of the Bulge in 1945, and to the boys who died in Korea, to them we owe our happiness. You have no happiness except at a price. And the price is always paid by the people who renounce their own happiness for the sake of others.

And I -- you -- I am not going to teach philosophy here for people who have a sweet tooth and want to -- just to enjoy life, gentlemen. There is nothing to enjoy about life. Too serious for that. You can enjoy it { }. But who cares whether you enjoy it? But this constant question on this campus, "Did you enjoy it?" means that you can't live. Life is not here for enjoyment. Life is to be lived. It's serious business. It's an act of God. It's a government of the world. It's the creation of the world today. And as you -- little as you are -- will ask a rose that opens its -- its -- its bud, "Do you enjoy it?" She has just to become a rose, has she not? That's all there is to it. She has to fulfill her destiny, whether she enjoyed it or not, it's a by-product.

You see, when -- when Richard Wagner's Bayreuth, the famous center of art, was opened, his wife, Cosima Wagner, who was the -- the mainspring of this great foundation -- you have heard it, it has been revived now, and many people have gone there -- spent the whole first evening in tears. And she wrote into her diary, "That's how all fulfillment looks." That's how all fulfillment looks.

They cheat you, gentlemen, by telling you, "Keep smiling." And "Life is smile." Life is not smile. Life is perfectly indifferent to your weeping and to your smile. You may weep on such a decisive evening, or you may smile. It doesn't alter the fact that Bayreuth had to be constituted, opened, and there it was. And the accompanime- -- -ment, you see, of the grin, or of the tears of the lady concerned, or Richard Wagner, whether it was -- he felt it was a triumph, or whether it was -- he felt it was a defeat, is a very minor matter to the fact that for 90 years people go to Bayreuth. That's the important thing that matters. Can't you see the difference?

And the same is true about getting a child, gentlemen. That's not an enjoyment. And it is -- it is not terrible. It's in between. Some mothers suffer terribly and have a very healthy and -- blissful child. And some people -- means nothing to them, the birth, and the child is no good. The int- -- obviously the

important thing is that a good child is born. And the -- the grin on the person's face, who is -- happens to be the mother of the child, is quite second-rate compared to the great event that a living being enters the world.

But you only look -- how does the mother, you see, smile -- does she smile? And then you are satisfied.

Well, I say this, gentlemen, because I have tried to write in this paper something about the serious business, about the tremendous jump into a new dimension which is -- we -- which was done when Greek philosophy got started.

The second thing I want to remind you of: last time, I tried to draw your attention to the fact that philosophy is second impression. Nobody as a boy can philosophize. Nobody as a child can philosophize, you see. You have -- it's a second thought, obviously, philosophy, you see. After we have already been made to think, to write, to read, to live, to breathe, to shit, then we s- -- take stock and we begin to philosophize. It is always second. You understand this. So therefore philosophy is second impressions. It is not first impression.

Once you know this, gentlemen, you know that philosophy alone cannot rule the world. It's an idiocy, Plato's idea that k- -- the -- philosophers should be kings. It's a very terrifying notion. That the philosopher- -- the Greeks in their madness went so far to believe, just as the Jews thought prophecy -- the prophets could run the world. Well, they can't. By prophecy, you see, the present day is -- doesn't get its due. Philosophy comes too late, because philosophy is after-thought. We can't wait. The thing has to be decided- -- decided now.

I once had a case of a real philosophizing lady. I'll tell you the story so that you may never forget the distinction between philosophy and rel...

[tape interruption]

...I visited a friend. And he had six children from his first marriage, and had married again, had a very conscientious lady who had of course taken all her degrees. And she had a seventh baby, that is, her own, to the six -- her foster children. And they lived in a little cottage -- in a suburban housing development. And three -- steps led down -- stone steps down from the entrance into the -- into the garden, when you went then to the -- to the street, when you came in or went out.

So when I took my leave, it had begun to rain. Not very hard, but -- but it

decidedly rained. The steps were wet. And she carried her baby on her arm escorting me to the door, with her husband. In this very moment, the child began to sneeze. And she in her great conscientiousness put the child down on this -- on the step in the rain and ran into the -- into the house to look up the book to find out what one should do when a baby sneezes.

That's a good story, gentlemen, and I have experienced this. She had been ruined by Smith and Wellesley. She was so conscientious, you see. And you can classify -- she certainly would -- should have gotten her Ph.D., but whether she should have gotten a baby, that's a different question.

I think the story is -- is very important, gentlemen, because you always forget this. You always have in America -- you can always hear people say, if they -- oh, if the people were only educated and if they only had a philosophy. That's modern rationalism in this country, that you think by education you can cure Mr. McCarthy and you can cure the slums, and you can cure foreign policy. Just give the people an education. And it -- if you give the people an education, the world would go -- run riot in the meantime. You all come too late. We would all sneeze -- with the mother absent in -- in looking up the book.

Don't believe this for a minute, gentlemen. I am a philosopher, and I know what philosophy can and what it cannot do. It cannot replace living. It's a second impression. It's a correction of our impressions, and not more. And this country is very sick, because the people have denied this since Benjamin Franklin's days, and have said, "Live by philosophy." This is wrong.

And I have tried to show you why it is wrong by bringing -- and now coming -- going -- getting back once more to this list, and then comparing it to the relation of this -- this tripartition to the problem of first and second impressions. If I asked you at this moment, who are all in this second-impression stage -- you all cultivate second impressions, you make up your mind, you try to have bull sessions, you meditate, you have afterthoughts, you are critical of your home, or of the college, or of politics -- you are critical of yourself, I hope, too. That is second impression. And in this moment, you are inclined to say that your only friend is nature. That that's first impression. And so you go into a chemistry laboratory and you think that there you have first impressions. Gentlemen, all experiments in a laboratory are second impressions, because they are all arranged experiments, and they are all theoretically, you see, reasoned out. A laboratory has nothing to do with nature. It's second nature. That's an arrangement. Experience is not experiment. But you all confuse always experimentation with experiences, gentlemen.

Now the decision which every man and human being today and in all ages always has had to make, and that's the decision which philosophy and the other powers of life is: what comes first? Physis, or logos, or ethos? Is your first friend, your main problem, nature? is -- are you and I first in union, like Mr. Thoreau thought, or { } in union with nature, you see, seeing the sun rise? Or are you -- we first united with society? Is society, which I have called ethos and logos together, or is nature our first impression?

Now this is a real problem of philosophy. And in this country it is no longer discussed, because the scientists have won out and people tell you that this is no longer a question: of course, nature comes first and society comes second. Gentlemen, in your life and mine, that's not true. In nobody -- human being life. Society is your first nature, you see -- if we can call it this way. It's of course a mislea- -- {-leading} term. You should not use it. But we are first made by the words spoken to us. And that's of course what the -- what the New Testament tried to hold against the philosophers. But nobody understands it today.

I'll give you an example of what I'm -- or two examples, perhaps. One is the story -- or the -- are the books of a -- the leading -- European biologist. He's a Swiss, lives in Basle, in the center of Europe. His name is Adolf Portmann: P-o-r-t-m-a-n-n. I think he's a very important man, more important than Charles Darwin, certainly. And he has a great following in Europe, and he is considered the leading man. In this country, where we always are a little in 1750, he hasn't yet been published. A friend of mine is just translating his book into English. And for -- while the wars -- was raging, of course there was a delay in -- in pe- -- things coming to this country, so his first important book appeared in 1943. That may -- explain why it hasn't been received here. But I think also the whole American trend of -- of mere chemistry and mere factory ideas, mere mech- -- mechanism, is opposed to his simple statement. His simple statement is that all animals, when they are born and leave their mother behind, are relatively rapidly able to stand on their own feet. It takes a few days, or a few weeks, you see, that the nestling can -- can leave the nest and then seek its own food. And it's a relatively short time, compared to the time of gestation that an animal is left to the help of the parents outside the womb.

Man is the opposite. If man would be an a animal, without the logos, without speech, he would have to -- the gestation period of you and me would have to be 23 months. We are born already after nine months. Compared with

the situation in the animal kingdom, we would have to be in the mother's womb another 14 months. But we aren't. So he says, Portmann says -- I'm now -- all -- that's all his, not my property, he just -- as a pure biologist, he says, "What is -- what's happening?"

Well, he says the mother's womb in the animal kingdom is cons- -- is constant. And once an elephant in the mother's womb, always an elephant, so to speak. That is, the same breed is hatched -- is born from these -- from the mother's womb. Man is taken out from the mother in -- at nine months in an absolutely helpless state. He would perish, totally perish, if he hadn't a changing environment. That is, if not from nine months to 23 months, there would interfere something which he calls the word -- or the -- a worded, a spoken environment, the cradle, the -- the -- the pabulum, whatever it is, what is at that moment the fashion, it can -- baby food, you see, or baby clothes. It can change. And it comes under the influence of speech. For 14 months after its birth, the baby is introduced to a society which is held together not by physiology, not by the umbilical cord, you see, but by words. And these words accompany everything that is given him. Whether it likes it or not, the child is surrounded by interpreted action, by directional action, because every one of these acts is accompanied usually with a smi- -- smile and say, "Now, Johnny, come. Let's eat." You see. "Come sit down and shit," and so on.

And as you know, all mental illnesses, all neuroses of your own days, all your problems are of a vocal character. They come because speech has accompanied the action -- has either approved it or disapproved of it. It isn't pure accidental, but it's always directional. Always it is said, "This is right or wrong," you see. "Go or go not." It's forbidden, you see, or commanded. He says that changes the whole aspect. These -- these children of man, you see, are under -- live in a mobile, historical environment which in any genera- -- every generation can be totally changed. But it can only be changed with the help of speech. It is -- not left to automation; it is not left to speechless dumbness, but the child is taken into the streams of speech, and words, and elucidation, and interpretation which the -- adults at that moment just happen to have learned about diet, about calories, vitamins, and what-not. And I wouldn't be surprised if the first word of a human being in 10 years would be just "vitamins," instead of "Daddy."

In a way, it is completely correct to call your father "Vitamin." He has given you life.

It's more than a joke, because our speech, you see, places the whole world into context, the logos. What we say, you see, is -- expl- -- always explanatory,

you see. You can make a man into a vitamin, you see, and another into a calorie, if you want to, you see. And vice versa. You can call the -- the food your mother. The Greeks did it. They called it Demeter. And they said, "It is the mother earth that nourishes us." It's not far-fetched, gentlemen. Just as you can call your father "Vitamin," so the Greeks did call the earth, you see, her moth- -- their mother, although they had a -- one mother first, you see, the physical mother; but the wider earth, with her food, appeared as the second mother. So don't laugh at these things. It is -- actually possible by speech to do these things, you see. You can call all Jews "Christ-killers," then they become to the baby the Christ-killer. And are they? They are not. But it's -- the child believes it obviously. It's the first impression. And the first impression is that what matters.

You can change the whole world by the world -- word, for the baby, for the newborn. The power is just incredible. The child will believe -- that's why people were burned, for the religions, at stake, you see, because you can make people believe, you see, that they are the dev- -- the antichrist and the devil. It has been done, even in Salem. Salem is called "peace," as you know, and the -- town in Massachusetts. And you know, all the witch-burning in -- in Salem. Well, these were good people. They were certain- -- probably much better than we are here today, these witch-burners in Salem. And I'm -- it's very easy, gentlemen, within -- within three years I can make you all burn witches. It's easy. Very easy.

Here, I met a young man on this campus. He's an instructor; he's a teacher. And he said to me he wouldn't insist -- resist totalitarian regime. Oh, his generation was wiser than my generation. It was all nonsense. He would compromise and get by.

I said, "So, it -- would you then heads -- burn people, and gas people?"

He shrugged his shoulders and said, "I suppose I would."

Teacher in Dartmouth College. And you aren't any better than this juvenile delinquent. I was ashamed. I said I -- if I had known this, I would have not come to this country -- that this country consists just of cowards. It's very serious. This man is 26 -- of age. He hasn't been hurt himself. Complete integrity. His only handicap is he comes from Wisconsin. So I told him that he probably has eaten too much of McCarthy.

But it's a sc- -- I mean, I'm ashamed of this co- -- that I call such a man my colleague, such a scoundrel? -- The majority of -- the American male would tell

you they wouldn't compromise, and they would prefer to make other people suffer if that was the question { }. So you can explain -- can very well see that the -- the modern witch-hunters are just throughout here. They are with us. The people of Salem are nothing which you can look back to as something you have left behind. Because the -- why is that so, gentlemen? Because the word in any generation can change nature -- human nature, you see. In every generation, man has a different nature. We call this the "spirit of the times," you see. And the spirit of the times makes you a creature of your own time, doesn't it? And since you are the creature of your time, if you put the devil into your own time, and he rules, you become the devil's grandson.

And -- obviously, the relationship of the devil's family is much more numerous than the other family, gentlemen, of the children of life. I mean, the -- devil's grandmother has innumerable offspring, because misuse of language is very simple, very { }, very easy, get -- get your words wrong into your throat. Gentlemen, if this is -- now, Mr. Portmann goes on to say, and he says -- has another -- interesting thing. That's -- of you -- for you of importance. He said all animals stop to grow when their sex life develops, when they have -- enter puberty. Man, the opposite. All of you have grown after you had reached puberty. Once more, you get a certain increase in size and stature. He says this way only humanity is conscious of its love. The animals are overwhelmed by this passion, but as you know how -- the way they produce -- procreate is -- is a -- blind passion. They are in heat, and they are in -- in the -- in the oestrus, and they don't know what happens, so to speak. They -- they lose consciousness, you see. You have this great privilege of cultivating your cul- -- your affections, your passions. That's why it is unforgivable, gentlemen, if you don't write poetry, and don't -- don't read poetry at your age. You have to cultivate the nobler feelings which come into you, because your body is more than your individual body. It serves the whole race. And this is again against the animal kingdom. In the animal kingdom, you see, there is a separation of your individual growth, you see, and the procreation of the kind. Portmann says that in man, this is very strange, that he is forced in every niche and nook of his body -- in -- every little finger, so to speak, and little toe, to feel this tremendous transformation which love entails -- affection, you see, sympathy, friendship, passion. Now I think you need this encouragement, gentlemen, for your own physical -- there is no division between the physical, and the spiritual, and the mental in a real person. We love with all our hearts. If you love somebody, you live -- love -- him or her, as we say in German, "hair and skin." I don't know what the expression is -- equal expression in English is. How do you say it? If you --

love somebody totally, I mean?

(Body and soul.)

Wie?

(Body and soul.)

Ja. Body and soul. Now he says no animal can. No animal can live body and soul. We can.

Now I think these two points may -- may -- may show you that the -- the relation of logos and phusis, gentlemen, of -- with regard to first impressions will make you or break you. Every one of us can be mistaken, and is mistaken for -- usually for many years -- what is nature, that is, what is the prop on which he should lean on the outer world, you see, and what is spirit, or what is logos, and what is -- what he -- what has he been told? What is the -- in his own time the new doctrine, so to speak, which calls vitamin "vitamin," and pabulum "pabulum," you see? And what is really a constant outside your spoken word, you see, like running -- lying there on rocks, without having been articulated, formulated, and abstracted, so to speak, and put into -- into other labels? Actually, gentlemen, we always seek reality through the labels of our parents and teachers. No escape. And it is better to admit it and not to dream up Thoreau {ideal} { } or Rousseau's idol, that he can commune with nature directly.

We can therefore say, gentlemen, that there are always two schools of thought in the world. In any moment, gentlemen, those who are willing to admit that logos in experience precedes phusis, or in other words, that society is your first element, you see, in which you bathe, before you can get outside society into what you call "nature" or "physics," you see -- or the other sect will always try to fight this, like Rousseau, and say, "Let's come to the bosom of nature. Forget society. You can be clean, you see, born, and you can relate to nature sans phrase, without any spoken word, directly. Very tempting, and it has been the temptation of the last 200 years, gentlemen. But I think we haven't -- it hasn't helped us very much. We are now -- landed with an A-bomb, which is -- with an { }, you see. That's the only relation to nature that's -- has been left to us. Very -- this is -- a very necessary result, because a bomb obviously is something technological, done by mind, you see, to nature. But it is not nature in its natural state, obviously.

Now therefore, you see: if you arrange logos, ethos, phusis as a biologist

would -- who looks into what really happens to a newborn baby in society, you would come to the arrangement, the logos first, the invocation, that Johnny says, "Oh, Mother. What is true?" That would be an invocation, because he thinks that his mother knows what is true, you see, so he wants her to tell him. We find it in Lucretius in the poem "Venus." She is of course the big mother, you see, who takes the place of the private mother of Lucretius alone, you see. Ethos, your relation to your neighbors to whom you speak or to -- who may -- who speak to you. And phusis as a third impression.

Pardon me. Here. And you can reduce this. And that has been done, I think, wrongly into -- into just a double partition. It has played a great part in Greek philosophy, the division, not in three parts -- logos, the authority that makes us speak, and tells us the truth; ethos, our behavior to our neighbor; and phusis, the contact with the elements of reality that do not speak, that are not related to us through human speech.

The usual division, as you also find it today with most men whom you ask is, both man is a social being and he's a natural being. He moves in society, and he moves in nature. But here I may perhaps show you that this d- -- dualism, society against nature, or nature against society, is a reduction of the true process that is threefold. And this will con- -- make -- help you consider -- you understand the problems of Plato and Aristotle. The -- the dualism is -- is a reduction of the real experience which any creative mind goes through, like Lucretius, when invokes the -- "Dear Goddess, you see, who makes me speak," you see, when he says -- admits that he wants to be read by his friend Memmius. And then he speaks about certain things that are compellingly true for Memmius, and for himself, and for us, too. You see this?

If you understand that the Greek logos, ethos, and phusis is richer, varied, more careful than what you usually speak about society and nature, you will understand that in this college, my department is wrongly placed. And that it is a great danger that you think natural science, and social science exhausts the field of sciences, you see. There must be a third.

It's very -- I talked about this, before. I only repeat this here, because these are all very difficult things. You can't hear and think about these things sufficiently often. All philosophy, gentlemen, is something that I cannot just deduct and go on the next time. These things must come to you -- us, so to speak, every day afresh. Every philosophical problem is eternal. And what I have tried to say in the first meetings, you see, I have now to repeat, to make you feel it's important. It is still between you and me undecided, you see, whether we can really do

with the simple division of natural science and social science, as most people try to do, you see, or whether we haven't to ask ourselves: how come, who gives us the authority to speak at all to anybody else, and to ask him to listen to us? Or who can -- how can I request from you to listen to me? You see, that's authority, that's logos, that's truth.

I just received a letter from a person in Germany who's very downcast. And she says nobody will sacrifice five minutes or a dollar for the truth. Passion, sensation, novelty, bestsellers, you'll go { } way. And the only thing I hear on this campus is, "It's enjoyable," "It is entertaining," "It is stimulating," and int- -- "interesting." I have not one of yours -- you s- -- really lie sleepless asking, "What is true?" It's unknown to you. You are all pragmatists. You say there is no truth, so let's ask, "What's interesting?" Or let's ask, "What is stimulating?" Gentlemen, the truth has no helpers in this country. Look at these elections. Not -- you don't even expect anyone to speak the truth. It's admitted. Advertising. Psychology. Everybody is out to cheat you. To -- to say something pleasant.

I got a letter and said, "How can -- could you say this?" the other day.

And I said, "It was true."

I got a letter back, "But one doesn't say the truth -- tell the truth."

It is understood today that truth has no champions, gentlemen. And truth never wins by itself. Some people have to witness. I mean, if you don't stand up for the truth, it will not win. Truth is as weak as a -- as -- as the wind is, you see. It -- but nobody wants to serve truth in this country. They want to truth -- serve their career, or a Ph.D., or -- that's not truth, gentlemen. Because your Ph.D., you carefully write only what -- what your professor will admit.

I have run into this all my life, gentlemen. My first book when I was to be a professor, the faculty turned me down and said I couldn't print the book, because it wasn't scientific. So I printed it just the same. And they made me a professor, just the same.

Truth has no champions, gentlemen. As soon as you reduce the three-par -- three-partition of logos, ethos, and phusis, the behavior to your neighbor, behavior to the -- to the truth that makes us speak, that is compelling us against our interest to let the truth stand; and phusis, the things which we debate and

which we cauterize, profile, with the help of our notions and our words, gentlemen, if you reduce this, as I said, to two, as it is done at this moment in the whole world, or western world, then you have no way of appealing to anybody for the truth, because society and nature are just there. They mold you, you see. And you must eat -- nature, you see. And you must have friends, you see. So you buy Daley Carnegie. And that's cheating. I mean, I -- I think any man who realizes that the man to whom he talks makes use of Mr. Carnegie's counsel should spit at this man -- at this reader of Carnegie and say, "I have nothing to do with you. You're trying -- to exploit me." Isn't that true?

I have such a rascal living in Norwich. He try- -- I know he wants -- all he wants -- one day he wants to sell me a car. So one day he interests me in some refugee from Europe, and -- and the other day he interests me in the harvest festival, and what-not. And I know the only reason is he has -- is a car dealer. And his only interest in me is that I should buy a car. So but he, of course, feigns the greatest interest in -- in some man shipwrecked on the - -- shipwrecked on the Andrea Doria, you know.

He didn't do a thing for this man, as I found out, fortunately, you see. But he built the case up: I should then sacrifice my money for this man on the Andrea Doria, because my car dealer didn't want to do anything. But he thought if he could get me interested -- talking to him, corresponding with him, you see, meeting him again and again, I would finally be unable to escape his wiles for buying this car. Well, I'm going to cheat him!

This I mean by reducing man's relations, you see, to these two: society and nature, and never to ask, "What must I do?" "What am I commanded to do?" "What's my destiny?" You understand that this -- higher question, a different question, certainly. Because it may be that I have to destroy nature or to destroy society. Do you think that the people who declared the independence of this country, that they were just the product of their environment? Obviously, they criticized the British crown and they felt that neither was the nature of America binding to them, nor the English society. They had to create something third. Gentlemen, you couldn't do that, because you have deprived yourself of all the 20 years of investment in truth. You have never thought that it is necessary to sacrifice your life for the service of truth. You think we are all fools who do that. This young man from Wisconsin who is my -- whom I have to call my colleague unfortunately, he thinks I'm a fool.

This goes very far, gentlemen. It's very interesting. We have a very great

journalist in this country, as you know, she is an honorary doctor at Dartmouth College, that's Dorothy Thompson. And she saved the life of a European. Although she did not approve of his politics, during the last war, she came out. He was to be interned here. He was a broken man and was very sick. And she saved his life, and she said frankly to the authorities, "This man is an able man. But he -- I don't share his political views, but he doesn't deserve to be handed over to the Nazis. They would murder him. So it is better for him -- I think it's his human duty to keep such a man here, because they would kill him, and we will stomach him, although he is not absolutely pro-American." She was very honest about it. And she -- stuck her neck out. It was of course as bad then as today to do anything so difficult, so complicated. This was not black and white. He was not an angel, you see, not somebody wonderful, all on our side, you see, best man in the country. She wa- -- she saw that he was a human being, with its -- shades and -- and neither white nor black, as we all.

Now she's of course an outstanding, great woman, I think, and quite superior person. And she came to me the other day, and she said, "You know our mutual friend?" And I knew only too well. And he said -- she said, "You know, it's funny. Off and on, he nearly weeps." He's -- the man is now very old. He's 75. And he s- -- tell her, "Dorothy, you have saved my life. And I shall never forget it. And I'm eternally grateful."

"But," she says to me, "You know, John at the same time thinks that I was a fool, because he would have never gone out -- all out for a person to save -- to save a person. So he cannot help being grateful. He cannot help even a little bit admiring me. But he can also not help feeling that I'm very stupid."

You understand? The person saved, you see, still thinks that the good angel who saved him is below his own intelligence. I'm -- afraid that's a very common attitude today, you see. You all are debunkers, and you all don't want to be taken in. And you all convinced that you wouldn't be stupid. Gentlemen, in order to live right, you have to be stupid. Believe me, intelligence is a great handicap for getting into Heaven. The scoundrels are all intelligent. I don't think they could have robbed the bank -- the Brink, without intelligence, you see. So they -- are in prison for life. Most intelligent people, gentlemen, can't do good because they don't want to be taken in.

And this is the important thing, gentlemen, between then such a little decision. If you forget that I'm not teaching either in the social science or in -- or in the natural science at this moment here, you see, that there is a third {verse} which decides how much society, and how much nature, you see. You take a

shortcut. You get lost in one -- pigeonholed in these two tin cans, Sir. And then you will react like this man -- a very clever journalist, a leading man. He -- he knows all of Europe, he knows America, he knows all of Asia. He -- he was -- he knew Trotsky, he knew Stalin, he knew Mussolini, he knew all -- you know, one of these men for whom the public, I mean, has the greatest respect because he has really intimate -- intimate knowledge, you see, { }.

And -- but the man's shortcoming is very simple in that he cannot genuinely admire a superior {article}. Dorothy Thompson to him is just -- it's a pity, she's -- and -- so please pray that some intelligent people still can be stupid. They do what is right, whether it's clever or not. You live on this.

Any moment then, people would only be clever, they would never do a thing that may cost their lives, because that would be stupid. So you can't have a good soldier who defends you, because it's just stupid to be shot dead. Just stupid. It's absolutely stupid. Asinine.

Sacrifice is always stupid to the intelligent person, gentlemen. And the whole world is run by sacrifice. And not by ethics. You know this very well. The -- the real household hangs -- sticks together by the one person who stays at home, when there is a pleasure at hand, and looks after the babies. You see, if there is nobody, you see -- at least the babysitter, and -- and then there can -- can be no integrated family life. Is that happiness? It's the one person who can renounce happiness who keeps the family together.

Why do I say these things, gentlemen? For the very practical reason that in our first impressions, as -- as children, there is of course already a mixture of logos, ethos, and physics. If your parents do not pray with you, if they do not invoke the logos, if they nowhere show that they are servants to the truth, that they receive higher orders, if you cannot see your ch- -- parents go down on their knees, or being contrite, or being overwhelmed by authority that is greater than their purely physical existence, you will always misunderstand life. That's why mothers in colleges should -- should make this decision: will they have to teach their children to pray? They shouldn't learn chemistry. It's not very important. What they learn in our girls' colleges is just ridiculous. -- Sheer nonsense. The one thing they never are asked to decide: why do I must pray -- must I pray with my child? And they can't, therefore. Most can't, I mean, these silly doggerels then they teach them. And it's not important that you should teach your child to pray, gentlemen, but the child must see you pray. You don't have to force a child to go to church, but the child must know that you go to church somewhere. You don't have to go to the stone church. You can go into the woods.

But somewhere you must wrestle with the service of -- to the truth. They must know that while everything is social, natural around them, you are still wrestling with the problem how much to nature, and how much to society, and how much to duty, you see. Society always tries to talk you out of duty: "It's not necessary. Join the country club." And nature? Always unnecessary, you see. "Go swimming. Go golf -- playing golf." These are the two simple things a child sees before its parents. Now if it never sees that the parents renounce nature or society for some higher interest, how can they understand reality, gentlemen? The problem is not making children pray, or making -- sending children to Sunday school. That's the conscience money of modern Americans. They send their children to these Sunday schools. That's a scandal. That's sugar. But that's not bread of life. The bread of life is when the children see that the -- parents are contrite, that they feel that any minute they may miss the road. And we -- don't we, any minute? If that's -- I mean, this is common experience of all mankind, that any minute, the happiest man, including President Eisenhower, can make such a mistake that he may jeopardize his whole salvation. You all can, tomorrow, today may -- you can make the decisive blunder of your life.

You feel so safe, gentlemen, that you never admit to anybody else visibly that you are up in the air. This is called prayer, this being up in the air. And if you can't make it -- the younger generation see that you are up in the air, you sin. You disintegrate society. You destroy nature, this human nature which is based on your word about reality which the child must receive from you, because it is born under the authority of the logos, you see, and not just -- physically.

So the thing is terribly important, gentlemen. It is all lost today. It is all lost -- you really believe the so- -- the humanities are a kind of decoration for social gatherings, where you play in Robertson Hall some silly fraternity play. "And Shakespeare, well, that's a kind of inheritance from Europe. We wouldn't write -- have -- we wouldn't have any Shakespeare, but that's just an old s- -- tradition, we -- we still play Shakespeare. Yes."

Gentlemen, Shakespeare is much more important obviously than all natural science taken together. But you can't see that. To you, he is a luxury. And yet, without the emotions of Shakespeare, the sacrifices for the noble life, the -- the perishing of Romeo and Juliet under the law of the feud of their houses, you know nothing about love, absolutely nothing. Whereas whether you know something about the -- chemistry, you can always get some of these chemists. I mean, the whole DuPont family is at your disposal.

We -- we buy these idiots who are chemists, we buy them for high money and make them rich. And that satisfies these people. Poor people who have to be rich in order to be satisfied. I mean, riches -- belongs to nature, to natural man. I mean, he deals with mines, and with chemistry. Don't begrudge him his wealth. He -- he should { } but you can read poetry, you can write poetry, gentlemen. You are much richer. You don't need a Cadillac to be happy.

But I have seen this, gentlemen. Here appeared a man -- a gentleman. He is called Greenwald. You know, he's the head of the Du- -- DuPont concern. And this man is a chemist. And he -- married the right daughter, a DuPont, and so he is very rich. And just these two facts blinded two- -- two- -- two-third of the Dartmouth students. They went down on their knees. That was their idol. And well, it's a very bad indictment against American society that 3,000 healthy college boys give a damn for Mr. Greenwald because he married the daughter of a rich man. That happened two years ago, and then I gave up all hope that it made any sense to teach philosophy in this college.

So in these little things, gentlemen, you really decide where you belong.

It's a very simple thing, the first impressions. If you arrange logos first, ethos second, and phusis third, then you worship your parents because they are worshipful people, you see. Logos. If you worship them for phusis -- if phusis comes first in your mind, you worship them because they spank you, you see. Not a good reason, obviously, to s- -- to worship your -- your parents. But I think any child will worship his parents and grandparents if they -- he sees that they are worshipful, that they have reverence. I think that's the most important thing that you have to consider when you get married, gentlemen: how to make your children understand that you have reverence. That's all that it needs to be -- have a real family. They cannot understand you in their relation to -- to them, to the children, you see, unless you show that you have a relation to somebody who's your father. Without this, there's no -- no way of their ever understanding your right in family affairs, you see, and your duty, either, that you can -- must educate them, you see.

And then this whole problem of spanking, and of neurosis, and of inhibitions will all disappear. Today, you see, what happens if you have nature and society? Everything is psychology. Here are the two brats: the boy and the girl. And here are these unfortunate mothers and fathers. And everything is a game between these four people, you see. And so you take out one stone there, and one pressure, and then it reacts on the other; they all get nervous all the time, you see, high tension and blood pressure. And so the boy is sent away to

college, and the girl is sent away to camp, and the father goes into a lunatic asylum, and the mother is left with the women's club.

Gentlemen, the -- healthier family -- fortunately there are these families. And I think most of you know something about a real family, and not this damned description of a family which you read in your social science books. The real family obviously goes on like this. Here is a tradition. Here come in these parents. They get married. And they beget children. And the children have a -- the feeling that the parents are representative, are officeholders of this great human race in which the whole truth of the human race, through the parents, reaches the children, so that the parents are nothing but the functionaries, the officeholders, you see, of the great truth of ma- -- life. The mother stands always for the church, the father always for the state; and the children receives what is true about state and church through the ages in some form or other, more or less, through these parents. Isn't that very simple?

But the whole relation is not one of -- here, confrontation. That's the damned sickness of the modern -- American { } by the way, western society. Freud has the same in Vienna, of course, the same problem, as though children were only looking at their parents, and parents only looking at their children. But gentlemen, they -- both look beyond their parents, and beyond the children. Can't you understand, you see? Because they are only agents of much larger forces, of the logos, that must -- goes down through the ages, you see. And that is not the ethos of the neighborhood. And that is not the phusis of the contact, and the weight, and the calories, and what-not. But that's the revelation of our destiny, what we have to say and what we are -- have been told. And that's not of any origin of 1956.

Let's have a break here.

[tape interruption]

...in mind this problem, that logos, ethos, and phusis are working constantly on us. From the newborn child to the dying moment, we cannot escape this commitment to these three elements of which we are ourselves expressions. What is true, and what is therefore represented by us? What's our destiny? What has to be done, regardless of our happiness, through thick and thin, because that is now the hour to do it, you see? You may call it ment- -- "manifest destiny." Or "This is the time which tries men's souls." Or you may try -- say, "This is our opportunity." Whatever you take -- call the logos. It is that which must be done, you see, even though it seems that it cannot be done. You may say, "Logos has

always to do with the impossible." It seemed impossible that God became man. And He became man. And therefore the coming of Christ certainly seemed absolutely impossible. Anything the logos commands us to do, gentlemen, always seems impossible before it is done. The logos has to do with the impossible. Nature has to do with the possible. And ethos has always to do with the Joneses. Ja, you see. It can be done, because the Joneses have done it. It isn't natural that you should play golf, but the Joneses play golf. So, you play golf. The impossible, gentlemen, is the -- our relation to the gods. That which has never been done before is divine. Man can do the impossible. When he can do the possible, then he's natural. And then he can do that which other people have made possible, then he's social.

If you use today a cocktail shaker, obviously you make use of a social invention which somebody else did at a time when it seemed impossible, you see, to invent a cocktail shaker, he invented it. Can you see this? Society makes use of former impossible -- -ibilities who -- which have become possible by our neighbors, by our brothers, by our society. Nature is that which you feel is possible anytime, that a stone -- you take a stone, it's natural that it should fall to the ground, you see. It's always possible. It hasn't to be invented. Nature doesn't have to be invented, you see. Society is an invention, a discovery, or a sum of discoveries, you see. God is the power to discover what -- there -- hasn't been done, hasn't been discovered, you see. You can also say God is the future, society is the present, and nature is the past; because nature is the world before man spoke. That we breathe, you see, that had to be done before man got dress, and clothes, and -- and midwives. But now we have midwives, so it is social -- a social way of getting a child that you have midwifery, or even the -- the -- the hospital, you see. Obviously that's a social invention, isn't it? It's not natural. But the logos, gentlemen, is the great hope of the world, because it means that things that have not been possible, and have not been inherited as -- as -- as social agencies can become possible.

Don't smoke, please.

If you now reduce this to the problem of the Greeks once more, I told you in the beginning -- last time, as best I could, that the Greeks had a weak society, a weak first impression, a weak speaking { }, because the world in which they lived was so much larger than the little city in which their children were born. And therefore I said the first great logos for the Greeks has become Homer, because he took all the Greek cities together and made them feel a common

purpose. So that every Greek, when he read Homer, could feel that he lived in an environment which was larger than his eyesight, larger than his, you see, than his -- his little city of his; all these cities together formed Homeric Greece. Now let's take the -- the second book of The Iliad. Please. I hope you have it. It's worth your while, gentlemen, to represent to your mind a little carefully why Homer has remained the teacher of the Greeks for a thousand years. And why, for an American, Homer still has this same appeal. You don't read Homer, gentlemen, but the songs which list all the 48 states, or sing, "From California and New England," and so, do the -- just what -- what Homer did. They enlarge the nature and the society around you to such an extent, you see, that you can try at least to forget the rest of the world, and to imagine that this is all you have to care for, you see. So that your first impressions might coincide with that universe to which you have to pay attention. Then you would be -- have to have no philosophy, you see. You wouldn't have to have -- afterthought. You wouldn't have to have any criticism. You would be perfectly happy to move within this one world, you see, your mother's world, so to speak, you see, the -- the mother country. And so Homer has created a mother country large enough to make the citizens of these tiny little units feel that they have a worldwide home.

Let's begin on Page 52. "The royal ch-" -- on the last line of 51:

"The royal chieftain of the king's council bustled around -- about, marshalling the troops and with them went Athene."

You have a divine -- a divine power creating this -- this social universe. In the feeling of every -- every reader of Homer ever since, especially in Greece.

"Marshalling the troops, and with them went Athene of the flashing eyes, wearing her splendid float, the unfading, everlasting aegis from which a hundred golden tassels flutter, all beautifully made, each worth a hundred head of cattle. Resplendent in this, the goddess flew through the ranks, urging the men forward. And in each of one, she inspired the will to carry on the war and fight relentlessly. Before long, they were more enamored with the thought of fighting than with that of sailing away to their own country in their hollow ships."

In this -- you see, we have disparaged war very often in this country by pacifism. Gentlemen, without war, there would be no nation, as we know, the -- the history of mankind, you see. The only way of creating larger countries has been in this manner, you see, that people overcame their sense of private happi-

ness and were willing to sacrifice their lives for their country. And all country, you see, that have been created to any size have been built on this power of man to seek this larger unit. Will you kindly now {-- Prenzler} go on reading? (Sir, I do not have the place. No, I have the book. But I don't -- I don't know --)

Page 52.

(Well, I have a different book. It's Book Two, right?)

Ja.

(And what line?)

Well, it -- unfortunately here, I must take my Greek.

(Did you start at the beginning of the book? Book Two.)

486. Second Book, verse 484. You have it?

The poet is so overcome with the importance of the scene that he makes a new appeal, a new invocation to the Muses. You have it? David? No? Richard.

(No, I don't.)

Who has it? Duke. All right. Ed. Go ahead.

("As they fell in, the dazzling glitter of their splendid bronze flashed through -- through the upper air and reached the sky. It was as bright as the glin- -- glint of the flames caught in a {distant} spot, when a great forest and a mountain pike is ravaged by fire. Their clans came out like countless flocks of birds: the geese, the cranes, or the long-necked swans that forgather in the Asian meadow by the streams of Kayster. And mill about, molting, flapping their wings, and filling the whole meadow with harsh cries as they came to ground on the advancing front. So clan after clan poured out from the ships and huts onto the Plain of Skamonder. And the earth resounded solemnly to the tramp of launching men and horses' hooves. As they found their places in the flowery meadows by the river, innumerable as the leaves and blossoms in their season. Thus --")

Now gentlemen, these great similes of Homer show you something -- who is in English? Who is majoring in English? Any one of you? Wie? The assumption today is -- or the Greek assumption, or the Homeric assumption that metaphors come late in life -- in language. Here, the -- the soldiers are, as a matter of fact, compared to the leaves, because Homer wants to create the impression of -- that -- that this society is a natural one. And we have to say a word later on -- on the -- on these metaphors. The place of metaphor in human speech is -- is distinctly different in the Bible, and distinctly different in -- in Greek tradition, in philosophy. And you have to -- will to -- have to make up your mind whether metaphor is elementary way of speech, or whether it is really only an after-thought.

And I only point out this, because these are very famous similes, and there is a deep, philosophical problem involved. Could you and I -- you and I commute, parents and children, for example, or I and you without metaphor? Is this a primary necessity, you see, that we -- speaks in metaphors, you see? Or is it a -- a luxury?

That's the -- the Homeric text brings this up, but it's a question that goes through all philosophy. You think that if you have a semantic positivist, who -- who says, "A equals A and B equals B," that this is somewhere wiser as when he says that the eagle of Zeus governs the mind of governors of states, you see. And you think that the symbol of the -- of the -- let's say, for the lion, or for -- for the evangel of St. Mark is just a very dry simile to you. The question is: can we human beings say anything to each other without metaphor? It's not so easy to decide this. You will be surprised if you -- we analyze this later.

But I want to draw your attention to these very famous similes in which the poet achieves one thing, gentlemen. In this nature simile, bees, and bl- -- leaves, the differences of these various cities disappear. They all look like one. And that's the Homeric problem, you see, to make all Greek as one. That's the appeal. That's the patriotic appeal. And that's the cement, the mortar around these -- the -- this variety of men. These innumerable, different shades of religions, of cities, of settlements, of forms of constitution. There were -- Aristotle wrote 258 different constitutions of Greek cities. Now Homer, in these similes, achieves unity by saying, "They all marched like," you see, "natural birds," or "natural flowers," or "natural leaves." Now go on.

("Thus these long -{ } soldiers of Achaea were drawn up on the plain, and facing the Trojans with slaughter in their hearts, as many and as restless as the unknown re- -- flies that swarmed

around the cow sheds in the spring, when pails are full of milk. And now with practiced ease, with which goatherds sort out their wandering flocks, when they have mingled in the pastures, the captains brought their companies into battle order. And in among them moved King Agamemnon, with head and eyes like Zeus, the thunderer; with a waist like the war-god's waist; and a breast like Poseidon's. As a bull stands out from the cattle in the herd, conspicuous among the grazing cows, so on that day Zeus made the son of Atreus stand out in the crowd and eclipse his fellow kings.") Here again, perhaps you understand, gentlemen. If I have {listed} the Russians, and the Americans, and the British, and the French fighting in the last world war, the commander-in-chief, and the chaplain, and the newspaper writer, and the historian, they all have to find some language which is neither Russian, nor English, nor French, you see, nor American. And in any such moment, you need metaphor. There is no metaphor { } {and the foist} -- the first metaphor offering itself is nature. He's like a bull, you see, in front of the -- the rest. Because bull is not social, and society is divided, in many societies, many cities. You can -- here study in this -- in this great famous prooemium, the necessity of rising to the occasion. It was the handicap, you see, of the Western allies against Hitler that he could always speak of the Germans without metaphor. He said, "I mean you, the Germans." Then they asked him, the Germans themselves -- to take in the Ukrainians, too, to -- to promise self-government to the Poles, you see, to be reasonable, to unite Europe. He said, "No, because I want to have the first impression. You have learned that you are Germans. I'm not going to let in -- anybody in into the company, because then I would have to use a second language, you see, an abstraction, like NATO." And you must admit, NATO is a very poor word, you see. Nobody can -- will -- wants to die for NATO, you see. And therefore NATO is nearly dead at this moment, because it has not risen to the power of the Homeric speech -- eagle, or bull, or the leaves of the field, or any such metaphor. So please, those that -- especially the gentlemen who intend to write short stories: get a certain respect for language. Language is under the logos, that is: don't say anything that isn't necessary. But under the logos, always something new has to be said. And therefore something -- so far impossible has to be expressed by your next creation, you see. Any short story, even, has to say something that hasn't been said before. Because it is necessary to say this.

Now -- and Homer has to say something new, because he has to tell these Greeks, you see, that they are one. They mustn't every one go to their own country. He wants to unite them. And -- I mean -- the whole poem, of course, is written around this problem. And for this you have then to find absolutely new terms. Can you understand, that you cannot appeal -- couldn't appeal in 1943 to the Russians, fighting for the capitalists, for the bourgeois, you see, the citizenship of the free world. And you couldn't appeal to the Americans for saving Bolshevism, you see. So it was terribly difficult to find any common language. And I think it has been the handicap of the -- of the whole war, that it was a speechless war.

And so -- poor President Roosevelt, when he was asked what the name was to be given to the Second World War, made this terrible surrender to -- to impotency, to weakness. But what could he do? He said, "It's a war of survival." But gentlemen, never has anything less inspiring been said about any war. All wars are wars of survival of { }, you see. But that doesn't signify any one war. You can see that. If you -- you -- if -- if I don't kill you, you kill me. That's war, isn't it? The "war of survival" just means, "Let's try to survive, although it is a war." That was the official term in this country. And it showed you -- I think later generations will say that the war has died in the hearts of men, because it could -- it was seen -- proved impossible to find a common language, which inspired men to see that this war was something natural, and something necessary, you see.

I think war is dying. But war is dying for the -- the symptom of it is that it no longer can be named. You can't name a war a "war of survival" and ask soldiers to die for it. I wouldn't die for a war of survival. That's good for a cattle-yard, you see. Any flea tries to survive until I eclipse it.

And -- this is very serious, gentlemen. The "War of Secession," the "War of Independence," the "Revolutionary War," these are all very good terms, very understandable, you see. But you cannot call a war a war of survival without defeating your own end. And -- and you know how Churchill called the Second World War? Is that not known? It's terribly important, because with Homer, the period of named wars begin. What is a named war, gentlemen? A war that is not looked upon only from one side of the fence, from the people -- the little group who goes to war on one side, you see, but -- so that -- a war -- if our history is a book that is -- an event that both sides, vanquished and victors, will call with the same name. Otherwise you have no human war, you see. Otherwise you have your slaughter, or butchery, or whatever you call it. Animal kingdom.

Now modern war has reached its extinction, nearly, because what happened in Homer was the Homeric -- the Trojan War was a war that could be quoted for -- by Trojans, Orientals, and Greeks with one and the same name. Today Churchill has called the Second World War, "the unnecessary war." That's his official term. The unnecessary war. And -- Roosevelt has called it "the war of survival." Both names, gentlemen, are pre-Homeric.

And I'm very serious in recommending to you -- I'm reading with you, and we must devote the next meeting to this again, of course -- I'm reading with you this second book, because it is the moment in which wars were christened, were baptized, were named. And what is a named war? A war that can make sense for both parties, victors and vanquished, you see. That's something new. The old Egyptians, the Babylonians, they never mentioned the war in terms that -- they wipe out the opponent, you see. He doesn't live to see it. All the people were, you see -- the women and children were made slaves, the men were all killed, as with the Indians. The Indians also here, you see, had to kill their men at the -- how do you call it? the -- pyre, {isn't it}? No. How do you call the -- wie? (Stake?)

At the stake. -- The Homeric war is a great invention, because it gives man a consciousness of the -- of life beyond the limitations of his own society. The -- all wars of the last 3,000 years, as you have to learn them in the history department, in your textbooks, have a name by which both parties will recognize the same event. Which means, gentlemen, that both parties have survived the event. Before Homer, the enemy -- one of the two, disappears, and he is wiped out. That's the -- it's the idea. And the thing goes on until he is wiped out, so to speak. Homer learns for the first time that you can make peace between two enemies. That's the world in which so far we have lived. Today I think the time is coming where we must have one world in which there cannot even be war. So we already are launching into this adventure, because we can no longer name the last two wars. The "necessary w- -- unnecessary war," and the "war of survival," to hell with that. I don't want my son or my grandchildren to be mobilized for an unnecessary war, you will admit. Wie? So that's defeating one's own ends. I mean, if the -- if the leading statesman, if the prime minister of England says to his own countrymen, "This is an unnecessary war," they'll say, "Now, please -- then please avoid it," don't you think?

You can't mobilize people for an unnecessary war. And you can't mobi-

lize people for a war of survival, either. Or you get, I mean, into this archaic situation, that the rest -- the others have to be wiped out. And so you got the feeling in this country that the Germans should be wiped out. Many in '45 felt that these were no longer human beings. They were beasts, you see. So -- no Germany. But the Morgenthau Plan.

This is all consequence, when you have no power to name the unit with which you together form the society and the nature around you, you see. So don't think that Homer is without its actuality. In Homer, the first war has been named, who was a -- the Trojan War for both, people in Asia Minor and the people in Greece.

I'm sorry, we have to stop here.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...and one American who's known as John Smith, of the family -- famous family of Smith, as against phusis, or whether this course, which has scalped you of your name, John Smith, and treats you as an individual, and tries now to remake you into a person who will do something with -- with this -- out of this abstract shadow of the dead, and -- what is an individual? An indifferent thing which I can crush. An individual is somebody I can kill. It's not my brother. It's just an individual. Now, individual fleas, individual flies, individual chairs, I can all burn them, kill them, mistreat them, gentlemen. There is no obligation for me to have any respect for individuals.

This I thought I -- I -- thought I should mention this, here, what's this -- this desperate attempt of Dartmouth College to get you back out of the shades, and the -- Hades, the underworld of philosophy. As soon as philosophy is not dealing with second impressions, but has taken root in you so that you think that's your first knowledge of reality, you see, you are unable to live. And this college course won't do you any good, I'm sure, except, I mean, perhaps enrich some psychoanalyst.

Now let's go back to Homer. I have -- can show you today the point where Homer and philosophy separate. I have brought with me also -- here, it's The Republic. And we'll see the point of divergence, from the Platonic treatment of -- view, and from the Homeric treatment. Let's go back to 486, I think it was, in the famous catalog of the ships. Here the Greeks are marching up like the flowers, the -- buds in -- in spring -- or as the leaves. Then we went on, about the thousands of peoples. 470 -- -69. Now we come to 484. Will you -- we -- I don't think, {Prenzler}, we have read this. Will you kindly read it?

(Now I have a different book. I have to have the page this time.)

Would you, Richard? What? Where the invocation to the Muses comes.

"Tell me, now, you -- you Muses." You must have this. Ja? Would you read it?

("Tell me now, you Muses, who have our homes on Olympus. For you, who are goddesses, are there, and you know all things. And we have heard only the rumour of it and know nothing. Who then of those were the chief men and the lords of the Danaans? I could not tell over the multitude of them nor name them, not if I had ten tongues and ten mouths, not if I had a voice never to be broken and a heart of bronze within me, not unless the

Muses of Olympia, daughters of Zeus of the aegis, remembered all those who came beneath Iliion.")

One moment. That's the invocation, once more. Now the strength of the thing is that there -- of course, the poet has begun his whole Iliad with the famous invocation, {andra moi enipa} -- no -- {ple iden nak elois} I mean, where is it? One moment. { } -- tell me the wraths of the son of {Pilos} -- {Epilus}, O deity.

So that is the first invocation. Now in the middle of the second book, that is, after a thousand verses, he is so impressed by the difficulty of his undertaking that he invokes the Muses again, and he uses a word which I think you should put down, gentlemen. He says, "I can -- shall not be able to tell," your translator says. Now this is the word -- use "myth."

You know there is a tremendous discussion today -- raging on mythology, on myth. Everybody talks today about myth. Nobody seems to know what he means by that. Since we are philosophers, we have at least to clarify our vocabulary. In Homer's days, gentlemen -- perhaps you take that down, this word my- -- "mythos," m-y-t-h-o-s, or "myth," simply means a tale, something said. And so the -- Homer thinks he is telling the truth, the real truth, because -- when he now lists the catalog of the ships, the catalog of the Greek contingents, and he says therefore, "I -- shall not be able to tell," and uses the word "I shall not be able to mythologize," to myth. You see, he thinks it's the highest grade of truth. You take myth always as something in shambles, something rotten, something wrong, something pseudo, you see, a dream, a fantasy, and you try to debunk myth.

Gentlemen, any limited statement is mythical. We'll perhaps have later opportun- -- an opportunity to state this. This course isn't meant to clarify the problem of mythology in the modern slang. But I warn you, if you go back to the sources, the word "myth" is an honest word. And it just means the word to be said, naïvely, without criticism. Poetically, I mean, statement of fact, narrative. You can say -- and that's -- I think you should keep in your vocabulary -- "mythos" in Greek begins its career simply as "tale," and to {"mythein"}, which is the Greek word for it -- I'll spell it in -- in modern -- in the modern way, "mythein" simply means to speak the truth, and not the untruth. And we are really up here against the terrible wall of infamous arrogance on the part of modern man, who thinks that he is without mythology. But gentlemen, in the Greek sense, you are much more mythologists than Homer is. You are full of myths. One -- is, for example, democracy. It's a myth. In Alabama as you know, in Mis- --

Mississippi, there live hundred percent inhabitants of Mis- -- so-called citizens of -- 51 of them cannot vote. But you can call this "democracy." That's a myth. And that's a lie. That's not honest truth. We live in a mythology. Every human being lives in a mythology. You also think that you are -- you and your family are excellent people. Nobody knows. They may be, but it's a naïve tale. It's un- -- un- -- uncontradicted, you see. As long as any word is without second thought, it's a myth in Greek -- the Greek sense. A naïve tale. Folk tale, for example. So take this down, gentlemen: myth is a straightforward say-so. Hearsay also, of course, later. Anything that hasn't gone through the mill of a second thought, of an afterthought. And obviously, nobody can live if every word would be an afterthought. I'm still speaking spontaneously to you here, you see. So I'm telling myth.

I warn you, because in the modern literature, in every newspaper, magazine, all these people who write in America are totally superior to myth. They all look down on myth and say, "I warn you against myth," you see. Well, I warn you against these infamous people, who don't know who -- who -- what humanity is like. Humanity lives, of course, wrapped up in decent convictions, that it knows already a little bit of the truth and it speaks naïvely its mind. That's always mythology in the eyes of these superior swines. They all have afterthought. When a -- when a mother gives a kiss to her son, the -- she says -- he says -- she has an Oedipus complex. Isn't that -- that's -- that's their mythology, the psychoanalysts' mythology today, you see, that everybody has an afterthought.

Myth is an honest situation with- -- -out which -- of which we cannot live.

It's a first-impression speech, you see, the first way in which we in -- present say, "This is my mother, and I love her dearly. I want to embrace and to kiss her. But I don't want to get to s- -- go to sleep with her as a lover." But there come these pigs, and that's their myth then. Everybody else is a pig. And they are allowed to slaughter the pigs.

So here we have this word, {muthysm} -- I can't tell you how important it is for you to know that this is an honest and innocent word. No {folly} without myth, gentlemen. How can you go to Dartmouth? The whole Alumni Fund is a myth. But a good one, isn't it? Everybody has to be grateful. We will see if you have to be grateful. It's not yet decided.

Now go on from here, please. The next. Here, your neighbor with the beautiful red --.

("As for the rank and file that came to Ilium, I could not name or even count them.")

That's again {muthysomei}. Yes. I just said this.

("There -- here then are the captains of the fleet and here are the ships from first to last.")

(Do you want to start reading them?)

Well, that's why we are here for -- what we're here for. That's cal- -- the great story. That's the important thing.

("First the Boiotians, with Peneleos, and Le- -- Leitos, Arkes- --")

May I ask what your difficulty is?

(Pronunciation.)

Well then, pronounce it wrong, but pronounce it.

("Ark- -- Arkilus -- Arkesilaos --")

Arkesilaos. In Greek, every word -- syllable is pronounced fully. It's still a phonetic language, you see. It's very euphonious. Very beautiful sound. Arkesilaos, und Prothoenor, und Klonios. Go on.

("They come from Hy- -- Hyria, and stony Aulis, from Schoinos and Skolos, from Eteonos, where the hills run high; from Thespeia and Graia, and the spreading lawns of Mykalessos. With them--")

Mykalessos. Not MY-kalessos. Mykalessos. They are very beautiful words, you know, all these. The modern poets, Swinburne, Hölderlin, Blake -- they all have made use of this tremendous -- sonoritousness of the Greek language. Ja. Go on.

("With them were those from Harma, from -- Eilesion --")

Eilesios.

("Eilesios, and from --")

Erythrai. Now the- -- this you'd better note. "Eruthros" in Greek is "red" in our language and "ruber" in Latin. It's a very interesting etymology, I think. I may use this opportunity. "Eruthros" in Greek becomes "ruber" with a "b" in Latin, but "red" again in Germanic languages. The "th" in Greek is a "b" in Latin and a "d" in English. The same word. Ri- -- red, the Red Sea, you have heard of the country Erythrai, perhaps. That's the country of the la- -- gre- -- Red Sea which the Italians had as their colony down to the -- 1945, when they lost it again with the -- Ethiopia, with Abyssinia. So Erythrai, a very -- a very common place name in antiquity because of the red rock, the limestone, you see, the red limestone visible far o- -- across the ocean. Erythrai.

So the -- the Red Sea in antiquity is the -- the Erythron, the -- that's red, you see. It is worth your while to compare -- to keep these -- these connections. Eritrea, the -- as the -- the country on the Red Sea, and Eritr- -- Pelagos, the -- the Red Sea, as an ocean in all textbooks of the 18th and 17th century would find still this word "erythrai" used. I don't think there exists in -- in America an Erythrai. But you have to con- -- consult the Post Office catalog. There's no place name, as you know, in a -- that does not exist perhaps in the United States somewhere. Go on.

("Eeleon, and Hyle --")

Hyle.

(Hyle.)

That means wood, or forest. "Hyle." That's an important word, gentlemen. Perhaps you take this next to "myth," because the people who believe the -- in -- in Greeks -- the word -- "matter" is expressed with "hyle," wood. So a man who is a materialist in Greek is called a hylozoist. That is, a man who believes that all life comes -- is -- is just material. So the word "hyle" is an important word. Hyle, wood, and then from there extended into being all materialism, you see. And if you are a hylozoist, you say all life is purely material. There is no mental life. There is no spiritual life.

("-- and Peteon sent their -- their men. So did Okalea --")

Okalea, ja.

("Okalea and the stronghold of Medeon. Ko- -- Kopai and --")

There's a famous Copais Lake to this day in Boeotia. Has anybody an intention to go Greece? Who would like to go to Greece? Well, come with me. I go next year. And I shall go to the Kopais See. Because that's the -- the great thing in Boeotia. We are still in the midst -- in Boeotia, there's one o- -- single landscape gives you -- yields you all these independent republics. And that's why we must read this, gentlemen, that you get some picture of the pettiness of Greek settlement, and Greek politics, you see, in order to understand the importance of their philosophy. We are still in -- here at the lake of Kopais -- Kopai. Go on.

{"Kopai, and Eu- -- Eutresis, and Thisbe rich in doves. They con- --"}

Well, that's the famous name, of course, from which Pyramus and Thisbe has been taken in -- where -- where do they play a great part, Pyramus and his Thisbe?

(Midsummer Night's Dream.)

Exactly. There -- that's the Greek name Thisbe, here, you see. Go on.

("They come from Koroneia too, from grassy Haliartos, Plataia -- Plataia, Glisa, and the strong men of Lower Thebes.")

Now anybody who later on in Greece, you see, read any of these names of course remembered tremendous battles fought there. Kopai was the first settlement in Boeotia, which used Egyptian means of irrigation. The Copais Lake is an artificial lake. Plataia is the battle of course of 479 against the Persians, the final victory which threw out the -- the -- the Orientals. So Plataia is a great name in Greek history. Now go on.

("From holy Onchestos with Poseidon's sacred wood, from Arne, where the grapes hang thick, from Mid- -- Mideia and holy Nisa, and from Anthedon, on the borders of beyond.")

Now Mideia is important, because King Midas is of course the one to whom everything turned to gold. You may remember the -- the myth, the story. And Nisa is probably baptized in honor of Dionysus because there was an attempt to connect Nisa with {"Nysos"}, which is wanton, but in these kind of etymologies the people have always in Greece excelled. Go on, yes.

("All these in 50 ships, with 120 young Boeotians in each.")

Now how many men then is -- does he assume that the Boeotians send into the war? Would you kindly make the -- up your mind, Sir? You read it. Can't you multiply?

(Yes Sir. A hundred and -- a little -- about 6,000 -- a little over 5,000.)

Just, please. Precisely.

(Six thousand.)

Yes. Why didn't you stick to your first guess? See? Too humble.

So this region -- it's -- Boeotia is not quite as large as New Hampshire, yielded 6,000 men. So it was rather densely populated for those days if the -- if the navy could -- would have 6,000 men leaving the country and going there. They are summed up then, gentlemen, these many different cities, in one militia, in one -- you may say, division, the New Hampshire division. Otherwise, however, you cannot strongly enough understand and represent to your mind the fact that all these names mean sovereign, political units. No -- none of these cities has to give orders to the other.

So you see that for the purpose of the war, the poet imagines that there has been unanimity, agreement, but otherwise congregationalism. Just as the Church in this country, that's called Congregational Church, doesn't allow any central bishop or organ, you see, to run the local church. Even the Creed, you see, is under the responsibility of the congregation.

In this same sense, you have there this and -- to compare these old cities to congregationalism is right in more than one sense. I have tried to tell you, and you always forget it, of course, and I must therefore repeat it, that the state of affairs there, of course, is that religion is part of the state. There is no separation of state and Church in antiquity. So if I say that all -- every one of these cities

formed a congregation, I am much truer than if I would say they form a state, you see, because they all had a religion at the bottom of their unity. They were first congregationalists, and had their own -- one -- worship, as you see. They had a big, sacred wood probably to attract pilgrims called -- in honor of Poseidon. Which line was this? Where is Poseidon mentioned?

{{ }.)

Wie?

{{ }.)

Ja. Thank you. Ja, the -- the famous -- the famous grove of Poseidon. And there is -- especially mentioned that it is a sacr- -- a sanctuary. Obviously there are people in Onchestos who had a -- open house and attracted pilgrims from afar, because they haven't -- they are not called a fortress; they are not called a city; but they are called especially a sanctuary.

However then, the main point I wish to make is, gentlemen: these were congregations under their own steam, sovereign in their religious charter, and therefore also of course very much according to their -- divinity they worshiped, also their organization would run. The Church, you see, in this country can be Episcopalian. And yet you can be a Democrat. But an Episcopal Church has a monarchical head, you see, one bishop. Therefore we have contradiction in the constitution of a church and of a state. Not so in antiquity.

If you had a bishop in your temple, you obviously also would have one ruler, a king, in the city, you see. If you had Presbyterian government in the religion, you would also have the nobleman, or the selectman, you see, or the -- the lord, so to speak, ruling the city. A majori- -- you see, a minority of aristocrats. You would be an aristocracy. If you had a -- congregationalism, in the modern sense in America, you would be a democracy.

So you must always see that the order of religious worship determined the constitution. This is to -- to you, you see, difficult to -- to fathom. But as you know, the Episcopalians, including George Washington, could never win the confidence of the people. The Jeffersonians always won out, because they wanted -- have nothing to do with the Anglican Church, and the Anglican Church implied a king in her bishops, you see. And that was against the spirit of this country. The political constitution here in 1776 took the lead and said, "Congregationalism." Congress is congregational. That is, every man a vote. You

can see this.

This for you is, I think, very useful for you once to look through. In the '80s, the Episcopal Church of this country, which comes right from the Anglican Church via Scotland into this country, had an interesting session. They said that they could not resist the democratic trend in this country, and therefore the lower house of the Episcopal Church had to be run on congressional lines. And as you know in this -- country, therefore, the lower house of the Episcopal Church is like the House of Representatives, and consists of laymen, you see. Not so in the Anglican Church in England, where the laymen to this day have very little to say. And -- so in this country, even the Episcopal Church has been modeled, more or less, e- -- also the Lutheran Church, by the way, after the model of democracy, because in our country, the secular form of government leads.

Not in antiquity, gentlemen. All ancient city-states put the religious form first. When the Romans introduced -- threw out their kings, who were also their high priests, they had to have immediately a new priesthood. And they took the chaplains from the army, the pontifex, pontifices, the people who were the experts, the engineers for building up the camps, the Roman camp, that's the meaning of "pons," dry camp, you see, the -- the -- how do you call the duck? Duck? The ducks -- here on the campus when it is mud time. How do you call it? (Duckboards.)

Ja. The word "pons" means duckboard. And the pontifices in Rome, the Pontifex Maximus was the man, you see, who could build duckboards in the Ro-- for the Roman camps. So they could be put on an island, or in a swamp, you see, defend itself against the enemy. And he had this technical knowledge. Now I only mean to say in Rome, when the kingship went and the presbyter -- presbyters took over the senate -- "senate" meaning presbyter. That's Presbyterian, you see. Senate comes from "senile," from "senectitude," from "senescence," from being the old -- elder, the elder statesman. Now the -- when the senate began to rule, they had to have there a new priesthood. And they took it from the army, because the senate took over the command of the army, you see, and the king had to stay home. And to the end of the republic, the king and his -- his priests, the flamines in Rome -- in the city of Rome remained in the city of Rome to be -- keep peace with the - the old gods, and the pontifices, and the consuls, and the praetor marched out and fought the battles. And of course, the man who wins the war is made president. So you cannot be surprised if Mr.

Eisenhower and the Senate became stronger compared to the old roy- -- royalty, you see, in Rome.

And -- but in -- in antiquity, the commander-in-chief needed his on- -- priest immediately. His religious organization was decisive, and that there was a pontiff enabled the republic, you see, to replace royalty. Do I make myself understood?

In every way, gentlemen, then let us repeat this, that theology and religion are not separated from philosophy and nature in antiquity. The constitution is intertwined and insoluble. One, it is a religious society, a religious state. And of this, this is here a good example, because here you have the mentioning of Poseidon. Now let's go on to the next. We must go on. I cannot spare you this, because I think it is your introduction into the real antiquity, and their real concern. Will you kindly read? Yes, Sir. No, I mean you, the gentleman with the -- what's your name?

(I don't have a book.)

Then borrow one. That would be an easy way out. Fifty -- 511.

Mr. {White}, just help him. {White} -- would you help him? He can't read.

("{ } Aspledon and -- Orchomenos who were { } Askalaphos { } Ialmenos, sons of Ares, whom Astyoche { } in the palace of Aktor from { } --")

-- Look, my dear man. Everybody wants to listen to you. But you must enable them to do so.

("-- Where the gentle maiden went in secret to an upper room -- an upper room and slept with the mighty { }. { } 30 hollow ships. Um -- Schedios --")

So which country is this? Where are we? Anybo- -- any sign?

{{ }.)

Well, they are still one part of -- of Boeotia, but that part which is under the Minyais. The Minyai are thought of as the oldest inhabitants of Greece,

previous to the Indo-Europeans. And they are sons of Ares, you see, and there is now given the daughter how -- the story how one woman, you see, received from the god of war -- although she was a respectable lady, and conceived or -- and had how many boys? Who are these sons of the god? How many?

(Two.)

Two. Quite. Now go on.

("Schedios and Epistrophos, sons of the magnanimous Iphitos, son of --")

Iphitos.

("-- son of Naubulos, commanded { }, who lived on --")

Phocaea. Ja. Gentlemen, that's quite an interesting town because Marseille, the ancient Massilia in France was founded by them. They were very bold people. They went all around the Mediterranean. And their daughter city, Marseille, is to this day after all a flourishing harbor. So these were not small people. They were very enterprising. Here they were in this little corner of Greece preparing themselves and their other daughter cities of Phocaea. So Phocaea was a great center of immigration and settlement. Go on.

("-- commanded Phokeians, who lived in Kyparissos, and rocky Pytho, the sacred Krisa, and Daulis, and in Panopeus, { } Anemoreia and Hyampolis, the lovely waters of Kephisos, by { }.")

What the --?

("-- Where Kephisos rises. Forty black ships traveled with these --")

Now Kephisos is, you see, if you had lived 50 years earlier, you would all know by now what Kephisos was. There are -- many poems have been written in all languages of the world on the river Kephisos, and his waters, because an -- at his water, Socrates and Plato philosophize. So it's not a despicable little brook. It has become very famous, just as the Thames or the -- the river -- what's the river on which Cambridge, England is situated?

(Thames.)

Ja. If you ever have -- has anybody every read Rupert Brookes? Who knows Rupert Brooke? Well, he has very beautiful poems on the C- -- river Cam, has he not?

So if any Greek, or any Roman, or any medieval man, or any man -- going to the -- to a -- a prep school in this country, or to a college down to 1910, if he read this word "Kephisos," he felt that was something very important. That was the ancient river of Oxford and Cambridge, of higher learning. So go on.

("Forty black ships {traveled with these}, too, under whose commander Phoceians seemed --")

Now Lilaia in -- on Sicily, there is a -- there is a derivative, Lilibeum, from this city of Lilaia. And it's situated at the -- at the mer- -- source of Kephisos. Now, how many? These leaders were -- were -- were -- were followed by how many ships?

(Forty.)

Forty.

("Under whose commandment Phoceians fell in and took the battle stations { } Boiotians on the left.")

Ja. Perhaps the next takes over. Ja. Will you?

("Leading the Lokrians came the fleet-footed son of Oïleus, the lesser Aias, not such a man as Telemon { } by far { }. { } or Achaian { }. His { } had come from Kynos, Opoeis, and

Kalliaros, from Bessa, and Skarphe, and beautiful Augeiai -- Augeiai, from Tarphe and Thronion, and the banks of the riv- -- river Boagrius. Forty black ships had set out under him, manned by the Lokrians, who live across the strait of Eu- -- Euboa. Euboa has --")

One moment, one moment. Euboa then is this large island, as you know, at -- to the east of Greece, near -- east-northeast of Attica and Boeotia.

Gentlemen, if you now look at the order a little more closely of what we have read so far, how are these m- -- cities listed? Not all just by the place name.

But there is another principle that -- that crosses it nearly out. We are mobilized. We are at war. Gentlemen, when you belong to a company, how is your company quoted? By -- in whose name?

(The commander who leads it.)

The captain. And the word "captain" is an immortal word. It means the head man. Caput, capitaneus. And you cannot be simple enough and -- and mythical enough about it. It's a typical myth that in a company, you feel greatly honored if you are named by your commander. It means that he is a good man and if you say -- you see, "Company Captain Smith," then the commander of the division knows exactly for what use he can put this company, because he can't -- put it to any better use than this captain is capable of. You see. If it is a poor captain, he'll keep them in reserve. If he has -- the -- you see, the luck that this is an excellent man, he can use them as a { }.

And it is -- to this day, gentlemen -- will you take this down? -- that the head man in war designs a contingent, a troop. In peacetime, you can give the space name. And here you have the first problem of any philosophizing about government. We have two states. In war, the whole -- group has to be quoted by its living commander. You settle down, you disperse into your settlement, you can quote the same group as Thebans, as Boeotians, as Lokrai, as Phokeians, you see. And this song is divided in this.

Now don't think that's a minor matter, because as soon as you have two notions for the same group, one under the aspect of war and the other of peace, philosophy, second impression is of course the search for the third name, which would, you see, embrace both. And there you see how you can be correct in -- in embracing both notions: the war side and the peace side. Or in getting a {thin abstraction} and giving something that omits the war situation and the peace situation. That would be a wrong generalization.

Now the whole problem of Greek -- of our modern politics, gentlemen, of -- your teaching of government is of course very often handicapped because they omit the war situation of Americans, totally. You can learn government today and know never what it really means to be a soldier and under the command of a wrong captain, of a very poor captain, which is the real tragedy of any army. There you are. He could throttle you, my dear man. You still have to obey him. That's your real problem. Wrong leadership, poor leadership. Today they call a -- a captain a "manager." They think -- the army can be managed. Well, no doubt, that means that hundred thousand of American boys will be slaughtered in the

next war, because a manager cannot lead people in battle. It's nonsense. General Patton can lead men in battle, but Charles Wilson cannot. He's a manager. And today in this country, total confusion between war and peace because, gentlemen, all our definitions of government are based on peacetime experience only. So they think that Mr. Charles Wilson can govern America. Gentlemen, it's the end of America. It already is. He's a manager. As soon as managers try to govern people, instead of { } cars, you have no government. This is very shocking today, but you here see the whole problem. Even Homer is alternating. Here he gives the local name, and the place name. And in the first, he is very -- he is -- obviously that was his first idea -- 495, I think the whole first thing is more or less localized. Then he -- we are already advancing. He gets more poetical. He gets more direct, and in -- in -- with the Lokrai, it's already Aias, Aias, the great hero, you see. And that's inspiring, that they have such a good general. And they forget all about their locality. And it's all the leadership which counts. Go on, with 536, please.

("From Euboia itself sent the fiery Abantes, the man of Chalcis, Eretria and Ist- --")

Eretria, yes.

("Eretria, rich in vines, of seaside Kerinthos and the high fortress of Dios, and those who had their homes at Styra and Karystos, these were all called captain by Elephenor, offshoot of the war god, son of Chalkodon, and chieftain of the gallant Abantes. His followers were quick on their feet. They wore their hair in locks at the back. They carried ashen spears and wished for nothing better than to lunge with them, tear the corselets on their enemy's breast. Forty black ships came under Elephenor's command.")

Well, that's even more pronounced. If you compare these lines, gentlemen, with -- if you go back to -- to 506 where Poseidon's sanctuary and his -- his grove is described, that's peacetime order. But if you come to this one chapter on Euboia, all we hear is the greatness of the soldiers, the -- these -- the strapping -- strapping men, you see, how they swing their lances, their spears, and how they're out to kill, with -- courage in their heart, and we know -- next to nothing told about their home situation. And now we come to the great Athene. You have no book?

("Next Athenians in their splendid citadel around the

magnanimous Erechtheus, the child { } by Athene -- Athene, daughter of Zeus, established by her Athens in her own rich shrine. Her { } around { } by Athenian youths. These were commanded by --")

Now here we have another situation, this -- the -- the religious order of Athene -- of Athens. You can think how the Athenians, through the centuries, they became the leading city of Greece, would read these lines, in which for the first time, you see, they -- they get their due. They get -- just in the middle of the story, they are listed. The assumption has been made that the order of this list came from the fact that the Greek fleet gathered in Boeotia, in a -- harbor of Boeotia, in Aulis -- A-u-l-i-s. There are many famous plays on Iphigenia -- Iphigenia in Aulis, because there she was slaughtered, the daughter of Agamemnon, for the fair wind, and then was taken to Tauris and the several modern, and several ancient plays have been written around her fate. You have heard of Iphig- -- Iphig- -- how do you pronounce it in English?

(If-eh-gen-eye-ah.)

Ja. Terrible. I once had to give Greek and Latin lessons to an American girl. She was 16, and I was 14. We couldn't get along, except on the English, because our pronunciation was so different. So come on. I still can't get "Iphigene."

So this is Athens. And there comes now a famous verse in 557, which gave -- rise to great discussion. Was Salamis -- with the Phoenician name, Salamis, peace, the island in front of -- of Attica, you see, was it really in the days of Homer already a part of the Attic community, or was it not conquered later by Solon? And therefore, there was great talk about the genuineness of the next verse, if you read it.

("Out of Salamis Aias brought twelve ships and placed them next to where the Athenian battalions were drawn out.")

Wie -- so here is not subjection of Salamis to Athens, but at least cohesion. They are allies, you see. Now on this verse, the ancients I mean waged many mighty philological battles, you see. Some people said that the -- the Athenians forged the -- the -- this verse, you see. They put it in to state their claim that Salamis was in a -- a life-and-death alliance, in with Athens, you see. Only to show you the importance of being listed in this catalog, and how

to be listed. It was the charter of Greece later on, for hundreds of years. This little catalog of which you think nothing, because you don't know with what a -- with what a feeling people would hear the first poem, the first secular poem in any human language coherent, you see. Not a liturgical song, not a psalm in the order to the -- to the gods, you see, but a song in or- -- in honor of the heroes. That's the oldest song we have for any human order on earth, and already shifting between the religious order, the geographical, the local order, and the military order.

Would you kindly now read on? I can't help you, gentlemen. It is my purpose to -- not to amuse you here, but to tire you out, because you must see that -- the encyclopedic character of this, that it is in duty-bound to be exhaustive. You think of course such a -- such a schedule or such a charter is -- is boring. It wasn't for the Greeks. It was their entering into -- into a common spirit. So please bear with me if I ask you to go on, 560, please. Here is your neighbor. ("From Salamis Ai- -- Aias had brought twelve ships and --")

No, we have read that.

(Oh.)

("The citizens of Argos and Tiryns of the great walls, the men of Hermione and Asine, down from the great, deep gulf of the sea, and Oizen- -- Troizen and Eionai, and from vine-clad Epidauri, with the Achaian youths from Aigina and Ma- -- Mases were led by Diomedes of the loud war cry, and by Sthen- -- Sthenelos, son of { } famed Kapaneus; high-born Euryalos, son of King Mekisteus, son of Talaos; and { } them { } man, but the warlike Diomedes was in charge of the whole force and 80 black ships set sail under him.

("The troops that came from the great stronghold of Mykenai, from wealthy Korinth, and good town of Kleonai, the men who lived in Orneai and lovely Araithyrea, in Sikyon, where Adrestos had reigned in {all the} years; and Hy- -- Hyperesia and the steep Gonoessa, and Pellene and around Aigion; and all these the length of the coast and broad land of Helike, these and their hundred ships King Agamemnon, son of Atreus, led. The following was by far the finest and most numerous. It was a proud man who took his stand among the people, armed in gleaming bronze, the greatest captain of them all, in virtue of his rank and as commander by far of the largest force.")

Now one moment, gentlemen. You can learn something for your English. This is the heart of the matter, Agamemnon. He is the commander-in-chief. He is not placed in the beginning, as any logical system would say. Commander-in-chief. He -- he comes in later. Any artistic organization never has an -- happy ending in your sense of the word, that the last kiss, so to speak, and then the curtain falls. But in -- in -- in real art, gentlemen, there is a climax, and then you keep the height of tension, and then there is a finale, as in any opera, also; there is a music that goes after the -- the ev- -- main event.

In the same sense, you see here that he has led up from the -- simple -- from the place, Boeotia, where the navy gathers, and en- -- is enlarging his horizon, and here we suddenly are told in the middle of nowhere, that these were the best men, and this was the commander-in-chief, and he was the greatest of them all, because we have been taken gradually into the -- the beehive, into the dynam- -- dynamics of the whole army. It's very hard for us to reproduce this. You are all second-impression men. That is, you organize your material logically, you see. And there you say who was the commander-in-chief, biggest contingent, hundred ships: he has to come first, you see. Where Homer was still dealing with first impressions, and therefore, you see, he has no -- he hasn't taken stock of everything first, and then divides it logically, with A, B, C, D. But he gives -- goes into it, you see, in his imagination as he would walk through the -- through this. And there is Boeotia, and there are the Boeotians, of course, because they have first access to their own harbor. They were there first, you see. And then come all the boats that came there, you see, across the sea to join them. And so he finally reaches the stately center -- headquarters of Agamemnon. You can study here, gentlemen, that Homer's heart is in following the first impressions also in the physical, in the real life, you see. He's not systematic. He's anti-philosophical. Can you see this? Because a philosopher must have all his material gathered before he can subdivide it, you see. Therefore it's always a second impression, it's an afterthought.

Once you understand this, gentlemen, you know how boring most poems in America are, who list all the 48 states, or at least 10 of them, you see. You know all these patriotic songs which list the cliffs in -- in Oregon, or the sand in Texas, and the oil wells in Dakota, et cetera. I would still prefer the oil wells in Texas. And they -- they -- they make now a habit. And they tell you that you can make this poetical, if you talk of the -- of the various states. You cannot. Because it is -- anything is unpoetical that already knows the whole and then subdivides it. No first impressions. You understand this? And therefore, Homer is a -- is a

great lesson for you. Hollywood mostly sins against this principle. They know too much, you see. They are so sophisticated. They bury their own -- the poets, you see. They hire them, let them smother them in -- and -- and -- and -- in -- in -- in -- somewhere in a corner in Hollywood. And then they have their producers and directors, and they are so smart. They know everything ahead of time. And the -- innocence is lost. And they le- -- dismiss you with the high point of the story, without any finale. But any man who is really impressed by a great event, gentlemen, then wants to have some swan song, wants to have something declining.

So what I have tried to build -- to show you here, how he builds up to the climax, to our -- would also apply to the end. You go down from the climax. Opera still has this, you see, an opera has -- or a symphony always has a finale. You cannot be dismissed with a high point, you see. But I think modern -- the more you get modern techniques, the more the people try to -- think they must dismiss you with the climax. That's very bad taste. Just sensation.

Now from -- there or from Agamemnon, I won't go on now with this all in detail, but we will only le- -- read the end.

There are, as you know, see -- still see a tremendous, long list. And we begin perhaps -- it doesn't matter, really. Let us begin at 730. Ja?

(What is -- what are the first lines? We don't have it in our book.)

Trikke. Trikke and Ithome.

("The man --")

No, perhaps we have to go back to 720, just before. I'm sorry. Lemnos.

That's quite an interesting thing, because it's an exceptional line. 721.

(Start with "Those from Methone"?)

Ja. Very good. Begin there.

("Those from Methone, Thaumakia --")

Methone, pardon me. It makes no difference. But it happens to be very long: Me-thon-ne. Ja?

("Methone, Thaumakia, Meliboia and rugged Olizon were brought by the great archer Philok- -- Philoktetes --")

Now, everybody has to know Philoktetes. There's a great, famous tragedy of antiquity, S- -- by Sophocles, Philoktetes, where his cries -- he was poisoned -- fill the air through the whole -- through the whole drama. Just as -- it was, of course, with music, played in antiquity -- all ancient tragedy is opera, as you understand. And so the great -- the great outcries of Philoktetes go through all ancient tradition. And here Philoktetes is the great archer, you see, comes with a very small troop. Only seven ships. But now you go on.

("-- { } in seven ships, each manned by fifty oarsmen trained to go to battle with the bow. But their commander lay in agony on the lovely isle of Lemnos, where the Achaian army had left him suffering from the poisonous bite of a malignant water snake. So he lay there, crying, so the Ar- -- Argives by their ships were destined before long to {think} once more of {King} Philoktetes. Meanwhile, though his followers missed their leader, they were not left without a chief. They were commanded by Medon, the bastard son of O- -- Oïleus, whom Rhene bore to Oïleus, the sacker of { }.")

Now one moment. I have to -- give you -- charge you with another word.

"They were not without a leader, although they were desirous of their old leader." It goes -- it says -- you read this. And then they said, "Medon was in command." Now the word which the -- Homer uses here is a very important word. And if you at this moment learn it, you will see the whole problem of logos and phusis, which is the topic of our whole lecture course, in a new light. You have heard what a cosmic order is. You use the -- we use the word "cosmic" for the universe, you see. Before man enters it. You know what the word "cosmology" means, ja. The -- the order of the universe. You may hear modern astronomers speak of the cosmological problems. That is, the origin of our -- of our world.

The Greeks were very much concerned with cosmos, in the same sense.

Cosmology is one of the fundamental things, as we said, of phusis and physiology, you can also say cosmos and cosmology. It would mean the same. And many Greek writers didn't write on phusis, on nature, but on cosmos.

But gentlemen, this word still has the law which I tried to emphasize, that it comes first from human society. And later only from the nonhuman world,

because "cosmos" here in this sentence means -- {cosmein}, exactly like "muthein," "cosmein" means to be in command of a human cosmos, of a beehive. You can use a -- perhaps the word "hive." "Cosmos" means a wreath, a garland, an order.

And therefore, the first meaning of the word "cosmos" to your and my surprise is a -- political. The meaning of a city, beautifully organized, yes? And only later was it taken out and carried into the nature, of the universe. If nature is a cosmos, it means that it is as well organized as human society.

Now since all our problem here is to settle in the history of Greek philosophy our own problem and in our own mind, what is first in our own impression, in our own experience? Human society, you see, or nature; that is, the nonspeaking world, you remember? The world which is not governed by human speech, by the word. It is terribly important for you to look at this point into the Greek language and to know the word "cosm-" {erkosme sen}, "he commanded," really means "he ordered." Cosmos means order -- will you take this down? -- and it means first, political order. And second, all other order which forms a semblance to the political order, which is equally harmonious, equally lawful.

So you all think that the law of nature is older than the law of man.

Obviously that isn't so. Nature doesn't know anything of laws; just is as it is.

Chaotic, you may say. We have made laws first, and then we have also tried to discover the similar laws in the universe. But the idea of a law was -- came to your and my mind only because we were under law. And these were statute laws. They were s- -- formulated, articulate laws, you see. When Mr. Newton articulated the laws of Heaven and earth, you see, he imitated human language. And he used mathematics, because he knew, he -- the sun couldn't understand English, you see. But it can hardly understand mathematics, see.

The -- the mathematical laws of the universe are then, gentlemen, second-impression laws. And the word "cosmos" yields us this great secret, that in Homer, it is simply the order set up by humans among themselves. And the word "cosmos" today to you has lost all this intimacy.

-- If you wish to understand the importance of this, gentlemen, I'll s- -- tell this you right after the recess. How much depends for your and my bliss, and beatitude on your clarity about the -- this history of all these terms, like "myth" and "cosmos"? But let's have a break first. Five minutes.

[tape interruption]

...at this moment, as you know, there is a -- a tremendous temptation all over the world to breed people like cattle, to forbid misgen- -- miscegenation, to lay down the rule by which blood groups you are allowed to marry another lady, because otherwise your child may die, and to make all kind of racial laws about the race. And the doctors, and the natural scientists write books on heredity, because they know absolutely nothing about it, and so they sell very well. And you believe all this stuff, gentlemen.

Now what's the argument? Gentlemen, when you believe in humanity, and when you believe in the experience of the human race, you would say that obviously the feeling of affection and love, and the falling in love between a man and a woman is the guide -- the first guide for our first impression, and the first guide to our knowledge about mating. Because people who really love each other form good marriages. That's the normal thing. And then we try to find it -- outside in nature, for the bulls and the wolves, an application of our own experience, and mate them, and breed cattle accordingly, and birds, and what-not. Whatever we try, and finally, hybrid corn.

And so we have cultivated the earth by applying our own experiences about breeding and mating to the outside world. This means that our inner cosmos, the commands of our heart were the first, and -- and the application of these commands into the outer world to whose hearts we cannot look, came second. Always when you have done this long enough, the devil comes and says, "Transfer the experiences of the outer world into your human heart, and ask the human beings to behave like cattle." That's the moment today. We have read so much science that today they try to tell you that you must not marry for love, you must not marry for desire, you must not m- -- marry for affection, but for the genetic reasons of Mr. Such-and-Such, some outsider who sells sperm to a Hollywood lady, you see, from a good-bodied student -- well-bodied student. Well, that's what they do, after all. They sell sperm. That is, they transfer literally the experience of bulls to humanity. That's going on in this country. It's not forbidden. I would expel these people. I would ship them across the ocean. Send them to Russia. { } it better in love affairs. Gentlemen, it's a great scandal of this country. Goes on under your nose. You know that thousands of boys do this, and give their sperm to a woman they have never seen and whom they don't love, and they think that will be good offspring, because cattle is produced this way.

This is your temptation, gentlemen. In every way of life, you can look at

the beehive and try to understand it from your own experiences, or you can look at the beehive, you see, and try to -- from -- which you only see from the outside, and be ruled then by imitating the beehive. And every one of you, gentlemen, I -- before you came to this class, were quite unaware of this constant ambiguity, how to judge the outer world and the inner world, what makes law. It is terribly important, gentlemen, that you keep in mind that -- all of you are philosophers. As soon as you get outside your family, your familiarity into the -- something outer, and you have the ovibos, here the musk ox coming to this -- you know -- to Vermont. Did you read the story of the musk ox? Whom they brought at great expense from the Arctic down to Vermont? Well, they want to tame it, you see. Now, do we carry over our own experience of familiar, and domestic {fact}, you see, to this usk- -- -ibos or do we take { } about getting us wild? That's always your decision { }.

So -- it is the -- the issue before humanity in 1956, and it will be for the next hundred years: do we carry over the experiences of the natural world into society, or the experiences of society into the natural world? Take -- take the fertilizing problem, gentlemen; take the chemical problem, you see.

I just read an article this morning, that wherever you -- you spray the trees and the bushes, the bees die. And go -- first they go crazy, and then some of these bees murder the others. They don't die directly, but they go crazy and they denaturalize their stock, so to speak. The discipline goes, they -- and so large areas -- my neighbor lost his bees this way from spraying his trees this summer. We are destroying constantly life because we do not go from our inner experience where we don't -- to the outer world. But we allow us to be more en-- included in the natural principles of chemistry, gentlemen. Chemistry deals with the dead -- dearest things in life. Chemicals are dead. If you explain life by chemistry, you will soon be chemical. And the -- of course, you have poison gas, and you have genocides, and you have the atom bomb. That's chemistry. Don't be surprised, I mean, that the atom bomb is around after a century of chemistry. Obviously the whole problem is to reverse the process and to say, "Since I do -- even a mother-in-law doesn't try to be an atom bomb in the family of her daughter-in-law, let's arrange the world so that the -- the destruction, the Vesuvius, the explosions are far removed from the center of human society, and that the heart of our cities cannot be destroyed by bombs, as we did in central Europe." And as you know, very wantonly, just because the air -- air marshal thought it was the won- -- a wonderful proposition to bomb Dresden -- we are

held up among Russians and among the satellite states every day over the radio as barbarians, because Dresden was perfectly wantonly, without any usefulness for the war effort, destroyed by the Royal Air Force, and the Americans later on. Very interesting que- -- ver- -- it's now admitted that the -- the strategical bombing took the -- chose the wrong targets. It didn't take the bridges and it didn't take the railroads, which some -- reasonable people tried to suggest in '43, but all the targets that were just conspicuous, that were big.

Which is very inhuman, you see, because the human is for the small things. The soul of man is invisible; a baby is very small; the switch -- the cross-roads where you can be -- the limbs where you can really feel a s- -- an order of society, they are all tenuous, delicate things, headquarters and such things. If you want to go out in nature and imitate Vesuvius and Etna, and -- then you will take the big targets. It's just an example of what happens when you go from nature into human society. These were very small units here, these people. You couldn't judge them from the ocean.

You -- you are all for bigness, gentlemen. That's why our life is so boring. Interesting are only small things. A group of 10 people is much more interesting than a country of 160 million people. You think the other way. And wherever you have bigness first, gentlemen, you kill life, because bigness is only for the human eye. Your private experience is always only dealing with small things. Pétain, the marshal of France, said once, "I can only really know 10 people. Therefore government must be organized in such a way that I have to deal with 10 men. Because then I know they are doing. They must have me -- every one deal with another 10 men. And on it goes. But my fiction, that I deal with 40 million Frenchmen, you see, is just { }. That's { }. That's impossible." Smallness must even exist in government, gentlemen, and in -- in our commanding armies. It's no good that the general commands 4 million people. He cannot do this, you see. But he must have 20 men around him whom he can trust like the apple of his own eye. Isn't that obvious?

So -- but this choice can only be made when you know that the logos, the intimacy of the group with whom you are on speaking terms, can never repro- -- be replaced by a natural order, where you count apples.

And this is now my task, gentlemen, to come to the conclusion here of this catalog. The step from Homer to philosophy can now be exactly defined, because you have here a list of cities, every one keeping -- being very small, and keeping

their own name. I don't have to repeat any of these names, but I just put here the word, "name," the term "name." Homer deals with named entities. And although we list them in a unified effort, everyone keeps its -- his name to himself, and it is even stressed by the name of the captain, its overname, so to speak. It has two names: the local name, as we said, you see; and that name which is even more alive, because it's a living man, at this moment, who is leading them. Now if you come to Plato, if you come to any philosopher, gentlemen, he does not list the many cities by their name, and then lump them together, as the "Greek navy." But there is one little step in Plato. Anybody who happens to have Plato here can look up the 10th book of The Republic. You have it there. I brought it specially to class here -- and here Home- -- Plato rages against Homer. And that's why I bring it up right away, because it's Plato's attack on Homer. Very famous. He wanted to forbid the reading of Homer in his -- to his students. Of course, he couldn't do it. But he made an attempt. And he begins with the famous statement: "We can no longer go on allowing the people to read poetry." That's the first sentence in the 10th book of The Republic. You have it there? Called -- Page 595. Everyone perhaps bring this next time and looks it up himself. Page 595 in the old {Stefanos} edition. That's the general way of quoting Gre- -- the -- the -- all the Greek texts from the 16th-century editions and their page numbering. So it's always printed here on the side, and you have it on top of the page, have you not? Yes, it is. I know it.

(It says Book Ten on top of the page.)

Oh, no, Sir. Here. Yes, I'm right, and you are wrong.

So Page 596 is the great fall from -- transition from poetry to philosophy made, because there Plato says, "The -- our task of thinkers -- of philosophers is to think about all the many things which may be called by the same name." Will you take this down, gentlemen? Poetry never thinks about all the people who come under the same name, but poetry has to keep the individual names of every one city here, you see. And then try to bring them together in a unity, without scalp- -- what I call scalping -- their name. It is not enough to say, "the Greeks." The whole -- catalog stands and falls with our interest in the captains, you see, of every individual city. That's why the Greeks read it, and thought it was great poetry. You understand this?

Now Plato says, in this whole page, which is -- as you -- you should -- really add a note to your Homer edition, that the Homer -- Plato attacks the catalog of the ships. He calls the poets "imitators" of the cosmos of politics. They

keep -- they let the people stand under their own name, as a way they call themselves, you see. They have humility of the poet who -- if Mr. Smith is called "Mr. Smith," lets him be called "Mr. Smith." Plato says, "I want to get behind the secret. I want to have second impressions. All tables, they are not to me the ebony table and the acorn table. They are just tables." And he says, "I therefore list all and everything by one name." And there is this little step done, gentlemen, which distinguishes poetry, animism, living with people, and philosophy, speaking of things.

Homer deals with all the many cities of men. Plato deals with all the many things. That's a strange transition from "he" to "it," from "he" and "she" to "it." Plato deals with every man as though he was an "it." And he has -- comes out with cattle breeding for example, for marriage, for this reason, because he doesn't see why he shouldn't decide on me and you as though we were things, "its," you see, all to be called by the same name. And that's the terror of Platonism, that we are all his ideas, and he thinks about us, where we aren't present. And we cannot complain if he calls us just, you see, "male" and "female." And you cannot say, "But I'm John Smith; and I'm not Jean Smith."

So gentlemen, we have here a great lesson and a great comparison to make. Plato is -- makes a desperate attempt to delete the political self-consciousness of the people of whom he is speaking, to give to them his judgment, you see, on their order. His second impressions. And denying their right to go on under the impact of their first impressions, their own laws, their own names, their own dialect, { }, their own religion, you see. That's all to be wiped out, because he knows better. And he says so by saying in this -- 596, Number 8, there is this strange sense: "We have agreed that this is an idea, which we have the right -- to -- we shall call 'idea,' that which we get accustomed to put on every -- all the many things to which we put the same name. Don't you understand this?" "I understand."

So there are many seats. There are many tables, he says. but the idea is one and the same, there is only one seat, one idea of a chair, and one idea of a table. Here you have, in a seemingly harmless little paragraph, the -- the real step from poetry into philosophy, from first impressions to second impressions. The man of second impressions, gentlemen, pays no attention to the self-naming of the people concerned. He wants to penetrate behind their consciousness, you see, and he strips them therefore, he -- I call it "scalps" -- of their name. Because my name is more even than my headdress, you see. It is my headdress, as a matter of fact.

If you strip a co- -- battalion of the name "Philoktetes," you don't have the same battalion in battle. Isn't that clear? And so the man says, "Philoktetes was left behind, but they had another man keeping the order, Medon." You -- we just read this. Now can you also take away Medon, and can you say, "There are just 500 Greeks"? Do you still have the same order? Do you still have the same thing? Plato would say "yes," you see. Philosophy will always think that it is well organized when it goes by its own concepts. It doesn't wait for the agreement, gentlemen, of the ordered. Philosophy never waits until you have said, "But I call myself miserable. You call -- me," you see, "happy."

Modern state -- very much of managerial society. All the managers rent buses, pack all their workers on Saturday evening in a bus and say, "Aren't you happy?" And then they have to answer, "Yes."

But that's just a glue put on from the outside, gentlemen. They aren't happy, but they are made to behave happily. All -- this is -- our whole modern mass movement. All these broadcasters, they all tell you that you have to be happy. And you -- no resistance. No contradiction accepted. Then you just don't -- drop out, and won't listen to the broadcast. They say, "I'm sorry. Can't do anything for you," because these mass media are not at your disposal. They are at their disposal. And you are just -- how do you call it, if you -- if you prepare your little victim by licking it with your spittle so completely that it finally goes down your throat very nicely? How d- -- how d- -- we have a word in German, a verb, where you -- we describe this process of first getting enough saliva around the -- the bit before devouring. How would you call it? "To salive" you can't say. Wie? (Salivate?)

Can you? Ja. Well, philo- -- you see, the -- the -- terribly important, gentlemen. The step from the many people to the many things. There's a great difference, gentlemen. If you treat people as things, they lose their own names. Their self-naming is lost. And that's the whole problem of philosophy to this day, gentlemen. Philosophers will organize and logically deduct, to use the order of the universe, with one little loss. The way this -- people think of themselves doesn't enter the picture. They are all men, for example. Or they are all Europeans. Now, ask a man in Holland. He'll never think himself -- of a European. He's a Dutchman. Oh, but you say, "I go to Europe," and to you, Holland is just one little enclave, you see. You pass it in half an hour by car. It's so small. To a Dutchman, it's terribly big. Who has been to Holland? Don't you think?

(Yes.)

Ja. And if you bicycle, it takes quite a time, you see. And they all bicycle, as you know. And 92 percent of the Dutchmen bicycle. Now, that's a different country, of course, to their -- in their own consciousness. A country which you measure by bicycle is a different country from a Cadillac country. But philosophy in the -- in the abstract sense doesn't take any notice. It says, "Here are Dutchmen. They also have two legs, and -- and a head. They are human beings. And they live in Europe. Therefore they are Europeans."

Gentlemen, Europe is one of the most bastard abstractions of philosophy. Except for the French who invented the term in order to be the greatest nation of Europe, the rest of Europe doesn't give a damn for Europe, you see. They want to be Dutch. They want to be Germans. They want to be Belgians. They want to be Danes. But one thing they don't want to be. They don't want to be Americans. Ja, if you make them into Europeans, you make them simply into second-thought Americans, you see, with ice cream and -- and Ford cars, because the condition under which they could become Europeans would be that they would become a second American. That's the one thing they don't want to become.

In America the continent is older than the individual part of the continent, you see. In Europe, that isn't so. You see, in this country, you have no dialects. But in -- every valley in Europe speaks a different language. And it -- there the individual order comes first. This is still -- like this catalog of the ships, you see, Europe. And it is not the abstract entity with the numbering, as you know, as we have it, Arkansas Number 10, for my baby, if I happen to -- to have a baby born in Arkansas and then fingerprinted.

What's your number?

Well, it's very serious, gentlemen, because I think at this moment, America is faced with the issue: do we want to go poetical? That is, do we want to go down to grassroots and brass tacks, despite our big cities, despite our technology, you see, and therefore give everybody a character of his own, you see? Or are we throwing -- forcing the rest of mankind to follow our example, you see, of mass production, and insist that it's the only way of life? That would be the philosophical way of life.

You haven't solved this yet, gentlemen. America is torn between the grassroot democracy of Jefferson with prop- -- private property, which means grassroots, you see, my own home. My ho- -- house, my castle. And the modern

mass state with a secret police allowed to enter and take your best friend from your home, because you no longer protect him by your hospitality.

I'll give you this last instance for this. I always put the question to my classes: when you have a friend, and he is seeking the protection of your home, and you happen to have a home of your own, and he sp- -- he wants to spend the night in peace there, and the police comes, and asks you -- can you arr- -- can they arrest him, will you protect your child or -- your friend, or will you protect the police? And I always got the classical answer: if it is the sheriff, we'll protect him. If it is the FBI, we'll extradite him.

There you have the two Americas. The first is the grassroot America of 1750. If a man was in your home, he was -- had to -- the name of your friend, you see. This was John Smith, and you had an intimate and personal relation to him. And therefore you could not be put to shame by giving him over to a police force. But today, you live in an abstract tenement house. And even in the country, you are just city -- there are just city money, and there is nothing concrete, and nothing direct. And so, if the FBI comes, you surrender. And that's happened in Russia, gentlemen, and it's happened with us here. And you are -- we aren't less abstract than the Russians, because we are ruled by philosophy.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...in its real, ancient meaning. We saw that it meant admiration for opposite orders of societies, or the men moving in these un- -- inimical orders. And we said admiration then is a philosophical virtue, because it means that we live in separate worlds, but admire the fellow who does his part in the opposite world. It is the relation towards enemies who at this moment have to behave as enemies. Gentlemen, this is today -- on you the term "humanities" and "humanism" is mostly lost. You think it has to do with fiction, or music, or the arts. But humanism is that faculty of you and me in the encircling gloom while the world is not finished. And while we are -- of course weak in spirit and really devote all our efforts to -- make our own country, for example, or own profession win, to keep a yardstick of behavior toward those who oppose our ends is very important. Christian love does not fight, so that ends the whole problem of the struggle. But humanism adheres to the fighting here and now, and says, "On the other hand, this man is admirable." And so it creates the code of chivalry. All chivalry, all international law, all behavior of truth between -- between modern lobbies, farmer's union, Re- -- Republican Party, bankers' interest, are still based on this humanistic creed that there will be a limit to their mutual slander and the pursuit of their interest.

So gentlemen, it is one of the most important things that you see that human- -- humanism has something to do with mutual admiration. And this virtue in ethics is never mentioned. I read all the textbooks of my friend { } and others here in this country, and oh, the -- in Europe it's even worse. Admiration is considered usually a poor virtue. Gentlemen, it's a central virtue for everyday living. People who do not admire cannot be educated. You cannot a chi- -- educate a child without admiration. If a child doesn't know what -- whom to admire, you cannot raise his sights. Then you can only speak in the abstract, of all the powers that are invisible, and there is nothing in between which at this moment already raises his sights. You cannot educate a child without admiration. They try hard in the last 40 years, so the children remain uneducated, and become juvenile delinquents. Well, whom do they admire? The robbers. If you do not make them admire the right people, they will admire the wrong people. That's what they do in this country. They admire Al Capone, or wild Western films, and all these comic strips. And -- it's very terrible, gentlemen. You have, in this country, just a wrong scale of admiration. And for what reason? Because it has been so- -- said to you, "Don't admire." Well, nobody can live that way. So then the people go and admire something -- the Hollywood stars.

So -- since you have no women whom you are allowed to admire, you admire the pseudo-women. That's what they are, the pin-up girl, and so on. It's nothing to admire.

So -- we have done something terrible to this whole sense of admiration. And it is fundamental, gentlemen. If you become scientists instead of philosophers, as you all try to be, then you throw out all admiration for people, and you only wonder -- have a sense of wonder perhaps about facts. And you want to learn the facts and buy the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Or you -- subscribe to Science, or you subscribe to Life, to be posted about the newest facts. I told you I could tell you that this is a very one-sided misunderstanding of the sense of wonder. The sense of wonder is triplicate. It is -- you have to admire the power that makes you understand. You have to admire the thing which stops you, because you don't understand it. And you have to admire the power that makes you able to communicate with others this admirable faculty that we are meant to understand the universe, to move in it with clear-headedness, and do something about it.

But I come back to my tripartition, logos, ethos, and phusis, of course, here once more. But I thought the last lecture tried to show you that Homer instituted for these envious knights of Greece, these -- they were, of course, barbarians as anybody else, the code of wonder, because he drew them out -- of their small, little confines of Podunk, and Delaware, and Rhode Island, and Vermont, and New Hampshire, and put them in this mighty, you see, wide world of a common enterprise. Like the Crusades, something like that, in the Middle Ages. You must -- may compare the Crusades with the same spirit. And just as the Crusades created the code of the Pilgrim, which you still have in Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, and the code of the crusader, of the code of the knight in shining armor -- there were no such things before. But this great common enterprise of the Crusades drew people out into this new humanity. So Homer did this for the first time in human history, that he drew the people out, and he did so well that he did better than the Crusaders, because he made them admire their foe. He made them admire Priam. And Achilles and Priam look at each other -- behold each other with aston- -- astounded eyes.

Now gentlemen, for all the future of you- -- of the Greek spirit, and humanism, it has remained then equally important that the philosopher remain somebody to be admired than what -- that what he says. The philosopher himself is an object of admiration. Alternatingly. The mo- -- simpler the world which he

explains -- like if you explain the whole world to be atoms, then the world is not very admirable. But all the more the mind is admirable who can say to you, "The world is very simple." So when Democritus said the whole world consisted of atoms, the sense of wonder migrates to the {philosopher}, you see, and rests upon him.

All realists, all factualists, gentlemen, in philosophy, all the people who say, "This is nothing but" simply mean to tell you that you shall admire them more than the things, you see. And all the people who say, "Really? This is great. The galaxy of the heavens is really the expression of this -- harmony of the spheres, is divine," as Plato said, this makes you concentrate your sense of wonder on physis, on the things of the world, you see. And therefore, you may be allowed perhaps for a while to forget the philosopher, or your sense of admiration for the philosopher.

So gentlemen, the sense of wonder migrates, or shifts, or oscillates, according to any system of philosophy, because you -- the wonder is something of a limited -- limited -- how shall I say { }? -- existence. You have not unlimited power to admire. Either you admire the riddle of the universe, or you admire the man who explains to you the riddle of the universe, or you explain the power that asks us to move in a hidden universe with our simple brains. You are either, you see, overwhelmed by the wonder of God, or by the wonder of society, or by the wonder of physis. And you cannot -- this is very difficult for you to believe, gentlemen. You cannot have endless admiration. Admiration is not unlimited. No power of the human soul, even love, is unlimited. You cannot love your neighbor more than yourself, for example. That's a sin very often committed in this society. People try to love their neighbor more than themselves. It never works. That's idolatry. Husbands worship their wives more than themselves, you see -- than they love themselves. So of course it ends in disaster. It's not good for a woman to be adored. She has to be told the truth.

So gentlemen, admiration, as all great powers in life, are -- how do you say? -- limited -- is that the right word? -- confined, restricted. They are not available in abundance. You live in a fools' paradise, because you do not know that your mind and your body, and we all live in a wonderful economy of powers. "Economy" means that every post in the budget is limited. You are told by naïve ideas that you can make friends with everybody. Gentlemen, don't believe it for a minute. Friendship is limited. If you try to make friends with everybody, you can't be friends with anybody. But that's a to- -- modern gospel, that you can make friends with 2 billion people on this globe. Don't try it.

It's nonsense. The four- -- the powers, gentlemen, which are -- come to play in your life in this universe are -- ja -- give me the right word -- are economical forces. That is, you have to economize them. You have to know -- you see, there are problems of distribution. They -- they are not -- there in -- in unending measure. The man who has imagination -- in his -- for his -- at great -- in -- in great wealth, he cannot have the same sagacity as a usurer. The usurer has no imagination, but he has sagacity. Sagacity and imagination usually exclude each other, you see. You -- and you must not then bargain one for the other. Either you are a poet, and use your imagination and write Shakespeare's play, Shakespeare -- as I think, the man who inspired Shakespeare's plays, was a great waste- -- spendthrift, and never -- never had enough. I don't think that Shakespeare, the -- sober citizen of -- of Stratford-on-Avon is the author of these plays. But that is a minor matter, and I don't hold a brief for this. But only to show -- tell you that I think that wherever you have great passions and great virtues, you cannot have the same energies also in the opposite camp. You understand this. But it is one of your illusions that you can.

Now philosophy is -- the history of philosophy is the revelation of this great law of economy. The whole history of Greek philosophy shows you that you have to choose what to admire most, phusis, logos, or ethos, you see. And you can't have it all three ways.

The second thing about humanism then, next to admiration, was that humanism is a second hammer throw, because first we are thrown into our own group -- family, state, community, church. Humanism tries to widen this group. And the problem then -- the second problem of humanism is not this problem of distribution of admiration, but: how far can we go in forgetting our first impressions, our first loyalties? How far is this transfer to a wider circle, you see, permissible? How far is it not destructive of our first bonds?

You see this very clearly when you ask our attitude of a cosmopolitan philosopher in times of war. He knows both sides, he -- obviously many people in this country knew very well that there was a relative right on all sides of the question in 1917. Yet, when the war breaks out, everybody has to stand, you see, behind the decision of the president who takes the country into war. So all their cosmopolitan knowledge, all their philosophy, for the time at least, is suspended, you see, and put in waiting. This is the question that faces, of course, every man who uses his mind, gentlemen, that at one moment in his life, his mind is no good. That is, his mind has no right to command his actions. With -- this I mean by "his mind is no good." So where is the limitation for philosophy?

This is the second problem al- -- immediately put by the very fact of philosophizing. Philosophizing, we said, generalizes primitive, first-rate loyalties. Now the question is: how far can this generalization do without the first loyalty? You all live in a -- this fools' paradise. Most people talk in abstractions, as -- for example, friends. But gentlemen, if you have never made a friend, the buying of the book of Dale Carnegie, How to Make Friends, won't help you. The first friend must already have occurred in your life before you can transfer this same experience to others, you see. And that's an immediate experience, and it can't be made on a -- basis of a book, because if it is only by the book, you will never know whether it is a real friend or not. You have to go buy Dale Carnegie, and I think he has only customers, and no friends.

Well, you live however -- most of you live in this second-hand world, with your mind. Fortunately not in reality, gentlemen. Your mother writes, "You come home for Thanksgiving," and you do. Why, you don't know. You are -- may be disgruntled because you wanted to go elsewhere, but you just go. And he -- she is an authority. And no philosophy helps against that. But where's the limit? Philosophy of course then, gentlemen, has to solve this second problem: how much to first impressions? How much to generalizations? That's the second topic, also clearly already developed in Homer.

Now I got this question from one of you. It's a good question. I want to start in with this right now. After we had dealt with the catalog of the ships, as the great example of generalization, of living generalization which did not kill the patriotism of the local group, you see, but took them -- all the groups, you see, in a common enterprise, every one, however, retaining his identity. We went over to the scene between Priam and Hec- -- and Achilles over the corpse of Hector. And we saw that great passions there were overcome by this admiration, by this astonishment that a greater thing could have happened, that Priam could return alive from the tent of the sla- -- slayer of his son. And we saw that the creation of this admiration was possible by the appeal to the fatherhood in -- in Achilles' father. And you see therefore that in humanism there is something third present always between two men. In America, you have this example when a rich man meets a beggar. Good America, you see -- in good America, the rich man treats the beggar -- so nicely, humanly, because he doesn't exclude the possibility that one day he might be a beggar himself.

As soon as the rich man doesn't do that, you see, he will treat the beggar inhumanely, because the functional approach will not be there, that he can, in his imagination, take the place of the beggar. You have two classes of rich in this

country. You have the unfeeling rich, who think that this can never happen to them, and they will always have enough. And you have the good rich, who never forget that from shirtsleeves to shirtsleeves, there are three generations; and one day he himself may need the same appeal. Do you understand the great difference on attitude? To one, his social status hangs around lightly, and he doesn't give a damn to the fact that he earns a million dollars a year, at this moment, you see, because he foresees the vicissitudes of fortunes. And I always think that if you want to melt a -- a manufacturer's heart, even of the National Association of Manufacturers, you just have to remind them that their -- their daughter -- own daughter may have to become a secretary and a typist. And that should melt everybody's heart about labor conditions. The -- your own daughter is involved in the game. There is no -- no security. Nobody can say that his daughter may not have to earn a living herself. Nobody can protect in modern times any member -- a member in the next generation against such necessity. Now if this is so, gentlemen, then the question is -- is legitimate: how much is Homer a philosopher? And what right do we have to say that Homer is not a philosopher, that he is a poet? This was my -- the question. After all, we found in Homer already these typical two situations which we have -- you see, determined as philosophy. The answer is, I think, at this moment, as far as I can give it to you -- you know a little -- not enough yet about the whole story -- is complex. And I don't see why I should oversimplify it. It is the beauty of dealing with real texts and real people, gentlemen, that things aren't so simple as you would like to have them for a final examination.

Homer is the teacher of all the Greeks. To teach is always to generalize.

You cannot teach without going beyond the immediate moment, with specificity -- specificity, as people say today, the specific moment, you see. When a mother says, "Bring me this basket from the attic," that's a specific command. The child will obey. But when the mother teaches the child, and tries to say, "Commands of parents have to be obeyed," you will understand that's always a philosophical element, you see, because it generalizes. You can see this.

So teaching is always philosophical. There is no other way of teaching, except example. But example has to be interpreted, you see. And the interpretation then will have this -- this generalizing element, always. The command, the example, and the teaching -- the indoctrination are threefold, and the indoctrination is always a philosophical element. In all instruction, in all teaching, you cannot help it.

Modern scientists are -- enemies of philosophy, great enemies, and de-

stroyers of philosophy, because they only want us to deal with things, you see. And want to be objective. They do not want to cultivate the cult of the -- the admiration of the person. But gentlemen, you cannot teach mathematics mathematically. You have to teach mathematics enthusiastically. Otherwise it won't stick, you see. If a mathema- -- teacher of mathematics cannot make you thought -- and feel good about mathematics, he cannot teach it. You see the difference? Science cannot be taught scientifically. Will you take this down, gentlemen? You either have to admire the teacher, or you have to love mathematics. Both are simply emotional situations. It's one of the dreams of America that -- you see it with these objective examinations, but I hope that one day there will be riot and they'll all be destroyed. That's a scandal. These so-called "objective" examinations, they -- they -- they seduce you to believe that the learning process is something quite different from what it is. It makes you think that you can do without these translations. That's a widespread -- superstition at this moment, in this country. But without somebody interesting you, and getting you interested in mathematics, there are no mathematics. Don't you see the difference? So gentlemen, there is in all teaching a philosophical element, because we have now learned already that the sense of wonder may also apply to the teacher. If he has a very boring subject, and he can keep you interested, you begin to admire him, you see, instead of the boring subject. But it works. It keeps you together; it keeps you awake.

In teaching then, there is also this element of wonder, either for the teacher or for the subject. And in as far as Homer is a teacher of the Greeks, we cannot get around the fact that he is partly a philosopher. That's one perplexity, or one -- one co- -- and Plato says of himself that Homer has been his teacher. Thereby he admits that there is an element of philosophy in Homer. Then he turns against him in this 10th book, which I asked you to read, and where he says, "I turn against the imitator" -- as he calls the poets -- "the imitator." Homer imitates. And that is, of course, the poetical element. And we shall s- -- call this element, gentlemen, "the element that lets things be called by their own name." I call the process of pure philosophy, Platonic philosophy, with a hard word, but I think a word which is drastic enough to stick in your mind: all philosophy scalps names from things, you see. If -- if I say, "It makes no difference whether a man comes from Thebes or from Athens, you see, they're both citizens," I have killed, I have murdered, I have shorn citizenry of Athens and of Thebes, you see. And therefore I have impoverished the citizens of Thebes and the citizens of Athens of their feeling towards their one and only city.

All philosophy, gentlemen, scalps. This Homer does not do. In this sense,

then, I would like to insist that Homer is not a philosopher. In as far as he makes us see wider than in our own city we have been looking, he is a philosopher. In as far as he demands from us to give still every one item its own name, the name of its first impression, of its first community, he is not a philosopher.

Now the third step, gentlemen. Homer is more a philosopher with regard to the gods, as with regard to men. With regard to men, he is a poet. That is, he makes men great. But Homer makes go- -- the gods small. And -- has always been reproached -- he has always been reproached with this irreligion -- also Plato does it -- because the gods look funny at times in Homer. They look small.

There's a simple reason for this, gentlemen. In order to inspire the Greeks with this one spirit of all being Greeks, of all being allowed to participate in this one great enterprise of one humanity, he could take every one out of his confines and give him a larger scope. He could not enlarge the scope of the gods. The gods were gods. And gods are always transcending your and my confines, your and my bailiwick, you see. They are always gods, which means they have -- participate in univers- -- in the universe. All gods in -- all tribes, never believe anything else what the textbooks say; all gods have represented, of course, the whole to us little members of -- the fragments of the universe.

And therefore, Homer could not aggrandize the gods. But he wanted to talk about them. So, as you may -- those of you who have read Homer -- The Odyssey for example -- know, at places he is ha- -- rather irreverent of the gods. He shows that he thinks that the gods are envious, jealous, wrathful, and just -- human beings allowed to live forever, so to speak, and therefore immune against death. The nondying quality is the essential quality for Homer's gods, because he cannot add anything to the cult.

The poet, you see, has one stumbling block. What is the social -- social situation of a singer, of Homer? Where does he appear? And this is important for us. The social situation of Homer is an -- that of an after-dinner speaker. Now after dinner, nothing is serious. So Home- -- Homer is handicapped with regard to the gods, because the gods are the one aspect of reality whom we can only entreat when we are serious. And Homer is in the desperate situation that he has to speak of a -- gods in a situation which is on principle, by establishment, not serious. After dinner, nothing is serious. Ever heard an English speaker after dinner? It's just terrible. It's as bad as a comic strip. I mean, there is no seriousness after -- in an after-dinner spe- --. Have you heard a typical after-dinner speaker? Who has? Well, there are even -- as you know, books who give you all the off-color stories you have to tell then.

So no wonder that Homer also tells an off-color story about the gods in -- where is the famous off-color story on the gods in the -- in The Odyssey.

({ }.)

Right. Which book is it, do you remember?

(In the first book, { }.)

What? Well, you'd better look it up right away at home. And bring it next time to class; we'll have a look at it.

Well, I mean to say, gentlemen. The poet is in a nonserious situation. He cannot help this. His public is relaxed. His public doesn't want to act. His public doesn't want to go to battle -- when he -- while he sings. It does want to digest. And it is just as little serious as The Reader's Digest. That's Ho- -- all pieces of literature are -- have -- are -- live in a second-rate reality.

So Homer can speak of man and things in the right style. It -- they are not harmed if you look at them with a sense of relaxation, recreation, distance, and even humor. But as soon as you speak of the cult of your city, gentlemen, with a sense of humor, you are no longer contributing to the lifeblood of the cult. And gentlemen, who is a god? God is a power that is present at this moment in this classroom. If God is omnipresent, I cannot blaspheme. And I hope I do not blaspheme. I am serious. I am aware of the fact that -- even our playful classroom here is under His augury.

The poet must try to get the gods into his speech, into his -- into his fire-side talk, and so he speaks playfully about them. And in -- with regard to his theology, I would then say -- sum it all up: Homer is a philosopher. That is, he speaks of God -- of the gods as his second impressions. They are all after-thoughts, his thoughts about the gods. They are not his first thoughts. They are not the words of prayer, you see. They are not the words of the -- of -- of Revelation. They are not the words of -- of -- out of a Book of Psalms, but they are the -- you see, the -- the off-color stories. They are the second-rate, the anecdotes, the legends, you may say, about the gods.

So with regard to the gods, Homer is a philosopher. And he has made it inevitable that the Greek philosophers distance, remove themselves from the cult of their individual city. When we come to Plato and Aristotle and ask ourselves: whose cult was important for them, was central for their own existence? -- you

will come to the strange answer, gentlemen, that the cult of friendship was the serious substitute for the cult of the local gods, for a Greek philosopher. Aristotle prayed to his friend. That's a great example of the seriousness of friendship, gentlemen. Whenever you get into po- -- the arts and sciences, you will find that they are not serious about the religion of the tribe, or of the country. But they must have some {full} devotion. And it is usually the devotion to their friends, which knows no bounds and where they go to any sacrifice.

If you look at the French, gentlemen. In 1789, as you know, France built in the two religions. One, the religion of the republic, and the other the religion of the Catholic Church. It's the tragedy of France that you have no Protestants in France. You only have free-thinkers, so-called, and Roman Catholics. It's -- the country has perished, by and large, from this split between red and black.

Now if you want to define the cult of these two groups, it is very easy.

The -- all the free thinkers of France have a cult of friendship. And an absolute, infinite one. I mean, there is an absolute solidarity which you do not know. On Montmartre, or in the salons of France, the one thing that is absolutely reliable is friendship. People who are poor themselves will pay rent to a friend so to support his work and his genius. And they will say nothing about it. And it will be concealed in him. There is a solidarity and a taking care of talent and friends in -- in -- in France. Quite unknown in this country. Here there is general charity, yes. But there is specific cult. My friend is given me, you see, as a unique creature. It cannot be replaced by 10 other friends, you see. At a- -- not at all. This creature is not a generalization. It's still a religion.

Will you t- -- take it down, gentlemen: that where philosophy does play around with the gods in Heaven, over the -- in the sky over a city, of a local community, there still is the cult of friendship. And that goes through all Greek philosophy, and is, of course, meant, what I called to you the dedication. But we have an altar built by Aristotle to his friend. We have of course the cult of Plato himself in his Academy. We have the cult of Socrates to which Plato dedicated himself. And if you read the -- the best elucidation of this cult of friendship as a serious business, not a sense of humor and friendship, gentlemen, all what you think is necessary. Friends -- there's no sense of humor. I mean -- a friend who goes astray makes you cry. You can't laugh about him. It costs you heart-blood, if you see him perish. Now this cult of friendship, which is lost in this generation, on yours -- I always pity you. I see thousands of Dartmouth graduates graduate without having a friend, you have only classmates.

The best description of this friendship of antiquity is in the -- I think I

mentioned it to you already, in Montaigne, the {28th} chapter of the first book of his essays, the great Frenchman. He is -- has given the simplest expression to the cult of friendship. That is, when you throw out the sense of wonder in the logos, of the whole universe, or of your city, in the cult of the Catholic Church or of the pope, you have to r- -- introduce another cult. And all -- never believe a free thinker when he says he has no god. They all pray for their friendship. And all France is in -- then in these two parties: the cult of friendship on the one-hand side, and the cult of Mary and her Son on the other hand.

And you must know this. Otherwise you are betrayed. You think there are atheists in the world, gentlemen. That doesn't exist. I've never seen an atheist. A Communist, doesn't he believe in the party? I mean, everybody has his cult, you see. It is one of the greatest nonsenses. You can, of course, have a cult of yourself, I mean, a narcissic -- you can have a mirror on your -- on your -- on your desk. And the famous saying about a chancellor of the Russian Empire in the old times, he's -- they said he -- he has such a cult of his own personality, that he -- il se mire dans son l'encrier. That is, he uses his ink stand as a mirror for the beauty of himself, you see. He looks even into an ink stand, as -- only to get his own picture there, aggrandize.

Gentlemen, cult -- the cult is a necessary ingredient of life. And you can test this, gentlemen, when you ask yourself: what keeps you going for- -- between the start of a difficult enterprise in your own life, and its end? That's the god who then -- whom you worship. Take a -- somebody who decides that he wants to woo the daughter of a -- of a rich house. And he's far from being sure that she wants to marry him. She may spend a weekend with him, but marriage is a different matter, as you know. What keeps him going? What gives him the faith to carry through this, while nobody is allowed to know it, nobody else -- that's always the test, you see, makes -- is then the god whom he worships. That's either his own beautiful self. He's a movie star who thinks he's just irresistible, you see. Well, then he's his own divinity. Or it is -- another conviction. His good star. That's an astrological deity, a very minor deity. But -- or you write a book. You begin in 1956 to plan this book. You can only publish it in 1963. Gentlemen, what keeps you going during these seven years? All these seven years everybody thinks you are a fool. You cannot prove to anybody that the book will be a success, you see. The people think you should invest in something better than your own manuscript, you see. You -- you -- you destroy your career, perhaps, because you have to write this book. Now, the power that keeps you alive in these seven years, you see, that's of course your divinity.

So only a -- it is -- it is simply a lack of -- lack of intelligence if a man says

there are people who do not worship a god. The difficulty is only: which god? You can worship a very limited god, or you can worship the true God. That's the only distinction.

Now in Homer then, there is this great problem, that since he is an after-dinner poet, he does diminish the reality of the -- the seriousness of the gods. That is, the first impressions of the cult in which we grow up, you see, are reduced there; and some people have felt, as Plato, that they are reduced to shambles. And Plato's hatred of Homer comes from this fact, that he said, "This teacher is not a teacher," you see, "of good things," because by imitating, by becoming an after-dinner speaker -- speaker, he makes the gods out to be foul creatures. And so he -- so Plato's hatred comes from the lack of reverence of Homer for the gods. The strange thing is, gentlemen, that Plato of course is not deeply interested in the Homeric gods, that you cannot get a lesson in polytheism and the cult of Athens when you read Plato. And most of you will think that after all, philosophers never worship. I warn you against this. It is not true about antiquity. We have already seen this about Lucretius. The thing is much more complex, gentlemen.

Perhaps at -- in the end -- at the end of this course, you will understand that cult and philosophy are like breathing in and breathing out, that you can't have one without the other. Just as your friend believes in you while you are despondent, and inspires you in this sense, you -- still you can get your breath back, so the cult always enters your life when you are weak. And you always dismiss the cult when you are strong. When the god enters you, and you are inspired, you feel good, then you are philosophize -- and you are in power. But we aren't always in power. Most of the time, we are sound asleep. So then we must hope that somebody else looks after us. The -- another Frenchman -- all Frenchmen know about the cult of friendship so well, the famous Exupéry.

What's his first name?

(Antoine.)

Wie?

(Antoine.)

Antoine d'Exupéry, yes. He has written that the simplest cult of friendship was in the fact when one pilot -- and another were together, and one was -- has fallen asleep, that his friend would simply push his arm under the other's neck

so that he might not get -- wake up with a stiff neck when -- when he wakes up from sleep -- and that this gesture of sympathy, or of help, you see, was the tenderest expression of his -- his cult of friendship. A very important notion. Don't look too far for your own cult, gentlemen. It's much nearer to your heart than you think. You don't have to join a mighty church of 400 million faithful so that you have religion. Everybody has religion. There is just nobody who hasn't. So the relation of Homer to philosophy perhaps has been clarified. It is complex. With regard to the gods, he does philosophize more than with regard to things, and to men. But now comes the fourth point. The fourth point about Homer is, gentlemen, that he introduces to you and me something which we take today for granted, but which is an invention of Greece. That is the metaphor. There are -- Homer's poetry is famous for its comparisons. We have already read one ourselves, that Achilles gets up, compared to whom? Anybody remembers last time?

(That was Agamemnon --.)

(The lion.)

Like the lion. Now you -- you say, "Well, that's just a simile," or a metaphor, whatever you like to tell it. A simile. And the similes are strewn like diamonds throughout Homer. And the similes are much longer very often than just the -- this, you see, we have already heard of the simile in the catalog of the ships, where man is compared to what?

(Bees.)

Wie?

(Bees.)

To the bees. Or to the leaves, or to the buds. Gentlemen, you all use in English these -- these similes. And I think they -- in creative writing, you are probably taught quite a bit about it. Now will you kindly understand that first impressions never speak in similes, but mean what they say. The language of the cult, which calls -- speaks of God's heart, or God's wrath, or God's right finger, means exactly what it says. God's right finger and nothing else. That's not a simile. That's not a sublime figure of speech. I always would like to kill the man who speaks in -- of -- of the liturgy as figures -- sublime figures of speech.

I -- I read yesterday a sermon of a friend of mine, a good liberal, good enlight- -- a good man of the Enlightenment. And he shouldn't have become a preacher, because he destroys the liturgy, if -- if these are just figures of speech. We speak of God as we must speak of Him, or we shouldn't speak of Him at all. There's no embellishment about Go- -- God ha- -- God's right finger is pointing towards you, or we shouldn't speak at all.

There are no such figures of speech, gentlemen, in our first-impression society. In the group in which we grow up, it is simply so that we have to use these terms and there are no others. Gentlemen, in any real society, there are no synonyms. Will you take this down? In all real societies, there are no synonyms. You cannot s- -- call the president of United States a "great chief." He is the president of the United States. The great chief is not a synonym for the president. Don't you see that? If you don't call him the president, you make him into a tyrant, perhaps, or the king of England, or what-not. He is the president, and that's the only legitimate expression.

Now "president" is a metaphor, because it means somebody who sits in front of the table, you see. But it is a necessary metaphor, and that doesn't deserve any more the term "metaphor," because it's the only way in which we can speak.

Gentlemen, all original speech, if you want to have it this way, is metaphorical. And there o- -- is no other speech. If I say that the king has to have a scepter in order to be able to -- to command silence, or that we are under -- his hand, or under his care, that's a necessary way of speaking. There is no other way of saying the thing. The law says that he wields the scepter of this country. And that's all there is to it.

You will never understand speech, gentlemen, if you do not understand that first impressions have to be expressed in an unshaken terminology. You cannot say to a child that the father of Jesus Christ is a supreme being without poking fun at the fact that you ask this child to pray to "Our Father in Heaven." He is either "Our Father in Heaven" or He's nobody. He's not "the supreme being." That's a philosophical term good for Free Masons. It's a second-rate expression. All philosophy has called God a supreme being. It's always the end of religion. God is not a supreme being. It's a nonsensical expression. I've written a whole book ab- -- on this. And my paper, as you know, which I gave you, contains the reasons why it is not a good idea to call God "the supreme being," because "being" is just a go- -- word good for the nursery. It is not for serious people. Call anything "being."

My paper has just this -- this -- this purpose, of shaking you up so that you know that philosophical language is second-rate. All philosophical language, because it reduces first-rate language, you see, to generalizations, has to admit of poetry as a refresher course, so to speak. After you say that Achilles was just a man, in order to build -- rebuild A- -- Achilles in your estimate, you have to say he's like a lion. However, if you live in a family, and your father is just your father, it is not necessary to tell the child that your father -- his father is like a lion. He knows very much how powerful the father is. He is just himself. He is the father, and that is a lionlike situation, you see. And the metaphor only comes in after the child has heard in school that his father is just a man like everybody else. Then it is very necessary that the mother, when the child comes home and the son is disrespectful of the father, says, "But your father is like a lion," you see, "and watch out. His paw may come down on you."

So gentlemen, metaphors come only after philosophy has entered the scenes. When we generalize, or after we begin to rationalize, you have to bring back by poetry the original power of your first life, of the golden age of youth in which you have no such doubts, and have no such belittlements of your environment, where you don't call your mother, "The Old Woman" but -- or the "Old Lady," but you say, "She's my mother." As long as she is your mother, you see, no room for metaphor.

Metaphor is only -- it is like this, you see. In our first impressions, we are immediately related to the divine as it comes to us in our family or in our locality. The whole divine spirit is upon us. It is not compared with anything else, it isn't -- we aren't frustrated by saying, "Oh, we are just one out of a million." But once you begin to say these blasphemous words, "I'm just a human being," by which always your -- your philosophizing begins today, "I'm just a human being," there you dismiss yourself out of the whole inspirational environment, you see. What your father and your mother have said, what the teacher has said, and what the church has said, the local church, is always missed, because you now are generalizing and say, "I'm just a human being." In this moment you are powerless. In this moment, you are deficient of grace. And in this moment, poetry enters the scene, and tries by metaphors to bring back, you see, the same. So we start here on a certain level of power in the family. Then we dismiss it, and poetry tries to rebuild it. Poetry is then, gentlemen, in intimate relation to philosophy. Philosophy is reducing first impressions, you see. Poetry is bringing back first impressions. And the means by which poetry brings back first impressions is metaphor, simile. After Achilles has become "just a human

being," he must be compared to a lion to bring him back. But gentlemen, in the first cult -- pick an Indian tribe, the man wears the mask of a lion, and speaks like a lion, and roars like a lion, because he is not like him -- he is the lion, you see, {rages} -- his name is called "Lion." That's not a metaphor. That's a way of trying to say who he is. It's an -- attempt to identify him. Do you see the difference?

Now nothing is more vicious today as your treatment in literature and English departments, and French departments, and humanity departments, of this whole rubrum of simile and synonyms. You all think that man can live by synonyms, gentlemen. Synonyms are second-rate. Every child should grow up with "spade is a spade" and "yes is yes" and "no is no." And "no" is not a synonym for "yes."

You know the famous story of the -- of -- of course, of the lady and the diplomat. Who knows -- who does know this story? Na ja. Will you tell it? ({ } who doesn't know it { }). Sorry.)

Well, that's -- they don't know the -- they think your "yes" is -- is "no" and "no" is "yes." Isn't that true? But everybody laughs because everybody feels that these two people are -- of course, outside the pale.

The diplomat deals with the -- the external society only, you see. Therefore nobody can expect him to speak the truth. He must have synonyms. Well -- is anybody going to -- does everybody know the story?

(No.)

Well, who is willing to tell it? Oh, many -- 20 or 30. Sir, you tell the story.

(Well --)

Get up and tell it.

(I'm not sure if I remember the context. A lady -- no. A woman, if she says "no," she means "yes.")

No, "perhaps." She means "perhaps."

(She means "maybe." If she says "maybe," she means "yes." If she says

"yes," she's no lady. On the other hand, a diplomat, if he says "yes," he means "maybe." If he says "maybe," he means "no." And if he says "no," then he's not a diplomat.)

It's a very great story. Thank you. Let's have a break here.

[tape interruption]

...immediately given in the Greek -- in the Greek world. Once you have to generalize, you have to replace the loss of warmth and energy by poetry. It's very strange. The arts and sciences go hand in hand. If you take sciences in the plural as a force that makes for philosophy, philosophy is the unifying link between all sciences. And the more you generalize, gentlemen, the more you have to build up the energy lost in this way for your first impressions, for your heart, by poetry. And that's why metaphor and simile are the lifeblood of poetry, you see. But don't mistake poetry for first language. A psalm is not a poem. I always read this in liberal literature today. A psalm is not a poem. And a poem is not a psalm. And you can turn your -- stand on your head, and you can never get the two things into the same bracket. A psalm is -- Ja?

(Isn't there a rhyme -- isn't Homer something like { } between a poet and philosopher?)

Ja, ja. It is an incredible creation, you see. And -- but the Greeks, you see -- the tragedy of Greece is that their state and their church were losing in power. And are -- they are the country of art -- the arts and sciences. That's why the liberal arts college is based on the -- on the Greeks, you see. They have given us the arts and the sciences. So they -- because they are the greatest poets and the greatest philosophers. And you cannot say that they are the greatest builders of empires, you see, or the greatest builders of churches. Neither have they given us a true religion, nor they -- have they given us a true state. As I said, they have never abolished slavery, you see. They have never been able to make peace, 300 cities. To the end of -- of their Greek independence, they would all go to war against each other. Even when the Romans were already conquering Greek in 146, the various cities of Greek were at each other's throats. They couldn't unite. They had to be conquered from the outside for this reason.

It's a little bit like Europe today. The Europeans are the Greeks. Beware of the Greeks in this sense. For politics, they aren't -- just no good. You see it in France. You see it in Germany. You see it in all European countries. Not even Holland, and Belgium, and Luxembourg can unite. They cannot. You see, they

are full of philosophers. But philosophers are impotent to create first the obedience, the loyalty which come in the first order of life. They cannot. They are only there for generalization.

(Could you go back to your distinction between a psalm and a poem?)

A psalm is necessary for my soul. A poem is a delight for my mind. That's a great difference. In a psalm, I find myself what -- gentlemen, oh, you may perhaps -- of course, it's not my business in this course, but perhaps I simply shall define what I mean by this. Very simple, gentlemen. In a prayer, the man who prays, recognizes himself. If you say "Father," you know that you are a son. If you say "Brother," you know that you are a brother. A sister is only a sister as long as there are -- is a brother, for example. If St. Francis prays to -- "O Brother Sun, and Sister Moon," that is for Francis important. That's why we have to pray.

We praise the Lord, gentlemen, so that we know that we are His children. Do not think that you can add an inch to the grandeur of God. But you can add very much to your own grandeur by praying to the -- your creator. That is, gentlemen, man knows in earnestness who he is by the way he speaks to others. Your addressing anyone gives you status. If the -- if these damned representatives from the South dare in a Senate committee to -- or a repr- -- House of -- committee, you see, to talk to the -- to the -- to the dir- -- president of -- Brotherhood of Pullman Porters only by first name, he feels very good about it, you see, because he gains status, this Southern gentleman, by calling any colored person with his first name. That's what they do. That's one way of asserting white supremacy. You see how important it is. If this man had -- would have to say, "Mr. Smith" to this man, he would come down from his pedestal, would he not? Very simple.

And that's how simple life is, gentlemen. You look far too far for your religion. Every day that you talk to a man, you give yourself status. If you say, "Mr." or "Professor" to me, you are a student, you see. And on it goes. Now prayer is an attempt to find our ultimate status. Obviously I cannot depend on my talking to you, or my talking to h- -- Mr. {Prenzler}, or my talking to any one of you, for getting my status, you see.

Prayer is then the desperate attempt to get out of all these accidental statuses which you give me, and my environment gives me, and the president of this college gives me, and the tax collector gives me, you see, and to find out who I really am. It's a desperate attempt, prayer, gentlemen, to sing yourself into

your proper place in the cosmic order. That's why it is inexorable. Everybody prays. The apes pray for their own grandeur. I mean, the -- these atheists, these sociologists, the psychologists whom I know, they are constantly trying to make themselves -- assure themselves that they know better, that they are superior. Nobody knows why. But they all tell you so, that they look into the secrets of human society, don't they? By some trick. I don't know which trick. You find this -- this -- this is the scientist's greatest temptation, then. Because he knows something, he is therefore superior. And sci- -- knowledge is power. It may be power, gentlemen, but it certainly -- usually is also wickedness.

Prayer is a very simple attempt to find one's bearings. Poetry is not this, {Prenzler}, don't you see? A poem is in addition to my status, you see, an expanse of feeling. And it is therefore not my prayer, a poem, but it is written -- it's a generalization on this state of despair, so to speak, in general, you see. I do not expect from a poem what I expect from a prayer. From a prayer, I expect to be answered, my dear man. But for a poem, unfortunately I expect to be read, which is a very different I -- aim and purpose. Prayers are not printed, and poems are. That's the whole difference.

There's a very good law in our churches that a man may publish his sermons, but he may not print his prayers. And yet if he is a good churchman -- I had a friend here. You'll remember him, Dr. Vernon, whose prayers were the excessive greatness in his services here. And he was a preacher here in Dar- -- Hanover. And -- and his sermons were -- well, they were good, but there was nothing extra. But his prayers you could not forget. And he -- I owe it to him that he says, "Prayers are unprintable." They are not to be printed. They come once from the bosom of your heart, and, you see, never again. That's why they are specific. They are not general, you see. And the greatest character, gentlemen, of the specific, of the concrete is that it cannot be repeated. A poem you can -- read 20 times. The same prayer is not the same prayer if prayed at another occasion, you see. It just isn't, I mean. This word comes upon your mouth at this moment, with necessity and urgency. So a -- a real prayer of a real preacher is once forever.

The -- gentlemen, the greatest things are the frailest things. Anything that is as big as a dreadnought is not important. Dreadnoughts are not important. But a baby is important. It's so frail. And that's -- true of a prayer. It's like a breath of life. And the breath of life cannot be repeated. It's just -- you cannot buy it, gentlemen. You cannot put it in a safe. You cannot have -- a bank account. It's now or never.

All first impressions, gentlemen, then have this quality, that they cannot be repeated. They cannot be put on ice. The proper prayer on Armistice days can only be said once by a nation. And since we didn't celebrate Armistice Day this -- war, we are cursed. This country has not been able to pray for the end of this war, and there is no peace in the world to this day. And this is the curse of -- all over the world, gentlemen, that the two world wars ended without prayer. They have not ended, yet. They are still there in the hearts of men. You are all -- you don't know it, gentlemen, that you are mentally all sick, not in -- as persons, but as members of nations who did not know how to end war. It's a deep mental sickness all over the world for this reason.

You can philosophize about peace, gentlemen. That's not meaning co- -- making peace. That's not concluding peace. Concluded peace has to be concluded by the serious words spoken of the -- by the co- -- political and religious community now. And it was missed. And we have missed -- and we are dragging this chain of not making peace to this day. And the whole world is sick with it. The -- call it the Cold War. But it is much deeper, gentlemen. It is an impotence of your spirit to allow the statesman to say this one word. Everybody had to s- -- some general ideas, gentlemen. That's not how nations live. They don't live by general ideas.

We live in a -- in a philosophical and poetical universe, gentlemen, without the power of creating peace. Very simple. Because peace cannot be made by poets, and cannot be made by philosophers. Once you understand this, you understand my whole course, in the -- the Greek philosophers could not make peace. They had eternal war. And they ended, as you know, as non-Greeks. They were just swallowed up. First by Alexander the Great, and later by the Romans.

The more you cultivate one-sidedly pagan philosophy and art, gentlemen, the more you deprive yourself of your power to educate your children. Because children want the faith, and they want the law. They don't want embellishments, and doggerels, and comic strips, and movies. That's utterly unimportant for children. You all overfeed your -- your youngsters. They don't need this -- these entertainment. A decent child doesn't need to be entertained. Life is so interesting for a young child if you allow him to work, and to participate. The rest is all nonsense. And the child wants to learn, of course. You don't allow the child to learn. You always allow -- force a child to play. A child -- a child wants to enter serious business.

So we live now in -- no, I won't go into it. It's -- doesn't matter.

But it is always -- what I try to do, gentlemen, is to show you the -- the achievements of the Greeks. I'm certainly an -- a great admirer of their achievements for all of us, and their limitations. You have to see both in one, which is difficult.

Now, the second -- the -- the -- phase from Homer, gentlemen, to Plato is a very precise phase. The Greeks' philosophy, the first half, consists -- or the first third -- consists in the attempt to try: how far they can do without first impressions. How far can they reduce -- can they scalp all first impressions? And how far can then generalization go? It's like a great intoxication, gentlemen. From the first philosopher, Thales of Miletus, around 500 A.D., to Plato, 200 years are devoted to the problem: how far can we do only with generalizations? And the entering -- the -- the -- the high point of this period is the name Parmenides. Parmenides is a great man. You know it already from my paper, and you have to read it still next time, please, every one of you, so that I can base my next lecture on this assumption, on the fact that Parmenides says, "I will talk to people who forget their first impressions. I can only talk to people who forget their first impressions. I shall talk about being. That is, I shall scalp all verbs, all men of their proper title or name. I shall only talk in -- in pronouns." Well, only say, "he" and "she," and "it," and we'll see how far we can get.

It's an attempt, gentlemen, to erase the political community from the minds of the thinker. And is an attempt you all make to make a clear -- have a clear slate in your mind and begin from scratch. A great temptation. The first man who tried to do this is Parmenides. So compared to Homer, it's just the opposite, Homer is in love with all the Greek cities, and says, "Forward to unity." Parmenides says, "My unity is only to be had under the condition that none of you is a member of any one city in his memory any more, you see." That we have a clean slate. It's just your { }. You are all Parmenideses, { }, every one of you, I think, is produce- -- as a product of an American high school or college has this vast -- vague idea that it would be best if his mind would be made into a clean slate, so that all his new concepts are correct. And -- just as Montaigne has written the high song of Greek friendship, so there is a famous biography of Descartes, Descartes, in his little booklet, the great Frenchman Cartesius has said, "If I only could have a mind swept clean from all the cobwebs which I learn -- put -- were put on it in the first 20 years of my life." That's a very good ex- -- explanation of the Greek ideal, you see, to have not lived in the first 20 years under the erroneous first impressions.

Now anybody who can fall for this and doesn't laugh at poor Mr.

Déscartes, gentlemen, is a real Greek. I laugh at Déscartes. I think he's ridiculous. I owe everything to my first 20 years. And I wouldn't give it for anything in the world. And to say that I should awaken to my thoughts to -- 20 years, would -- I know that I would just be a brute, terrible man, a monster. And -- like mathematicians, they're usually human monsters.

And it is an incredible idea, that these first wonderful 20 years should not have allowed me to enlist the impressions of the morning star, and of morning glory, and of my parents and of my sisters, and my -- this is just incredible. I can't understand even -- the man is insane to me. But there is -- are two parties, gentlemen. I think in this room, if we take an impartial vote, 98 percent of you would vote that Déscartes and the Greeks have a good idea -- Parmenides, in this attempt to wipe clean the slate from the impressions of the polis, of the community. What is the polis? Environment. Everything that has worked on you, and to begin from scratch, you see. You would have nothing to work with. In order to generalize, gentlemen, you have had to have particular impressions. Otherwise you don't know what you're talking about. A generalization, gentlemen, without a root, a stem on which it is built up as the bud of this stem, you see, and has no roots, is -- lunacy, real lunacy. Most people, gentlemen, whom we call "lunatics" have generalities in their minds without the first experience, you see, the first impression. "Lunacy" is a very good word for this, a moo- -- you see, the lu- -- moon is up in the air. It has no roots in reality.

This is a very practical question for you, gentlemen. For all your decisions, can generalizations be arrived at without experience? That's the problem of Greek philosophy. And in the first 200 years, they -- people think they can. The idealists: we will create a world of generalities without experience. And Plato is -- and Socrates is the breaking point, so to speak, in which this flood, this tide is stemmed, and there comes the sobering up. And then they say, "Look, there is a limit," you see. "Man must be good if he -- his exper- -- ideas shall have any value." That is, what is goodness: first impression, first attitude, a direct relation to life, you see. Not a secondhand one.

So the history of Greek philosophy, gentlemen, runs from Thales to Socrates in the attempt to forget first loyalties. I will now not say "first impressions." You will understand why not. To make a man a member of the sect of philosophers, you see, by erasing his membership in the previous community of his little hometown, by saying, "Forget that you once were coerced by the policeman of your little town, and learn that you couldn't make a noise at midnight in the street. That's not necessary for your philosophy." Gentlemen, it is necessary. I assure you. You must have made the experience of a police force first, before you

can judge about the best state, whether it should have a police force or not. You don't know what you're talking about, {otherwise}.

Now the practical question, gentlemen, is: what was the fruit of this tremendous assault of the sons of man, of these titans of the mind, to do without their city? It's a great story. And to give you today only an introduction, I want you then -- of course, we will deal with Mrs. -- here Miss, the lady's very good book. We know very little of these first thinkers. But they must have made an admirable impression in the great plight of the Greek cities against this tremendous power of Persia, and the Oriental empires, these many cities of the Greeks. As we find in the battle of Troy -- war of Troy, try to build up something that would unify them. You must understand that this is a political aim, although it seems that it is only an aiming for truth. But if I replace my Miletian religion, or Ephesian religion, or whatever the city is from which they come, by some generalization, I still say it in Greek that I want to appeal to all the Greeks that we can agree, and of course then also come to common action similar to the Trojan War, and resist the Persians. And you must never forget that from 582 to 410, the battle against the Orient ennobles the -- the -- the -- the zest for a Greek philosophy. The Greek philosophy seems to be able -- all this time to replace the little home city, you see. "If we can get a common doctrine, if we can -- got a general philosophy," these people feel, "then we are Greeks against Persia." That is, this little group of 500,000 people, perhaps, you see, can then feel that it has a front against these millions on the mainland of Asia.

So philosophy, of course, is at that time a political force. And to prove you my point, I -- going to give you my explanation of the philosophy of Thales. If you open book -- the book here by Mrs. {Freeman}, on Page 18, you will find that we know very little. But we know one thing, that he must have said that everything is water, that he reduced then all the distinctions of the universe to one source element. Just as we would say today, "everything is electronics." The people say it without understanding what it is. Nobody knows what an electron is, but it sounds very good if you -- you are up to date, if you say everything today is electron. Nothing is said with it, to tell you the truth, you see, except that you create a common religion for Russians and Americans. If everybody says, "Everything is electron," you see, we are outside the polis of Russia and America, are we not? We talk about something third. That's very helpful, you see, because we can do this without hitting on each other's head, you see. The Russians say, "Everything is economics," I don't know what Americans say. They think everything is dollars. It's not much difference in my mind. But it -- still it sounds different. But if you say, "Everything is electronics," you have already a common vocabulary.

Now gentlemen, with Thales, who said "Everything is water," it is not only the greatness of the conception that the whole world was one, but I'll tell you very practically how important this was. The Greeks lived around the salty sea. The great civilizations of Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt, who had invented all the sciences -- writing, and reading, and astronomy, and agriculture, plows, the building of temples, the stone masonry, all the surveying power, all the arithmetic and geometry known in 700 to the rest of the world, that was all Egyptian, and Assyrian, and Babylonian. And it was all based on civilizations that cultivated fresh water -- civilizations, rivers, you see, river civilizations.

Now for a man who lived on the Mediterranean, the first attempt had been to imitate these civilizations, and to build temples to Zeus for his rain, as giving water to the earth, Hera, and to imitate the cult then, in some form or other, I won't go into details. In my course in 58, we go into it in great detail, but we can't do it here. To imitate these freshwater cults, so to speak, of agriculture in the smaller way, in Athens, and in Sparta, and everywhere. Anybody who reads a Greek tragedy will find vestiges of this imitation in their religion. Also in Homer, there is a great story, the great metaphor in The Iliad -- will you do me the favor this -- these four people there and look up the place in Iliad -- The Iliad where -- where Hera and Zeus are in the terms of Homeric poetry entering their sacred marriage? That is, the embrace of Heaven and earth so that the earth may bear fruit. That's a cult of the -- Egypt -- Egypt. Now Thales breaks with this cult, because he says that the saltwater, and the ponds, and the rain, and the freshwater -- it's all one.

That's -- is a tremendous achievement, I think, which is never stressed in our modern books, on Thales and the Greeks, that to call all these waters fundamentally one is already one great logical achievement. Because originally, of course, the water of the Nile is a totally different water from the water of the sea. It's just a different -- it hasn't even the same name. If you live in -- ever come to Egypt, gentlemen, you will be impressed by the fact that wherever the Americans dig a well in Cairo, or somewhere else in Egypt, they assume that this wonderful sanitation will impose on the Egyptians so that these poor fellahin will run and get the artesian water, because it's sterilized, and is -- has no bacteria. Oh, lo and behold! Not one of these Egyptians is ever going to touch artesian well water. They run down to the River Nile, with all the dead crocodiles in it, and drink it, because it's sacred. Because Nile water cannot be replaced by any other water.

In other words, gentlemen, the Egyptians to this day are pre-philosophi-

cal. They cannot generalize Nile water by putting it one category with other water. Its just is itself -- a thing by itself. And I mean this. I have seen it with my own eyes. I have talked to these men. I have tried to persuade them to drink the water of the Chicago House in Luxor. And they laughed at us, and said we were just these barbaric fools. We didn't know the qualities of Nile water, you see. Nile water is just not water.

To you this is very difficult, gentlemen. But if you want to understand real, human thinking, you cannot distinguish sharply enough, you see, between concrete experience and your -- what you call "experiences." Yours is all abstract. You go to 16 countries in Europe. So you never go to any one of them, of course. Because if there are 16, you never have the quality of every -- any one of them by its own name, you see. Austrian -- Austria, you see, it's not the 16th country of Europe. But for an American, it probably is the 16th country of Europe.

And you know the two Americans { } back, they got quarreling. Had they been to Austria? And the one man said, "Yes, we have been."

"And how can we prove it?" said the other.

"Because the porter at the hotel wore a blue cap." That was the only specific notion they had of Austria, you see.

You can't think in specific terms. To you, the whole world, gentlemen, is just a philosophical universe. To you, the generalization comes before the specific. We live in a -- we are a strange humanity, gentlemen. We are a second growth. Chesterton -- once said, you see, we are children of a second birth. We are post-philosophical. The wor- -- world of the Greeks has perished, in which second thought, you see, came after first thought. You are all brought up in all our schools by first -- not -- no, by second thoughts. So you think, "All men come first, you see, and then there is United States." But for the child of the Nile water, you see, the water of the Nile is something that is clearly a different item, a specific, you see. You cannot subsume it under "water."

If you cannot understand this, you cannot understand the driving force of Greek philosophy. It has given us this aloofness. That even what your five senses perceive to you is no longer a swallow. It's just a bird. It's not a swallow, you see. But for a Greek, of course, a swallow is not a nightingale. A nightingale is not a swallow. And the general expression "bird" -- hmph -- very doubtful, you see. They don't care for that, you see. They speak of real -- real animals by their own name. An elephant and an insect cannot be both lumped together as animals.

That has to be learned, you see, and can only be carried to a certain point. Otherwise it becomes meaningless. To you, that isn't true. You call everything a "thing." You are already thing-thinkers, aren't -- you not? You see. Therefore, we all -- I too -- have a trouble in -- in knowing that we owe it to Thales that the generality "water," you see, was created out of the water in the sky, and the water on the -- in the -- in the pond, and the water in the ocean, and the water in the sea. He made one, which already abstracts, don't you see? That this is already an uprooting of man's religious relation to the god of water, to the god of the ocean, who was the greatest god, even in Greek religion. He was the father of everything else, you see. But that was all saltwater. Very specific water. It had nothing to do with the Zeus water, which was rain. Okeanos, o- -- the ocean, was the first god of the Greek theology of the explanation of the order of the universe.

So this is what I have to say today, gentlemen. I cannot go into all these first Greek philosophers with the same eagerness, so to speak. I cannot admire them quite so much as Thales. But Thales had been to Egypt. We know this. And Thales had studied Egyptian priest lore. And Thales knew the importance of the Nile water, which is a great mystery, because it rises in the summer, when all other rivers dry out. It never rains in Egypt. You must know this, too. So for a man who came home to Miletus, in the middle of the Mediterranean Sea, you see, he brought -- brought a great news: "Gentlemen," he said, "We do not have to think that the Egyptians have an -- a total advantage of us. They have a world by themselves. We can look into their laws, and priest lore, you see, and try to get something we have in common. Because if I have discovered that when { } everything to the Nile, you see, they would have to -- we have similarities. We can penetrate into the common denominator."

So gentlemen, Thales discovers what you take for granted, that there is for all things a common denominator. Perhaps you take this down, gentlemen, that you should learn, from the first philosopher of whom we have the name and the personality, what it means to create a common denominator, where there hasn't been one before. Nobody had before dared to call Nile water and rain water with the same name, really, because one was Zeus', you see, gift, and the other was the gift of the Nile. One was from the sky, and the other was from the bottom up. The common denominator gives you, I think, a good label, a good emblem for the first achievement of philosophy. Therefore for us, and you and me, it doesn't matter that he calls "water" the common denominator. Obviously the important thing is the idea of a common denominator. Can you see this? You can

shift then. You can say something else is the common denominator. But you still have now the notion that you can reduce all concrete things to one common background, to one common denominator.

And there you see the scalping of names. The Nile goes, you see. Down to Thales of Miletus -- let me finish this as a -- a very flagrant example. The Greeks had tried to imitate the Egyptian cult, and had given to a little river, for example, a little brook in Boeotia, near Thebes, the name "Nile." That is, as you have "Norwich" here, and -- and "Hartford," you see, and you have it in Connecticut, you have it in Ohio, the same name was made to migrate. The -- Thales said, "Don't do this anymore. You don't have to call the river in Thebes 'Nile.' The -- it just doesn't play the same role as the Nile in Egypt. That's just an -- an -- an illusion. Look. In Boeotia, the rain from Heaven gives you the fertility. Therefore, arrange your cult in a different manner," you see. "Do not cultivate the cult of the Nile."

The common denominator then, gentlemen, indeed frees from imitation. And when you read in the -- Plato's Republic, in the 10th book, that he turns against the imitators, you see now why. An imitator in Miletus, another man like Thales, would have said, "We must have a Nile in Miletus if we want to have the wisdom and the quality of the Egyptians." A man who invents the common denominator can ask, "Which other form of water plays the role of fertilization, you see, that the Nile does in Egypt?" And so you penetrate behind the word "Nile." Can you see this?

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...acting as the teacher of philosophers in Greece. He is not a philosopher in the sense that he wants to strip individual cases of their proper names. We have talked about this. And that's the essence of philosophy, to generalize, to subsume more than one differently named thing under the same heading, as you all do, every day. You are all philosophically inclined. You want to generalize. You say, "That's sex," and thereby you destroy your personal relations to your girl, because a girl is unique, and if you call it "sex relation," there is no relation, to speak of, left. That is not a relation with a girl. But that's a naturalistic relation, because this girl has a proper name. She is Elizabeth Smith. And Elizabeth Smith has no sex relations. But she either loves you or she doesn't love you. If you don't have the power to let her stand -- and this relation stand in its own right, you can never live. You'll remain the -- a psychic case for the analyst. Most of you crave this. You want to be somebody else's case. You want to be judged by some man who can -- or your mother, or so, who can chaperone you through life -- and "Oh, this is nothing but." And we said that all philosophy tries to say of all disturbing events, "This is nothing but."

If Dante had said, "Beatrice is nothing but a girl," he would have never written The Divine Comedy. If Washington had said, "This is just a rabble in arms" at the Boston Tea Party, he would not have ceased to be an English gentleman and become president of the United States, which nearly cost him his life, because he hated the rabble and all its -- their works. And he was not a rebel, and not a rabble. And he didn't belong to these bankrupts who started the rebellion in this country.

And therefore, gentlemen, you make life just as impossible as The Dartmouth when he today writes that this country, which is in a sound coma, is taking a decisive step by taking unasked and unrequired the case of Israeli to the United Nations. Have you see this ridiculous statement in The Dartmouth today? This man should be spanked. Who writes this -- this stuff? Huh?

(I did.)

You did? Well. Courageous man. Decisive. Decisive. We should be ashamed of such action. Nothing what these lawyers in -- Washington know except to talk. They have been warned -- warned for a whole year that this is brewing, you see. And now they feign as ob -- as -- this they are surprised. It's a great scandal, that the greatest country of the world knows nothing but to weep

like an old woman. Old women, that's what we are in foreign politics. And old women do not want to see that a new thing has happened. The -- they always recall -- reduce everything to precedent, to something that happened before. And that's philosophy, gentlemen, which wipes out this event as a unique event and says, "That comes under Paragraph Such-and-Such."

We said, however, there is one item in -- in Homer, where he really opens the way to this onslaught on all personal life, which is philosophy, because -- Homer is an after-dinner speaker. He cannot get his audience in the temple, or in the assembly, or in the army, or in court, or in the family -- the bedroom. He can only get his audience where? Where does a singer -- where does a -- an epis- -- where is it -- where is it sung? Wie? At a festival. And that's an unreal situation, because it's not even at the cult of the festival, but at the end of the festival, when everybody is -- makes -- is making merry.

And gentlemen, you must understand that there is -- is a limitation of art.

The public for art is not serious. The -- the only person serious in Hamlet is the -- Sha- -- is -- is Hamlet -- is -- is the poet, Shakespeare. But you, who buy a ticket, gentlemen, you are not possibly serious because you want to spend a pleasant evening. That's not serious. You are not willing to do anything but -- being amused. You want to be entertained. So the entertainment industry, gentlemen, has its limitations in the desire to be entertained by the people who buy the ticket.

And that is Homer's far-reaching first step. There have been, as far as we know, no such things in the world before, an epics -- a poetry, which was only there to entertain. All former poetry, gentlemen, has still connection with prayer, with cult, with -- war, battle song. That is, it had a serious purpose. For example, you take a battle song. That's the marching order. That makes you march, you see. And soldiers fight better. So it is not disconnected with serious business. You understand the difference? But your pinup girl, in the barracks of an -- of an army camp, that's different. That's for your entertainment. And that therefore undermines morale. They say it -- it enhances morale. I don't know. Maybe. But certainly it is not serious for the army as such. It's your private business.

And so the first public, gentlemen, out of a people is created by Homer.

And perhaps you take this down, because in this country as you know, there is today a -- a sad confusion between public and people. And any philosopher must know the difference. A people is -- you and me in serious business, at an election, at a marriage, at a funeral, in court as a witness. This is -- are the people. Today in America, however, you get away with murder if you pretend that the public is

the people. The public will not stand it. Gentlemen, the public is not the s- -- people, because the pub- -- the public is the irresponsible mob that wants to be entertained. And a statesman has to go for the people against the public. And to live by public opinion, gentlemen, is a bad policy, and I'm afraid you see at this moment, Sir, a great example of this going on in this country. The -- coun- -- country -- must -- can only live through people. It cannot live by public or -- by the public, because the public is nothing but sand dunes. It ch- -- shiftless. Has no root, has no time sense. It is in a hurry. It has -- is sensational. It's Hearst. We have this reputation in the rest of the world, did you read this -- this kind of rote -- name-call, I mean, about the -- Asiatics and the Africans, why they hate us, because they say we are only out for sex and murder. Any headline here is "Sex" and "Murder." That's for the public, gentlemen. Obviously it's not for the American people. And woe to you if you insist that the newspapers give you a cross-section of public -- people's -- the people's opinion. We are lost. You can only hang -- our head in shame and you can -- expect the rest of the -- the other four continents marching into this continent, destroying it and its wealth, just from hatred and contempt. All the goodness of the American heart is absolutely camouflaged by this idea, the -- a man in India or Indochina forms of America, that it is only interested in rape, and in murder, and crime. What else can they? Marilyn? And such -- na, I won't say what. I mean, your -- your heroines, gentlemen, they are a -- scandalous in the eyes of other people. The lowest of the low.

The public looks at the posterior, at the sensational, at the dirt. And the people have to live through the ages. And the great difference, of course, gentlemen, and the simplest for you to remark is: the public has to be entertained now. The people can wait. The public cannot. -- Here, we are assembled. I have to entertain you. If you take this as entertainment, as some of you do, then -- I cannot -- you will not have any -- any gain from this cour- -- class, because the gain should come in 10 years from now. Then you are as real people. If you, however, forget this -- when you leave this class, the whole thing has been a mistake, because you would be much better entertained on the other side of Main Street -- other end of Main Street, in The Nugget.

So there is a great difference, gentlemen. We in this college, we should appeal to you as people. And on -- in The Nugget, they appeal to you as public. And I'm afraid we have very bad precedents. There's a book in this country about -- on politics, which makes the public the hero. It's written by a justice of the Supreme Court.

({} people {} -- as individuals or {}?)

Whatever. You can be a friendly group. Can be a fraternity, in which you call dirty stories. That's also the public, because not one of these people lives here on his -- here you are, my dear man. You are 21, now -- you see. You have a decent background. Your parents take -- trouble and finally you end up here. Anything that enters your mind which -- which is -- going to -- to procreate in you the power to keep us -- a people going -- this nation going, goes to you as a people. Anything however, that goes cross-sectionwise to entertain you at this moment -- here are the seven fraternity brothers -- in as far as most of the fraternity brothers, if they are any good, know a little bit about each other's background, and help each other pass their exams, and -- and -- spend their weekends, and meet their families, they are people. In as far as they can be put together, at this moment, the more, you see, momentary their -- their -- their gath- -- gather- -- gathering is, you understand, the more this is public.

So we all, at every moment, gentlemen, are torn. The public is that which is here and now. The people is that which is from Adam and Eve to the last day. Because the public, as you know, reforms any moment. Public opinion is -- is like a woman -- that is for sale. You can buy public opinion, you can cheat public opinion. You can impress public opinion, because it is out for sensation, can be tickled. It can be stimulate- -- you even say so of a lecturer. This unfortunate man, you -- you dis- -- dishonor him, you treat him like a harlot. You say "He's stimulating." Well, heavens! Young men haven't to be stimulated, gentlemen. I have -- I think I've told you this before. I have -- all my life, I am now nearing 70, gentlemen, the only question I have to ask from my environment is: heavens! not to stimulate me. I am stimulated enough. Are you so bored that you have to be stimulated?

But gentlemen, I am driving at something which has to do with philosophy. Philosophy is hard-put, because it is second impressions. And all philosophy has to look therefore for a new, special group, as we have it here in the liberal arts college now, finally, as its outcome, which is gathered and convened, and driven together to listen to philosophy outside the first-impression orders, outside the Church, outside the school, outside -- I mean -- I mean, the grammar school and the nursery -- outside the family, outside the court, outside the nation. Philosophy is international, is it not? It is interfamilial. It is interlinguistic. It is inter-, you see, inter-, inter-, inter-, inter-, inter-, inter-, inter-, inter-. Because it is second, you see. And it is that which every one of us wants to know besides the immediate order in which he knows very well when to get up, and when to go to

work, and when to vote, you see. It's all this realm of second thought where you say, "Perhaps I wouldn't have to get up in the morning," you see. And "Perhaps I wouldn't have to vote in -- in Podunk." And "Perhaps I could emigrate to China," and "Perhaps" and "Perhaps," you see. All the perhapses of your mind get organized in philosophy.

Therefore, in Homer already there awakens this tremendous problem, gentlemen: Who are the people who philosophize together? What is the brotherhood of philosophers? Where do I meet the other men? And in this sense, then the public of Homer is the first attempt to create an audience outside the responsible barracks of the army, or the responsible place of a court with all -- the jury. To speak, gentlemen, you must understand this -- to you all this is so natural -- to speak in freedom and irresponsibility, anything that's -- goes -- crosses through your mind, you need an undangerous environment. You cannot in a little town say anything that is true about your neighbors. They will otherwise lynch you, you see.

Most people in a little town know so terrible things about their neighbors that they feel they can never talk in this town about them. They have to go to some place in Florida. And then they can tell the stories they know about their neighbors, without giving their name, I suppose. But it's very entertaining, if they tell all the stories they know of what has been going on in their town. They cannot tell it in their town, you see. That's absolutely impossible. If you want to live in your family, you cannot tell all the stories about your family -- to these members of the family. They don't want -- like to listen to these stories, that they have been in jail. But they have been in jail. And they have been divorced. You cannot talk about it.

Have you ever been married -- met this problem -- of meeting divorcés -- and the husband and the wife in the same room? Or -- to talk about the sacraments with the divorced couple? Or -- with one partner, the -- what you believe in, the sacrament of marriage. You can't tell them. You see, you better keep quiet. You see, you may keep your conviction, but you can't spread it there without wounding these people, you see.

It's terribly -- so, there are any number of things which in our vital relations, gentlemen, we can neither think nor say. It is no good, gentlemen, to think of the Oedipus Complex while you are with your mother and your father. If you are lying on the couch in an analyst's room, no harm done, you see. You are, so to speak, in a second world. Well, that is the creation of philosophy, gentlemen. There would be no analysts if there hadn't been philosophers in Greece who at

one time said, "We must create for any mind a realm, a room, a space for second impressions." But he must never bring these second impressions in confusion, you see, in cahoots with the first impressions. For heaven's sake!

So any -- as you know, any analyst is very careful to create this second space, where nothing what you say about your impressions -- your first impressions is ever -- ever leaks out. You couldn't live with the people of whom you tell all your first impressions to this man in the realm of second impressions. It's very serious, gentlemen. Anybody who burns through this -- this safety valve, this fuse, goes nuts.

A young man in Manchester, New Hampshire, of Greek Catholic origin had a -- father and a mother who -- who were still practicing this religion. And the father, as a matter of fact, is a Greek Catholic priest. And there were also sisters. And the boy was the youngest, and the -- you may say the least gifted. Wasn't directly feeble-minded. But it seemed wise to have him go on a farm on Long Island and milk the cows. Which he did, to everybody's satisfaction. Then the war came, the Second World War. He went out with the boys, and suffered from being strange, from not being -- belonging to the ordinary religion -- here, Roman Catholic or Protestant, but being a Greek Catholic, of course that's -- was for him too much of a -- nonconformism.

And he said to his father that he wanted to become a Roman Catholic.

And this father was very cheerful about it, and said, "Oh, that's all right." And -- but unfortunately he was prevented -- the parents were prevented, and also the sister, from attending the ceremony. The boy was just as good as gold. And he is still a pre-philosophical mind where "Yes" is "yes," and "No" is "no." And so the Catholic minister -- the Roman Catholic priest made a terrible mistake. He baptized this child of God again. As you know, that's in -- in itself forbidden. But the Roman Cath- -- Church has this rule that you cannot be baptized twice. But in case -- they -- they call it, you see, a conditional rebaptism.

But in this case, gentlemen, now I beg you to be very serious, because most of your sisters and brothers are destroyed by the American chil- -- childishness in these matters, and indifference in these matters. Well, this boy -- he was 18 or 19 -- no, no, 21, when he was -- when this happened; 21 -- ja, something like that. But being very simple-minded. When he heard that he hadn't been baptized before, that he hadn't been a Christian, that his father was denied the privilege of being a priest, of having standing, and he was not just a layman, as you think, this good father, you see, whom he had worshiped. It was his competition between the American army, so to speak, and the -- this serious environment,

and the comradeship in the army, and this good -- very good parenthood, this very good background in his family -- when this word "baptism" and this word, "I hereby baptize you in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit," when this was spoken again over him, and he suddenly became aware that in the eyes of this Roman Catholic preacher, he had been a pagan, his father was a pagan, his father was not a Christian, he collapsed. He had to be in -- put in a straitjacket, and he has lost his mind.

That is the human relation to the word, really, when it is still unspoiled.

That's the relation which you find in an Indian tribe. That's the relation which you find in all real societies, which are not as degenerate as ours, where words mean nothing, where you cannot reach a child or a person by just calling his name and thereby building him into society. This is very serious, gentlemen. The man -- has lost his mind. The -- this could have been prevented if the parents had been present at the ceremony. And the Catholic priest has -- has repented. They -- he asked his father to go with him into the cell of this unfortunate victim of his stupidity, and crudity -- crudeness. And of course, to this poor Irish young priest, this was all new. He had just done what was routine. And he hadn't done -- known what a human soul is. You find many theologians who don't know this. And the Ro- -- coarseness today is very much today with the theologians, gentlemen, that I have to say you -- tell you frankly. It's terrible. They don't know A from B. He just thinks that this is something in itself, and -- and doesn't have anything to do with your and my daily life. But you also live by certain words, and if you would be put into a -- into a concentration camp, gentlemen, would be given a number, and would have to live for five years without anybody recognizing that you have a name, you probably would also break down under the strain. Because to have your own name is the recognition of the unity and continuity of your existence, you see. And this cannot be discussed. There cannot be a second impression replacing the first impression.

I -- made you -- I want to threaten you with these two examples, gentlemen, that you must take the problem of philosophy as one of dynamite. This is not a pleasure to philosophize. The Greeks had to philosophize in order to be Greeks, in order to live in a world of mighty empires under the impact of trading, and -- with the enemy, so to speak, constantly, with people who believed otherwise. But once you -- omit this addition that any man needs these first impressions to bind him to his sanity, to his friendship, to his kin and kindred, you do not see that philosophy is not anything that you can put over on a 4- -- 1-year-old baby. But that it is a second experience, and therefore, is lacking always in stringency. It is always a step outside your room -- your -- the -- the -- soil in which you

must remain rooted.

And here is this great story which proves it. Will you kindly read this 8th book, where this begins?

You have the real -- Page 129. {Prenz- -- Prenzler}. You have it?

(The eight- --)

Oh, keep your legs. They are wonderful. No objection. Who has it?

Nobody brought The Odyssey, I suppose.

(Oh, The Odyssey?)

Yes. Yes, Sir. You?

(What page, Sir?)

Wie? 129. No Homer? No Odyssey? Who has The Odyssey? Please.

(At the point where- --).

"Presently." "Presently."

("Presently the bard's fine voice was heard above the music of his lyre. His theme --")

Turn around. They should all -- they have no books, you see.

("His theme was the love of Ares and Aphrodite, of the beautiful crown. He sang of their first and stealthy meetings in Hephaestus' palace, of the many gifts Ares made her, and the dishonor he did her to King Hephaestus' bed. But the son, {Islay}, went on to tell, had whit- -- witnessed their loving embraces, who came to inform Hephaestus, who when he heard the galling truth, went straight to his workshop, with his heart full of evil thoughts, laid his great anvil on the { } and forged a chain network that could neither be broken nor undone, so as to keep them prisoners forever.

("His fury with Ares inspired him as he worked. And when the snare was finished, he went to the room where his bed was laid, and threw the netting right around the bed posts. A number

of further lengths were attached to the rafters overhead, and hung down light as gossamer, and quite invisible, due to the blessed gods. It was a masterpiece of cunning work.

("When he had thus surrounded the bed and set his trap, he made a pretense of leaving for the pleasant town of Lemnos, his favorite spot on earth. Meanwhile, Ares of the golden reins had not kept watch for nothing. Directly he saw the master craftsman leave, he made his way to the great god's house, filled with a passionate desire for Scytheria.")

{Si-ther-EYE-a.}

(Si-ther-EYE-a? of the lovely crown.)

Ja. That is Venus.

("Now she had lately returned from a visit to her mighty father Zeus, and had just sat down when Ares came in at the door, grasped her hand, and saluted her fondly. "Come, my beloved," he said. "Let us go to bed and lie in each other's arms, for Hephaestus is no longer about. He has gone to Lemnos I think to visit his { } friends and listen to their barbarous talk." Aphrodite desired nothing better than to sleep with him, so the two went to the bed and lay down. Whereupon the netting, which Hephaestus' ingenuity had contrived, fell around them in such a way that they could not move or lift a limb. They found too late that there was no escape. And now they were faced by the great lame god himself, for the sun -- acting as a spy -- had given him word. And he had turned back before reaching the island of Lemnos, and hurried home in anguish. Standing there in the entrance, he was seized by a spasm of rage, and raised his voice in a terrible shout, so that all the gods might hear him.")

Would you go on?

("Father Zeus, and you other happy gods who live forever. Come here and see a comic and cruel thing. Zeus' daughter Aphrodite has always despised me for my lameness, and now she has given her heart to this butcher, Ares, just because he is good-looking and sound of limb, while I was born a cripple. And who am I to blame for that, if not my father and my mother? I wish they had never begotten me. But you shall see how these two have crept into my bed and are sleeping in each other's loving arms. The sight cuts me to the quick. Yet I have an idea that they won't be eager to prolong that embrace. No, not for a moment, not for all their love. Theirs is the sleep that both will soon be tired of -- theirs is the

sleep that both will soon be tired of. But my cunning meshes are going to keep them just where they are, till her father hands me back every one of the gifts I made him to win this { }-faced hussy, who may be his daughter, and a lovely creature, but is the slave of her passions.

("The shouts brought the gods trooping to their house with the bronze -- with the bronze boar. Up came Poseidon, the earth-shaker, Hermes the bringer of luck, and the archer, King Apollo. But the goddesses, constrained by feminine modesty, all stayed at home. There they stood then, in front of the doors, the immortals who are the source of all our blessings. And when they caught sight of Hephaestus' clever device, a fit of uncontrollable laughter seized these {happy} gods.")

Now, let's stop here. Gentlemen, the -- the indignity of the story and the dignity of the story, I recommend to your attention. I hope you will leave -- read on yourself. It's of course a famous example of the reasons for Plato's hatred of Homer, or hatred, or his -- his great love, admiration, turned into fear and terror of the consequences of this treatment of the gods. If you ask yourself -- this is a very famous story, of course -- what is dignified about this is, it is the genuine mistreatment of this polio-stricken Hephaestus, whom his wife betrays. I just got some news today that a good woman gave birth to a boy -- her father lives here in our town, and is deeply polio-stricken. He is a complete cripple. His first wife ran away from him when he had polio -- when he got polio. This woman had the courage to marry him, and they are very happy. And they -- here is this child born to them. And you can imagine then that there is a great tragedy involved when such a cripple is betrayed by his wife in favor of a strong man, exactly as it is described here. This is much more horrid than when two real rivals of the same physical status, you see, are one winning out over the other. It's a much greater moral injury. And I think Homer stresses this point very beautifully. And I think that is that aspect of the story by which it is made tolerable, because we have not just a joke, and not just a farce, but we also have the cutting pain of the cripple.

And therefore I -- this story is not to be dismissed lightly. It is a great example, gentlemen, how Homer sides with men against the gods. He humanizes the gods to such an extent that even Hephaestus isn't -- not just a clown, but a semi-tragic figure, you see, because he deserves better. He deserves real love, and not this -- this Hollywood love. And on the other hand, gentlemen, of course, the human -- the -- the divine majesty of the gods is -- is missed. If you humanize the gods, then the gods cease to be gods, to a certain extent. All you

can {save} is that they are at least human. You understand? Isn't -- do I make my point clear? It is important since we have these three words, of the logos, the ethos, and the -- and the physis, you must see that Homer does humanize the gods. And what he takes away from them in majesty he adds to them in humanity. You can see that the -- the ethos of Hephaestus is perfectly accessible to you and me.

Now I would say that this is a typical attitude, gentlemen, of any such social intercourse, as in your fraternity, as at a -- at a -- in an after-dinner speech, as in the theater. Anything that is not totally serious will always take the world below -- above us, and the world below us, and make {us} -- into some human thing. You have a social gathering, and you will treat the dog fight, and the roosters' fight, and the bull fight as a social entertainment, you will in a way humanize, domesticate the world below us, too. You will have flea races, as they have in Florida, I'm told. Is it true? Wie? Wie? Flea races, no? F-l-e-a. Isn't that correct?

I have a friend who has made all his money by bullfrog races. Also in Florida, there are the stupid ones, and they are bored. It -- it's very strange, gentlemen, and may -- help you to see the impact of what we are -- trying -- what I am trying to develop here before you, that if you -- if you are in the non-serious situation, if you don't have to plow the land, then you can treat the ox as an object of a fight, you see. But if you want to plow the land, you better don't do that, because you need the bull. You under- -- see the difference?

We live today in -- in a -- in a -- such an apartment and -- and skyscraper world that it is quite hard for you to see that at any minute, gentlemen, when people gather in a carefree mood in a bar, or in a -- at a -- in a club, or in your fraternity houses, or at Mac's, or whatever it is, that they really do something to the world beneath us, the world of nature and the world of things, and to the world above us. We humanize both. The way of any social intercourse is that the ethical, or what you call "the social," prevails and absorbs all considerations about the powers above and below. Look how you talk about a revolution or a civil war at -- at a bar. You say, "Oh, it will be quite excited to see a revolution." Now gentlemen, in a revolution, in Budapest, many shed -- tears are shed, many lives are destroyed. Many hopes are buried. But in a social ga- -- gathering, as a paper, for example, is -- your -- I don't know if your paper brought this terrible news: first that Hungari- -- Hungary would go to the Olympics just the same, and said second that two of its first-rate athle- -- athletes were killed in the rioting. Now gentlemen, I was wounded by these two -- news at this moment. It's after all much more important whether the people of Hungary get their liberty

than if the Olympics take place. To hell with the Olympics, compared to this. That's -- one is serious, and the other is not serious. In this country, of course, the Olympics is serious, and the fate of Hungary: who cares? That's how you treat play in comparison to seriousness. And the -- at least the papers play it up for all it is worth. The headline is: "Olympics" -- "Hungary Goes to Olympics." The headline is not: "Let's Fight for Freedom."

That was different a hundred years ago. This had -- all this treatment of the events in Hungary, gentlemen, when Kossuth died under the same Russian gunfire -- or he didn't, but his cause did -- died in 1850 -- was very different. Kossuth was a great national hero in America, as you may have heard. And Kossuth suffered this very fate that the people in Budapest have suffered, you see. The Russians intervened. The Hungarian rebels had -- had conquered their freedom against the emperor of Austria. And then, in -- to their dismay and shame, the emperor of Russia offered brotherly help to the man in Vienna, and marched in, and the Hungarians were overcome by Russian arms. And that makes the whole thing in Hungary today so very difficult for the Russians. They know very well how they are hated, for this memory of 1850. But the papers here so -- are so ill-informed, they have mentioned even the monument, and the holiday of 1850. But they have never said that it was the Russians who defeated the revolution. They only talk of the Habsburgs defeating the Hungarian -- no, the Russians did it in 1850, and therefore every Hungarian at this moment feels that -- this gruesome game, you see -- must not be repeated. I hope they will not trust any offers from their so-called government.

But the -- the massacre is already wholesale. And at such a moment, pardon me for -- insisting on this, it is bad taste for the Americans to mention the Olympics, and not to say that good people fighting have died in Budapest, but to pick out the one athlete who's killed and s- -- and give him a special space when he is dying, together with his -- the rest of his people. So that the people here get the -- the, so to speak, the picture, that the only thing that matters in Hungary: will the Olympic Games remain intact?

But that comes from after-dinner.

(Sir, I think you'll find that if you read a few other newspapers, the one newspaper you read is only one, and there are probably hundreds across this country that are describing thousands of other Hungarians who are being killed as well { }.)

Well, I have seen these headlines, Sir. I'm -- have to tell you this, I mean. I

-- I grant you that -- by the way, the -- your newspapers are far from reflecting the -- the serious people in this country, as you know this, too.

But I think it is sad that our public opinion does not reflect what really I think the people at this moment feeling. They don't -- they don't. They are scared to ob- -- for any -- any -- any real broader sentiment.

But this is an inevitable situation, gentlemen. Philosophy must look for a second public. And the Homeric public is the first public that has been formed around something that is not serious, and yet is mental. The mind here goes for a walk, you see, but it is not a -- solitary walk, but people get together on a certain theme. And since most of you are not accustomed to understand this difficult problem, gentlemen, of living in a -- in a society of direct action and immediate responsibility of mores, and another society of mental reflection, I have to draw your attention to the fact that this second social world has been created by the Greeks. And for example, the Russians try to destroy this. There shall be no such second world, you see. The -- they try -- to make the philosophical world into the serious world. That's why they are such poor Platonists. They are really Greek philosophers who want now to make their ration- -- their plan, you see, their abstract picture of society their utopia, their republic, their laws, their Platonic dialogues, their "dialectics" as they call it, you see. They want to make -- to penetrate the home so that the child must denounce the parents, you see, if any word is said that isn't Marxian dialectics. So you see it's of very practical impact that you understand that philosophy is only in a second realm possible. If you make it identical with the first, hell breaks loose. And if you don't have it at all, the little groups stagnate, and you get the uncivilized Indian tribe, where there is no thing but serious, you see, life, and there is no meditation, and no reflection going on in public.

So the formation of a public, gentlemen, it's very hard for you to understand, is necessary. Where you have no -- only the people, you have primitive life. Where you have the public, you have reflection. Where you have only the public, you have tyranny. Because you destroy the -- these groups that can afford immediate action, undoubted action, you see, immediate integration, celebration, ceremony, ritual, and -- liturgy, serv- -- divine service, what-not.

And the constant problem of mankind is, gentlemen: how much public, how much people? Whenever we philosophize, we gather with people with whom we do not live day by day. We gather with a public that stretches out through universe. You can s- -- also say, gentlemen, that from Homer's burlesque fear about the gods, the problem of philosophy has been: to ennoble the public

so that it ceases to be just entertained. Philosophy is an attempt to make out of this after-dinner audience of a public, you see, a second world, a second realm, a second citizenry of spirited people, who -- although they are on stilts, although they live in a second community of thinkers, of grownups, of people removed from their -- from their immediate community, will only be entertained by a -- reflection on these serious things, and not be only interested in -- in letting their hair down and cheapening the seriousness.

In Homer's Achilles and Ares, gentlemen, what happens? The tone is lighter than it is in the morning, when the priest offers sacrifices to the gods. You can see this. This is laughter, you see. This is joke. Well, it's like an after-funeral, when the gay music sets in. You cannot weep all day. So at the funeral, you are serious. You come home. Then there -- always the -- at a military funeral, the music, you see, returning from the cemetery is asked -- always required to play a gay melody. That's a very wise custom, you see. You have to return to -- to life by this relief of tension. And that's the same with an after-dinner speak, after a big festival, after a great celebration, you get humorous, and you give off steam -- let off steam.

Now this then is the -- the problem of philosophy since Homer. You can see that if all the activities of a group like the Greek people roaming the seas, coming to foreign places, would be to go in Hoboken into a bar and to get drunk, so to speak, and to dismiss authority, dismiss seriousness, and just joke about it, that there would be a total loss of energy. And it's -- you must think of it in terms of physics, of the entro- -- the law -- how do you call the law, of the loss of -- ? entropy -- loss of, you see, a loss of energy, you see, loss of heat. If our society would always give off steam and never rebuild it, then we would of course be faced by a tremendous loss, and then every Indian tribe and every Mau-Mau group would be perfectly entitled to cry out against colonialism, to say, "Let the English go home, because they destroy our mores, we -- the things become less serious, we now see that things are not so decisive, so important as we do them." You can do them differently, so people will stop doing anything. They will become indifferent.

Gentlemen, if we had only Homer, all over the place, and Broadway, our life in this country would le- -- lose too much energy. Now philosophy is the strange attempt to use this leisure -- to use this leisure to build up energy into these private homes, into these courts, into these barracks, into these army places, into the White House, and not to play golf with Cola-Cola people, but to listen to a seer, or to a poet and to be inspired again, and not to relax. I -- we always hear in this country only that people who are busy must relax. I think

they mustn't relax at all. They must be rebuilt up again, to a higher pressure. But always you hear in this country that these poor businessmen have to relax. That's not true that this is enough. They have to get on a higher pitch than all the businesses -- life. They must then come in to their business from a higher point of view, and not from a lower.

And it is just as important, gentlemen, to rebuild the necessary tensions in a society, than always to say that they must be dismissed. This is what I regret to say about this business of Israel. For one year, we have been forewarned, but since this country wants to sleep out his -- its prosperity, you can't find anybody who will do anything, or sacrifice anything for this peace outdoors, so to speak. It's too hard a life out there. Most Americans have to return from Palestine, because they just couldn't stand the life there. It's too hard.

So gentlemen, philosophy is against Homer in this sense, that it wants not to relieve the tension, but to build up a higher pressure tank. You know of a -- these water systems where the pressure tank is put in the attic, and then the water runs down. The problem is then, for philosophy to build this attic, where you can put your pressure tank so that the peo- -- the rooms in which the people normally live, you see, can receive new -- the water with new pressure. It has never been solved by philosophy, but it is its ambition. It's Plato's ambition. It's Aristotle's ambition. It's the -- ambition of the Stoics, that -- couldn't they find an avocation, a public, a -- a treatment of the public by which the public would be so ennobled that it would impart to the people, you see, in their daily activities a better life.

And I think anybody who studies philosophy must have this dream or -- in his mind, gentlemen. Philosophy is an attempt to use the leisure, you see, not for relieving the tension, but for increasing the tension. That's for you perhaps a little difficult to understand, but it must -- should make clear the -- the paradox of philosophy. Since the Greek days, gentlemen, the Greek philosopher says, "Here I -- I take advantage of leisure. Homer has created a -- the good use of leisure for entertainment, for humanization. Into this niche, into this nook, I also {march in}, you see. And I'll get my public, you see, then to {replace}, with the background of their {family life}, with the background of their laws, you see, with the background of the universe, with the real order.

So, leisure ennobled. That is the social task of philosophy. You will admit that it is the critical point today: you get a four-day week, what are you going to do with your leisure? If you treat it as merely non-serious, you see, you will get

just murder. You will get every day a fantastic crime, because people will not do -- know what to do with these three days. It's a very serious problem, you see. How can you treat 160 million people to a four-day week if they don't know at all what to do in the rest of -- for the rest of the time. And there will be so many perfect crimes, because that will be the only thing that will come to mind. Well, that's serious. It's -- it's a very serious business, gentlemen. Nobody -- heaven knows what going to happen. The pious one may go to the mosque on Friday, and to the synagogue on Saturday, and to the church on Sunday. But there will be very few people who want to do that. And what do you do with the rest?

This is not -- this is not wanton, gentlemen. You must think in these very practical terms of today. There were no three days, of -- but the rich, of course, had leisure. They had slaves, in Homer's days as today. And it is to the people who had -- were liberals in their own -- in the ancient sense, that is, who had no work to do, who had other people to del- -- do their work to whom philosophy caters.

And this Homeric story here therefore has much more than -- than meets the eye. It is the constant problem of your -- our time today. We are all now through the machines in the place of the people in Greece who indulge in philosophy, you see. They either indulged in philosophy or in sports, or in -- in -- in orgies, in debauches, in -- in all kind of nonsense, in self-destruction. And we have the same situation, of course, today, because a whole nation today is freed from chores through our machinery. And very few who could philosophize in Greece are of course nothing compared to a nation that is -- how many horsepowers are behind every American? Does anybody know?

(Potentially four.)

What?

(Potentially.)

Fifteen years ago it was already 31 horsepowers behind every American. It must be- --.

{ } talking about the machinery. You're not talking about the development of the { } body itself?)

But you are not a horse.

(No. But the human body is -- { } development now.)

No, I mean the electric power, the steam power, the gasoline power, the combustion engine, all the -- horsepower that are disposed of -- amount to, I think, 111 or something like that for every American at this moment. Working in -- in your service, Sir. You have it. Every American -- I don't know the figure, by the way. Does anybody know? It's a -- who is in Tuck School? None of these economic slaves? Well, look it up. It's a very -- most fascinating story. You must think that every one of you, as we sit here, have 111 horses constantly serving us 24 hours a day. Well, have you ever thought what -- that -- this is really true.

That's -- we are all drunk with this power. I mean, all the accidents on the road teach you that the temptation of having 300 horsepowers at your disposal goes to a man's head. We all are today great captains, because every one of us has a whole army, at least a company backing him up. Ja. Isn't that true?

For these people, philosophy is the problem, gentlemen. If you have power, and if you have time, what to do with it. All people under the necessity of life don't need to philosophize, because every day, you see, the laborer -- has -- knows that if he doesn't work, he will starve. That's very simple, gentlemen. Ten hours a day work, no philosophy, you see. But leisure.

The problem, gentlemen, of philosophy is: can leisure be treated as the avant-garde of life, or is it the epilogue of life, of your weekly life, of your daily life? And mo- -- for most of you, it is the epilogue. But it should be the avant-garde, it should be the prelude. Leisure is a seed, gentlemen, and not the dregs. That's a great problem.

Let's have a break here. But only three minutes, please. I have to go on.

[tape interruption]

...the first hundred years -- or thousand years of Greek philosophy -- or 800 years of philosophy -- who dies, and -- whom I call the Nietzsche of antiquity. Nietzsche comes at the end of the story of modern and medieval philosophy. He is, compared to Abélard and Thomas Aquinas, a -- a man who explodes philosophy. And he is, as he called himself, at least, a materialist, however doubtful that may be. And he is an atheist. And yet, if you read Nietzsche, has -- has anybody ever read anything by Nietzsche? He -- has been no -- no such religious philosopher in the last thousand years, Nietzsche, because the -- the death of

God is his great cry. "Where is God?" so to speak, you can ask. His whole work is centering around the death of the divine inspiration, the divine spirit. And so he has this paradoxical situation then -- circumscribed in which you and I find ourselves. The more skeptical we are, the more we will represent today the divine spirit; and the more orthodox, and routine churchgoers we will be, the mehr -- more we will contribute to the death of the spirit. That's a paradox. Every Sunday when I go to church -- I preached last Sunday in our church, it is quite a pain in the neck, because you are not sure that this is the place where the spirit today lives. This paradox is, however, of -- exists from time immemorial, and in antiquity, we -- I made you read Lucretius to see that the same tension that we find in Homer: the gods, and men, and the gods critically humanized, and the man exalted by a greater unity into this tremendous effort of the Greek spirit in this common enterprise, and this common enthusiasm -- that this is at the end of the era the same. Lucretius invokes the gods, speaks to the -- Memmius, and deals with matter as the only power that is needed to explain everything. That's paradoxical. It's like -- Nietzsche, who assures you that Christianity is dead, and is -- the -- when he goes mad, breaks down, you see, with a -- signing himself, "The Crucified," because so much was his Christianity in -- awake in him that he only lived with the great incognito, because the gods, gentlemen, can only come to life if we do not blaspheme, and do not quote them too early. The man who says, "In God's name," usually doesn't act in God's name. But you may very well act in God's name without saying so.

This is the same paradox in Lucretius. And -- I cannot explain this to you, because you stand partially before life. But I have to arouse you to this sense of wonder, that an atheist in antiquity invokes the gods. That's -- is strange. But it is not stranger, gentlemen, than that you should honor your fa- -- father, and your mother, and love the wife of your choosing. Any man who -- who has to go through this has two religions. And he has to unify them. That will seem to you strange. But we live by contradiction. We don't live in a very nice, settled system. But we try to make contradictions, you see, live in us in harmony. That's the problem of man. We are not -- mathematical examples, with 2 and 2 is 4. But we have two prime numbers, so to speak, inside ourselves. Let's take 37 and 31. And you have to harmonize the two of them. Every one of us has so -- contradictory genes in himself. You have to be your father's son, and your mother's son, and you have to be your wife's husband, and your children's father, and you have even to be a member of a party, and you have to -- citizen of the -- member of a church, and it's all not -- and it doesn't end in -- in -- in -- in an equation of mathematics, gentlemen, most contradictory. And therefore philosophy is only honest when it begins with a contradiction, Mr. Leibowitz. And I cannot tell you,

as in chemistry or in medicine, you see, that 2 and 2 is 4.

I wrote a letter -- read a letter in church last Sunday. Since you are a premed student, I'd better give this to you, where I say the scientists today lose their heads, totally. They won't wonder anymore. They say that they are only scientists, these doctors. And they kill their patients. Science in this moment in America kills medicine. And -- and a friend of mine left -- this college because he thought the medical school was just absolutely bent on science. And so -- he's a doctor -- son of a doctor, and so he has some good tradition in himself. And he went to another medical school. And he wrote me the following letter: "My professor gave us a first lecture today on medicine. And he said, 'A doctor who is honest must know that he can comfort everybody, he can relieve a few -- he can relieve numerous people, and he can cure a very few.'"

The modern doctor who is science-drunk, thinks that he's only there to cure. And he gives up to -- relieve, and he gives up -- to comfort. Such a doctor doesn't know the limitations of science. "'You must know, my dear students,' he went on to say, you must conquer everybody. But you may relieve a few -- some, and that you may cure indeed very few. And if you don't, you don't know the limitations of your science."

Now, in the same sense, gentlemen, philosophy wants to show you your limitations, Sir. And as long as you do not wake up to the fact that philosophy is not a science, gentlemen, you are not -- philosophizing, you see. You try to { } -- we know certain things in philosophy. I know what a syllogism is, you see, for example. And such simple, and minor things. But they are of a subordinate nature. The great power of philosophy is to check every one of your blasphemous arrogances in your own proper field, as a doctor, as an engineer, as a statesman, as a mother. They -- you all go haywire because you think that you are God Almighty, if you follow the procedure of his business; 150 years ago, a father thought nothing of spanking his -- his son. It was within his rights and -- there have even been Spartan fathers, as you know, who would prefer to kill their son against letting pass an -- disobedience, a lack of discipline.

Now we don't think this anymore. So here's a family, by a sense of wonder of -- the part of philosophy had to be put in a new light. The rules of the family no longer, you see, are the same, because we have upset them. Today, I think, philosophy must attack science, because science is haywire. It's absolute megalomania, as you see from the atom bomb. All philosophy -- centers around the fact that we have to tell physicists that we are not interested in their findings. Or only very limit- -- they help us. And that they have nothing to say. And as

long as you go to the physicist, in asking for political advice, this country will -- is at the brink of disaster.

Philosophy has to do this, or it's no good. Because the sense of wonder must always make you attack the god of the day. The sense of wonder has nothing to do with your toothache, or with minor matters. The sense of wonder in philosophy is wondering about the shibboleth, about the dogma of the day. For example. I do -- I won't -- can't go into the details of this today, but it's obviously -- if philosophy has any future, it will have the future of criticizing science, of saying that science is only possible by scientists, and scientists are people who still have a sense of wonder, and therefore you cannot streamline men, and you cannot buy men, and you cannot have science through money. And then I read such statements that in 20 years we can harness atomic energy economically, I hope that this will break down, gentlemen. I do not think that you can predict for 20 years any such thing, you see. It's just, I think, ludicrous. Well, that's just one example of -- of what we're up against, against the megalomania today of sciences, who, however, have been produced by philosophy persuading the older order of society, the priesthood, and the family, and the nation to allow these scientists. Now they've gone too far. We now have to call them back. Formerly they burned the witches. Now the witches burn us. Well, these -- isn't -- aren't these producers of atom bombs -- and -- and bacter- -- bactericide and so -- are they not witches? They are. That's all they are.

So, Mr. Leibowitz, is -- does this -- I -- it will not satisfy you. But I had to defend my position, why I had to show you that in every generation, in the first of Greek philosophy as much as in the last, at the end, in Lucretius, you see, there is still a contradiction. It isn't so simple as you would like to have it, as you can have it in a special field, of a science. Philosophy protects the living man who can produce sciences -- perhaps you take this down -- of various kind, who has created one day chemistry, and the next day sociology, and today a science protecting us against science. We call this today "sociology of science," which would be an attempt to confine, or to show what the scientist can do and what he cannot do, you see. The place of science in society would be the solog- -- sociology of science. You can see that this is a new science -- it wasn't -- it wasn't necessary 500 years ago, when science had to be created, to talk of the sociology of science, because we had to -- just to think of getting -- getting science. But today, we must know what a physicist can do and what he cannot do.

Only to show you, gentlemen, that philosophy is the perpetual sense of wonder to distribute in us our power to find new truth, our power to get along with our fellow man, and our power to dominate dead matter. And to distinguish what is dead matter, what in you and me, for example, is just routine, is -- is a question of our changing concept of nature, our changing concept of theology, and our con- -- changing concept of ethics, or of mores, or morality of the social sciences.

Now this was my justification towards you. And now look -- let's look up the text of this very good book by Mrs. {Kathleen Freeman} and let's read -- or let's at least speak of the people who turned from Homer's attempt to joke about the gods to the opposite attitude to become serious about things, and to try to find the divine in the cosmic order of the universe. And we had already Thales of Miletus crying out, shouting that everything is water.

The two next men we have next to no -- no fragments from them: Anaximander and Anaximenes, gentlemen -- tried to correct Thales in a certain way. Thales says, "I have my first common denominator. I'll get my Egyptian friends, and my Mesopotamian friends, and ourselves on the salt lake of the Mediterranean, and the people -- far away on the ocean all together in the recognition that water is one, and that probably all earth and everything comes from water." Now you see, he is not very far from the truth, because as you know, we supposedly have the same blood as the fishes, because we used to live in the water. And saltwater still today is the cure -- curative for your eyes for this reason probably, because if you put saltwater in your eyes, any inflammation will immediately disappear. That's a very strange fact, because fishes of course would have their eye, or -- or sea animals would have their eye in the water, you see, and therefore feel the saltwater sympathetically as -- as part -- best -- the best environment they can {be in}.

The -- it is very hard for you and me to understand why this man Thales should be so important, if we only know this one thing: everything is water. I have however today, in the first half, I -- made an attempt to remind you of this fact that in leisure, people should also try to get up steam, and not to get -- off steam. And if everything is water, you can see that all the partial civilizations of the Nile, and the cult of Osiris, and the cult of Poseidon -- which is the god of the salt sea -- suddenly appear in a new light. And these cults can be purified, and can be regulated, you see, in the various cities of Greece, in the light of this recognition -- Heaven, what man wants to -- to worship is his common origin, you see, his -- the original force. And it doesn't matter that one is Osiris and one is Poseidon; a tremendous simplification sets in, and as far as people give in to

this consideration.

And here you have the power of a generalization, gentlemen, and that power of generalization may free you from local, parochial anxieties. And since everybody says today we should get out of our anxieties, and the "Age of Anxiety," Thales, of course, is important and made this tremendous impact on tradition that Thales is called the beginner of all Greek philosophy, because he shows the driving power of -- towards generalizing, towards finding a common denominator. If you can find a common denominator, people of different origin and background can be uni- -- -ted in some common effort, some civilizing effort. They can go home, everyone in his different cult, into his different city, and do something in the same direction, although what they have to do in the cult of Poseidon, and what they have to do in the cult of the Nile god will look different, you see -- see how the application of such a generalization, you see, is individual. But the principle is identical, and you can therefore imagine that people would travel to -- to Thales and get indoctrinated, you see, to take home something they -- everyone would have to apply in a home town, in his own way. You cannot talk to a worshiper of the sea god in the different -- same terms later on, as you talk to the worshiper of the Nile god, you see. But you can bo- -- in both cases perhaps tell them that they don't have to sacrifice human beings. And it seems, as far as we can see, that from 600 B.C. to 400, more or less, human sacrifices were eliminated in Greece. Under the impact of such teachings, the local cults, so to speak, lost their stringency, their severity, and people wouldn't dare to risk their all, life and death, on -- on these cults. The cults themselves lost their severity.

That's just a -- one example -- one aspect of this. We are told that Thales traveled, went to Egypt. And you see immediately that once this process is set in motion, the next man tries to improve on it in an opposite direction. Thales thinks, in your eyes, materially: water. To me, it's a great spiritual step, the unification of different phenomena. To you, he will appear perhaps just as a {hydrograph}, a man who worships water, and a materialist. Now Anaximander of Miletus, the same city, as you see, on the coastline of Asia Minor, all three are of Miletus on these pages of 18, 19 of Mrs. {Freeman} here -- says the non-limited is immortal and indestructible. It is very hard for us to understand what the unlimited -- non-limited is. But one thing is clear. The -- this second man tries a logical category instead of a physical, non-limited, you see. You cannot define it as water. You cannot define it as earth. You cannot define it as Heaven. You cannot define it as -- as -- as fire. Anaximander feels it is indefinite. That's perhaps the

best translation. I think the "non-limited" in -- on page 19 here is -- is confu- -- is -- is not the best translation. There has been much debate of what is meant by the -- that which has no boundaries, no -- no boundary line, no borderline. You cannot define it. So I think the best translation is "the indefinite." Or "the indefinable" is perhaps -- comes closest in my mind to what he tries to say. He says, "Behind all the things we can define, because they compare and can be opposed to each other, there has to be something common." If you get earth and water, and you try to get down to the common denominator, you see, Heraclit- -- Thales says it's all water. But he lets still one of things of our immediate experience stand, one first impression.

Now the great step, gentlemen, of Anaximander, and I hope Mr. Leibowitz, you will -- you will see what a scientific progress there is in this, is: I must also sacrifice the water. I have reduced everything to water. Now I must take the final step and must say, "That source material cannot even be called water. It must be called the indefinable, or the indefinite. That which is the matrix out of which all these elements, you see, disperse. Therefore I construe a background thought, you see, which I nowhere find in reality." Because the great idea of this man is that this which is in back of everything remains in back of everything, in the sense that "I can only think it, but I cannot present it," you see, because "I must reduce everything that appears in the phenomenal world, in the physical world, in the world of my five senses, to something as we do today exactly with atoms or electrons. It is a constant zest -- quest of -- of our nature that we want to penetrate behind that which is of the moment, because it is passing; it is transient. It is not the very thing. So the -- the step from Thales to -- to Anaximander is one from phusis to logic.

Now we get the third man. If I read him right, Anaximenes of Mil- -- Miletus coming 15 years later. Fifteen years in the life of the mind, gentlemen, are as much as 30 years in the life of the body. When you come to Dartmouth College, to any college or any university, you will find that it has to be refounded every 15 years. Human beings change their nature every 30 years. It is unknown in this country, which has no intellectual experience, so to speak -- it cannot -- that things of the mind have to be revamped every 15 years. You cannot send your child to a school which you haven't known for 15 years. You have no idea what quality the school has. It's just prejudice that you think still it's a good school. Everything changes in a school within 15 years. That's very important to know for you. Don't send your child to a school unless you have made sure that its reputation is not dated, you see. I could -- I don't wish to slander any schools in the land. But I could give you chapter and verse on some interesting institutions of high standing in the -- in the, so to speak, hall of glory of this country,

but they just have lost their -- their power, you see. And they still live on their old names, like the Saturday Evening Post. That's a similar example. They should have shut down a hundred years ago.

Gentlemen, all spiritual enterprises should have a limited lifespan. We once founded a magazine which is now very famous in background -- in -- in -- in -- in hindsight, so to speak. And we said it should not last more than four years, which it did. And then we had spent our -- our energy and our faith, and we had said what we wanted to say, and that was it. -- In America, this -- this -- this technicality, that everything of the mind is treated as though it was like a legal corporation, to live forever, is very bad. Very bad. Things shut -- close down just as much as they have to be founded.

I have a friend who in his youth founded a fraternity under the condition that it had to dissolve after one term, and then be refounded by fresh blood the second. He said, "It will only be good as long as we find people who, in the same spirit, will have still the same faith as I have now to found this time, this fraternity." He exaggerated, I grant you. It was -- but it was an expression of his real understanding of the laws of the spirit. He did not want to rely on mechanics, you see. And he didn't want to see the spirit die. And I -- I ask you to consider this seriously in your own groups, gentlemen. You haven't to -- to refound everything every term. But to let things just go on because they are there is a very -- very poor reason, very poor reason. It's really no reason.

So Anaximenes, gentlemen, tries to vivify, to ethicize the universe, because he says, "As our soul being air, holds us together, so do breath and air surround the whole universe." That is, he tries to treat the cosmos of reality, the whole world of reality as a living being, as our -- as somebody like you and me, as ourselves written large. It is the first idea of the macrocosms, which penetrates and prevails in all {Greece}. But you see here that it is still done in the -- exactly the order which I have tried to make important for you, which any modern man forgets: that nature must be judged by society, by the polis; that physis is -- is a second experience for the man who has grown up in a community. And so he says, "As our soul, being air, holds us together, so do breath and air surround the whole universe."

So gentlemen, if you say microcosm is man, and macrocosm is the universe, you usually think that we are the second edition, the -- this pocket edition of the universe. Now Mr. Anaximenes of Miletus on page 19 here says the opposite. What does he say? He says that the universe is what? Do you have the text? Who has this book? Well, what does he say, if you read this sentence? Who is the

-- who is the analogy of what, of the other? Here is an analogy. One is like the other. Well, who is -- leads, and who -- who is compared?

({ } he is comparing himself with breath, and the breath is surrounding the universe, making the universe in other words within { } man { } is around the universe.)

So who comes first? Whose experience is the older one?

(The man.)

The man. "I know of myself that my breath keeps me together. I die if I don't breathe." You see, "holds together" means simply, "keeps me going." That's -- would be the better, little too slangy, translation, you see. As our soul being air, you see, keeps us going, so the universe is kept going, you see.

Now obviously this is terribly important, gentlemen. Anaximenes is an ethis- -- ethical natura- -- naturalist. Anaximander is a logical physicist, you see. And Thales is -- is quite drunk with the -- the phusis themselves, you see. He generalizes water, all matter into water. Anaximander generalizes the logical expression: "I must be careful; the -- the primary thing cannot wa- -- be called even `water.' It must be called that which has no name, yet, that is not yet, you see, gone in any one direction. That is not visible, that is not definite." And the third man says, "If I want to understand the universe, I must com- -- have an analogy of -- from my own life breath. It's a living universe."

Now all these three things, gentlemen, today are lost on you, I'm afraid, because we live in a dead universe. Modern physics, gentlemen, and ancient physics -- I've said to you this before, but it's terribly important for you never to forget it. Physics today is a special science. And the ancient physicists were philosophers. Therefore, the ancient philosophers always knew that there had to be life inside that which they define as -- as phusis. The modern physicist is a specialist, and he's only -- has to do with dead -- dead things, electrons. He is not responsible, you see, for the spirit of the physicist himself. He has to explain Mr. Planck. But Mr. Anaximander has to explain Mr. Planck, and Mr. Anax- -- Anaximenes. And so Anaximenes then says, "As I live, so the universe lives." This is still a valid statement, gentlemen.

L.P. Jacks -- has anybody ever heard the man's name, L.P. Jacks? A very great Englishman who died at the age of 96 last year -- a friend of mine whom I owe that he -- I lectured at Oxford on his -- at his invitation. And I owe him a

deep load of gratitude. He wrote a very wonderful little booklet -- he was very popular in this country -- which was called -- is called "The Living Universe." And in -- he is the editor of the great Hibbert Journal -- or has been. He's dead now -- for 30 or 40 years. Hib- -- has anybody seen the Hibbert Journal? Who has? Oh, gentlemen! Well -- Hibbert Journal is the great cultural center of English theology and philosophy, the Hibbert Journal. And -- it just shows where Dartmouth lives: not in the living universe, that not one of you has seen this. It's of course lying on the shelves here. Do you never look at these -- at these magazines at all? You only read sports? Reader's -- why ly- -- is this -- is this -- is this -- book -- magazine room there?

Well, "The Living Universe," gentlemen, shows that the philosopher has quite a different universe at heart than the physicist. Our physics- -- the physicists deal with the little element in the universe, those things as a -- as a very great Frenchman has called it, "which have already died." The physics -- physicists deal with the corpses in the universe. The stars, and the -- the -- has been even said that all oxygen in the universe is dismissed from our -- from living bodies. And when they die, this oxygen streams out into the universe and fills the dead spaces. That's -- Félix Ravaisson's doctrine of how oxygen came to exist, because oxygen, this fiery element, is always -- it generates in -- in living creatures. And when you find it outside the living, you ask: How does it get there? So the physicists deal with the corpses. They deal -- not deal with the beginning of life, but they deal with the remnants of life, with the relics of life. And therefore, you have the wonderful primary story of man. -- I'm always overcome myself by the sense of wonder, that Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximenes take the three steps to interpret the universe so that any man in Egypt, in Mesopotamia, in Persia, in Asia Minor, in Greece can a -- prove, one: that all matter is one; the other: that this source matter should not be called with any specific name, but should, you see, have a general name; and third: that if we want to understand this universe, which the two others try to develop and to make plausible as one universe, that it should be -- at least have the quality of a living, breathing, living, you see, universe.

All these three things, gentlemen, come to me to this day with a stroke of genius, and with a great challenge -- if you could today bring Anaximenes of Miletus to life again, and lead Félix Ravaisson's doctrine to victory, that physics deal with the corpses of the universe, with the dead aspect of the universe, and that this is a -- a -- a posterior situation to the creation of the living universe, you see, the whole world would look different, and we could even make peace among ourselves and with the Russians, because you are hampered today in all

your thought about reality, including the news in the papers, gentlemen, with your idea that we live in a technical, physical universe. We don't. We live, as Anaximenes said, in a universe that does breathe, and draw air as our soul.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...way into all human wisdom, Parmenides and Heraclitus. If we had not these two men, we would not understand what Thales of Miletus, Anaximenes, and Anaximander really were after, as we have only fragments. And I -- showed you on page 19 of this book here, which you pe- -- kindly will open now, that there is very little. We can only wonder that a life of a man was remembered for these very sayings. Obviously their attempt today would be ridiculed, because today people write an article per diem, for money. You can buy the modern philos- -- there is a famous pamphlet written by an Italian in French, which I recommend to your attention. It is called "Les Philosophes Saliariés," the philosophers which one can buy. It's the average idea of the American businessman that one can buy college professors. Everybo- -- -thing in this country is for sale if you only offer enough. Bernard Shaw has said in his play -- one of his plays, in Major -- Major Barbara -- who knows the play? -- that everybody has his price. You remember?

Now gentlemen, it is very hard for you to believe -- there is no place in this country really where -- which gives you reason to believe that wisdom is not for money. The whole problem of these men, which always strikes us today with great -- wonder on the one-hand side, even doubt on the other, is: how come that these men, for their -- for their devotion or for their integrity, and for their single-heartedness, and their purposiveness, were able, with one sentence, with a few doctrines, to get the attention of centuries to come? Why are these people remembered? Everything in -- today is forgotten. You have so many wits on the television sets. One chases the other. And who are these wits whom you listen to? Just farcical characters. And they have to have a very simple name, Bob or Alan, or something like that. They can't be called Anaximander, and Anaximenes, and just say, "Warn you."

That it is enough to have produced one such insight for a whole life, and that it is the -- a practical problem of -- of real wisdom, gentlemen, to get after such a thought and to enhance it to its full power. If you think of the withdrawal of the Russians from Hungary today, and you read the sentence of Anaximenes, "As our soul being air holds us together, so do breath and air surround the whole universe," it will not dawn on you that the implication of this total defeat of -- of -- of Russia is already stated by Anaximenes, that one has to treat the -- the remaining universe as much alive as we are ourselves.

The Americans, as you know, are at this moment finished in Europe, the

same manner, because we have treated the whole universe as too alive. We have not considered the dead regions of the world as having lower standards of political power and right than the fully integrated one. In this country, one -- The Silent American, you know perhaps this novel by an Englishman, since -- because he is naïve in -- which -- because he thinks that everything is water. Even Egypt is as good as the United States, or as France. And -- that's a similar naïveté to judge the world by one preconception, by one dogma. But I mean to say that Russia has really tried to -- to treat the rest of the world as not breathing, as being able to be dominated as a cemetery, as a graveyard.

We have treated every part of the world as already fully alive. You call this self-determination of nations. It's equally naïve. You have to distinguish between dead matter and living matter, gentlemen. It's the whole problem. And parts of the universe are much deader than you think, and much -- other parts are much more alive than you would care to admit. I mean, the -- because you treated Germany as dead matter, the reeducation of Germany backfired totally. And every American whom I talk to now, quite wrongly by the way, even exaggeratedly, is ashamed of this attempt to reeducate Germany within five years. And now every American tries to forget it, because they treated German- -- the Germans as -- as just so much dead objects, dead matter.

"As our soul being air holds us together, so do breath and air surround the whole universe." You th- -- of course think that's not an important statement. But gentlemen, we live by deciding: Where is air in life, and where is dead matter? And in a time of A-bo- -- H-bombs and machinery, I assure you, your American psychology at this moment, for example, draws the line of dead matter far too much inside the human being, far too much parts of us are called manageable and manipulable. They even try to manipulate generals, and to psychologize leadership, because they do not know that this -- these people have to be judged as we ourselves want -- would like to be judged, the psychologists themselves, you know. They would like to make a career, and get rich, and have a beautiful wife. And we allow to follow their whims. But if it comes to treatment of other people, they think they can recommend recipes, machinery. You are all imbued with this idea that very far into man you can expand the idea of a dead universe, which is not as much alive as you are. So we destroy the soil by chemicals, because we think you can treat the soil as not alive. And we'll -- we'll die from nervous exhaustion, because the bread, and the eggs, and the milk, and everything we produce is pasteurized; it's killed.

Gentlemen, what is alive can spoil. And this whole country wants to have food that cannot spoil. So it -- can't get food. That's not food what you eat, gen-

tllemen. You have to eat so many calories, 3,000 and more than any other person in the world, because most of the food you take in is dead, absolutely dead. You don't believe that the -- universe, according to Anaximenes, has to be treated as alive, and not as dead.

That's a very serious question today for the future of the human race, gentlemen, that you are all inclined to forget that the air which you breathe must also circulate in the soil in which you plant. But the -- where there are chemicals, it's all burned up, as you know. You have to have rain worms, instead of chemicals, if you want to have a soil which heaves and which breathes. I'm quite serious. And there are very many serious people, gentlemen, very much concerned with your apartment way of life. You are departmentalized and apartmentalized today. And therefore you are de-mentalized.

So I only want -- before going on to Heraclitus and -- and Parmenides, I want to tell -- say -- tell you that these little phrases contain a whole world view. You don't have to write a long book of -- in two volumes, *The World as Will and -- and Representation*, as Schopenhauer, or *System*, like Thomas Aquinas in 49 volumes. Thomas Aquinas is not a greater philosopher than Anaximenes of Miletus. And that's very hard for you to understand, because you only live by quantity. And you say even, when an author comes to this campus, Mr. -- poor Mr. Cerf tonight, you say, "He's the author of 13 books." Put them all on the scales and weigh them, you see. Well, the more books, the more scandalous. What does this mean? Author of one book is enough. Author of one sentence is enough. It can make you immortal. If you really follow it through. If you do, if you think, if you act -- and this is the great lesson of the Greeks, gentlemen, that in their beginnings, they were so over-awed by the common power to generalize, that we know of these people only one generalization. And yet, I assure you, and here I come to -- get back again to Mr. Leibowitz, in the history of philosophy, you must come to learn that none of these philosophers is dated. None of these is obsolete. None of them is swallowed up by the next philosopher, as you always think, in your naïve idea of progress. That's not true. Philosophy is in- -- completely immortal. The first philosopher, Mr. Thales, is as creative for your and my mental education as he was 600 B.C. If you don't believe this, gentlemen, you don't understand why the -- philosophy has to be taught as a history: of the human mind, you see. Every one moment of this history is equally alive today, as all the others. It's quite new for -- to you, because you think history is bunk; history is that which has gone by. It isn't, gentlemen. Just as little as Homer is in any way obsolete -- made obsolete by Mr. Hemingway. He isn't. He's much greater than Mr. Hemingway, the lesser he wrote for the day --

the less he wrote for the day. The more you write for the day, the more obsolete you will be.

That's -- with Parmenides now, the logical conclusion of these first -- as the ethical, physical, and logical attempt of the first three men is reached, Parmenides, who is printed here a little too late on page -- where is he? -- on page 41, is given here a date which I think is exaggerately low. I would put him into the year 490. And let me say here a word of technical explanation of these dates in this book. When you -- you have to work for your term paper also a little bit on the chronology of Greek philosophy. Now if you -- read this book through, you'll find that at -- one year is given -- is placed with every one of these men as being -- their being in their prime. It's a little doubtful translation of the -- Greek word "akme." "Prime" I think in your consideration would mean your own age. Aren't you in your prime? But for the Greeks, it was a little later. They had a -- some time to think. And so the -- the akme, the -- the flowering of a man is in his 40th year. And so the later Greeks, the Alexandrian scholars, who look back at their homeland in Asia Minor, and Italy, Southern Italy, and Greece, from afar, in perspective, when they came to the Ptolemaic court, where also the Old Testament was translated, where there was a great center of the library in Alexandria, in this place, they -- they carpentered, they -- they -- they, so to speak, conceived of a chronology to make the mutual dependencies of these philosophers consciously known. And they simply put every man to his 40th year. Now obviously man is not a mech- -- mechanic -- human being. And some people have even some ideas at my age. It's rare, but it happens. And the others begin at 20, and have b- -- big ideas at your age. That doesn't happen, either, often. So the -- there is a chronology of the Greek tradition in Alexandria which you find preserved in this book, is pretty arbitrary, because if you have always the -- the year 40, you do not know the interrelations of these men. Sometimes the man of 20 may already criticize a man of 40; or vice versa: a man of 60 may criticize a younger man, who comes up chronologically after him.

Now this is exactly, it seems to me, what has happened with Heraclitus and Parmenides. And that's why I have given you this book, this -- my pamphlet to read, so that you can study. In this book here, Heraclitus is on page 24, and Parmenides is on page 41. And yet I insist that many of the fragments of Heraclitus are written against Parmenides. And that shows you the dangers of this mechanic placement here, because Mrs. {Freeman} says that Heraclitus lived -- had his prime about 500 and Parmenides about 475. So the superficial reader is led to believe that they follow each other without any inner contact, and any -- any dialectics, any dialogue between them. Any dispute -- between them. This

cannot be true. It is obvious that they had a very lively duel carried on between them.

As Ephesus and Miletus are neighboring cities, and both of great importance in the trade and in the religion of the Mediterranean. Where is the city of Ephesus still very famous at the end of antiquity? For -- where -- whence do we know something about Ephesus? Who lived in Ephesus? Well, where do you meet Ephesus in non-Greek sources which you -- were known to you? Mr. Miller?

(I'm thinking Saul.)

What?

(I said, { } I was thinking Saul. But I'm not sure.)

Saul? Well, I call him Paul.

(Paul?)

Yes. So? Why do call him Saul?

(I'm sorry.)

No, you don't have to be sorry. You have some good reason for this, too.

But when he was in Tarsus, which is in the south of -- of Asia Minor, and went to school there -- probably to the liberal arts college of Tarsus, I think he was a very good student and -- there, which is always underrated. He had of course a full Greek education, Paul. He called himself Saulus from Tarsus. And then he went on and wrote a famous letter to the Ephesians. Never heard of it? Where can you find the letter to the Ephesians? Wie? Where is it printed?

(In the Bible.)

Yes, in a book quite well known formerly. Letter to the Ephesians. And what's the story about his relations -- his -- own experience in Ephesus? Where do you find the experience of Mr. Paul von Tarsus in Ephesus? It was very unpleasant. What?

{ }.

Yes, yes, Sir, yes. And what happened? Well have you never heard of the great outcry of the mob against Paul? Great is the Diana of the Ephesians? Never heard of this? {None ever heard}? Well, it's remarkable. The real religious revival in this country.

Gentlemen, Ephesus is a very great place. I mean, I hope it's all before you; at the age of 50, you may begin to read the Bible. And then you will find that the Apostle -- Johan- -- John -- St. John lived in Ephesus, that Paul was persecuted in Ephesus, and had a tremendous clash with the great cult of the Aphrodite, or Diana of Ephesus, the goddess with the innumerable breasts, this fertility goddess of all Asia Minor, compares -- a -- tremendous cul- -- cult. You find in Naples, for example, in the museum, a wonderful, marble statue of this Diana of Ephesus. Nobody can see this without being deeply impressed about the fanta- -- fantastic imagination that worked these people up to -- to throw their all and everything into these -- this cults, you see. Men were castrated -- the whole cult of -- the whole religion of eunuchs and castrates comes from this fact that the god of fertility had to receive the breasts of the women and the penises of the men to increase his fertilities. That's quite some sacrifice. That's worse than life, the -- the human sacrifice. Don't think it's any ri- -- -thing ridiculous, Sir. It's quite serious, gentlemen. And against these mighty cults which intoxicated people, and led them to real sacrifices, it is very fight -- hard to fight with a sober religion, gentlemen, because religions are -- only impress people when they make -- ask for great sacrifices. You have no religion as long as you don't know that "religion" and "sacrifice" is the same word. Religion is nothing nice, is nothing peaceful. It certainly is not for the peace of mind, or the piece of soul as modern bestsellers try to make you believe. But it is worship. And the service of God is a very severe service, gentlemen. And your God demands sacrifices from you.

And -- since this country is told by its rulers -- yesterday in -- an after-dinner speech at 7 o'clock, that this country does not live by sacrifices, this is in a very bad mess. These -- every -- every drop of blood shed today by the Israelis, the English, and the French is to be laid at Mr. Dulles' doorstep. He is responsible for all the bloodshed. But here sits -- the Americans back and say -- say, they -- they want to stop the bloodshed which they have caused. It's very scandalous, gentlemen, because you are not serious in these matters. And you -- therefore you do not understand these philosophers of antiquity who had to fight against tremendous odds, against the severe cults of their cities -- no, no smoking. And -- that's the sacrifice I have to ask from you.

And -- it is very -- still astonishing how these men could stick their neck

out, and be heard. And we still listen to them. And I think the only reason is this deep desire to find men who wud- -- were not totally encased in their nation, in their city, in Greece. The word of course in Greek for the political unit, as you know, is "polis." And our word "politics" comes from -- from this word, which means the city-state. Of course, it was a -- a city within walls with some territory -- some fruitful territory around it. And the cult was always one of fertility god, as in Ephesus, of the Diana. And therefore all the people in all these cities for which these philosophers thought, were exposed to tremendous hardships, to tremendous sacrifices. To sacrifice your firstborn, and to -- perhaps to castrate him in honor of the goddess -- that's not a small thing for a father. It's just as bad as the slaughter of Isaac, with -- by the -- through Abraham. And you must think that the very abolition of human sacrifice, which the Old Testament tells you about -- Abraham, and which you gloss over now as a minor thing, means that in all other tribes and cities, except Judaism, the human sacrifice still exists. Why is it told in -- in the New -- Old Testament? Because Abraham is acquitted from this sacrifice, you see, this bloody sacrifice. But all the Greek cities had it. And therefore all these philosophers, of course, try to find a way out of this anxiety of every individual, political order of every one polis to go it alone.

They tried to generalize, they tried to find some principles which would not make it necessary to be totally engulfed in the -- within the precinct and the walls of one city, in one's own mind. It is an attempt to unfetter the mind so that the physical universe and the political universe come to an equation. We still some try -- of course, laboring for this. Today it's a crisis which shows you how difficult it is, how you can overshoot the mark, and how -- the American idea--everything is water--does not immediately equate the real political situation of today with your ideal. You want to live in a uni- -- fools' paradise already. That is, you say, "All -- the whole globe is peopled by civilized nations, and therefore no war," gentlemen, then you eternalize all tyranny. If the Hungarians had said, "No bloodshed," as Mr. Dulles says, or Ei- -- through the mouth of Mr. Eisenhower said yesterday -- because I don't -- I'm afraid our president says nothing of -- by -- on his own, so then you -- you say, "No bloodshed."

Gentlemen, that's no -- that's nonsense. You can't live that way. Tyranny cannot be eternal. Should -- the Hungarians not stone these -- their tyrants? Doesn't your heart -- isn't your heart uplifted by this fact that people with bare hands and naked fists can throw out a terr- -- a terrible tyranny? But if you read the official statements in America, then any bloodshed is wicked. It's nonsense. There's good bloodshed and wicked bloodshed. It's both.

You never know which is which. But certainly to say, "All bloodshed is wicked," is absolute nonsense. There would have never been a United States if the people had said this here.

And this deep sickness of your soul, gentlemen, is really something to behold, because you believe already that the physical universe is the only universe that exists, that the polis is already totally abolished. You are philosophically corrupt.

Now Parmenides is a great name, gentlemen, before Plato, who came forward -- and I had a friend who always said it's one story from Parmenides to Hegel, from Parmenides to William James, from Parmenides to modern philosophy. It is always the same thing. Nothing much has been changed. That's quite a challenge.

What did Parmenides? After these people -- these other people--there are a few other names whom I can pass over--had tried to encourage the youth of their cities with the idea that the mental world was wider than the world of their cult, and their city, and their military duty, that the right and wrong had to be thought outside the city walls, also. After these people had stated--stammeringly, you may say, and stutteringly--these first possibilities, Parmenides comes and says, "All first impressions are wrong." I have talked to you about first impressions and second impressions, have I not? And I said first impressions are those which ask for our immediate loyalty, which cannot wait. When a house burns, you cannot doubt whether you should help putting it out. You have just to extinguish it.

Therefore your first impression must unleash an immediate act. You can see this. And if a man doesn't help extinguish a fire, he's a coward and he's a scoundrel. And no philosophy can ever justify it.

First impressions demand immediate action. They are not wrong impressions, but they are compelling impressions. Against this, Parmenides is the first philosopher who has said, "All phenomena of this world, including the political phenomena of the city, are to be looked through as wrong, as pseudo, as lying to our senses. And everything realized before I wake up to philosophy, all these first impressions are to be called 'cheat,' 'illusion,' 'lie.'" He's the first who says that the phenomenal world is a world of what the Hindus would call--how do the Hindus call this world of illusion? Oh, you have heard of this, some of you. Mr. {White}.

(Nirvana?)

Ja. What?

(Nirvana?)

Oh, a little knowledge is a bad thing. Terrible. It doesn't matter you -- of course, for you. Nirvana is just the opposite. Nirvana is the freedom from illusion.

(Karma.)

Karma is your character. No. No, it's called maya. Have you never heard of maya, this appearance, the world of apparitions? So really, this nirvana of yours is before -- is -- yours is the sleep before one wakes up. Nirvana is the sleep after one has suffered too much. Really, don't use words -- without context. "Maya" is the -- is the illusion against which the -- philosophy tries to wake you up.

So Parmenides, gentlemen, is the first man who has the courage then imitated more or less by later philosophers, for example, by the Frenchman Descartes, that -- who says the first impressions are bad. They are wrong. We should get rid, at your age, so to speak, of all first impressions. I love my mother: illusion, you see. Hated my father: illusion. I played games: illusion. I ran around with boys: illusion. It -- is a defiance. -- This moment of the awakening of the intellect, you see, is of course for all of you a temptation. You really think that you can abolish God and the government by discussion. If you think so, if -- man is independent, you see, you think you can forget that you constantly must breathe while you are thinking, so certain life processes have to go -- be carried on. Any man, gentlemen, whose mind is alive, goes through this phase of temptation where he tries to get outside the world by his mind, with the help of his mind, and make the mind the judge of all these previous impressions, and say, they may all be wrong.

This is Parmenides, gentlemen. Therefore he has -- become, and you must keep his mind -- his name carefully in mind, gentlemen, he is the prototype of pure philosophy, because he takes the philosopher for the first time outside the seriousness of the responsibility of the citizenry. He says the philosopher must not be tempted by the illusions of the city in which he grows up, by the -- of the temple in which he worships, of the schools in which he is taught, of the parents whose heir he is. He must free himself of his environment in space and time.

And Parmenides therefore is the first man who tries to penetrate against his own local and his own temporal limitations. And it is the first radical statement of the ambition of all philosophy, gentlemen. And Parmenides therefore is in a way more important than Plato. And more than Aristotle, because there is laid down the rule that the ambition of philosophy is to slay the dragon of times and spaces, and to discover, you see, what is true outside your time and outside your space. It is still your ambition. And you are much more Parmenides than you think. You are. Parmenides is perhaps no more -- nowhere more alive than in America.

How does he do it? Parmenides is also the first man of whom we know in philosophy that he based his community on homosexuality. That is, he created an artificial home for the mind, where men and young -- young boys could live together without any political need of marriage, of all the needs which would make these first impressions so utterly valid. If you have normal life, the problem of childbirth and of parenthood immediately occurs, and then it is laughable to wait for philosophy until you can lay down the rule, you see. You have already to comply. But if you pervert man and make him -- make him autonomous, even in his lust, even in his sex, you see, then you can create this fools' paradise of a philosophical club in which people are self-contained. In which they therefore do not have to comply with the laws of {city}. This is a deep problem, gentlemen, of homosexuality and man- -- mentality. And that's why it always creeps in where you get big bunches of boys -- or men, young men, students in Oxford or in -- or in Harvard. And the temptation is then always to become autonomous. This is nothing -- it's very serious. And you know how serious it is, from very com- -- miserable -- -miserating cases.

Homosexuality is the consequence of an abundance of mind, of an abundance of intelligence, you see, waiting for second impressions, and stripping yourself of these so-called illusions, or first impressions, as not valid. Because in all these first illusions, there are certain laws that incest is forbidden, or perversion is forbidden, or whatever the -- the -- the obnoxious thing is, that befall the man who steps aside and begins to play in his mind with all possibilities. It's of course possibili- -- possible to play -- to sleep with a cow, but it isn't right. It is forbidden. Now if the mind is -- left to its sovereignty, the first thing is: nothing is forbidden. You can see that this is the first answer.

Therefore, gentlemen, all philosophy in Greece is tainted -- tainted by this thing and we hear, by -- from Parmenides that he already was a sweetheart of an older man, and that he had gathered around him many men. We don't know how much this was pure sex, and how much it was just sympathy; but it was

this incredible tenderness, which you still find in Oxford and Cambridge permeating the whole atmosphere between the dons and the boys, and depriving the English home of much of this same fascination. An Englishwoman always seems to me a very poor person, because she's deprived of these tendernesses which men in England extend to each other. They are -- haven't to be homosexuals. But there is a spirit of sympathy and manly friendship in all English political life, too, in the Parliament, you see, and in -- in -- in the colleges, which has been stolen from the -- from the hetero-erotic life between the sexes, which we would expect as going on between girl and boy, and husband and wife.

And -- England is a very good example of this transfer -- of this possibility of transfer. The whole English political life is based on this -- on this strange -- well, it is perversion of -- transfer of the Eros from the life between the sexes to the life between friends, between -- between political or scholarly friends. It doesn't exist, I think, in any other country to that extent. Here it is more -- just a vice. I mean, senators of the United States Senate have often been found guilty of homosexuality. But I think these are just frustrated people who had -- never had the courage to love a woman. And it seems sometimes to be the line of least resistance, homosexuality. It has many reasons. It is just sometimes frustration. But not so in England. Is -- in England it has -- it isn't very often there homosexuality in any physical sense. I know a case where a young girl came to me in her -- in her plight in England. She loved a very beautiful man -- that's already very dangerous, if they are too beautiful. And he was in politics. -- He was -- all his ambition in politics. And when they were together, he would beat her up and only talk to her about his next speech in Parliament. That is, his love song was in Parliament, and with her he was just cruel until she had to run away from this man. That's not rare. It's an old story in psychiatrics, that there is a whole tradition of flagellantism in England.

I must mention these disagreeable things, gentlemen, because Greek philosophy is an attempt to get outside first impressions, and that always means to get outside the city. And that always means to try to do without the community and its austere rules of chastity, and of probity, and of honesty. You can take different steps. A cynic would try to go it alone, you see, and the Parmenides group would try to go it as a club. And so you can have various ways of escaping. Or you can go on a desert island with your virgin -- Paul et Virginie, in an idyll, you see, and have, so to speak, a couple set aside, and live like Robinson Crusoe, or Paul et Virginie, the French novel, which according to the French of course, is much more reasonable because it doesn't omit womanhood, you

see. Paul et Virginie is much nicer than Robinson Crusoe. The American -- the English, of course, thought up -- Robinson Crusoe with a man helping him, you see. What a boring island! That's typically England. And it was written in the high days of the development of the English character, and -- when was Robinson Crusoe written? It's very important.

(1808.)

Wie?

(Actually the end of the 1700s.)

I think 1718, something like that, if I'm wrong. About this time. That is the day -- it's a -- you know that all our economic theory is based on this, Robinson Crusoe. It is very harmful, this world of mere men, you see, because the economic man is of course in -- reality, gentlemen, the father of a family, a husband-man, who has a wife, and children, and sons who waste money, and daughters who -- who are -- who -- for whom you want to spend as much money as possible. And therefore in the real economic world, gentlemen, the -- even -- even the dollar-man, the man who is out for the money is...

[tape interruption]

...not even allowing her -- her son to go to the doctor, because it would have cost money, so he remained a cripple all his life. It's famous -- you must read it, the -- her biography. It's a great story of {dollar} {}, where a woman takes over the function of the -- the husband, so to speak, you see, to look out for the wherewithal.

Now gentlemen, if one -- a man in a -- in the family is out for making money, and the daughter is asking him to make her presents, and the son is out to making debts, running into debt, and the -- mother is there to economize with what is there, make both ends meet, you have a normal, human society. But if you get a theory like Robinson Crusoe, you see, then everybody is asked to be -- a Robinson Crusoe in economics, you see, following only self-interest, and you get a mad society, which we have at this moment at the stock exchange.

It is -- they are -- the -- when I took -- I have this privilege quite often to talk to New York brokers. They strike me as the most insane group of people. They are absolutely insane. They think it is normal only to -- to -- to -- to see the whole universe, and -- and -- I talked to a bank economist four days ago. Well,

the man is absolutely crazy. He said, "Every year -- we -- we -- we gain by -- 3 percent in wealth and efficiency." And such no- -- such mechanic ideas about human life.

The world is, in this country, full of these Parmenideses in economics.

And of course, everything is artificial, because they -- they only can see that every human being is like them, whereas the beginning of wisdom is to say that to philosophize, gentlemen, is something very eccentric, is a function for the community. And I tried to show you from the beginning the no- -- nobility of philosophy is that it adds something to the orderly processes, because they do not suffice, you see. They are deficient. But if you say, "Tha- -- that's all," you go into the Parmenides direction. Now against this, Heraclitus -- stands up, and therefore I think he wrote against him, under the impact of this terrible danger, that there would develop a philosophic community, which would simply criticize the whole political world as insufficient; therefore, would undermine morale. It would be like the Red { } -- the -- the -- Alger Hisses in this country would anticipate a world state and would undermine the defenses of the United States in the meantime. We had the same problem in the last 20 years. Whereas the Platonists in this country, the Parmenideses in this country said, "Well, we already envisage a world society, therefore we have to give away all secrets of the United States to Russia."

This is all very practical, gentlemen. It's the tam- -- total temptation always to think about your second thoughts as though they could abolish our first thoughts. And I have tried to make you believe--it is very hard for you to believe--that this is impossible, that children have to be educated with severity and with authority. You have to tell your children what is true and what is right. You can't get out of this and you can't say, "They shall find out themselves." That's nonsense. Then they will be monsters, like the Loeb brothers, who tried to find out themselves what they -- the perfect crime. But this is still the theory in this country, the -- the -- the -- the idea that the next generation can find out by themselves. Then you wouldn't be in this college, gentlemen. There would be no college, because this college is waiting for you and expects you to come. Isn't that all prearranged? Isn't that all an attempt to save you much trouble?

Now you can see, gentlemen, there is a long way from the Parmenides group, the first liberal arts college in the world, to us. I always simplify matters by saying, "No -- no homosexuality on this campus." That's the different -- distinction between Greek philosophy and modern philosophy. We cannot pay this price for thinking.

Once you look this through, you will find many other problems in this college already solved, which the Greeks could not solve in their philosophical clubs. They called these clubs love -- love-meetings, eranos. And the word "eranos" is spelled this way: e-r-a-n-o-s. And it contains of course the word "{eramai}", I love. And is -- in the word "eros." And you know eros is the love, regardless of where it falls, whether between man and woman, or men and men, or women and women. "Eros" is the word for the passion of the heart as well as of the body. It is not sex. You cannot translate "eros" with sex. That would be really an injustice to the Greeks. They have never fallen so low as we -- to call, to divide men. Men -- we are units, and if I love, I sing, and I want to embrace. But I do not separate my body from my -- my soul, when I am in love, as you try to do. Sex doesn't exist for decent people. That's for the animal. But eros does. Eros is the driving passion which makes us overcome our mutual shame and resistance and drives us into each other's arms.

So "eros" and "eranos" are con- -- connected. The word "eranos" is the official term in Greece all these centuries for the friendly group in which people converse on problems of truth. And there is today in Switzerland a -- a maga- -- a yearbook, which is called Eranos, in which the leading people like Mr. Jung, the famous psychologist in Zürich, publish their findings, or poets like Hofmannsthal, and Rilke. It's called Eranos, and is published every year, because this is the immortal term for the loving conversation between men. Eranos.

It's not argumentation. It's not discussion, you see. It's not debate, what you think. It's not a -- a lecture meeting where people then ask questions, you see. But eranos is what you find in the -- your book, The Symposium, of Plato, you see. The Symposium is a one mome- -- a one-evening eranos, you see. Eranos would be a constituted situation in which people meet twice a week, so to speak, at a symposion. You understand.

So the -- the -- the Platonic philosophy also climaxes in such an eranos.

So Parmenides is a terribly important figure for this reason, that he says, "All political impressions, and all first impressions," gentlemen, are -- as -- as the translator say- -- calls it, "opinion," by which he means "worthless," seem- -- "appearance," just "sham." And says -- creates now a second term for the real, for that which is true. And here is his famous word which today makes -- so -- gives so much headache to the existentialists, and in my paper I have deal -- dealt with it, too. That is the word "essence." He says, "There must be behind all these semblances of political orders," you see, "and technical laws the real world,

which we cannot see. Behind water, there must be nitrogen." He didn't know what nitrogen was, but he tried to penetrate be- -- into the elements and into the lasting truth of everything. And therefore, he said, "Opinion is what we receive first." And most people get stuck in opinion. "I, however, with my boyfriends, I devote my life to stabilizing the lasting truth against this passing truth of time and space." And you get here this arrogance of the philosopher to tell you that he knows about the things outside time and space, whereas the ordinary man, you see, is blinded by time and space.

Now of course, you would admit that Mr. Parmenides never got outside time and space. He had to love his boys. And he was loved by his boyfriend himself. And therefore, he was very much in time and space. -- It is the illusion however, of most high-brows and most pseu- -- intellectuals that somewhere, through a loophole, they have escaped, like the devil out of the chimney for -- from under the roof of hu- -- common humanity, model humanity and -- and they look more clearly, with a bird's-eye view. Oh, they survey -- "your survey courses," they are kind of this devilry still. They give you the impression that one can survey things.

Gentlemen, nobody knows anything which he doesn't love. And all the attempts of making -- I -- when I see these "individuals and society" people there -- stream out and into this cave there, to this prison, I pity them. Nothing enters their heart. Therefore, they can noth- -- understand nothing. Everything understand -- enters their brain. It's a mistake, this course, a grave mistake. It's an illusion. Every one of them should go on a farm or -- or in a -- in a workshop and work one day, and he would know more about the individual in society than sitting there in -- in this hall. You can't do it. It's impossible.

Our -- our -- it's -- the -- the same illusion of -- of the Par- -- it's the great temptation of the Parmenideses, gentlemen. The Parmenideses do think that outside the polis, outside the city is the proper -- place to philosophize. Well, that's all right, to add second impressions, criticism; I'm all for it. But they go further and they say, "All the first impressions are wrong, and we are somehow outside space and time. We are idealists. We are in this famous second world" -- the ivory tower some people call it, you see -- "where we can look down on the rest of the world -- through a telescope, so to speak, as though this was another planet."

You well know that this is an illusion. We don't get outside our own planet. It's not true. But this illusion feeds most philosopher -- philosophical tradition in the world, that the philosopher deals with all the units -- passing

units in space and time from some telescopic viewpoint, you see, which allows him to say -- tell us what space and time are. That's not given to mortals, gentlemen. We are not outside space and time, ever. Ever. But philosophy has always, since Parmenides, tried to prove this point. This very point, you see. And you come -- we come later to Plato's ideas and the ideas are somewhere immune against time and space, you see. It's very tempting.

And anybody who is out for the truth, gentlemen, must of course try to find some such foothold in the eternal, in the everlasting, in the unchanging, in the outside-space-and time. Every one of us, I included, of course, are always trying to persuade myself that I do not fall for the transient, for the mortal, for the corrupt, for the momentary, or the purely parochial. Not one of us want to be provincial, gentlemen, but we all are. But we can di- -- separate the -- divide the world into those who say, "We are provincials," you see, and the others say, "But we are not." Now I side with those who say that they are provincials, I -- preferably, to those who say they have no prejudices, you see, and they are not dogmatic. Because that's their dogma.

Most philosophers you can trap because they say, "I have no dogma."

That's a dogma. Nobody can live without certainties, gentlemen. It's impossible. You live in some city. And if you don't live in the real city, you live in this dream city of nice students and -- as we try to live here in Dartmouth. And you know, it's a pseudo-city.

This is an artificial existence, gentlemen. I can tolerate this and you can tolerate it if you da- -- say to yourself, "It is an artificial existence." Then no harm is done. If once you say, "This is normal, and the other people are all fools," then we go wrong, you see. Then we must turn values topsy-turvy. Can you see this? I think it is necessary for us to go through the hardship of this isolation for four years. That's a good training, you see. But you must know that it is not the law of the universe, this separation of the sexes, here, and this -- these four years in -- in -- in Baker Library. Then, it can fulfill, like any medicine. You see, you don't say of a medicine that it is the norm, that it is the daily food. Yet you will not deny that medicine is a very good thing in -- in time -- at times to take. And so I feel that the liberal arts college is a medicine which should be swallowed as something that is in its own day a cure for the excesses of the human mind at the time when it begins to grow in you, and otherwise would confuse you. And this community is an attempt to ma- -- make you see that the mind is given us to pool our energies for the purpose of unanimity, for the

purpose of common understanding, of fellowship, and then it's -- does its thing. There you see again, that Parmenides, as all great people, combines greatness and truth with falsehood. His perversion of the natural love between men and women is something we cannot imitate. The loyalty between these people to find out truth is something very much worthwhile. And the insistence only is that many of the first impressions need reprobation, or need criticism is also nothing to be -- to be -- be -- { } {up}. All freedom, all progress has been based on his power to get outside his own city. And it's very interesting, gentlemen, he was an American. He lived in Elea -- he came from Elea to Southern Italy. And Southern Italy was a colonial state from Greece. And the Greeks settled there in Southern Italy and Sicily at great danger, because there were the Phoenicians, the Puni from Carthage, who were competing with them. Many of these -- of these harbors were in the hands of the Phoenicians at that time. Like Sardinia. That was totally Punic, Lilybaeum, other cities in -- in --in Sicily. And so the Greeks came there under great danger. This is a kind of situation as between the Spaniards here in Florida, you see, or in Texas, and the Anglo-Saxons in the North. A similar, bloody competition. And you know, there were many terrible events between Spanish settlers and Anglo-Saxon settlers for 300 years. Now in the similar way, the Phoenicians in the south of Italy, and Syracuse -- and Sicily competed with the Greek settlers. Therefore these Greek settlers were pushed forward to modernize and streamline their thought as well as their civilization. And in Her -- in Parmenides, we have a man of the new type, a pioneering man who wanted to do away with these prejudices as living in a new-founded state and said, "Let's philosophize straight. And let's consider everything under general denominators. Let's forget our first loyalties. Let's not be prejudiced by any other, older religious cult." So he -- goes so far to say, "All first impressions are illusions." Page 41, gentlemen, it is shortly -- stated there in -- in small print: "He wrote a poem in hexameter verse addressed to his pupil Zeno." You can also say "his sweetheart Zeno." "It was divided into three parts: the Prologue, the Way of Truth, the Way of Opinion." Now it is just as queer as the Lucretius in that it invokes the gods, in the Prologue. But it then s -- tells what is real being, what is the essence of things, unchanging, forever the same. And then says, "But in order to condescend to you, foolish mortals, I'll show you how your way of opinion looks if I judge it, if I describe it." And I have done the same now. I have -- am -- just published two volumes of a sociology in German. And in the -- my first volume, I deal with the illusions of the space-thinker. And then in the second volume, I try to tell my truth in terms of time-thinking. So obviously the Parmenides situation repeats itself in

every generation, that to a certain extent, one has to write from -- with the Eros of one's contemporaries, you see, in order to convince them that one is -- even -- just as able as they are, to follow through their illusions, their prejudices. And so I feel very -- very strongly for this man, Parmenides, in this sense that I also have two volumes. The Way of Opinion is my first volume, you see, and The Way of Truth is my second volume. And the way of opinion is in my case the ephemeral way of momentary sensation, stimuli, impressions, and news, you see; and the way of truth to me is the man who is able to live in -- represent three generations in his thinking, and has his father and his child in -- in him- -- mind just as much as himself. And you can see, these are two different people. The man who -- in any act thinks: how does this compare to the values of my father and of my son? -- will act very differently in -- in his lawgiving and in his rules than a man who is swayed by the latest fad, about vitamins, or about the Mormons, or about some -- some fad, as you -- most of you think you have to. And that is to me the way of truth and the way of opinion. And therefore, the division of Parmenides is a stroke of genius. But we have a hard time to understand that to him it was -- the way of opinion was the way of my local environment, of my five senses, you see. And the way of truth was the -- that was -- remained forever unchanging. His difference is change, you see, as the fools who run after change in space and -- I tried to say yesterday to my class, that to you, gentlemen, who -- run always with opinion, who don- -- know any- -- that there is truth agai- -- against opinion, who are totally -- every three months you have a different truth, and you are very much insulted if a man already speaks up for the truth of your next three months, which is not very difficult to know. But you -- are insulted, I mean.

I never forget when I s- -- was standing at The -- in The Wigwam -- in the -- what's it called? The Indian Bowl? In the Indian Bowl -- at that time, it wasn't called the Indian Bowl. It was -- it was before its first bankruptcy, and it was called The Wigwam. And -- and there was the war announced be- -- under Mr. Forestal's secretaryship between Russia and us. And I was just sipping a cup of coffee. And next to me the student of Dartmouth elaborated on the fact that now there would be war.

And I said to him with a very quiet tone, "There will be no war."

And I was a leper to him at that very moment. At that time, you had to say in Dar- -- on the Dartmouth campus that there woul- -- s- -- be war, you see.

Today everybody has to say the Americans will not be involved. Three months

from now, they will be involved. But this -- is just how this country lives, you see. On September 4th, 1939, I have heard the president of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, say over the radio, "There shall be no blackout of peace in America." And five months before, he had said to a friend of mine that this time, when the European nations went to war, the United States would have to go into this war within six months. That's politics in this country.

But -- the whole country loves it. You ate it -- eat it all up. "No involvements," headlines in the papers. Is this politics? This is just for children. Children. How can a great statesman know what's going to happen? He can say, "I pray that we may not have to be involved." Never can he say, "There will be no involvement." That's more than human beings can say. That's forbidden. That's blasphemy. That's God's will, and not human will. So you elect a president 1916. He kept the country out of war so that he might take the country into war the next day. That's American opinion, gentlemen.

And that's exactly what Parmenides attacked. And therefore, Parmenides has an eternal position in your own -- in your own breast, gentlemen. If you will have to live this silly life of hunting opinions down, of chasing butterflies, which you think is the -- the life of the informed mind in this country, who knows nothing, but is informed every day about something else, then you think of Parmenides, who was fed up with this and said, "I distinguish the way of truth and the way of opinion. And I cannot worship at the shrine of opinion, because I become the laughing stock. I become nauseated with myself. Shall I believe every three months something the opposite?" That's no truth, gentlemen. That's silly. And I've never seen -- the -- the childishness of this country has reached an all-time high, because you don't mind being sold down the river every three months for a different subject. You think that's the way in which peop- -- things have to move. You do not even want to be remembered -- or reminded, I should say -- reminded of the fact that three months ago you believed the opposite.

So the Opinion -- gentlemen, the Book of Truth and the Book of Opinion are enemies today, as they always have been. And therefore with all my regrets about Mr. Parmenides' homosexuality, I forgive him much, because probably it was at that time the only way of getting outside the fog, you see. And a -- a kind of violent medicine was taken. I mean, the -- the means was as atrocious as our H-bomb is, the homosexuality between teacher and students, gentlemen. But it worked. It has had the tremendous merit. And it is very strange. We have to say that we owe the Greeks a contribution which probably no other group could ever have made. On the balancing, on something unnatural, and con- -- counter-natural, you see, they yet did something, and there we -- we look into the tragic

-- tragedy of human beings. You see, if there is great corruption, the -- the medicine is oft -- often corrupt, too, you see, because two minus, as you know, give us a plus. And the corruption of the individual passionate city who run to their self-destruction in one war after another, led these philosophers to use desperate means. Fortunately I think we live in a world in which the -- means don't have to be desperate. But gentlemen, if you don't have to have homosexuality, for -- telling the truth, or knowing the truth, or learning the truth, sacrifices are still needed; courage is still needed.

The cowardice which prevails on this campus at this moment, gentlemen, and the timidity of your mind will destroy the colleges. I think -- 50 years from now, the colleges will be -- all be abolished as perfectly unnecessary, because they no longer serve truth. They just serve opinion.

I'm very serious about this. We have -- over the last 20 years, the American colleges have destroyed their right of existing -- existence. If you want to hear a very distinguished American speak about -- his mind about this, read Samuel Eliot Morison's -- the great historian's of Harvard -- address in Kingston, Can- -- Canada where he speaks out against that trash which today is called "truth" in our -- your education. It's -- just appeared. I'd advise you very much to read it. "Freedom and the -- and Higher Education" it is called. Samuel Eliot Morison.

Things are in very bad shape, gentlemen. The sore spot in America are you. Your education. Not yourself. You are very innocent people, gentlemen. But what you -- you do not contribute to the truth, to the -- to -- you contri- -- only contribute to -- to the opinion. For this we don't need colleges, gentlemen. Opinions form in every city, anyway, you see. Opinion is that which is the -- the gist of -- of daily life, the routines of life. If you only repeat these routines yourself, if you do not obstruct them, if you do not appraise them, if you do not outgrow them, then why should there be a college? Why -- why should you have just the same life in an easier way of the plumber and the man at the filling station, you see? You must oppose their opinions to find out the truth. That's at least the idea of the liberal arts college as it was founded by Parmenides.

Now comes the -- the dangerous result once more. The essence says, "This group can forget about the city. It has no duties in the realm of first impressions." That's Parmenides, the pure ivory tower concept. Against this, Heraclitus says, "We have to find the truth within the first impressions," and that's why the fathers of the Church called Heraclitus "the only Christian in all Greek philosophy." Why? Because the Christian suffers within his congregation, and within his community, you see, for the truth. He doesn't go outside. But he is redeemed, so to speak, to look through the opinions of the day, you see, because

he's willing to suffer.

Gentlemen, anybody who is willing to be the underdog, who is willing to suffer, can know the truth.

I have here a colleague, I told you this I think in class, who has shocked me terribly, because he said under any dictatorship, he would comply, because he couldn't suffer. And he would certainly have helped to -- to -- to extinguish the Jews in Germany; and in Hungary, he would have shot down, as the secret police, the peasants, because he would go with the power. He has no guts to resist evil.

I said to him, "Do you know that you then commit evil?"

"Yes," he said. "Maybe I have to admit it."

And I said, "You are much worse than the evildoers, because the -- the lukewarm are always the ones who make life impossible." You -- the lukewarm are always the majority, and they are the real, guilty ones. Because the evildoers are punished by their wickedness; but the lukewarm, you see, think that they are not punishable, if they have done nothing wrong. They have just followed their so-called -- enlightened self-interest or what-not.

Now this colleague of mine, gentlemen, is a very important example of one fact, gentlemen: if you suffer -- are willing to suffer, you can know the truth inside the existing orders. As long as you do not identify yourself with the powers that be, the full realm of truth is available, because the truth is between the culprit in court and this district attorney. The truth is not -- neither has the district attorney the full truth nor the criminal. But if you could ta- -- take the two together, you would have the full truth of the case. That's why Jesus sided with the -- with the culprits, because the district-attorney wisdom He had anyway. He was innocent. But if He was also on the side of the culprits, He represented the whole truth of human community life. That's why it is equally important that Jesus was innocent, and that He was on the side of the -- found on the side of the sinners, you see. Because through -- by innocence, I share the insight into the righteousness of the law, but on the -- by siding with the sinners, I also see the incompetency of the law, that the law is never enough, that the law doesn't cover all the facts of life, you see. It's always limited.

So gentlemen, he who can suffer, Christianity says, can know the truth.

Philosophy says: he who can get outside can know the truth. These are the two

ways of philosophy and Christianity, and they are always in opposition. Now the word -- I now may ask you to have read next time this paper of mine. Who has read it already? Well, you -- I make this point that this word "essence," you see, is an attempt to sanctify the easy talk of boys outside the city. In the city, there are no such pronouns and proverbs, you see, like "being." In the city, you only know that -- there is -- war is raging, a pestilence is coming, a ship is landing, you see, prices are high. That is, events which you can name. There are -- all named events happen. And in a -- in a symposium, in an eranos, we can tal- -- talk about essences, abbreviated, as you talk always of God, "the thing," or "something." When you -- try to -- to explain what you do not want to name, you speak always of "something," or "anyway," you say. Most people say, when they mean God, they say "anyway." You can test this out. It's very strange. When you find people are quite serious, "I have to do this anyway," they mean, "It's the will of God that I have to do it. I wouldn't like to do it."

So -- you all use these very -- same abbreviations which I pillory there in my letter. And Heraclitus is -- as a major -- sel- -- elder -- elder statesmen in Ephesus tries to say exactly what the Christians say. If a man would see its own opposite in the city -- his -- its own -- no, his own opposite in the city, he would not have to get outside. If he wa- -- would have the wits, you see, which later Christ had, you see, to see -- to pray for His enemies, you see, because they don't know what they are doing; if you could see once your own opposition, your own enemy as comprised in one unit, the s- -- district attorney, so to speak, and the culprit, you would see the full workings of the universe. And -- as fire and water are needed, and air and earth in their contrast to support us, so -- and woman and man, and -- and foe -- and friend and foe, we cannot abolish these contrasts. You see, you live here in a -- in a world which preaches: there can -- all can -- men can be friends, there have -- don't have to be foes. It's an error. You can only have friends as long as there are foes. It's not -- not possible to ha- -- if everybody's a friend, nobody's a friend. And then friendship -- foe -- enmity will break out in between friends, because opposites are necessary. You have to have enmity in order to have life.

So Heraclitus' deep sermon is against the Parmenideses and their juvenile henchman in -- I said, "Don't set up this second community." Don't set up this second community. Of course, he went unheard, but he made a tremendous impression. Plato, gentlemen, is the combination of Heraclitus and Parmenides, because Parmenides says, "Pure essence. Outside experience. Forget your first experiences. Begin from scratch."

Heraclitus says, "Nonsense. Truth is inside our deepest experiences." We only are too short of breath. We only say, "I"--what shall I use as an example?--"Well, I go in this direction, for example; I go from Elea to Miletus." I -- a man who is wise considers that at the same moment some person must go from Miletus to Elea. He's -- makes the very strong point that to every achievement there is the way toward and the way back. It's one thing to climb a mountain. Who has climbed a mountain? I suppose you all have. Gentlemen, some of you will admit that the way down sometimes is much more disagreeable than the way up. And if you only consider the time it takes to climb a mountain, you are utterly wrong. It is just as much a problem to come down without sore feet. He has this great picture, Heraclitus. And he says, "The way up and the way down are the same way, but they look utterly different." And most people in your -- in your own desire, you only are -- try to get somewhere, gentlemen. But you also have -- all -- all human ways have also to be evacuated. It's very nice to become president, gentlemen. But it is -- takes great wisdom not to stand for reelection. That's a way back. That's just as much God-given, gentlemen. And that is, of course, in Christianity called the wisdom of death, that we have to die to our ascent. Death is the most general term for this way back. We go up -- we get up, you see, but for Mr. Rockefeller, it was one thing to acquire the millions. It was just as difficult for him, as you know, to get rid of them. And so he pays all these idiots for their Rockefeller stipends, and makes great havoc in American civilization, because all kind of nonsense is produced now on account of this money. It's called beneficial. Is it? You see. It's a bribe. You say -- you simply don't think about this, gentlemen. But obviously, I would -- I would -- con- -- my consequence of Mr. Rockefeller's foundation would be that he should never have acquired so much money in the first place, because now it has to be invested in this dead weight, in this dead-hand of a foundation and put to all kind of obsolete uses. And that's not good. I would consider then therefore a legislation justified which would prevent any man to make so much money as Mr. Rockefeller. That's my logic. Because I see how all research today is handicapped by these foundations who are full of old-time prejudices, the -- all the heads of these foundations are anxious people who don't want to make blunders. And will never support a bold venture in thinking, but will always support the most stupid and old-fashioned kind of inquiry and research. The money that is spent for -- over the last 20 years on cancer is all wasted. Why? Because people 20 years ago thought that cancer had to be something like Pasteur's infectious diseases. And therefore all the money was spent in imitating Mr. Pasteur, who lived -- who did his experiments in 1878. And the cancer research was -- has been delayed for a whole generation because

of too much money invested in the wrong direction. Anybody who tried to say in 1920 that cancer was not such a disease was -- could not become a professor of physiology in this country, or in Europe for that matter. And of course, all the money of the foundations was thrown behind the people who had the obsolete, aping ideas of -- you see, saying it was something like -- like hydrophobia. Isn't that the word for the dog disease? And -- and so we are very far behind what would have been possible if people hadn't had this foundation money.

So the way back, says Heraclitus, is just as important as the way in. How do you get out of any fixation, you see? For it -- take the Constitution. It's very nice to have an ironclad constitution which you can never change. But gentlemen, it can lead to great disaster if in a decisive moment, no pow- -- no constitutional amendment can pass through the two-third of the states, or three-quar- -- or how many have to be? Three quarters? Wie?

(Three-quarters.)

Well, don't you think that's a very dangerous proviso? In a decisive moment, that can lead to the destruction of the union, because the amendment is not passed in time. So you see, the way back, that is the power to alter what I have done, you see, is very important. Same problem with any new human vow. Very nice to say "no divorce." If you look into real life, there are marriages that are such hell that you have to find a -- divorce, you see. That's also a way back. Now Heraclitus says, "While you are in for one thing, you have already to allow the community to have an ordinance, you see, which also allows you to get out of this again." This is -- seems very simple, gentlemen, but you all live only in one direction always. Every opinion means, "Today is everything. I'm only looking in this direction," you see. Some wisdom would mean -- real philosophy would mean that although you are allowed to go full and wholeheartedly in one direction, there is some mechanism which protects you against the Dionysian, you see, orgy of your will and mine -- you see, and says later, "Now come; we'll get you out of this trap, you see { }."

So you see perhaps that Heraclitus is the wiser, the much more -- older type of man. He's the -- he is the type of elder statesman. And that's why I think that he wrote to Parmenides after he was dumbfounded by the boldness of this new approach of Parmenides, who declared that truth can only be had through people who get totally out of the city, totally out of the laws of the times, you see, and out of politics, and looked at the world from the outside. And he says, "You can have this if you are wise inside." And that's the only way in which we

can really have wisdom.

So you can see why Plato is a combination later of Heraclitus and Parmenides. Parmenides he follows in the purity of his search, outside the passions of the city, you see. But the content of his thinking is dictated by -- to by Heraclitus. He says, "I must find the real city." Parmenides is not interested in the city at all, you see. He negates -- he negates it. He wants to have the truth of the essences, of being outside any human political intercourse. He has his autonomous world. And -- of Plato, you know, he wrote a Republic, because in devotion to Heraclitus, he knew that the real human wisdom could not remain outside the affairs of men.

Perhaps we read now a few fragments of -- on page 41 so that you can see the difficulty for our friend Parmenides to formulate that which has been the bugbear of all future philosophy: what is essence? What is being? As you know, for the last 30 years in France and Germany, there rages a battle between existentialists and essentialists, you see. The existentialist is a Heraclitean, you see, who says, "I know nothing but actions, certain days and acts of my life." The essentialist is a man who says, "I can penetrate behind space and time." All Roman Catholics today are much less Christian than they are essentialists; they are philosophers. It's a very strange turnaround. Most Catholics I know are philosophically corrupt by Parmenides, because they believe in essences. Now it's not a crime of the Christian faith to believe in essences, but that's what most of these educated Catholics unfortunately believe. Thomas Aquinas inherited from the Greeks, you see, this tradition. And therefore people perorate in this -- in Manhattan College in New York with great eloquence on essences. Following Parmenides. Before Parmenides, nobody ever knew what an essence could be. Will you kindly read the -- we have still 10 minutes -- will you kindly read 7 and 8 on page 43 -- oh no, Number 6 on page 43. Who has it? Will you? ("One should both say and think what being is. But to be is possible, and { } is not possible. This I command you to consider. For from the latter way of search first of all I debar you. But next I debar you from that way along which {wander mortals} knowing nothing. Two { } perplexity in their bosoms { } their intelligence astray. And they carry along as deaf as they are blind, amazed, uncritical { }, by whom to be and not be are regarded as the same and not the same. And for whom in everything there is a way of opposing stress.")

It -- as in two minds. You see, which is a much better translation. Go on.

Do you have it? Ja.

("For this view can never predominate, that that which is not exists.")

No. That that which is not, exists. It is difficult, I grant you. You see -- ja.

Go on.

("You must debar your thought from this way of search, not let ordinary experience in its variety force you along this way, namely that of allowing the eye. Sightness as it -- sightless as it is, and ear, full of sound, and the tongue to rule. But you must judge by means of reason, logos. The much-contested proof, which is astounded by me. There is only one --")

There you have it. The five sense are rejected. You may also say, gentlemen, that if Parmenides, and all philosophers, who -- who move into their ivory tower of pure thinking, one thought must beget the next thought. In normal life, here I -- think something. If I go out the door, I have another thought, because while I -- going out of the door, I have seen something and I have made a different experience, don't you think? All our thinking of normal human beings -- occurs this way. We do something. Strikes us such-and-such. Then we go on to another action. And again we have a thought. That's the way I live, you see. Going from action to thought, from action to thought, from action to thought. Philosophy however, in Parmenides reaches a point, and that's in this paragraph, { } it's a little difficult for {you} to grasp. What you think is correct, that a syllogism, as in mathematics, you see, can proceed without further experience in their meaning. That is, I have grasped one clear thought, let me say that -- that all -- just one space. Now the philosopher tries to deduce his next thought, you see. If there is only one space, you see, all men are contained in one space, and should live in one world state, you see. That's what the conclusion is -- most philosophers conclude. The logic is that it is more normal to live in one state than in many, if you start with the assumption that the world is one space by the nature of things.

This is the typical philosophical conclusion, whereas gentlemen, when I conceive of the sun shining here and say, "Oh, the universe is wonderful," and then I stumble out of this room and run into this -- fall over the staircase, I say, "But this room is fully built," I -- don't connect in my experience the problem of the sun shining over the universe, and the space here confined to my political

entity, you see. I have no such theory that the whole world should be one world state, because I do not conclude from one logical -- you see, basis other {assumptions}. Don't { } -- most people think erratically, sporadically, don't they? Now the whole problem of Parmenides is to persuade his henchmen, to persuade the student, as we do it--Mr. Mandelbaum does it in his class, and every one of us in our department does it--that it is possible and worthwhile to have a maxim, to have a basis of thought, you see, one assumption, and to build on this assumption certain waterproof, logical conclusions, you see, without intervening new experience. That has been the temptation of all systematic philosophizing, you see. I think it goes against all first impression, { }. All the first impressions of a child are that it does something. And then it says, "How strange that I did this," you see. Then it does something else again and again it says, "How strange that I did this." But it's a very far way of demanding from a normal human being, you see, a taxi driver, to connect all these thoughts -- afterthoughts, after any one of these actions { } {well-rounded} system. And as you know, your mother never achieved this, and had never any intention of achieving this. She's quite a reasonable person, but she's far from ever having the idea that all her thoughts had to form a logical whole. You see this? This is however Parmenides' assumption. Once you get outside the first -- light of first impressions, of first actions, of first responsibility, of direct obedience to law, { } -- then you have to embark on the center of this ivory tower, that on this first thought, you see, you must build more thought.

So you can say, gentlemen, Parmenides is thought upon thought upon thought, you see. Once you understand that this is not the normal life of man, you see how artificial philosophy is, and how dangerous it is. It's -- I doesn't -- I do not say that it's always wrong. You can reach certain conclusions. But certainly it's a second way of life. And you can never wish that any child, for example, should ever become a philosopher throughout, you see. It's impossible. It would damage his -- his responses, wouldn't it? Can you see this? Now let's still read the last paragraph, and then have done. But that's quite important. Here, the next. "There's only one other description." Would you? Your neighbor? You read it?

("There's only one other description of a way remaining.

Namely, that what it is, is. In this way, there are very many signposts, that being has made coming into being no {disruption}. For it is whole { } without motion and without {end}. { } together was, or will be, because it is now. A whole, all together, one con-

tinuous {for what} creation of it will you look for? How, whence could it have sprung? Nor shall I allow you to speak or think of it as springing from not being.")

That's the famous -- our conception of creation out of nothingness. He denies -- he denies this, you see, as an impossible thought. Everything has been there all the time. It's this -- Ja? "For it is neither expressible nor thinkable that what is not, is. Also what necessity impelled it, if it did spring from nothing, to be produced later or earlier. {That} is -- must be absolutely all or not at all." That's a very good sentence to sum it all up. He says all these appearances, winter and summer, behind it is weather, behind it is some state. Winter is changing. Summer is changing. But there is something in summer and winter which I call being. That's behind these opinion-creating semblances of warm, or cold, or sunshine, or -- or rain, or snow. And you know, we haven't reached any further perfection. If you ask me what's behind the galaxy, behind the firmament of stars, there's no answer. Why are they there? We still have to accept that there must be some meaning in all these tremendous movements in the stars' being. What it is? Nobody has ever expressed it better than Parmenides. And also, if you read it now, it sounds very hollow. Yet it is a challenge. You see the sky move. The people in Argentina see the sky move. And we all see it in different -- times, and different stages. "What is it in essence?" Parmenides cries, you see.

"What is the essence of all this? And what is not opinion about it? So far as that is concerned, justice has never released -- being in its fetters and set it free, either to come into being or to perish, but holds it fast. The decision on these matters depends on the following: it is -- that's the way of truth, or it is not. It is there - fore decided, as is inevitable, that one must ignore the one way as unthinkable, and inexpressible, for it is no true way, and take the other as the way of being and reality."

Now the strange thing is that everything the normal child of God calls "This is," he says -- calls "Not being," you see. "This is sweet." He says, "That's a delusion, because for somebody else it may taste sour. Therefore I will not give the predicate 'sweet' to anything except in the realm of illusions, and the chemist will bear me -- him out heute -- today and say, "We have penetrated behind sweet and sour, and we know that these are just degrees of some, you see, or -- order in -- in the composition of things. It's just expressed by numbers. "How could being perish? How would it come into being? If it came into being, it is not. And so too"--because then it hasn't been at one time--"and so, if it is about to be at some future time. Thus coming into being is quenched

and destruction also into the unseen."

Will you kindly take the trouble and read for the next time the pages 44 and 45?

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

If you understand the entrance of Parmenides and the so-called Eleatic school into the history of the human mind, you will find that Parmenides, living in the then-America of Greece, in South Italy, across the ocean, across the sea in a colonial environment, for the first time reversed the order of first and second impressions, and said -- in so many words, "The cults of the gods of my home city, and the legislature of my constitution are unreal compared to the insight I can get of the lasting character of the natural order," of phusis.

This has been the tenet of all philosophy ever since, that the first impressions have to be brushed aside or scrutinized by the second impressions to such an extent, gentlemen, that we -- we should try to forget what we have experienced in love, in faith, in hope, in traditions, in law, in justice in the first 20 years. It is a horrid claim. And it is always again being defeated by wiser philosophers. But it is repeated time and again. The whole American enlightenment of the last 200 years -- I just happened to read in an article in the Journal of Higher Education in which this man says, and -- Mr. Eliot Morison, I told you, Samuel Eliot Morison repeated it -- this article in the Journal of Higher Education came right after the Second World War -- he said, "America is drunk with the idea that the laws of a Mau-Mau tribe and the laws of the United States are of equal value compared with the nature of my mind. I can look at -- objectively at these things."

Now gentlemen, no man in his reason can think for one moment that this is true. But it is taught this way, that the law of the land is purely historical, purely gen- -- evolutionary, purely passing, and the laws of nature, however, of the atom and of the -- of your mind are eternal. This megalomania of philosophy, gentlemen, is paramount in your own brain. You are most this -- this -- the -- most of you are the victims of this idiocy. And that's why I have to show you the relative grandeur and the relative misery of this position.

If first impressions, gentlemen, become the football of second impressions, of what we have called "philosophy," by a group of onlookers, you see, then the whole history of philosophy is set in motion down to the destructive character of Mr. John Dewey's philosophy of pragmatism; then everything is pragmatic; then the means -- are more important than the ends; and then you -- expl- -- understand the American household, bowed under the installment plan, where a man has an income of \$500; \$400 are earmarked for the rest of his life with mortgaging his future, and it -- his house is cluttered up with unnecessary

things. Because then, tradition is nothing. Debts have not to be paid. We live as -- exactly in 1928, gentlemen, today again in this same fools' paradise, that all the old laws of the -- of the ages are abolished, waste is better than saving, death is abolished, madness is abolished. And so the country is exactly today as you know, in 1956, again in this wonderful coma that the laws of the city have been abolished in favor of some philosophical trick by which you can expect a pay raise every year, automatically. There will be no crisis. There will be no war. If there is a war, the school- -- little -- schoolteacher of America will lift her finger and say, "That's very bad, very nasty," and -- and you will vote for a government that promises you elimination of all hardship, of all sacrifices. That's philosophy of pure nature, gentlemen.

Parmenides is already anticipating, gentlemen, all s- -- later schools of philosophy, as I want to show you. If you take the result of the -- Parmenides' sec- -- secession to the sacred mountain -- as you know, in -- 20 years later in Ro- -- the city of Rome, they had the famous secession of the plebeians from the aristocrats. Who has heard of this secession of the -- of the plebs? Has anybody? Well, that's all {that} you know, {still from history}.

Well, it is said that in 496, in the days just of this same South Italian upheaval of the mind in Parmenides, the plebeians already tried to secede from the old traditions of the Roman city, and went to the sacred mountain, to the {Mont Sacra}, and the famous story then it was told -- told to them, when they were asked to return--do you know the story?--told to them by the aristocrat Menenius Agrippa that they were the stomach of the city, because they were the toilers. They produced the bread. And of course the -- stomach one day was very angry, because he had to serve all the other limbs of the body, so he went on strike. But then Menenius Agrippa shows very nicely that the poor stomach would not -- could not live without the limbs, and could not stay outside the operations of the heart, and the brain, and the speech, et cetera.

That's the famous first attempt to secede. And I'm quite sure, and I -- I think as research goes on, and we will come to see this more clearly, the -- most of the constitution of Rome, gentlemen, was worked out under the impact of the South Italian philosophers. And there are many other signs that the -- the whole Roman constitution already was largely influenced by the philosophies of Southern Italy in the 5th century. That makes Rome so an interest- -- such an interesting community, because Rome is already founded not simply by tradition, but already by the Enlightenment. Very much as this country, you see. It's a -- Rome is the Jeffersonian democracy, so to speak, of antiquity. And it also had originally a very weak government, as you may know for one year only. And

two consuls, you see, competing with each other. It's li- -- very much like the Congress and the president, you see, checks and balances.

And -- well, I'm not going into this, but I only want to sh- -- point out that Parmenides already sets the pace for an influence of philosophy on the political practice of the communities. And although this is as yet not accepted, I -- I think it is mo- -- most probable that the results of this man in Elea, which is a little south of Naples, already had an impact on the whole of Italy, especially the Roman republic and its neighboring cities in La- -- Lazio, on the {Lataeni}. { } more clearly you can see, gentlemen, that with Parmenides, there is set in motion a -- a whole chain reaction. First, the second impressions of the natural world are more original, somebody will hold, than the laws of any city. The laws of the city are arbitrary, what Rousseau said. You have heard -- that much of Rousseau. He says, "Man in a state of nature, you see, is good; the city -- laws of the city are all pseudo. They are all forgeries," you see. "They are all misnomers." And so you get instead of mind and Heraclitus, definite loyalty to first impressions, that first the cult and the law, that is, Church and state, of the city have to be upheld and must not give way to second impressions--you get immediately after Parmenides, gentlemen, the new order. If the first impressions are all semblances of reality, if they mislead us, as Parmon- -- Parmenides-to-Hegel, you see, people teach, then obviously nature is first -- phusis is fo- -- first, has a -- you may say phusis is a priori. And the city con- -- comprehended in the term, "the law," as you find it also in the Bible, "the law." The world of the law -- of human law, you see, is second. Greek, this is "nomos." You have heard of "economy," which means the nomos, the law of the ecos, of the household -- its husbandry. Eco-nomy. You have heard of "bionomics," perhaps. Nowadays people in -- Mr. Tillich in Harvard speaks of "theonomics," of the law of God under which our own will is revealed as His will.

So "nomic," "nomos" is a very important word, which I recommend -- take it into your notes. In Greek, the word "law," La- -- Latin, "lex", is expressed by the word "nomos" as we have it today in "economics." And you need this word to understand now that what I have called "ethos" so far, in the reversal, by the philosophers, now becomes "nomos." And "nomos" means in their eyes human invention, human doing, human position. The word Greek -- the Greek word for position is "thesis." "Thesis" means it is put on, you see, by my will, by my rationalization. And -- it is very strange, gentlemen. If I meet an American boy discussing these problems, he always thinks that that's just human fallibility, or wrong law, that his reason is infallible, and he can judge the law.

I never understand -- have never understood, since I'm always been an arch-reactionary in political thinking -- I have never understood how all of you -- all the students in the whole world always have this brazenness to say that their reason is excellent. But the reason of all the legislators is just arbitrary. And if you could only understand -- educate these benighted people who have blue laws, who forbid -- have censorship for movies -- for obscene movies, or who have laws that -- there should be no work on Sab- -- on the Sabbath, and the people who burned the witches in Salem -- if you could have only enlightened the legislators with your own light, then all these terrible laws would never have happened. When I then talk to these people, I'm very happy that these reasonable people are not legislators, because I find their mind, their -- absolutely incapable of formulating any law. I don't think there is any one boy in this -- class who could formulate a hu- -- law for human society. You're -- totally unprepared for this.

Yet you trust your philosophical mind to sit in judgment and say, "Nature is better than men's laws." Gentlemen, to me this is utter nonsense. Men's laws are better than nature. Because I'm a piece of nature, and the ex- -- most extravagant piece of nature. God created me to help nature. And obviously, gentlemen, I still think that the Aswan Dam's be- -- is better than the Nile, if it could be built. And that the George Washington Bridge is the completion of human nature crossing from -- from one side to -- the Hudson River than the whole Hudson River itself. And Erie Canal, too, is better than the Lake Erie.

So I don't understand you. And I don't understand this kind of American philosophy which really thinks always the light -- the light of the critic who writes on Homer -- about a play, or a law, or a political party or so is perfectly inhuman, is infallible. But the things he judges are humanly so frail, you see, that they are less than he. It is absolutely ridiculous to me, but you find -- this is the American heresy, that every later-comer is -- has a better mind than the people who pass the law. To my mind, it is obvious that my mind, since I have not suffered as the people who fought in the Civil War, and went to war there against slavery, obviously they are more competent to judge the question of slavery than I do, you see. But you don't think so. You always think because you are born later, your lazy mind is more alert than these people who have decided to lay down their life for a new law. Have you decided to sacrifice anything for your judgment? Always ask yourself the simple question, gentlemen: How much is the critic willing to pay for his truth? Then you will know how true he is.

And if you read Mr. Atkinson on the new play in The New York Times,

that's utterly ridiculous to trust him, gentlemen. But you all read only book reviews and judge all the books by book reviews. The -- the general plebiscite in this country among the college students is that the critic is cleverer than the poet. Now who suffers in writing this poem -- if he is a poet? The poet. The critic is paid for passing silly judgments. Costs him nothing. Absolutely nothing. That is the phil- -- Mr. Parmenides' attitude, however. You go outside the city. You look at this law -- these laws, and you declare them to be second-rate. Because nature -- "I'm communing with nature."

We had such a man -- gentleman here. He was quite famous on this campus. When you met him in the middle of the -- talk with him, he would simply stop and -- and -- and fall silent. And you would be very surprised. It was rather impolite, after all, you were very -- in the midst of a talk. And after a -- minute, he would see -- speak to me and said -- say, "Oh, pardon me. I had just to commune with nature." Yes! Imagine!

Now here he was, condescending to the pigs and leaving me alone. And I'm a human being. Well, you find this nonsense. It comes from Rousseau. It comes from Thoreau, you see. You commune with nature. Costs you nothing, because nature doesn't -- answer you. You can -- it's a waxen nose. He stood there on campus, and probably just -- yawned in- { } -- and that he calls "communing with nature," no resistance. I offer him resistance. So of course, he didn't like me. It's very simple to commune with nature, you see. It's just vacuum. But all this nonsense, you can hear in every Pentecost divine service on a mountain here with frozen noses.

Yes. Have you ever -- or Easter is even worse, because it's still colder. Yet -- that's how they try to captivate you, the modern church, with -- by pulling you out into the cold there on a -- on an Easter morning and selling you this as communion with nature. You shall not commune in the church with nature. You shall commune with your creator and your brother man. But this heresy is all rampant, gentlemen. This kind of detrimental church service is a -- is a typical capitulation to the philosophers who say, "Nature first," gentlemen; that is, the dead things first. And man is no longer in nature, but he's just a fallible lawgiver who runs after nature and is less than nature.

So gentlemen, the problem since Parmenides is that philosophy tempts any man to say, "I must get out of politics." Well, you hear so many s- -- people say this, you see, "Politics is dirty. This is just politics." Gentlemen, a man who gets out of politics because it is dirty just doesn't know himself how dirty he is. So what else can politics be but dirty? Don't you know how dirty you are? You

have to shit. And well, what is shitting, gentlemen? It is a problem of consumption. It is a problem of goods. It is a problem of your daily bread. Isn't that very serious? That's nothing to laugh about.

So politics have to be -- deal with the -- with these dirty processes. Because we are greedy. We are afraid if we aren't fed well. You are dissatisfied if your father doesn't buy you a car. That has to be -- comes from somewhere. And it comes from an attempt of politicians to satisfy your nature by articulating something that will coerce your nature so that you don't destroy the city. Now obviously, their law is a little better than your own natural instincts. It may not be good enough. You may improve the law. But you cannot improve the law by saying, "My instincts are better than the law." That's however the general gist of -- of modern American -- Americanism. That's called "pragmatism." First my desires and wishes, and then I frame the universe after my -- my wishes.

Do you think there would be any government in the world if this had -- has prevailed? Neither the United States forged in Valley Forge nor the state of Israeli could exist for one minute on your philosophy. It is contemptible. It's an old-women philosophy. Yet it prevails in this country. And there sit these people and -- and cry out, because the Israeli broke -- broke into this -- through these fetters of a constant dea- -- deadly threat of their existence. That comes first. But here you are, and you -- it leads immediately--will you take it down?--Parmenides leads for any philosophical group, for any high school, for any college, for any university to the temptation to say, "The laws of nature are better as we find them--as observers--than the laws of men." Therefore, the relation is of -- no longer that, as I put you -- before you, logical, ethical, physical. But as soon as you give the little finger to mere philosophy, not in a balance to your serv- -- divine service, to your religious loyalty, or political loyalty, but if you say, "I'm first a philosopher," then you get into this situation that you will call the ethical, gentlemen, the "merely political," or logic- -- or nomical -- the Greeks { } -- well, or positivist. That's the best translation of "thetical," of "thesis," you see. Put on by man, you see. What Hegel calls the the- -- or what the Marxian calls the "thesis," and the "antithesis," you see, and the "synthesis." It's what I do rather arbitrarily, and thereby challenge to be resisted and contradicted by the antithesis.

As soon as you therefore, gentlemen, see yourself safe outside the city, with your homosexuality, your -- independent of marriage, of children, of the whole growth of wisdom through the generations, if you have your second world to yourself, as in ancient Greece these people did get it, Mr. Henry Miller

has now construed, I am told, the same thing in -- at the -- at the Pacific Coast, you get the reverse nature-phusis. Nature comes -- is the a p- -- is first. We may call it with the learned expression, the a priori. That is before I wake up to think. And the second is, the world in which I actually grow up is -- is then the a post-eriori. It comes later. That is, it's -- it's second to my own mind, and I judge it as merely nomical, or thetical, or positive. That is, it is not a part of the created nature, but it is just done by human wit. And this human wit is then under my judgment more than nature. To natural law I have to bow, you see; but human law, I can sit in judgment and criticize.

Now the -- the -- we listen. Now gentlemen, of phil- -- of schools of thought that has streamed out of this Eleatic school is tremendous. Let's put this word--you have to learn this, the Eleatic school--you find in your book of Mrs. {Freeman's} the list of all these names. And I still take it that you have learned how to read and write, and I'm not going to take from you the duty of reading this -- these names yourself, Theophanes and Zeno, and the other adherents of this school. It's not important, those names. But it is very important that you understand that at the outcome, Epicurus, the Epicureans, and the Stoics, you see, are immediately born much later -- 300 years later, 200 years later, I should -- 250 years later -- Epicurus says, "Therefore my relation to nature is all that matters, and there is no loyalty to the city needed. My private bliss," you see, "taking to the hills, when the draft calls you, is all that matters." That's Epicureanism. He was a very noble soul, but it was a life for him alone, which he recommends. The world is so nomical, so abused by politics that he says, "Not for me." And the perfect bliss of the Epicurean is to enjoy in wisdom, by the way, and in great subtlety, you may even say, and refinement the goods of life and the lonely being -- alone, so to speak, perhaps with his friends, you see. But without responsibility for the whole of the world which cannot be helped, anyway, which is going to the dug- -- you see -- to the dogs, as all Republicans thought under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

You talked then to a businessman, "The country's always going to the dogs." It's a general practice of the defeated party to say that the country is going to the dogs, because it is going to the other party.

Well, that's Epicurus, gentlemen. At the same time, the Stoics said, "If you penetrate deeply enough into nature, nature will -- serve you with laws which are the best for the real city of man."

The Stoic lives in nature as his city. He is a cosmopolitan. "Cosmos" and "polis" grow together there in this wonderful word "cosmopolitan," you see. The

physical world is the polis of the wise. Therefore you see that already in Parmenides, the much later school of the Stoics is raising its head. Parmenides didn't say this, because he had just to conquer a way of life outside the city. But if you -- can you see immediately in the history of philosophy that if you think this through to all its consequences, it means that I can create out of my head the real city. And this real city must of course coincide with physis, with the whole natural world. Therefore I can only be a citizen of the world. And that -- it means the word "cosmo-politan" -- "polis" and "cosmos" coincide in the word "cosmopolitan." And therefore you see that at the end in the Stoa, man is alone -- in the Epicurean world, man is alone. And here "physis" and "nomos" coincide. That's the mean- -- is meant by the word -- those of you who write on the Stoa can see there the -- the -- the -- the seed of the great Parmenidean conception of freeing myself from the immediate appearances of my environment. It leads then to the -- reversal of the order: the cosmos is the only city that counts. Marcus Aurelius, the emperor, who was the last philosopher king in antiquity in 180 A.D., he wrote as you -- in his diary that Zeus was the king of the city in which he, the emperor, lived. That's the good expression of this cosmopolis, you see, where he tries to see that he is a citizen of the world, I -- very American expression and very American conception. A great desire of man, you see, to -- to arbitrate between the discord of one political society, like the United States of America, and the whole world, by -- here they now use the United Nations for this kind of smokescreen so that every American can at the same time be a good American taxpayer, and at the other hand, feel very good as a cosmopolitan citizen of the whole world. I don't like it. If you had no United Nations, this country would have to act much more realistically. It's a smokescreen for your conscience. It doesn't do any good to have the United Nations, as you see in the last days. But it helps to -- to avoid responsibility and to pass moral judgments, who in any family quarrel, as you know, are only poisoning the atmosphere. But that's your decision. But you -- can show -- see at this moment very much the Stoic attitude.

This man, Marcus Aurelius, you see, I told you this I think before, is the most tragic figure of antiquity, because he was the perfect philosopher on the throne. He was a Stoic. Physis dominated nomos in his mind, here -- up here, you see. And therefore, he believed that he was an emperor of cosmopolis, of the universe. On the other hand, he destroyed the Roman empire, because he had become emperor as the adopted son of An- -- Antoninus Pius, because he had the qualities to be adopted. His father had been adopted; his grandfather had been adopted, because the great wisdom of the previous emperors has been to see to it that by adoption, you can have all the benefits of republicanism, you see, be-

cause you could select your successor by virtue.

And here comes this man, who writes this great diary on cosmopolis, and seems to use the -- always poses in America and in Europe, and in schools of Enlightenment as the great philosopher. And he allowed his terrible son, whom he had produced from his loins, his carnal son, to follow him, and thereby destroyed the emperor -- empire, and overturned all the philosophy of a whole century of reign, of adopted governors, you see, by this one weakness. And this one weakness I think is much more important than all the philosophy with which he plastered his diaries.

There you can see again the weakness of mere mentality, of mere philosophy, you see. He convinced himself every day in the evening, as you probably do, too, by keeping his diary, that he was an excellent man, and an excellent philosopher, and a cosmopolitan, and followed the laws of nature. But the one difficult law of human society, you see, which is not natural, that you adopt your successor, you see, and frustrate your carnal son from destroying the empire, you cannot find this in phusis. You -- nature doesn't know adoption. Nature doesn't know the spirit. Nature doesn't know den- -- self-denying ordinance, you see, of abstemiousness. Na- -- nature is not ascetic. Nature cannot renounce any claim. And therefore you have the real consequence of philosophy, which puts nature before law -- human law, because he succumbed to nature, you see. Here was his physical son. And this man had not the guts--as so many thinkers, and many reasonable people don't have the guts--to resist their own family. And he couldn't tell his wife that her son was not the right successor. Probably he would have to put up with his wife, you see, more than with the son in this case. And so she might have murdered him, and of course put her son in. If you can't risk being murdered under the laws of the city, you are not a good citizen.

Nature, you see, it's like my friend {Ames -- Adelbert Ames} communing with nature. Nature doesn't contradict you. So let Mr. {Ames} here on this campus could commune with nature. And Mr. Marcus Aurelius, emperor of Rome, could commune, you see, with nature, and leave his succession, the most important decision of his life, to accident. Because the law established, since 96 of our era, that the emperor should desi- -- designate the best man in the state to be his successor, you see. That would have asked for a loyalty to a political decision. You understand the difference? A political decision is -- cannot be proven from the texts of nature, you see. It's -- you walk a tightrope. It's like the decision of Mr. Truman to dismiss MacArthur, or to go to -- resist the -- the North Ko- -- Korean aggression, or to have the -- Greece and Turkey defended against

Communism, you see; or to have the airlift in -- in -- in Berlin. These are the vital decisions. He cannot base them on anything natural. They are perfectly unnatural.

There is nothing in nature which gives you any clue to what to do. And as soon as you believe in nature, gentlemen, you are misfits for politics. Absolute misfits, because in -- in -- in the history of the human race, you -- we live by precedent. And precedents are irrational. They have happened. That's experience, you see. That's empirical. And you have to believe your ancestors, that they had some wisdom. And you have to learn by -- by looking up to these heroes, you see, like Mr. Truman who said, "I read, because I couldn't play sports -- at sports, because I had poor eyesight. I read history. So I read how Mr. Lincoln dealt with McClellan. And then I knew how I would have to deal with a disobedient general." And you don't. You don't.

The void in which -- Sunday I preached and then after church, we had an old -- old leading woman of the church talking to me. And I had talked about this -- these historical predecessors, these -- these forbears who create our values. You remember. And well, she came to me. She's our most conservative lady. And I could tell many funny stories about her, but she groped for understanding, and she said, "Yes, I look up to my father. He was a deacon of the church. And then I had my great, heroic example."

Well, I didn't want to -- to educate her, because it's hopeless. So I didn't say that she should learn to look up to people who were not carnally related to her, you see. That this would only save her. She could not naïvely look at her own flesh and blood as the examples, you see. That's too simple, her own father; that's how she glorifies herself only.

And so this girl cannot be helped. She has to die out, because like Marcus Aurelius, she cannot, you see, take the step out of nature into the risky selection of her values by mere historical wisdom. By simply saying, "Lincoln is my man, although I'm not related to him." You see.

So Marcus Aurelius is -- is the great example, gentlemen, of the last consequence of Parmenides. Before we come to these, I want to put on you this -- further list however of -- of successions from Par- -- from the Eleatic school. The first consequence of the Eleatic influence, when it came back to Greece and Asia Minor, was to say that therefore we can treat the city as accidental. And the group that said so is -- are the sophists. What is a sophist? A sophist is the man who has already learned from philosophy, gentlemen, that the mind is

eccentric to the city, that by -- with the help of your mind, you can be the critic of the city. And the sophist says, "Ooh, well, then I'm superior. I can play a trick. I can beat the stock exchange. I can make money on the Depression."

I had -- I met a -- I had a gentleman for a lunch the other day. And I really had a great impression. It's a man who lost all his money in '29. He was on the right side, on the bearish side in '29, but when he sold short--you know what that is--then he had to cover two days before the -- Black Friday, and lost his shirt. And ever s- -- he was a rich man, and he has never forgiven himself and nature that this should have happened, {all this}, that he -- he nearly was a rich man, you see, very rich indeed. Put all his gold on this bet, and he was right, but only by two days, wrong. And -- so ever since, he has been a poor man, and he drives an English car, which he disapproves of, and -- a small { }. And so he can't get over the fact that he is in reduced circumstances.

So he came to me and said, after all -- the country was very much in the same situation as in '29, only this time not from the money side, but from the side of commodities, the installment buying, you see, and the debt. And everything pointed to the similar crisis. And now how could he pull off this time the stunt the right way? Recuper- -- recoup?

Well, he was a pathetic case, because after all, 1929, and 1956, I wouldn't live hipped on this for 27 years. It's a little startling to find an old man of 60 just hell-bound, petrified, I mean totally hypnotized, you see, by this one, great, semi-mistake in his life. Because he wasn't wrong, you see. But he just had bad luck, by two days.

And the sophists then said, "I can take advantage of the second-rate nature of the city." That's I think the simplest definition of a sophist. "I can take advantage of the transparent, second-ratedness of my -- of any city." And so the sophist be- -- became a wandering troop of {rhetors}, of people who resold the wisdom of how to circumvent, how to play with the laws of a city. And when you read the Platonic dialogues, and when you read the history of the 5th century--it was repeated in the 13th century in Italy, exactly the same phenomenon--people available -- the so-called "humanists" in the 13th, 14th century, available, because they knew how much in these small communities, you see, bribe, and persuasion, and coteries, and cliques could be operated, and how you could -- twist the law and give it a waxen nose.

Sophistry--you all know this term--is a natural feeling of power. It's what you call today Madison Avenue. That's sophistry. I have written in a -- there was

a -- a questionnaire sent out by a philosophers' association in -- in Yale. And we had to make a very brief statement of what we wanted to say. And I said, "We live today again in the age of the sophists." And they printed this, and said to me they were very much startled, but obviously it was true. But nobody is allowed to say it loud today in this country. We have exactly the pre-Socratic situation of sophistry, I mean. And you don't even mind, that everybody tells you openly he's g- -- out to cheat you. But they do. They say this. That's exactly what the sophists did. And so the excess of freedom, gentlemen, begotten by Parmenides, is with you. And therefore you need a mild dictatorship.

In a -- sophistry, gentlemen, always begets dictatorship, tyranny. It's -- can't be helped, because it's abuse, and any abuse cares -- you see, must be right. You -- cannot. If you have expensive spending at this moment, and television, and all this business because of Madison Avenue, then you have to have an Addison Avenue, you see. You have to have another avenue to life which offsets this, and that has to be severity. Very strict -- strict measures. It's -- very strange that you should -- could believe that you can get away with murder. You may get -- away, but your daughter will not. She will reap the fruits of your murder -- I mean, murder ec- -- in the economic sense. You're selling out -- you're selling liberty short.

Anybody who's -- who is impressed by advertising, and by the television, and by the modern mass media, gentlemen, sells short his freedom, obviously. Because there is of course a relation between truth and reality, gentlemen, if you eliminate the truth as of today, it has to be paid back with interest, and usu- -- usurers' interest, of course, 4- -- 54 percent per annum the next day. Therefore gentlemen, Parmenides is followed by sophistry. That -- are the immediate successors, because they eliminate the unconditional loyalty to one's own city. They already straddle the way between the cities. They migrate, you see, they become a group -- well, in the -- now modern days they were called intellectuals, or intelligentsia, but it is much too weak an expression. They are the whole ph- -- sophical group s- -- who say, "We have a wisdom that transcends the laws of the city."

I don't think that it is at this moment for you and me of great importance to go into the individual sophists. But you know, one of the sophistical theories is a famous one. The -- the tortoise and Achilles. You can prove by sophistication, you see, that when the two run the race, Achilles can never overtook -- -take the tortoise. You know. You know how the argument runs? Can you tell us? Get up and tell us.

(Well, I'm not sure, because he runs -- Achilles runs twice as fast as the tortoise, but he always only runs half the distance, so he can never reach the tortoise.)

Ja. Well, it -- is funny, but by sophistry, you can prove {else}. I think the argument must be in the book. You have it there? I -- I never think it is worth a man's dignity and a man's mind to de- -- have much dealings. Our students seem to be very interested in these -- kind of sophistry -- sophistry. But I have always despised them so deeply that I have never given it a moment's time to stop. I know that Achilles can overtake the tortoise, and I do not see why I should read the sophisticated argument that he can't, you see. I still don't see it. Where is it? Zeno.

(145.)

{ }? 125?

(There's something on Sophists. No, 79.)

(No, not there, either.)

No, I think it's still a different place. Who can find it? Well, of course you get first Zeno. He's very famous, because he -- Page 47. You want to make an impression in Smith College, learn these things by heart. Well -- for example, take Number 4 on Page 47 -- this typical sophisma. "That which moves, moves either in the place in which it is, nor in that in -- neither in the place in which it is, nor in that in which it is not. So therefore movement is impossible." Well. It is this tremendous overrating of reason, you see, as against facts.

You know what the young lady said to her fiancé -- "Don't bother me with facts. I have made up my mind."

But here, it is, you see: "My mind construes the world, and therefore the world has no law except I mentally," you see, "approve of it."

The Greeks however, must have been rather intoxicated because of this, because you must imagine that these philosophical schools and these migrat- -- -grating sophists enabled a man to feel that he was at home in a wider world than his small city. Has anybody ever heard of {Chrystel de Coulange,} The Ancient City? Who has? It's a very famous book by a French- -- {Chrystel de

Coulange}, This Ancient City, in which it is shown how cruel, how severe, how integral the existence of any ancient citizen, before Christianity came in, was, because Church and state were identical. And therefore the cult of the gods was in the hand of the rulers of the city, and woe to you if you do -- did not, you see, comply with their double role of priest and statesman, you -- you just couldn't move. And there -- every -- everything was as under the same tyrannical s- -- discipline as here the Puritan rule was for the man in the little town, you see. You could not work on Satur- -- Sunday or Saturday afternoon. Everybody had to behave according to the common law, and the common discipline, and the common cult.

And wherever you have this total duplication, you see, that the man who commands the earth also commands the heavens, the individual, of course, has absolutely no space for his own thought, or his own freedom. The Sophists were the first to persuade every citizen of Athens, or of Elea, or of Miletus, you see, that they could devote their mind to second thoughts as much as they could send their triremes, their ships, across the Mediterranean. That there was then outside their own city, you see, a second realm of afterthought.

The third consequence, gentlemen, of the Sophists was -- the second part -- the Sophist is the man who questions the wisdom of the city in which he moves. He questions it. He asks questions, and is willing to answer any question which he is asked. And they -- they are the advisers of the citizens, therefore, and perhaps this is -- I should stress more, that they are asked to give advice. They are hirelings, they are experts hired by each individual government, just as Syria or Albania now hire experts from the United Nations, you see. Very similar. They are, so to speak, the UNESCO group of the 5th century, because the smaller cities can ask for these accomplished minds to get some advance report, and advance knowledge.

And of course, these Sophists were partly--let me stress this--they were partly great experts. My -- if I have said negative things at this moment about the Sophists, perhaps I did this in order to help you understand the -- the discredit into which the word "sophistry" today has fallen. But originally the Sophist was needed by the smaller communities who had no intellectual group, in order to bring a fresh wind into their little cities. If you think there were 300 -- 400 such cities, you can imagine that many were without high schools, were just like Podunk. And you just had to get somebody from the outside to improve the city's laws. Or to say, "This is obsolete. We no longer have human sacrifice," or "We -- you don't have to pledge your whole fortune when you enter a contract of buying or selling," you see. All these very crude first rules of commerce could be

mitigated by sophistry. So the Sophist was the loaned expert without roots himself. He was the man from outside who would move through one city without being asked any questions, "Whence do you come? Where do you pay taxes? Where do you belong?"

Of course, he paid very dearly for this by -- sometimes he was exiled from the city where he was used. The -- of course, the mob would storm his -- his house and would say, "This is a bloody foreigner." And he would also suffer for his courageous intervention.

The important thing which you have to keep in mind is, gentlemen, that the Sophist sanctifies questioning. He sanctifies questioning. And that is a -- I think, a step which is already implicitly to be found in the story of the mind from Homer to Parmenides. But in sophistry, it becomes so paramount that the -- you and I have to ask what it is to ask a question. You never think about this. It is one of your birthrights that you think any child can ask any question, and has to be answered. The first answer Heraclitus would s- -- give is that stupid questions must not be answered, that question is a revolution of the human mind which puts the man who's ignorant in a pow- -- position to -- exercise power over the people who are knowledgeable, who are know -- in the know. You don't see this, gentlemen, but one fool can ask more questions than hundred wise men can answer. Most questions, gentlemen, should not be answered, because they are wrong questions.

And this I'm going to prove now, till the intermission in the next 10 minutes, gentlemen. The process which Parmenides sets in motion, and which is signified by the problem of the Sophists has later been concluded by Socrates. Socrates is not a Sophist anymore, but as you know, a philosopher, although he ranked with the sophists and he was killed as a Sophist. He was killed for that which he didn't try to be -- tried -- did -- tried not to be. But Socrates drank the poison as a Sophist, and that's the important thing, that in Socrates, the problem of the question is changed.

If you want to understand Socrates, you now must understand what I'm going to tell you about the Sophists. We shall then see that from Socrates there are two ways possible. One into Plato and one into Aristotle. I have tried to show you that from the Eleatics, there is one way to the single man in Epicurus, and one to the whole city of nature, or nature as a city, in the Stoic. But in between, we have the great climax of Greek philosophy: Plato and Aristotle. And in order to -- to -- before we go in detail in this, I want to give you a -- the whole road map.

Why is sophistry and Socrates the evolution of the Parmenidean scheme? Parmenides says, "The only real thing is that which is not given me by first impressions: the prayers that my mother teaches me, the law that my father teaches me, the military service that I have to perform for my country: they are all semblances. They are all -- one day I have to go to war, the other day I have to go to court. Ha! Everything changes. Everything is -- what is all this, you see? Here I marry, and there I bury. That's all semblance. There is an eternal universe with its laws that I am con- -- interested in, the being. All the rest is just New England weather.

The Sophists say, "Therefore after Parmenides has said so, I can question everything of these transient things. I can question whether the war should be fought," like the Labour Party in England now. And they can -- "I can question everything. Authority is ridiculous. Law is for the asking." And therefore the Sophists ask any questions.

Now gentlemen, before Parmenides, and before you were born, in a normal community, gentlemen, of red Indians, fighting for their life, or Eskimos, of any group not sophisticated, as we rightly say, you see--all the people you think are primitive--these people are not primitive, but they are integral and they are primordial. And they are out for the minimum conditions of any good human society. What is this, gentlemen? The minimum is that those who know are considered to be inside. And those who have to ask questions are considered to be outsiders. When I come to a foreign city, and I ask a man, "Where is the commons?" I suppose that he knows, and that I don't know. And why do I think he knows? Because he has moved across the commons, and I haven't. I'm a newcomer to the society.

And therefore, will you take this down, gentlemen? Originally, to ask a question means to try to join the group. Anything you ask means that you are less -- no -- no, you see, less familiar than the family. You ask, "How many daughters do you have?" Well, the father knows very well how many he has. And the mother knows. But you don't know. Therefore, gentlemen, you have completely forgotten that he who asks and he who knows, or answers, live in two different societies. One is inside, and the other is outside. Now America, which consists of outsiders, doesn't understand this, because here everybody's an outsider, so to speak. But that isn't normal. And you still find in the small town that it isn't handled that way. The man who asks questions there is immediately spotted as an outsider, of course, you see. He doesn't even know, you see, basic. He doesn't A from B. So he cannot become selectman. He cannot become

mayor, even if he has paid taxes there for five years, the people feel -- he asks too many questions. He doesn't take the ways -- the folk ways as the only ways, you see, just -- going on as always. We know. They don't ask questions. They know. But he, this disturbance, you see, he asks questions. If you want to serve up in a new community, never ask questions. Always claim that you know all -- how it is done. You have to show that you are one of them.

You know Willa Cather's book, do you? One of Ours? Who has read it?

Gentlemen, that's one of your tragedies. Who has read Willa Cather's book, One of Ours? But gentlemen, Willa Cather is one of the great souls of the last 30 years. But you only live with the last moment. How can you -- there be any American literature field if a person like Willa Cather is not familiar to you? Gentlemen, you can buy the legs of Marilyn by the dozen. They're valueless. Why do you do that? Have you -- who has read any book by Willa Cather? That's all? Which -- what have you read?

(My Antonia.)

Wie?

(My Antonia.)

Ja. And what have you read then?

(Same one.)

It wa- -- obviously was prescribed reading in high school. Well, she has written this very wonderful book, One of Ours. Gentlemen, the problem of the One of Ours is that no questions are asked. You are unquestionably in. You don't have to ask.

Gentlemen, if you would understand that the -- who is taking English as a major? Now for you, it is of some importance, as it is also of importance -- more important of course still in -- in the law, and in history, and in logic, if you take the sentence, "The commons { } lies east of the church," well, this makes only sense in a certain town with the name of Podunk. Or New Town, Newton, or whatever it is. That is, it is only true in a concrete, you see, situation. You can now put your linguistic sagacity to work by questioning any one word of this sentence by putting in a question: "The what?--you have not heard the sentence--"lies," and on it goes, "east of the Church." You have not heard the word "commons." So you ask the "What lies east of the common?" Then you can ask,

"The commons does -- what?" Does what? And then you question the verb. East of the commons. Well, it lies there. It doesn't march. In this case, of course, that's a poor example, but in this way a living thing, you see. If you say, "The" -- "the" -- "the militia," you see, then you could have "The militia marches," or "The militia runs," or "The militia waits," or "The militia camps," you see, you could alternate the verb. And so instead of "what?" here -- you would here ask, "behaves how?" Then you have the question "where?" And there you have the question "whither?"

If you have any longer sentence, gentlemen, you will see that to question means to take a full sentence and to have at one point of the sentence a lacuna, a gap, which our words, "what," "whither," "whether," "who," "how," try to even on -- by sound try to articulate as less-articulate, as -- it's a hyphen. All the words of interrogation, gentlemen, are semantic blanks. And these people had no writing at that time, and so they invented in all languages--German, Greek, Latin, Spanish--wherever--Hebrew--wherever you go, the words of interrogation are so-called enclitica, spoken with less power, a kind of -- fall of the voice, you see, because you are ashamed that you don't know. And you s- -- ask the other fellow to whom you put this question, "Would you kindly help me in, and complete this sentence?" you see. I say "how?" I say "why?" I say -- "what?" Would you kindly put in the verb? Would you put in the noun? Would you put in the preposition, you see? Would you help me to say the full sentence? That's the essence of a question.

Therefore any question presupposes an answer. Therefore, you cannot ask the question, "Who is God?" You cannot say -- ask the question, "Is there a God?" It's all nonsense, because God is the power that makes you speak. Including the que- -- of asking questions. That we call God. You cannot question Him, because He puts the word in your mouth that you ask Him, if you aren't the devil. And then again, the devil only exists by the mercy of God.

So there are questions that should not be asked. Most of your questions, gentlemen, are so silly, and since nobody in this country is spanked, that they shouldn't be asked. And they are -- just asked in America, because there is no one who stops you and say, "This question is nonsense." Most of your questions in all your bull sessions, whether the will is free, or man is immortal, and all this nonsense, you know all the answers beforehand in your heart. But your mind is just like Achilles and the tortoise, occupied with sophistry. Three-quarters of the questions asked in Dartmouth College are questions that cannot be answered. Because questions can only be derived from answers, from positive statements. People in a society must have said certain things. That's what you can question.

Other things you cannot question. At least not at first sight. And there we come to Socrates, later.

So the first thing is, gentlemen -- is that when the Sophists asked any number of questions, there was absolutely no discrimination between questions that can be asked and questions that cannot be asked, sensibly. There are innumerable questions which your children will ask you, and you have asked your parents, which the parents should not answer. The -- one of the insanities of this country is that every stupid question is answered. The first education of a human being is that it is told that there are questions that don't deserve an answer. In this moment, you are only free as an educator. As long as you try to answer every question of a child, you are their slave, but not their educator. Because there are wrong questions and right questions. Certain questions can be asked, and certain cannot be asked. I am not against asking questions, but I'm asking against the very strict beweeding of the questions.

And this is probably the most difficult thing for you to understand, gentlemen, that philosophy in the long process had to weed out wrong questions. And that is the second step after Parmenides and the Sophists: to know what can be asked and what cannot be asked. And here we come to Socrates. You see, Socrates appears to the citizens of Athens as a Sophist, that is, of a man who asked wanton questions. And to himself, he appears as a man who overcomes the Sophists, because he asks them. All the books of Plato are questions put by Socrates to the Sophists, to the questioners, to these people who ask simply arbitrary questions, you see. And he puts them into the wrong, because he says -- he points out that their questions are wrongly asked. Has anybody read a dialogue by Plato so far? Who has? Which -- what is it you have read?

(The Death of Socrates.)

Wie?

(Death of Socrates.)

That's not a dialogue. Criton, yes. Well, here you see that he bows to the -- to what does he bow in that -- bow into -- bow in the Plato? To -- ?

(Whom he bows to?)

What does he bow to? That's a question which I can answer, because he does bow.

(The will of the city.)

Wie?

(The will of the city.)

To the law of the city. The law. And there you have the answer to sophistry. There is a -- you see, a restriction on questioning. You cannot question the laws of the city. That's his answer to the Sophists. You understand? It's a very pathetic answer. I told you perhaps that I -- The Criton -- this sentence of The Criton, in which he says this is the motto of my first book which I wrote as a young man, my -- my book on -- on which -- the basis of which I made my whole career, 1914. It just quotes The Criton, you see. To -- to -- you strike out any number of questions once you say the law has to be obeyed. And especially when it is -- would be to my advantage to disobey it. Then you have to obey it. You can perhaps disobey the law, if it is to my -- to your -- somebody else's -- to your friends', you see, advantage to disobey it. But you cannot when it is your own { }. That's { }.

There he turns against the Sophists and says, "This cannot be questioned, obedience to the law, in the case of my own -- of my own sentence." You understand? And that is the greatness of The Criton. Only a few pages, gentlemen. And nothing has been more beautiful to me than the sentence in which he says -- who has the text here? Has anybody the text of The Criton? Where is The Criton?

{{ }.)

I have put the Greek words from the end. Here. "This, I have to -- I assure you, my dear comrade Criton, if what I seem to hear the laws telling me." And now comes the words I have quoted in this, "So in my ears the sound of these words keeps coming, and makes me deaf to other things. As far as I can see, you may be sure that whatever you will say contrary to this, you will say in vain."

The vanity of a human question when the sentence is known, gentlemen, that's of sublime greatness, and that puts a stop to the -- to the realm of sophistry, gentlemen. Here a man accepts death because the laws of his city, the first impressions, have spoken. The polis is still alive.

And therefore in Socrates, gentlemen, we strike an equilibrium between the questions that the sophists have asked and the first impression that must

remain. And therefore, Plato and Socrates, gentlemen, put a stop to this flood of questions set in motion by the physicists, by the people of being, by the people whom I have described in this letter of Heraclitus to Parmenides. Who has read this letter in the meantime? Interesting. Wouldn't the other gentlemen proceed to do that, too? Or, at least give me back my text? I don't see why I should give you this as toilet paper. Why don't you read it? It's hopeless. I -- know nothing of the assigned readings, gentlemen. You -- I treat you as grownup people. But I thought that if I give you a text which is not even published, yet, you will be curious enough to read these few pages. So bring it back next time. I want to collect them again. They are precious to me, if they aren't precious to you. Heraclitus, you see, is the man who already anticipates Plato by -- because he says his first loyalties cannot be destroyed. And the whole century from 500 to 400 consists in a mad race of philosophy against first laws, against the laws that can even bury a Socrates under their debris, because he has no right to question them.

Now what does Socrates do, gentlemen? Socrates, I told you, asks this -- the Sophists. He reverses the process. He asks the questioner. And therefore, you will never understand the Socratic method if you read Mr. Durant -- Mr. Will Durant. Who knows this book? Ja. Well, he shouldn't have written it. He doesn't know what philosophy is. He doesn't take it seriously. He thinks it's what everybody does, gentlemen. Your little mind is also called a philosophical mind. Will Durant has this American assumption that everybody is a philosopher.

I have told you in the beginning that there are few philosophers, that philosophy is difficult, and that it is always against common sense. You may not believe me, gentlemen, but my course is given under the -- assumption that this is so, and that Mr. Will Durant therefore is wrong, because he thinks he can make it a bestseller. Philosophy will -- must never be a bestseller. If it is, it is -- has ceased to be philosophy. I'm sorry. That's just what it is. And as a proof, I mean, you haven't read my paper. Two-third of you didn't even bother to read this, because I've made it an assigned reading. Gentlemen, philosophers are not read because they are assigned. Because -- they are read because -- they are so attractive because they are difficult. If you cannot appreciate difficulty, gentlemen, don't come to this whole department of philosophy. I'm not here to smear pap around your mouth. It's nonsense. I mean, if you can't think -- if you do not want to learn to think, please leave this room right away. I'll give you a B in this course for truthfulness and veracity. It is contemptible to -- to take a course in philosophy and to think that I have to think, and you have not.

The problem of Socrates was to reverse the process of the -- the question had gone -- be degenerated -- had degenerated. Everything could be asked. Is this law -- law reasonable? If it isn't reasonable, don't obey it. Escape, cheat. Do -- do something -- do something around it. Circumvent it. Socrates says, "There is a compromise. We have to find the equilibrium between the existing order and the workings of our mind." And so he prefers to die to this rational escape which his friends hold ready -- you know, they have made a -- had a -- already hired the ship to go where? Did they tell you? Isn't this -- the story tell you, in Criton? You know, it -- it has been said that Plato was reproved -- reproached by all his friends, because he did what Pla- -- Socrates didn't. Socra- -- Plato was not present when Socrates died. You know where he had to -- gone to? Didn't you take Philosophy -- Humanities 11? Who di- -- did take Humanities 11? Well, there they tell you this. Classical Civilization, too. Ja?

{ }.

Well, he went to Megara. And in Megara was a -- there was a famous school of philosophy, too, similar to Elea. That's why it was interesting. He went to his philosophical friends, Plato, in Megara, that is north of Athens, and -- and it ha- -- it has been said that he wrote all his dialogues and his -- established his Academy as a re- -- as an act of repentance against his absence from the death of Socrates. And I think it is a trauma -- what they call now in psychoanalysis a "trauma." There must have been a kind of deeply felt wound, that he was abandoning his teacher at that moment, at this decisive moment. However, that's a wanton guess, because we simply don't know the -- why he went or -- the -- we have no -- no inkling.

But it is remarkable that he writes the story of Criton, you see, but has to admit that was not the Criton. And if a man writes all his life on Socrates, you of course wonder what's the relation of his -- his existential position to Socrates { } and his -- his professional writing, so to speak, on { }. And I think it's a very profound question, because in human psychology, I think it is true that the -- the -- if you have omitted an act, you have to repeat it endlessly, endlessly in order to -- to try to say that it has happened. I mean, "I have not been present at the death of Socrates, therefore I must circle around the death of Socrates, you see, unendingly." That is, there is a deep problem between Socrates and Plato, because it is otherwise hard to understand why Plato should have never seceded from this umbilical cord with Socrates.

The point I have to make today is very simple. The point is that Socrates stopped questioning in one direction by reversing the direction of the question.

You ask the man who puts all the questions, the Sophist, you see, and in this very moment, you have a dialectics to the second degree. You understand? If I ask the man who puts the questions, then we have a certain freedom now. The questioner is not always superior to the man who is questioned, you see. The laws of the city have yet a chance, for the first time. If I, from the realm of nature, communing with nature, you see, and Mr. Parmenides, {who is} being, and with my young friends, sit in judgment in the stadium or my walks on the philosophical avenues around the city and say, "Laughable, these -- these -- these hidebound citizens, you see, of this Podunk here, we are superior. We can criticize all these { }." And if they are suddenly caught in the same process of questioning, and Mr. Socrates want { } Protagoras { }, you see. How did you spend your time? How -- how come -- why can you corrupt these young men, you see? Then you see that freedom is reestablished, the real freedom, you see, because these men are also under { }.

And Socrates includes, gentlemen, the newly created realm of the mind into that reality which has to be investigated. The man who abuses the city, as well as the city, now come under scrutiny; therefore -- you always hear about the Socratic method. And in the Will Durant book, it is the most shallow thing I can imagine. If this is the Socratic method, it isn't worth anything, and wouldn't have taken tears, and bloodshed, and execution, and -- and martyrs to establish it. Gentlemen, the no- -- Socratic method doesn't consist of a teacher -- a little schoolteacher asking a child, "How much is 2 and 2?" And then getting the wonderful answer that it is allegedly 4, which of course untrue. And -- you can never know what 2 and 2 -- 4 is in real life. That's an abstraction.

I once was asked this question by a famous theologian, by Karl Barth, if 2 and 2 is always 4. And I said, "No, it isn't. It can be 5, or 7, or 3 in real life." And he said, "How come?"

Well, he had this problem that four people were -- five people were marching through the desert. And they had only four bottles of water. And one bottle was just sufficient to save a man's life, so that he could make the exit from the desert. It was so hot and -- all our { } assumption in his question. And it's the devil -- diabolical, Soph- -- real Sophis- -- Sophist's problem, you see, like Achilles and the tortoise. And he said, "Now, what do these people have morally to do? Five men, all doomed if they can't drink water. And four of them have a bottle. And the fifth has none. And who gets the water, and how do they get out?" And -- and -- what was -- would be your answer to this tempter's question. Lead us not into temptation, of course, is the only answer. But -- and it was here

really put by this rascal. They wanted to print the answer. It was a kind of -- he asked all his friends. What's your answer, Mr. {Wynant}?

(Well, one man would agree to sacrifice himself.)

Who -- one of the -- who is the -- fifth who has to sacrifice itself?

{ } -- to go around.)

What?

{ } and eliminate one man.)

Now the sun is very hot. If you idle away the time, it's only 10 minutes, you are already -- get 10 minutes later and you can't make it. Therefore any -- such stop, you see, is already murder for five of the men. Because the condition is so clear that only now if you immediately act, you see, can you make the exit from the desert. So if you spend now time idling and quarreling, and -- and -- and arguing, and -- and you just -- everyone is lost. You just get more thirsty, the water gets hotter, et cetera.

(I'm not sure what I would say about the conditions in the desert, but -- but looking at it from the viewpoint that we { } now, outside of the scene, it would depend on what type of system of morals you had. If you were a hedonist, or something like that, I suppose you would have to say that you have to drop out, because you couldn't live with yourself afterwards. In other words, you had -- you would have to take the route which would give you the greatest amount of pleasure in the long run, even it meant sacrificing your life { }.)

You mean, that's -- in the long run you sacrifice your life.

(Well, I'm saying if -- if you believe in this type of theory. I wouldn't say -- I wouldn't say my own personal feeling is --)

I agree with you. I think it's a funny expression to say that the man who will live shortest has the greatest pleasure in the long run. Because you cannot use the word "sacrifice," that's not used in American colleges. So you have say, "pleasure in the long run." It's a funny expression. He has to sacrifice himself, my dear man. That's all. All right. But can the others accept the sacrifice? Could you live with -- knowing that one man has given his life -- given his life for you, because you were such a da- -- bastard?

(Don't they all?)

What?

(Don't they all have to sacrifice?)

Of course, they all have to smash the bottles and make it, because they will be so enthusiastic, because they smash the bottles, that they'll have twice as much strength as they had before, because man has a second wind.

(Do all five men get out?)

Because all this assumption is all nonsense -- what? What did you say?

(He said, do all five men get out?)

What?

(He wants to know if all five men got out.)

All five will get out, of course. And the -- the weakest one will be carried by the others. You see, the whole assumption is that -- { }. Explain.

(He wants to know why I laugh?)

Yes.

(I think the assumption you're giving is ridiculous.)

Sure, it is. Because, you see the Sophist exactly as in the tortoise and Achilles, thinks that space of the tortoise is -- is in tidbits, so if I here run 20 centimeters, the tortoise will run 10 centimeters. And if he runs another 20, then again 10. So he'll -- he always is a little ahead of him, you see. It's all nonsense. He just overtakes her, you see. The same thing is -- is if you assume that five human beings are just moral spinsters, you see, who sit in judgment on what is right, you just abolish reality, because every man can have an increase of power by sacrifice, you see, and by courage. Everyone. And the greatest temptation of course to be overcome is such an idiotic question, you see. And the idiotic question is paralyzing him. And -- and in order not to be paralyzed by this terrible temptation to weigh the evidence: who's worth more, who should survive, you

see. You have to smash these bottles, because otherwise you will -- destroy all your stamina. But these questions are asked every day, of course, by Dorothy Post. Or what's her name? Dorothy Dix.

This is the -- terrible of ethics, you see, in the abstract. It's just shocking what -- and this goes on in all America. All these quizzes are of this nature, all these moral questions. There are no such answers. And again, the United Nations are so idiotic that they do not see that a country that is in a qu- -- a qu- -- life-and-death struggle has of course to -- to create a new situation first of all, before it can talk business in terms of the -- Mr. -- corporation lawyers like Mr. Dulles, who always have a vot- -- a voting majority on their side first. But -- Israel has to get a voting majority before it can -- that has never happened to Mr. -- Mr. Dulles that a minority is in the right. He always thinks the majority is right. It's ridiculous.

How can you say that a majority is right? All your aunts are down on your engagement, and you know that you are right. Do you think the majority then can rule that you cannot marry this girl? You are the only person who's right, and all the aunts in the whole family are wrong. The uncles, too. You -- you who act on these -- assumption every day. And yet when it comes to politics, you want to change the whole universe, because of your timidity of sophistry. You are -- you are all in the spell of Sophists. And Socrates is the man who asks the Sophists. "Ha! Sir. What is your credential? What do you do to these young men? What do you do to this city? What's the consequence of these judgments?"

So I only wanted to say today--I hope I have achieved it, gentlemen--that the problem of the question is the question of questions -- of all questions, you see. The -- the Sophi- -- the -- the pre-Parmenidean situation of the questioner is that he is outside, and therefore inferior to the people inside. He has to wait for their answer in order to know. The Sophist says, "I question these four insiders as to the legitimacy of their answers," you see. "I question everything." That's -- that's what you do, gentlemen. And that's why -- what the American brat is taught to do in school, and at home. And the -- of course, complete decadence -- decadence and degeneracy is the follow- -- consequence, because once you are allowed to ask the fundamentals of your family life, gentlemen, you have lost your family. Because the family is authority or it's nothing. The family is either so as it is, and the child has to stomach it; or it is nothing. If you have to explain and to justify yourself to your child, it isn't worth that you have any { }. The child cannot understand it. It has first to experience it. And years later, it can understand why there is a turkey at Thanksgiving. First it has to be there at

Thanksgiving. The child cannot go the -- on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and say to the father, "Why don't we throw out the turkey?" Isn't -- you see. It cannot. It has just to happen. And you cannot say when the draft comes and say, "Wouldn't it be better to escape to Megara?" And not to serve? First, you have to serve. Later you can criticize the draft.

I've made it a law in my whole life, gentlemen: I will not criticize an institution of which I have not been a member. I can here -- criticize a college and the university, because I have been a full-fledged member of it, but not otherwise, because I don't know what it is. You can criticize a thing if you belong to it, and have -- have done it. And Socrates' criticism of the laws of Athens are amenable -- are acceptable to me, because he has died under them. That makes sense. Don't you understand? But the man who criticized the laws from the outside, I'm very doubtful, because he doesn't know what a law -- even a just law is.

And so Socrates, gentlemen, reverses the problem -- that's the Socratic method: question the questioner. That's why most of his dialogues are -- have a name in their head, Protagoras, you see, this {great} Sophist, for example, you see, and Theaetetus, and Ion, and all these other dialogues. They always ask the asker. And this is your own question, gentlemen. Ask yourself, "Who asks?" And you do it, by the way, in a sound instinct. Most of you are much better than you think you are, because most people well know when a man is purely argumentative, you see, and asks questions for questions' sake, and when he is entitled to ask the question, wouldn't you say? We are quite well aware of this fact. But it has to be formulated.

And the history of Greek philosophy the- -- gentlemen, then is that in Socrates, the revolution of Parmenides reaches full cycle. It comes back to the tempter, that he himself is tempted. Socrates puts Parmenides, so to speak, the Parmenideses, you see, under contribution. He says, "Let me hear Parmenides." He has written a dialogue, "Parmenides," has he not? And he has not written a dialogue, "Heraclitus."

And perhaps that's the end of what I wanted to say today, gentlemen.

The Socratics reconcile Heraclitus and Parmenides by writing dialogues on all the people who are not Heraclitus, you see. And coming back to Heraclitus' position that there is a minimum of loyalty, a minimum of devotion, a minimum of existential identity with the things discussed, you see, which Heraclitus set up as a -- and which Plato then inherits, and Aristotle, in -- in -- in Socrates, in Heraclian strength and the Parmenidean, and -- meet, in a very subtle way

because the questioner is now questioned. And therefore, he doesn't go to the -- back to the Heraclian conservative of one-city order. But it's the wider realm consisting of cities and intellectuals. And Socrates encompasses both. He questions intellectuals and he questions the laws of the city.

And therefore you have in Socrates for the first time the new public of Parmenides brought under discipline. For the first time, the question arises, "What's the minimum standard of morality, which the Sophists themselves, these freelance intellectuals, you see, have to give proof of?" For example, what is the minimum morality of Dartmouth College? Because we are the heirs of the Sophists, gentlemen. But we are under certain Socratic criticism, you see. You cannot settle anything here, you see. It has to be in relation to the laws of a good city. It can be critical of the city. I'm very critical, as you know, of the city. But I'm under scrutiny myself, too, you see. What is the price I'm willing to pay for my truth? Can you see the difference?

And that is the new -- the great story of Greek philosophy, gentlemen, that in Socrates, the year of -- 399 of our era--perhaps you take down this -- this year, you see--Parmenides and Heraclitus come to a new synthesis. The synthesis is in Socrates, because he says that the intellectuals themselves are under the same scrutiny as the laws of the individual city which they criticize. And in order not to be mistaken for a Sophist, he drinks the cup of--what is it? hemlock?--of hemlock, to distinguish himself from the Sophists, you see, to show that he is not a Sophist. And that is his greatness. He says, "Otherwise, the citizens of Athene will always think that I simply -- I'm also a seller of questions," you see, "of superfluous, critical questions. I am not. I can distinguish," you see. "I question the questioner, as much as I question the laws of the city. And therefore I create a new democracy," gentlemen--take this well--a new democracy between the people who have intellect, and wisdom, you see, and the people who have political property and the vote.

You -- you are very limited in your reasoning about the state. Gentlemen, the state since 399 doesn't exist anymore outside the realm of mental processes who transcend the city. Ever since 399, there is a public, and public opinion; and a city. And the public opinion is bigger than the individual city. That's the inheritance of the catalog of the ships. Can you see this?

There is a patriotic enterprise for humanity on foot, called "philosophy," of which the public is not at home in Athens, or Sparta, or Megara, but in all three cities. In all cities of humanity, as a matter of fact. And if these intellectuals are as decent citizens of the world as the citizens in the individual city, we can

talk to each other. If they are just newspapermen, you see, who -- who are Mr. Hearst, and -- and only publicize crime and -- and love stories, away with them. -- That they have to be ignored. You can't debate them seri- -- take them seriously.

And this {type}, gentlemen, of the -- of the code of ethics for the public is today just as important as in 399. And I -- you need Socrateses a gain and again, people who say that although they ask for liberty of conscience, they do not mean to break the laws of their city for this reason. It's -- that would be too -- too wanton, I mean. The difference between Socrates and Walter Winchell should be -- evident by now.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...I tried to show you that the line was such that in Parmenides, there is already anticipation of two solutions: the soul alone, that's Epicurus; and the soul, so to speak, eagles the world; and the second, the Stoic {wanted} this world as one soul. That's to the Stoa. That's a cosmopolitan solution, and that is the peace-for-yourself solution. The hill -- go, take to the hills, so to speak. It's eternal, gentlemen. You will all -- at times you will all be Epicureans in the deeper sense -- good sense. And in the other, you will be Stoics. That is, gentlemen, these two philosophies are constant moods. And perhaps the deepest thing you should know about the history of philosophy is that it does display in its course your and my mental moods. They are not the truth of the matter. But they are great auxiliaries, means for your and my mental survival not to go insane in times of -- of doubt, in times of despair, in times of lying low, in times of waiting. Philosophy, gentlemen, is not a luxury. Everybody has a philosophy. But philosophy is much more a companion of life than an interpretation of life that holds water. You have to shift. I suppose any -- man who lives today, from now on will have several philosophies at his disposal. Because his despair will come from various directions. Sometimes he will -- what does a poor Hungarian do today? He needs some philosophy at this moment that hasn't to be valid forever. But it must carry him through the day, so that he just can still speak, gentlemen.

You watch, gentlemen, the end of a thousand years of the history of Hungary. Hungary was founded in 1002, with the baptism of St. Stephen. And -- Mr. Mindszenty -- Cardinal Mindszenty -- Mindszenty, by going to the American legation, ended the history of the crown of St. Stephen. And this is a very cruel millennium. We open -- it opens up, you see, end of the march of nations, gentlemen. There will be no nations in the future -- there will only be world powers. That has been in the making. I have prophesied -- seen this -- this is what -- could be seen coming. You see, America delays this. You are still all for small nations. You are even for -- for Egypt, which is not a nation. But you think everywhere there exist nations. It's just an -- an absolute, atrocious idea. Only in America you don't believe it. You have wiped out all the American nations. There you have no feeling. But in Europe, you assume the nations -- that's all nations. Well, they are nations. But gentlemen, the Christian nations of the -- of the Occident, they were nations because they were parts of the Church. They were all church-nations. There can only be nations with a spirit of their own. The nations of Mos- -- the Moslem world just doesn't have -- don't have that.

That's why they are no nations. Syria is the only exception in the Arab world, because it has Christians.

The reason for this is, gentlemen, that in the history of the Church, the nations became articulate as members of their councils. And the -- the Church used to vote on its last councils by nations. And these nations therefore got representatives -- from big universities. And the university of -- is essential to a nation. Paris is the greatest nation of Europe, because it has the oldest university, Paris.

So gentlemen, perhaps you take this at this moment, it's a very tragic, and very solemn moment and just -- a European like myself, we can- -- one cannot sleep. One just lies sleepless every night over this fate of Hungary. And m- -- all my news from Europe are to the same extent. The people of Europe are sleepless, because the whole history of Europe draws to an end at this moment. And America just can't do anything, I mean. It just -- it's a -- well. So the -- the mourning is -- goes very deep.

But perhaps you -- for your illumination, gentlemen, in passing I may say this, because it has to do with our Greek tradition and with the history of philosophy: a nation in Europe has been, since the year 1000, a body of people who have a spiritual center. It's not a group of people who speak Apache or Sioux. You -- in your terminology, just as you think that an individual is a philosopher, and -- so you break down the barrier between a real philosopher in his own right who speaks to remedy some foggish situation in his generation, you see, and the people who read books on philosophy and have their own opinions on something, since you always mistake the -- this and say that every American has a philosophy, instead of saying that he uses a philosophy, that he, you see, chooses a philosophy, but he hasn't made it--so in the same sense, you think anywhere, in Libya, or in the desert, there live nations. That is not true, gentlemen. A nation is a -- a unit of man plus a spiritual center, which contributes something to the -- common belief of mankind.

Any university is such a center, or should be. At least in Europe it was. Paris, or Salamanca, or Sa- -- Naples, or Salerno. Those of you -- who has taken Philosophy 10 with me? Well, you know that this has been developed there at some length without stressing much the -- the result for the nations that participated. But -- that is the trouble with India. And that's the trouble with China. The -- they are not nations in the European sense. They are something quite different. They're imitating now, the English, I mean. India has no such spiritual center. And it's still to se- -- to be seen how it -- how it will get one. It is very

hard-put. It can hate the English, but that's not a go- -- a sufficient basis, you know, the hatred of the others.

You assume that India is such a unit. It is not. That's one thing that is certain. And Mr. Nehru had to shoot, just as -- I see, as the Russian now shoot in Hungary, you are -- you just don't like to see these things happen, but they were in the papers, even. He just had to shoot. And he'll have to shoot much more in India. You are not at the end of the bloodshed there, because he's of course not the real ruler of India. How do you think--325 million people--he's an accident. Very passing accident, Mr. Nehru, Mr. {Mennon}, and all these sheiks. But in your eyes, you don't understand that, you see, you -- because you think a nation is a collection of people who vote for a selectman.

That would be no contribution to humanity. Without the Declaration of Independence, America wouldn't amount to anything, and without the churches here, you see. Would be a bunch of people, but this wouldn't be the biggest nation in the world of -- as of today. You have to contribute something to the common faith of mankind. That's why, if you div- -- separate Church and state, that doesn't mean that you can be a nation without a church, you see. It is -- they are separate. But you only see now today the Congress. Gentlemen, the Congress is a very barbarous bunch of fellows. Well, I have seen five senators competing with five quiz kids on -- on television. No, not on television, on -- on the radio, because I haven't seen that, television. That was before the days of television -- 10 years ago. Five senators.

Well, dyspeptic ge- -- old gentlemen. They -- this is not the nicest -- the cultural aspect of America -- our government, gentlemen, but what is going on in every American home, the good life that's led here. And that doesn't come from the state, you see. It comes from quite other resources. That isn't nourished by the government, but it nurses the government. We nourish the government, and -- government doesn't nourish us -- nourish us. How do we do it? Well, from resources that make us into civilized people, you see. And therefore the -- I think it is important for you to notice that the Hungarians always knew this. -- The -- the -- their pride and -- was the national museum and the university in Budapest. They would show this to everybody. I have lectured in Budapest as a professor. And I was very much impressed with this li- -- when that was destroyed now, the national museum of Budapest, I knew that was the bullet into the heart of the nation.

So gentlemen, the nation has received this power from the Greeks, because the Platonic tradition, that the good city has to discuss with the intellectu-

als from all over the world its own affairs, this international forum within a national boundary -- territory, you see, which you have in Harvard, and which you have in Yale, which you take for granted, you see, but which is very artificial, and which -- as you know, Mr. McLloyd -- -Leod in -- in -- in the state department and Mr. McCarthy in the Senate nearly destroyed if they could, you see.

This international discussion without -- in a nation is a part of the national life. That means that the nation has a window into the world of the mind open, you see. And this mind is not of the city, of the polis, of the nation, you see, but is admitted into the city, as a ferment and as a correcting thorn in the flesh. And this is what the Greeks have imparted to the rest of mankind, that you cannot be a nation, gentlemen, without receiving into you an article -- as an article of faith that there must be a platform in the nation, in which the nation is in a conversation with the other nations. You must always see that this is not natural. The Russians don't have it. You see, you -- and they crush the -- Hungarians for this very reason at this moment, that they think they can have -- without your { } -- or your -- what is it?

(Just chewing gum.)

Two years old? Well, has nobody a piece of sugar for the man?

So to come back. Why is it so important, gentlemen? On this road from Parmenides to Epicurus and the Stoa, the Greeks outgrew the -- their own nation, their own polis. And their eternal contribution is that they have now been admitted in the form of colleges, in the form of books, in the form of encyclopedias, which wouldn't have to exist, gentlemen. You must always forget that at this moment in the year 2000 of our era, they tend to disappear.

I am -- have cooperated at an American People's Encyclopedia at -- coming out in Chicago, gentlemen, in which the Catholic readers are so anxiously -- catered to by the editors that abortion and all such things, or homosexuality, or some -- these catchwords couldn't appear in this encyclopedia. My own articles have been dissected and -- and -- and revamped. Anything disagreeable to any reader cannot be printed in this People's American Encyclopedia. So of course, it cannot contain the truth. Because in America, there are 160 million people -- potential readers whom this man -- wanted to catch, you see. He cannot -- if he pays attention to everybody's -- crackpot's ideology and prejudice. But he tries to. This is a remarkable editor. He lives in Chicago. So they do that there. And of course the truth is abolished. If you li- -- leave the Encyclo-

paedia Britannica for a second -- another edition in Chicago, you won't hear the truth anymore. It is already deteriorating in this new edition. Don't buy it, please. It's a very poor encyclopedia, because in Chicago there are so many commercial pressures on. You see, this group will not buy it. And this group will not buy it. And you -- then you cannot print it.

There perhaps you see the greatness of philosophy, gentlemen. Philosophy is a challenge to the local prejudice, isn't it? And it sells its truth regardless of the trend.

Did I tell you my experience with a dean of a great university? Mrs. Huessy was having dinner, and myself, with this m- -- gentleman in another house. And he said, "I don't understand your husband at all. What he's doing is against the trend."

And he said -- she said, "Yes. That's why he is doing it."

And he was at a loss. He had never heard of such a fool. Well, that's my business, gentlemen. I am a philosopher. So if I am not against the trend, I sin. I am a criminal. That's what I -- what I have taken an oath of -- as a doctor for, to tell the truth against the trend. It's not interesting to be with the trend, gentlemen. That's -- you see. Didn't I tell you, I mean, that I was statistically unimportant? That's the business of philosophy, gentlemen, to be statistically unimportant, because otherwise, the statistically important ones would have no future, because they would then live from one trend to the next. And the trend would be not of their own making, but they would of course always just be-trend it. In other words, you would live -- if you go by the trend, you live by accident. You become not master of your destiny. And this old word which today is quoted, but never acted upon, "You are the captain of your soul," means exactly this attempt to be free from the trend. To win against the trend. You have to know the trend, sure. But you have to laugh at it. And you have -- you may argue -- have to bring yourself into posi- -- in a position so that you can survive it.

(Must the trend always be wrong, Sir?)

No, but as a trend, it is wrong. If you only do it because it is a trend, this is nonsense. You must have made the trend. If it is your trend, of course. Then you can triumph. You see. Oh no, nothing is good or evil. Thinking makes it so. You know that. But it is -- I mean, what do you say about an eastern wind? I

mean, it is neither good nor evil, you see. So -- you won't go against the eastern wind. But you will also no -- not -- also not go with the eastern wind. It's -- you tack. You understand? It's not you. You cannot -- say that, you see, as here in this country, where everybody feels that he must be part of the wind -- of the -- of this eastern wind.

Or at least feign that he is. I mean, I think most people are so incredibly adroit that they -- you see, they go to church because the Mis- -- of Mr. McCarthy, and then they stop going to church when Mr. McCarthy has no power. That's what happened in this -- and this whole thing is called a religious revival. You have forgotten this, perhaps. But it's only four years old. People suddenly got religion. At least on Sunday. Ja?

(Sir, if you generally go -- continually go against the trend, why are you not forming a trend of your own? In other words, aren't you --)

No, no, Sir. No, Sir. I -- my dear man, you know this very well. The difference between a -- hybrid corn and weeds. The corn is meant to grow one day. But it doesn't grow as a trend. It grows by a slow process of weeding. The weed would be the trend. I mean, any cultivated plant -- of course it has to grow and also respect the season. It needs sunshine, rain, et cetera, Sir. But you will never con- -- confuse wheat and -- and weed.

(Well, the thing is, and what I was thinking -- if you make it a habit of going against the trend, don't -- I mean, you do generally make a habit when -- { }, well I must go against the trend.)

No. Oh no. Well, that's -- would be a negation that would make you dependent on the trend. Oh, heavens! Oh no, my dear man. Certainly you can't misinterpret me this way, you see. I didn't -- you have to -- there are deeper resources for knowing your direction, you see. But any mere trend is destructive for the community. That's obvious. That's why the country was very wise, and had a -- has now a Democratic Congress and a Republican president, you see. I think that's an attempt of the Americans to get out of this trend business, because no great republic can live -- you see, the more foreign policy we have, the less we can afford to be swayed in one or the other direction, obviously. It is impossible.

It's a very -- you see, that is called "conservatism." In this country there has never been conservatism in the -- mind -- there couldn't be. And the problem, as you know, the problem is, there have some voices in the last 10 years

trying to establish an American conservatism. But I have -- has anybody read this book by a gentleman called Kirk? Who has read this? Is it popular? Well, poor man. He tried to -- be the -- the standard-bearer of a new conservative party in the United States, and you haven't even heard of the man. Well, gentlemen, you are so reactionary, you don't have to.

And -- this is a conservative country in a way, but the main essence I wanted to say about conservatism as a definition is, that it tries to cap the trends so that they cannot go out of hand, you see. Whereas the left people are inclined to let the trend, you see, rule them. They are for the new, they are for the news, they are for the -- progress. And I think this is the real difference. The reactionary would be a man who just stops progress. That's not interesting, you see -- always only a few. But the conservative already sees the next and the next trend, you see. And therefore says, "Not one -- or any one of these trends must ride the crest of the wave totally."

I think it's a very good definition of conservatism, if you do not see left and right as opposites, as you think, like a tug-of-war, one saying, "Go forward," and the other saying "Go backward." That's not the problem of a conservative party in England, for example, or of Disraeli, the -- who was a real, great conservative, you see. But the problem of the conservative is that he can--because he is his father's son, and because he remembers his grandfather gladly--he can see that what is of the day, you see, is not of the generation; and what is of the generation is not of the century, because these little crisscross of trends, you see, per diem, and per annum, and per generation, they -- they cross each other out -- out. And if you go totally in -- in the zig-zag, you see, of the trend, you waste an enormous amount, you see. You have to -- to burn, and you destroy what you have to rebuild the next time. And as Robert Frost said, "I couldn't afford to be a revolutionary in my youth, because then I would have had to be a reactionary in my old age, and I was afraid of -- that that -- would -- will happen," you see. You understand. So that is why Robert Frost is a conservative, you see. That is, he wants to conserve the continuity, despite the trend.

□ These are after all important things, because you can see under what immense hazards the element of free criticism, the element of philosophy, this element of the autonomy of second impressions, of criticism, had to be implanted into every city, and that at this moment, we feel -- and that's I think the greatest danger we face today, and it isn't dissolved at all -- resolved at all, yet, that the Russians have declared they are a philosophical government, their government has a philosophy, therefore nobody else can have a philosophy, because they have the right philosophy, you see. So in Russia, you have pure Platonism, pure

Parmenides, ruling. It's a philosophical government. Its whole raison d'etre is philosophy, but if you make philosophy the basis of the government, instead of the basis of the school, or the academy, or the philosophy criticizing the state, you get tyranny. You get a terrible state. You must never forget that Bolshevism is a philosophy. And we cannot shun the responsibility for it. It's Platonism. The Russians are Platonists in a certain -- to a great extent. All that tyranny can be derived at by reading Plato's Republic. I would forbid the reading of Plato's Republic for the next hundred years, lest we lose our democracy, because Plato justifies every measure of violence against disobedient citizens in no uncertain terms.

Fortunately the philosopher, you see, because Plato says, "If the philosophers get kings -- become kings, you see, then everything is fine, you see. Well, everything is wonderful then for his philosophy, but everything is terrible for the man who has to live by it, and doesn't agree. Because the one philosophy which is the mold of the mind governs, you see, then all the other molds of the mind are just excluded. This point is -- as important. There are two things that I wanted to start with then today. One is that the Greek element of philosophy has been -- had to be added to the Christian nations. They had to be vaccinated or -- ja, with it, equipped with this thought in order to become a civilized nation. And there is an absolute def- -- defined term to a nation, gentlemen, which you always omit in this country. And that's why you cannot deal with these problems of -- of the Arab states, or the problems of Africa, or the problems of South America. You see, Bolivia and Paraguay are not nations. that is utter nonsense. They may be governments, and certainly mis-governments, but they are accidents, yet. They are not necessary to the human race. They have not proved it, because nothing happens there in the conversation between ultimate truth and {}. They are not -- they are not part and parcel of the whole group that moves forward in a common struggle. And as long as they aren't, they must be conquered. They must be ruled. They must be determined by others. Your idea of self-determination stems from groups, you see, like the 13 colonies who have not {} security, gentlemen. That's why a small handful of gentlemen in this country makes America into something different from the five nations of the Indians. You can sink down to this very soon. Just overnight, you can. And you don't know the {}, gentlemen. You think it is granted to you that you are in the {} of civilization. Gentlemen, that's not true. In the last 10 years, America has been great -- in great danger that this would not be true any longer. You can become {}. You can excise -- castrate your mind, and you can destroy the window in which you -- through which you converse with the rest of the world. If you have not

this decent respect for the opinions of mankind, as in the Declaration of Independence, this country is just as powerful as any other. In itself, a parochial group does not deserve to be spared conquest.

You must understand that the world is made only for those people who belong to the whole of mankind, the human race. They must do something about it. Just are speaking, what you call "English" in Chicago through the nose, you do not -- are not citizens of the world. That's just a group language, gentlemen. That's -- that's parochial. And any group gentlemen, that separates itself from the tree of the whole human race has to be wiped out. It has been wiped out. that's the story of mankind. You do not think that the aborigines in Australia are -- can live on. They just {}. {} you see, the Easter Island there, and here what's -- what about the {} division. It's not accidental, gentlemen. These people could not find any translating process by which they revamp their five nations {} of the future of human society, you see. That's very difficult, but when I -- the life of mankind, gentlemen, isn't as happy-go-lucky as you think. Please look at the tragedy of the red Indians in this country, and look at the Incas, and look at the -- at the -- at the Aztecs, and Montezuma. And now look at Hungary, gentlemen. The danger at every moment is tremendous. That whole -- whole parts of the human race are wiped out. Well, one of the ways of preserving the human race -- I won't say it's the only one -- has been this international power of philosophy. It's only in addition, as the big word "international" shows you, to the life of the nation that you need this, you see. "Inter-national" after all is only something that is second. You never think that international powers can take the place of national powers. I know that, you see. But a civilization is a nation that has international processes into its own education, for example. If you have a history book in the United States which is pure propaganda against Russia, you will admit that you have -- are beginning to cease to be ed- -- a civilization, you understand? Because in this history book, you cannot afford also -- the Russians would not interfere although the Russians would not interfere. You can, but you may not.

So gentlemen, philosophy tries to inculcate into the educators and the rulers of any polis of any -- that is, of any political unit -- I must introduce this word. As you understand, it means just as well the United States as it means Athens, or Sparta, or Rome. The philosopher introduces into the polis a standard of truthfulness. And therefore insists that many po- -- political acts can be done, but they may not be done. You see? And the important acts which cannot be done, which a philosopher intrudes, so to speak, inculcates are of course those which do harm to other {}. You see. Because, as you know, the priests of any

religion in your own country cannot resist that temptation. All people preach to those who are in church. And those who happen to be absent or belong to another church are never dealt with fairly. But if the historian, you see, knows what the truth is, then he will not write a textbook in a school which could be introduced -- gladly, you see, but may not be introduced for the { } history. Some of the textbooks used in our schools, gentlemen, are certainly not good. But they are recommended by Mr. McCarthy. In every minute, gentlemen, this process happens. You think of course there's progress, and these things cannot happen to us. Gentlemen, they have happened -- in the last five years, there has been a considerable re- -- recession in -- in truthfulness, in veracity in our textbooks. That is, certain things have -- certain things have been said a little less, a little less, and other things have been said a little more loudly, et cetera. For example, I have always puzzled with the tra- -- tradition in this country about the 300,000 loyalists which left this country. They were all the good citizens liv- -- living in America at that time in 1776. Now you know what happened to the president of Columbia University at that time? Who is from New York? How was Columbia called at that time?

{ }.

Wie?

{ }.

And what happened to the president? Do you know? Well, he had to jump out of the window and run for his life. And he went to Canada. It would be just the same as if -- well, if President Conant or President Dickey -- if he, in such a crisis, you see, didn't happen to him. You can hardly imagine, because you seem that you [people will always be on the right side, because you are such conformists today. But then, you see, all the good people were on the wrong side. All the Dickeys. Yes. And you know, we lost a president of Dartmouth College -- when did we last lose our last president for a political affair?

(Civil War.)

Who was he? Nathaniel Wood Lord. Why? Because he was for slavery.

Proved it from the Bible. Oh ja.

I feel the textbooks should be full of these examples, to show how difficult life is, you see, how great -- grave the decisions are. If you live on the --

through the 4th of July all your life without hearing that 300,000 of the wealthiest, best, and most important citizens had to leave this country, lost all their fortunes, their houses were broken -- burned. Their belongings were destroyed. If you never see this plastically see this happen, how do you know what the price of a revolution is? How can you esteem what the founders of this country ever did? And How can you ever get out of your own softness? Why is America so soft? Because of the schoolbooks. Because of the little schoolhouse. Because of the sweetness and light in these houses. With some spanking, you would know how hard it is to live. But you never are spanked.

A friend of mine who went to England after the war -- she was a German. The girl and a daughter -- the granddaughter of a famous scientist -- they came to a Quaker college, Woodbrooke. And she was very well received. And one day, however, it was in 1920, only two years after Versailles and after the First World War, and so people were still quite exasperated in many respects, and so people pounded on the Germans. And she got very mad. And when one of these sweetness-and-light girls in this -- from this Quaker college said something nasty about Germany, she slapped her in the face. Silence. Quaker college, I'd never heard before. No resistance. So she locked herself into her room for three days and shoved some tea into it. And after three days, Mrs. -- Miss Judge, that's a famous Quaker family, asked her -- the principal asked her to come down and -- tears in her eyes, Miss Judge said, "Now, my dear Miss Henning, what are you going to do? This has never happened in Woodbroke, and I'm terribly sorry. And what do you say?"

"Well," Miss Henning said, it was very simple. "Miss Judge, have you ever felt like slapping anybody in the face?"

And Miss Judge said, "No."

And Miss Henning said, "That's the whole story."

That's the whole story. Story ends. Ja. Ja. Exactly. Wrong education.

(I went to a boarding school --)

Wie?

(I said, I went to a boarding school and --)

Ja? Where? But you see my point.

(Yeah. I see your point.)

Well, the 300,000 loyalists are people who -- who, you see, represent the roughness, the toughness of real life, of passionate life, you see, because the people slapped these people in the face. They did, indeed. And that's the price for the revolution. And it's the price for any revolution, gentlemen. And that you can found states without war or bloodshed is nonsense. And that is probably now what is destroying Israeli, if Mr. Eisenhower gets through his made proposal that -- well, it is mad. The Americans are just as cruel with their morality as the Russians. In other ways. I may insist -- I'm gravely concerned with this, gentlemen. States cannot -- have never been founded with rosewater. With -- they cannot. It's an act of violence, that others wake up and admit that they are states. I'm sorry, but the pope -- Pius II, a pope after all, wrote in 1464 the great sentence, "Now the truth remains, that never has a state been founded, nor shall he -- it be founded without war." That's a pope's statement. And he knew what the world was like. And he said it when he convened the princes of the Western world against the Turks. It was after the fall of Byzantium, of Constantinople to the Turks. And he said, "You are all pacifists now, gentlemen, but if you want to save the Western world, don't have illusions about the basis of nations, about national life." This illusion that you can send a lawyer -- a corporation lawyer to draw up a contract, and now have a Gaza -- the Gaza strip or the desert or something, as the frontier, that's all nonsense. You have to be there. And you have to take a beating. And you don't like to hear this, most of you, because you have dreams about grandeur without grandeur. Of peace without war. It doesn't exist. Peace and war are mutually relative terms, gentlemen. Peace is senseless without war., And war is senseless without peace. I grant you that. If you fight a war in order to have this problem of this war always end in a peace.

The Americans have never given up territory conquered in war.

Now philosophy, gentlemen, is therefore the disagreeable truth, if it is anything. The disagreeable truth. That can be -- disagreeable in various respects. You can say the earth turn around the sun. That was disagreeable to the people of the days of Copernicus, you see. that is, you can change the local aspect, the -- the -- space aspect of the universe, or you can change the judgment of the times over its own goodness. It can be an ethical judgement, it can be a logical judgement, it can be a physical judgment which you disprove as not valid, although it is parochially felt.

So there is an eternal, gentlemen, fight against the trends in society, in

religion, and in the natural science of his day. And that's why I insist, gentlemen, that there cannot be common sense philosophers. One of the most frequent -- how old -- is called this? -- reverses, I would say, of the definitions of philosophy at this moment rampant in America. There are even some books, they are called Common Sense Philosophy. Gentlemen, philosophers have come into the world against common sense, because common sense is the philosophy of yesterday, you see. What you call "common sense" is the inherited philosophy, you see. But it was common sense of 1600 to say the sun rose. And it was against the common sense that -- Kepler said that it didn't, or Galilei. Gentlemen, your common sense is the common sense created into you by historical tradition. Every sense that anything makes to you is common sense, because you have inherited it. But don't forget that all your values have been created by philosophers, that is, people who have stood on their head and said what the common sense was of their days was, was not good enough. As long as you think 160 million Americans can philosophize, or are born philosophers, or all men are equal with regard to philosophy, I'm very sorry for you, gentlemen. You haven't looked through this constant fight between common sense and abstruseness. And what is abstruse to you today is common sense tomorrow. But it can only be common sense tomorrow if it appears at one moment as abstruse. It isn't so very difficult to understand this, gentlemen, that -- can you? -- that philosophers therefore must remain in the minority, that they must not become kings. And what I'm doing today is to recapitulate now the story of Parmenides, and the Sophists, and Socrates, with regard to the attempt which we find in Plato and in Aristotle to connect the nation, the polis, be governed by the philosopher. That is Plato's dream, as you know. And you always read in the textbooks that "unfortunately, it was aborted." It's very fortunate that it was aborted. Philosophy is an additional function that is needed. Don't misunderstand me. But it's so difficult for you to understand, that it must never lead to the shortcut that the philosopher becomes king. Then you get the Bolv- Bolshevik government. Mr. Lenin was never anything but -- you see, but a parochial man. He was an international philosopher, and therefore he was so cruel, so brutal. No resistance. Because if you have not philosophy as a second order in which your mind is trained, then you use this mind to overrule all the facts of life, all the rights of other individuals, you see, all the given conditions of con- -- community, you see. You -- you just ride roughshod with your mind. And since we have philosophical government, gentlemen -- we -- we

have today to divide again philosophy and government, and that's why I feel very strongly on this business of Platonism in -- in -- which is rampant in our colleges -- that's -- can't go on, gentlemen, because Plato proclaims that philosophers should -- should be kings. Now it would be very nice for me if this was true, gentlemen. I would feel aggrandized. My whole class would go up. But it is not so.

Just as there is a division between Church and state, gentlemen, there has to be interpolation--how shall one say? I think that's the best word--interpolation of two time phases between philosophy and the nation. Philosophy is the educational ferment of the national life. It is anticipatory of change. But it is not able to rule itself. It must be sifted through all kind of -- of very difficult processes until it has conquered the minds of men. Otherwise there will be bloodshed. Otherwise there must be barricades, you see. Otherwise there -- roll tanks and destroy Budapest. You see, that comes all -- what's the good conscience of these ideologies, you see? What does this Mr. -- this tyrant proclaim, Mr. {Zublov}, and Mr. Kádár, and all -- all these people whom -- whom the -- one doesn't know why the sun shines upon them. How can they kill all these people? Because they say, "There must be a communistic state." Now what is a communistic state? It's a state sold to a philosophy of history, you see, to economic materialism, historical materialism. However you call it. Economic -- historical. And therefore that's the only justification. Who does not think--not believe--but who does not think as we, you see, deserves to be killed, and deserves to be -- not be allowed to send his -- his children to a higher school, as {}, as you know. If you are not a Communist, you have no right that your child should get an education, you see.

All this follows through -- by the nature of -- of philosophy if you put philosophy into the government of a country. This is -- pardon me?

(Don't you think that a democratic government is also based on a philosophy?)

Ja, but the self-denying ordinance of a democracy -- democratic government is that the ruler must be an average man, and not a philosopher. It's -- a difference, you see, between the American democracy, or Swiss democracy on one side and these -- Bolshevik government. The party in -- in -- Russia is exclusively known for the strictness of its party line. You see, that is the reason why a man is in power there. Here the reason is, you see, that the -- even the party with some platform has to look for a popular man who is not sold to the party line at all: Woodrow Wilson wasn't. Roosevelt wasn't, you see, but who -- the

party machine in this country cannot nominate a machine man for the president of the United States, you see. Because the people wouldn't vote for him. It has to be a free man, you see, who is not subservient to any such formal statement or -- even of the party. And the party is already a watered-down philosophy, isn't it? -- and contains innumerable contradictions.

So the Democratic Party and Republican Party, they really have not a homogeneous philosophy, you see. It's a hodgepodge of compromises, you see, of concessions to this group and the other group, et cetera, and attempt to -- to put this compromise in such a frame that it looks as though it had any logic in it. You see. And then comes the party leader, the modern Republican, and says, "Sorry, but the whole platform is not for me," and he's elected. Isn't that true? So you see the freedom of the president of the -- in the United States is a -- is a very real thing, that he is not fettered by a -- what a -- we would call a real philosophy. He is fettered of course by promises he makes, you see, by situations he faces. You understand. It is understood how we'll cope with certain situations. But that's not philosophy in the abstract.

If he was a -- sold for -- to -- to any maxim like eugenics, or mercy-killing, I wouldn't vote for him. Heaven -- Heaven forbid that we ever get a vegetarian president! But you understand. And it -- the gravest mistake in the history of the United States was the Prohibition issue, wasn't it? Why? Because that is a philosophical decision. There you can see, you see, what happens when women go to college.

Please.

(I don't understand the distinction you make, Sir, between on the one hand, the Russians crushing the Hungarians from a philosophical point of view, and the point of view that we would be justified in conquering Uruguayans or the Ecuadorians because they are not in a real sense a nation.)

I haven't said that we should conquer them. But I doubt that they can govern themselves. Tin governs Bolivia, and that's a very poor government, you know. I assure you. The -- the speculative dependency of these poor countries, you see, on some economic hazard is -- is very tragic. I think the history of Paraguay is the most tragic history of any country in the world. Have you ever read it? I recommend it to you. It is unbelievable. The history of Paraguay is an example of what the -- usurpation of state rights by a territory that is not able to -- to claim it. What then happens? It's -- it's -- who has been to South America?

Where have you been?

(Venezuela.)

That's not far enough south. I -- unfortunately I have never gone to Paraguay. I have friends who settled in Paraguay -- the famous Hutterites, the -- that are pacifists. They came here first from Germany. They were friends of mine in Germany. And then they went to Paraguay when here the Second World War made it plausible that they would have to take up arms here. Very good people. And -- also the consul in Paraguay is a friend of mine. And so at least I have some direct connection with the -- but I have also studied the history. You know, the -- at one time there were perhaps two dozen males in Paraguay left. The rest were women and children. They had all killed each other off. In the -- 1846.

This history of Paraguay is -- is really something you ought to study, gentlemen, if you want to be cured from your incredible optimism. You see, you are all -- you all on the one-hand side think you are -- cannot be taken in. On the other hand, you all believe in words, in mere words. Bec- -- if somebody calls himself a nation, you believe it. If Paraguay says, "I am an independent republic," you bow and say, "Well, then it must be so." If Nasser says he's the legal government of Egypt, you accept it. And you will even have -- we haven't broken up diplomatic relations with Hungary. Mr. K d r, this bl- -- butcher, you see, this provincial governor of a Russian province, will now pose as an independent government. I'm sure he will. And you accept and say from now on, you will -- you will -- and we will play even in -- in -- in Melbourne with these rascals or -- in the Olympics, because it would be bad -- bad for the -- why doesn't the American Olympic team leave Melbourne right away? No, that would spoil the game.

But you are word realists. That is, to you, a name, if it is not -- is -- is real. The word "nation," self-determination of nations. Instead of asking, "Is this a nation?" That's the o- -- main question. "Who is a nation?" you should ask. You see. Then -- that's why I -- threw out my definition. You can only grant rights of nations to people who belong to a -- some commonwealth of nations, you see. But if you -- if you take in Liberia, as we did in 18- -- when it -- was it founded, Liberia? With this rotund Mr. Tubman. Has a wonderful name, you know. I always think of a tub. He's president of Liberia -- or ex-president of Liberia, you see. They have slaves, these Negroes in Liberia, you see. They had -- and they -- the Americans would- -- didn't even want to s- -- look into the matter, you see, how these -- these American Negroes exploited the African Negroes, worse than any colony. But you say, "Liberia is a free republic," but the good treatment of

the natives by the English administration, that doesn't count for noth- -- anything. That's colonialism. You see. But be quiet, because the people who govern Liberia and abuse it are Neg- -- are black. Tyrants they are. Horrid. We have done it. We have founded this state. And there are two classes. One is the American Negro in Liberia, and the others are the colo- -- colonials. But nobody is allowed to mention this. In every -- Ameri- -- European geographical magazine, you can see that the worst part of -- of Africa is Liberia. But here it mustn't be said, because how can it? It's all wonderful, you see. It's an "independent nation." It's the worst part of Africa. The Belgian Congo is Heaven against it. But if it comes to an issue, you will vote for Liberia and against Belgian Congo. One is a colony, and the other is a free country. God help you.

When -- when will you wake up to -- to -- to know what a nation is, and what a government can be, and what it is not? It's all just words.

And therefore I think the definition of a nation--I have given this in a work called the Autobiography of Western Man--it's very important, gentlemen. What has been sanctified in the law of nations, and in the treatment of nations as a nation is a part of the history of the church, of Christianity. And the -- it is very fashionable today to dismiss missions, to dismiss Christianity, and to dismiss Church as obsolete. I warn you. In politics it's still a very important practice to ask if this country has been -- any country on the globe -- has been educated by the freedom which only comes when you separate Church and state. Because only in this separation, which has been produced by philosophy, you see, can you have -- speak of a civilization. As soon as Mr. Nasser is at the same time the religious leader of his people, you get an impossible situation. You can't cope with this man. He's a fanatic. The -- the religious leader of -- of the Moslem world has said to a friend of mine that every Israelite -- I think I told you this, you see -- child and baby in mother's womb has to be murdered. He says this now for seven years to everybody who wants to visit him, day after day. Why isn't this printed in great letters here? That's a declaration much more than war, but of -- of -- of destruction. And that goes on day after day. Wie? Did I tell you this before?

(No. Abdel Nasser is not the religious leader of the Arab people -- not by a long shot.)

Well, the -- he has tried now to inherit this. Oh, yes. You don't know this, but the -- even the Vatican has made a pact with him on mutual toleration against bad -- wicked Communism. Six years ago, that was very unfortunate. The pope -- and Mr. -- and then Farouk entered into such a { }. And Nasser

has inherited it. You read his proclamations; his whole appeal is to the Moslem world.

So in -- you may say he is not qualified by the tradition of Moslem, which has never recognized this, you see. But his language is -- he -- he has no other, since he has no legal basis for his government, you see. All illegal governments must make some spiritual claim, you see. They have to have some basis, you see. And Nasser has absolutely no right to govern, except a coup. I mean, a coup d'état. I mean, he just went there and dispossessed the king and said, "Now, I rule." Then he dispossessed the first prime minister, whom he nominated and his -- you see, Mr. Naguib, to whom Mr. Dulles gave a silver pistol, as you know, as a present -- as an invitation to shoot.

Well, I really -- this is, of course, a quandary, gentlemen, of our -- great -- of our times. A philosophical quandary, gentlemen, of a definition of a state, of a modern state, a modern polis, a modern nation. And you have to distinguish between statehood, that is, some political concern like -- where shall we turn? -- like Panama, or Guatemala, and a nation. I think even you would doubt for a minute if I said, "Is there a Panama nation?" Of course, there isn't. You see. There isn't. There is a state. It is -- is -- it is a vassal state of the United States. That's all that is. That's not so little. But it is nonsense to say that the Panamese form a nation, because some -- some hirelings from America set up their government when we needed it. It's an artificial thing, isn't it? It -- it is not a nation, gentlemen.

If you bring yourself, which is nearly impossible, it seems to me, for -- in your mental processes, to say, "Panama is not a nation," you have advanced to the necessary degree to understand the function of philosophy, because it has pure- -- told you that you cannot call everything a "nation" what you please to call a nation. What you want to call a nation, that you have to give it a certain minimum of reality, you see.

Now in the history of the human race, gentlemen, the nations of the Western world became nations, threw off the yoke of pope and emperor, when they implanted into the heart of their own territory an institution of free criticism, an international institution. And that is called, gentlemen, the institutions of higher learning. The word "higher" implies today what the -- Greeks called -- meant- -- first by philosophy and later by the academy, and later by the -- these -- these scho- -- eranoi, this eranos, this group of lovers. Gentlemen, the word "higher" means sovereign. And a school of higher learning is sovereign with regard to the laws of the state in which it roams. It can criticize them. And there-

fore, a state, plus an institution of higher learning--that's perhaps the simplest definition--you see, which it tolerates not only, but which it recognizes as necessary to its own improvement. Such an institution is a nation. That's that minimum of separation of Church and state, you see, of separation of reverence and criticism, without which you can -- don't have to have great respect for the boundaries of, which you dispose of.

Now the Americans will be challenged to dispose of Trieste not only, but of the Polish issue, of the German issue, of A- -- poor -- everything comes -- is brought to the Americans, if you have no criteria to judge these issues, if you do not at least understand the dis- -- dis- -- distinction between a group -- batch of people who live in a -- in a suburb of the world, like Alexandria or Cairo, and a nation. And a nation must have an institution of higher learning to criticize its own laws. Before, it doesn't participate in the community of nations. And that's much more important, in the long run, gentlemen, than the -- having embassies. You can imitate all these things, you see. You can put Mr. Tubman, president of Liberia, into a tuxedo, you see, and -- and then say, "He's president of Liberia." But that's your own illusion, gentlemen. And it will be to our own disadvantage if you are hoaxed, coaxed into these errors by simply the usage of words.

Now, why do I say all these things, gentlemen? I say it in preparation to the tremendous function of Greek philosophy in forcing the individual city, in forcing the individual city to criticize its terms, you see, to define its terms. You say always, "Define the terms." Now that's a philosophical victory over the city, you see. In -- in -- when you are one of ours, when you are just a member of the parochial community, you do -- never -- have to define your terms, because you speak as everybody else does, you see. There's no necessity of defining your terms. The -- term, "Define your terms," in other words is the way by which the city has lost her sovereign jurisdiction to some higher Areopagus, judicial court, but in front of which it has -- to justify itself.

And gentlemen, don't forget that this decent respect for the opinion of mankind is a strictly philosophical expression. The United States, when they were ge- -- were born, were born as a part of a world in which a conversation goes on between the minds, you see. And you cannot set up -- up house. A son cannot set up house if he denies that he will be one house in the community, and therefore take over the orders of his father's house, in a -- to a certain extent into his house. You cannot claim, without recognizing other people's precedent. Marriage is impossible, gentlemen, if you do not accept for yourself the obliga-

tions to do likewise, to set up house. And a nation cannot set up -- up house if it doesn't accept to do likewise.

You know the problem of Spain. Protestants cannot live in Spain. That's for our notions impossible. You cannot leave the Catholic Church in Spain. There's the border, and that's why Spain to a certain extent is not a civilized nation. It isn't. It is fo- -- a fossil. It's purely accidental. Everybody there is a Roman Catholic. I would say, therefore nobody is a Christian. Because you cannot only be a Christian if there is a possibility of being not a Christian. In New York, they called a school {Steppinat} School. Have you heard of this? Who knows the {Steppinat} School in New York? Well, I just talked to a man from Croatia, whose mother was forced by Mr. {Steppinat's} archbishop of Zagreb to become a Roman Catholic by violence. He was here. She was left alone there, the old woman. And they said to her that she would have to migrate on foot, 500 miles to Serbia, unless she became -- she was a Greek Catholic, you see, she was a good Christian -- a Roman Catholic. And she was one of thousands and thousands.

Now the -- Americans are so stupid that this bloody, great inquisitioner, who should be burned at stake himself, this Mr. {Steppinat}, is worshiped as a saint in New York City. Well, that's the electorate in New York. These are the voters of New York, the most unenlightened group I have ever known. {Steppinat} is a saint in New York. A man who forces people -- now for New York, that means something. I mean, that's the issue of issues in New York, that religions should be free, isn't it? Even Mr. Sell- -- Spellman has to admit it. Comes hard to him. This is a scandal, gentlemen, and nobody has protested in this country. But I have a friend whose mother has been forced to change her religion, and a school in New York is ch- -- is called after this tyrant.

So wake up to the fact, gentlemen, that we are very backward, gentlemen, that philosophy does not play the necessary role at this moment in America. But you take everything just at face value as a journalist does. And journalism, gentlemen, is the curse of this country. All the news are wrong. They are -- they are all right and wrong, but they are not true, because the -- the words are all -- the Hungarians are called "in-" -- "rebels" and "insurgents" in this country. Can you -- can you imagine what harm has been done by this simple use of -- in The New York Times of the word "rebels" for the Hungarian people? How can we call them "rebels"? Against whom are they rebels? Against the Russians. Is this rebellion? That's a simple --.

There, you see, if you don't define your terms, gentlemen, if you have no philosophy, the city is lost. And poor Hungary. I think you might have gotten the Americans to do something if the telegrams hadn't been all slanted and all for a fortnight now only said that rebels were insurging in the streets of Budapest. It was a legitimate government of Mr. Nagy and {Tilde} who's fighting. And you call these people "rebels." And that goes on here, and nobody says anything. Everybody eats up these -- these drugs, these -- these venom -- this venom and this poison, because you are just -- not -- these newspaper people do -- can do with you what they please. What comes first into their ink stand, it's done.

You -- just -- the Europeans have never done this. There is not -- you see the demonstrations in Paris, and the de- -- wreckage of the Communist headquarters in Paris today in the papers. I get the -- my news of course from my homeland, from Germany, and I get it from Switzerland. And I get it from England, by the way, by -- accidentally, too. All Europe is in an uproar. But of course, these people are saying there -- never mentioning that these people are rebels. They are the legitimate citizens of Hungary and the legitimate government.

Ja?

(Well, { } these people { }.)

Wie?

(What would you call these people they call "rebels" now? { }.)

Exactly. Would be a much better word. Of the citizen army, I mean. I mean, whatever you -- you cannot call them rebels, because you have brought up the people here, you see, they are such conformists now. Rebels -- sheesh. "Unfortunately we can't do anything, because the legitimate government is putting down a rebellion." Wie? That's within the international law. Don't you see the difference? As soon as you call them "rebellions," we have no ways of saying to the Russians, "Stop it." A -- rebellion has to be crushed, any rebellion.

(What about "revolutionary?")

It's not a revolution. It's not a revolution. If you throw out -- an invading army, that's not a revolution.

(Well, when you have the original government { } these people { } and now being put down { }.)

Now, that's of course a very involved and very long story, because we allowed, of course, against Churchill's will, we -- we sacrificed the whole east of Europe. I mean, if we were -- had remained in Prague, all this couldn't happen. I mean, the Americans are -- after all, have done this all. We were in Prague. We had conquered Prague, as you may know, and we -- and with Prague -- "Who ha-" -- "He who has Prague has Europe" is an old saying, which unfortunately no American schoolchild ever learned. And since the Russians have Prague, they have Europe. And we have done this against the warnings of everybody on the continent of Europe, you see.

I have a friend who -- who went to -- from Germany, Count Moltke, who went to -- '44 to Constantinople, at the risk of his life, which was then in the German orbit, trying to -- to see Americans to tell them that there was still a chance to keep the Russians out of Europe if Germany could -- if they only would land there in -- in the East. And then they could own the whole of Europe. Of course, he wouldn't get through. The hatred was far too much to listen to such an argument. A -- a memorandum was at -- brought out only a very short time ago to this count- -- into this country now. Nobody -- the -- the -- the FBI simply didn't -- the agents of the -- Mr. Allen Dulles didn't think fit even to communicate with such a reasonable proposal. So we -- it's all our own making, gentlemen. Hungary would of course be in our camp to this day. And perhaps not Warschau, that is hard to say. But certainly there would be no Eastern zone of Germany, if we had just done what our military power demanded us to do. We -- you -- you know this, of course, that we -- our troops were in Prague.

So "Who has Prague has also Budapest," that's -- that's the real thing. That's why you asked me about the legal government, you see. It's an -- after all occupation army. Never forget this, you see. And everything that goes in under an occupation is of course not legal, you see. It's just there, it's de facto, it's called -- such a thing is called, you see. It's a thing in -- of fact, but not of law. You can understand.

Now all the government there derive their -- their -- their power therefore from this military occupation, which was a joint occupation, after all, of Americans and Russians. And in -- whether -- how we divided it is another matter. But that's how it was done. So this joint occupation of Europe by the victors, Ameri-

ca and -- and Russia, broke down. And I -- read it three weeks ago when it showed that our {plein pouvoir}, our decision to let the Russians do as they please in the East of Europe came to an end, because the people of Hungary wouldn't stand it. And th- -- so they set up a government, which was recognized by the Russians, as you know -- it was, you see. They dealt with Mr. Nagy as a legal government. At that moment, I think you had the first postwar government of Hungary in its own right. You see. That was -- it was felt. It was the awakening, just as Eden's and -- and -- and {Alphons} or {Mali's} own step in Suez was the awakening of Western Europe from the -- from the servitude to the United States. So in the East, Poland, and Hungary, and Tito, I mean, woke up and said, "We are still -- after all, we have some life of our own, what -- " you see. And therefore I feel this is the legal government. And then for reasons which I cannot di- -- distinguish or dis- -- I mean, cannot tell you, and probably nobody knows, the Russians suddenly veered in the opposite direction and said, "That's too dangerous for us," you see. "That sets an example which we cannot possibly tolerate," and -- and they have made no bones, that this new government is of their making, you see.

Now, you can of course claim that they still have the rights of -- an occupation -- army of occupation, but they don't claim that. That's the interesting thing. Yet, I would say, "Well, the victors," you see, "it's the same situation in '45." But for- -- strangely enough, the Russians -- these new Hungarian tyrants, as Mr. K d r, as far as I can make out, does not claim that this comes all from the Russian occupation in the war, you see. So he has given up the only possible logic which would make his government into an understandable government, you see. And he makes no bones that he is simply there at the behest of the Russians as a Communistic government. So that's a civilian ideology. That's a peacetime ideology, you see, Communism. That has nothing to do with conquest.

Now, strangely enough you will say I'm a -- strange fellow. I think that in a war, a victor is entitled to set up a government. There is -- I don't think that -- that's the essence of -- of war, that leads to such things. Whereas, I hate to see a philosopher set up a government because he's a Communist. You see the difference?

So I think the -- the Communistic government which now says it is there because Russia cannot tolerate a non-Communistic state, is infinitely more cruel than the reason that "I have been provoked by Hitler," as he certainly was, you see, "and I have invaded his satellites and I have set up a -- a government in

Hungary in order to -- to satisfy my victory -- to fit my victory." This I think would lead to a better treatment of Hungary, you know, mere occupation, than the harsh brutality of a -- of a philosophy of government. See the difference? But the strange thing is that this is claimed by the Russians, and by the -- the new -- these -- and their henchmen in Hungary, that they have to be there because they have to have Communism. No military security ad- -- adduced, you see. Just -- just Communism. And that -- that's why I warn you: a philosopher as king is the worst man you can have.

(Did you say that K d r is { } to Hungary?)

What?

(Mr. K d r is a traitor to Hungary?)

Oh, my dear man. You don't know how I feel about this word. They just published three days ago in Germany two letters -- open letters of mine about this term "treason." I still haven't heard of the reaction, but it's quite a document. You know, treason has occupied my own mind for the last 35 years very deeply. And -- since 1918 -- how long is this? -- it's nearly 40 years, isn't it? And so there is at -- at this moment in Germany are two little volumes in circulation and have been sold out like hot potatoes on treason. And they have lumped together all people, you see, who have ever been suspected of treason in the last 30 years, which is quite a number, in all countries of Europe. And Ezra Pound is in it, too, for example, you see.

And so the issue which you raise is a -- is a tremendous issue. When is the loyalty, you see, of an existing order exhausted -- to an existing order, you see, exhausted? Mr. K d r was in- -- was formed in Moscow. Now the one thing the Ignat- -- Ignatius Loyola school of -- secular Jesuitism in Moscow does is that -- the first doctrine is that nations are there to be used as tools, that you must have yourself complete indifference to any national issue. Therefore they take Hungarians under one condition: that they cease to be Hungarians. They take Germans -- same, Americans, you see, under one condition: that they rise above the nation, because they say -- and I think that's very logical, and I think you can't blame them -- "We are a world revolution. The condition of our victory is that our staff, the Communists, are totally indifferent to nations."

And that is such an urgent matter for the Communists, because in 1914, gentlemen, all socialist parties, all Marxian parties on the continent of Europe voted, including Mr. Kerenski, for the national war. Mr. Jaurès, the one French

leader who was against the war, was shot dead the -- on the eve of the outbreak of the war. The German Social Democrats, who were violently anti-militarist, voted for the credits for the war. The English Labour Party, of course, did. The -- Italian socialists did. That is, in all Europe, the socialist parties proved their patriotism, you see, and went with the existing order. The -- Lenin, and the so-called "Group of Zimmerwald," in Switzerland, that -- was a small group of 12 international Communists said, "Therefore the Second International has betrayed the workers. The workers are against war for capitalistic, nationalistic reasons. Therefore"--that was in 1916--"we have to get together and found a Third International. And the Third International is based on one, and one onl- -- sole item as against the Second, you see, that not one of us must be interested in nations."

Therefore, when Mr. K d r goes to Moscow, it means that he ceases to be an Hungarian, but becomes qualified to govern Hungarians, you see, from the viewpoint of the Third International. That's -- therefore you can hardly ask me, "Is he a traitor?" when you -- the question is "When did he become one?"

(He's a philosopher.)

Wie?

(He's a philosopher.)

Ja. Exactly. Exactly. You understand. He doesn't become a -- traitor now, you see. But if you -- and that's I think why we are right to say a member of the Communist Party plots the downfall of the American government. It really does. Or it is not a Communis- -- a member of the Communist Party. You see, it's begging the question, what you are asking me. If you are a real Communist, not a run-of-the-mill Communist, but a trained Communist, the first thing is, you see, that you are circumcised and that the term "nation" will find no echo any longer in your heart. Can you see this?

(Yes.)

No, who asked the question?

(I did.)

Oh, you did. I thought your sec- -- the man in front of --.

(He's also not a member of Mr. Nagy's government. { } government.)

K d r wasn't. No. So he was not in this government. He was before.

{Gero} and K d r were the Moscow-instructed people, and -- as far as I know. I will not quibble. Do you think K d r was in his government?

(I think he was. { } was the party secretary or something like that.)

Well, I don't know the details -- you, of course. Did you know that in Amer- -- in -- in -- in the Russian system, the janitor of the embassy is always more important than the ambassador, because he's the man who spies on the emb- -- ambassador. It's true.

So a -- I don't know the details of their -- of their order. But if -- if -- if Mr. Nagy had to keep K d r -- it showed -- the weakness of -- probably that he felt otherwise the Russians would have -- would march in. He probably had him as a -- as a safety valve, don't you think? But then he was overthrown by K d r, obviously.

Well, gentlemen, I have tried to show you -- to tell you or to warn you that this history of philosophy has to deal with the very practical issue: the -- the globe is peopled today by states who are civilized in as far as their civilization -- what we call "civilization" comes from "city." Never forget that, you see. From the ancient city of the Greeks, polis. "City" is the translation of "polis." Most people -- you -- you -- you squander this term "civilization." It's something rather simple. A group of civilized people is a people who have made special arrangements, that they s- -- talk of the town shall contain an element of international conversation. You see, of inter-town conversation, in a serious way, not -- not gossiping, not talk, not news. But so that the viewpoints of the rest of the world are heard in the education of the citizens. You understand? And it is -- always can be lost every minute, this qualification. And it has to be restored all the time by philosophers who -- who are beheaded for this purpose, usually, or as So- crates have to drink the -- the cup of hemlock.

Don't believe that you will be spared, gentlemen. You will either poison or be poisoned. Nobody can be impartial in this game of civil- -- civilization, gentlemen. Don't think that at the end of your life you can say, "I did nothing bad and nothing wrong." You'll either have helped this international conversation to continue or to be bettered, and improved, and sharpened, or to have it less effective and go parochial.

And nobody is neutral in this. With every decision -- to which school you send your children, how much money you give to the schoolteacher, you decide these issues. Because the way you treat your schoolteachers, these poor people of course have to dance at your whistle, at your whim. I mean, there is no independence of the schools in this country. The school boards rule them from their prejudices. And there are no institutions of higher learning that are really free. A man like Mr. Oppenheimer could be excluded from the councils of this nation just like that, by whim of the president. Our president doesn't see philosophers. He sees presidents of Coca-Cola companies. He doesn't speak to any man of weight, of insight, of wisdom, of independent judgment, of international judgment. He wa- -- doesn't want to. He doesn't read books, he doesn't read papers. So he is very much immunized, of course. And if I had had a free ballot--of course, I couldn't do it--I would have voted for Sherman Adams. Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...and you may say in order -- that this may not be lost on you, gentlemen, that if you take in Greece alone around 400 poleis, and every city with its own law, and cult, and severity, and directness, and you get then the Sophists and the philosophers trying to generalize; and we have today, for the whole globe, instead of for Greece, perhaps 70 nations, that this is already a tremendous streamlining process achieved through philosophy. Because obviously, the modern nation is the sum of many cities, of many poleis, and is infinitely larger. But it still has this one element which is irreducible. As long as there is a nation, it must have its own philosophical, higher s- -- institutions of learning.

And I t- -- I warned you that -- I said you don't -- misunderstand this and therefore you lump up Hungaria -- Hungary and Libya in the same category of independent nation. And you'll get into -- you are already -- we are already in the deepest of troubles because people think that the -- that the Sahara Desert is just as much a national territory as -- as Hungary is, which has a center called Budapest, and which has a record of religious and other mental problems, law problems, for centuries.

Without a mental struggle, gentlemen, no nation. And America is the one, big territory in which all this is denied. If you get here the individual American mind, and if you get here the city of man, called the "United States of America," then you think that here are the individuals, and among them everybody are the philosophers. But if, for the real understanding, gentlemen, of the workings of the political map of the globe, as between the laws of a country already -- controlling, checking your destiny, giving you your name, your private property, your security, your civil rights, your schooling, and the function of philosophy, the situation is very different. Any city of man, which we call, as I said, today a nation, that's so to speak, the technical expression for the city of man, this nation must have institutions of such a rank that they can philosophize within the limits of this nation. And therefore, it is not true that the philosopher ranks with the individual. But that which the ancient philosopher in antiquity represented was the first attempt to have an institution of higher learning that had to be tolerated by the individual city or nation, you see, as a criticism of the nations' institutions, and not of your individual whims. And since you are stubborn individualists, this is very hard for you to admit that a country is higher, more structurized, much more complicated than your own brain and your own mind. And -- so, as I said, America is visited -- has this great visitation to under-

go with the idea that philosophy can be commonplace. Then it is no longer philosophy. Philosophy is only necessary as a criticism of commonplace and common sense. Because commonplace and common sense is the result of our living in a -- routines of daily life, where things are done in a certain way, where everybody moves in a certain manner, and where you even think in a certain pattern. You are -- all have pattern thoughts. You -- we all have. I too. We all are patterned according to our daily -- daily mass media.

And I'm always delighted when I meet a man. I can always know whether he reads The New York Times or the Herald Tribune, and he always sells me the editorials of these two newspapers as his own opinion. Nothing more funny. They never admit -- any American will always say it's his opinion. He's just reverberating what he absorbs every day. And you can always find people who will say "no" to what they read. But the wrong question formulated by your newspaper dominates your thinking, even if you deny the answer given by this editorial, you see, because what is asked and what is the topic of conversation, you get every morning, served. That's what you talk about.

Now gentlemen, a fruitful mind -- anybody who wants to bear fruit in the community must not think on the same themes on which this -- these mass media think. You must be more fruitful { }. If you think how much time you waste by talking about things you cannot change, wouldn't it be much more useful if you would begin to think something which starts a new trend of thought? And a fruitful one, and a positive one. Why do you think about all this ugliness which you read in the papers about? Even if you say, "We should do something against juvenile delinquency," you still think about juvenile delinquency. Now wouldn't it be much nicer if you would think about a -- a -- a life savior, or some -- some -- or the saints? People thought in former days that it would -- was much more useful to meditate o- -- about the saints than about the mishaps of daily life. But you are so absolutely in this gondola exposed to the wind as in any wild-chase balloon of the temp- -- in the tempest of time, that you are absolutely unable to think about any subject which isn't mentioned in the paper.

Now it doesn't matter, gentlemen -- what -- if you give the opposite answer from your -- from your paper -- your favorite paper. Your paper may be for Stevenson, and you are against Stevenson. Gentlemen, you are still for and against something raised by the paper. That's -- in fact you are just absolutely in servitude, in mental servitude to the things broached by these mass media, are you not? And I still have to find a young student, gentlemen--there is -- are two on this campus whom I know in all Dartmouth, two I know who just won't be --

they will think on more fruitful things. They will think about the Greek tragedy or about the Greek lyrics. And that's worthwhile thinking. And they are the only men of whom I expect something in the future. Of you, I do not expect anything, because you only discuss the trash of the day. And it doesn't -- I care -- care in the least what you think about the day. You can say, as I said, you can offer a variation to the Herald Tribune, you see. That isn't the important thing. The important thing -- the Herald Tribune forces down your throat every day what you have to think. Or it can be The Valley News or it can be the -- the -- WBS, or whatever your -- your station is, which { }.

But gentlemen, the institutions of higher learning which today, so to speak, take the place of philosopher -- the philosopher, Thales of Miletus or Empedocles, are people who say that their train of thought runs -- runs on an independent line. And that is absolutely unheard in this country, because even the professors at Harvard, and at Princeton, and at Yale willingly comply with the mass media. They talk -- and I do prove -- I've talked to you in class about Hungary. Terrible, all wrong. I'm not a philosopher in this sense. I may vindicate myself now by taking you back and showing you -- .

(Sir, if the questions such as juvenile delinquency are of utmost importance to the stability of our society, how can we get { } if people who didn't consider them or think about it not necessarily be { } --)

But before you know how society should look, how can you know what to do about juvenile delinquency? Perhaps you have to throw up your hands in despair and say, "The times command now that the juvenile delinquents are -- have to become more numerous." I mean, don't you see that juvenile delinquency's importance can only be stated after you know what's important?

(Well, certainly. But it -- where is this -- where is this to be had? I mean, evidently even the situation in Hungary is of sufficient, moral importance today that, I mean, you --.)

Too late. Too late. If you had kindly thought about this 20 years ago, we might not have -- the mothers of America might not have allowed all you -- your older brothers to go home so quickly. Then we could -- we have now betrayed the Hungarians, because we come 11 years too old -- too late. In 1945, we couldn't get anybody to say that Europe hadn't been delivered at all. It had just been handed over to the Russians. That's all we did. And now we complain.

(But that was the topic in that -- at that time.)

Well, it was the topic of conversation after 1918, and -- and nobody wanted to discuss any -- such a serious thing, and as you know when Bill Mitchell tried to -- to tell the American people that they weren't through with the First World War, he was court-martialed. And I think the cour- -- if -- if more people had been court-martialed, we would be better off. I mean, because there would be genuine martyrs. If there had been 10 Bill Mitchells, they would have stopped court-martialing people and they are -- would have done something instead.

(Sir, don't you think the Greek mean { } apply here?)

What?

(Greek mean, { } from both sides { }.)

What is it? The Greek -- ?

(The mean. The golden mean of the Greeks. Aristotle's mean {of proportion}.)

Well, there are two means in this moment in this country. The one say, "Don't get excited and compromise." And the other says, "Go to both extremes, and then you'll know what the golden mean be." In this country, you can't have the golden mean, because nobody ever goes to any side. How can you have a golden mean, if you don't know what 100 percent left and 100 percent right really means, Sir? Your golden mean is just talk. You have no idea that Aristotle means by the golden mean that you first have to have a -- somebody who goes to one extreme, and the other to the other extreme, you see. And you get Stevenson and Eisenhower.

(I'm talking here about --)

Well, are they golden means? They are just leaden means. That's the opposite from the golden mean, Sir. The golden mean means that the philosopher and the king of a city must be at odds, at loggerheads, you see. And then the people -- the citizens can strike a golden mean. If the teachers, and the ministers in the church of a -- of a nation, and the people in government are at loggerheads, then the citizens can vote right. If however the ministers only kowtow to the president of the United States because he has joined their church, then it's the end of civilization. Because both powers--the philosophical power, and the critical power, and the legal power--are in cahoots. That's what you have here in

this country here today. They are in cahoots.

The physicists cannot do any research -- unless they are paid by the government. So they'd better play ball. For example. All our natural scientists are slaves of the government, because for all their means of research, they depend on the government. So what -- else can they do? You see. If do- -- not, it happens like -- to them like Mr. Eisenhow- -- like Mr. Oppenheimer. They are just secluded. He can sit in -- in his ivory tower in Princeton, but fortunately there are still some other means. But this real research he can't do, because too expensive. It costs a billion dollars a year. This -- the power only with Mr. -- with Admiral Strauss.

You have no separation here any longer of -- from Church and state in the deeper sense at this moment. This is -- you can't call this the golden mean, Sir, because the golden mean is -- is a -- is a result of tremendous suffering on both sides, wincing, you see, under the criticism on the part of the governors and your having to accept it, and on the other hand, the critis- -- critics being in real danger for their future, and risking -- sticking their neck out. But if you recommend that nobody should stick his neck out, you can't get a golden mean. Isn't that obvious?

Would you agree with me? This is the bitter lesson, gentlemen. We have totalitarianism on both sides of the globe today. It is much milder here. It's a femin- -- effete conformism, gentlemen, but if you don't talk like the stock exchange, you're just out of luck here in this country. Even the president of this United States kowtows to the stock exchange. And I think they are insane, because they live day by day. To them, the -- the selling of -- of oil is the main thing, of oil stock. It is not very important, gentlemen, whether oil is up or down. But in this country, it's rated as the first-rate news.

Somebody -- I think -- wasn't it in this class that somebody said now, the -- the -- the Suez Canal may be blocked, how could the English and French do this -- brought a harm to themselves? Well, if you -- didn't we talk here about this, that the long-range issue of such a thing for the next 200 years has -- is something quite different from a blocking of the Suez Canal for the next six months. And that this country -- if it wants to decide such an issue on the surface of things f- -- as for today, because now, at this moment, there is a tanker sunk in the Suez Canal, you'll never be able to have a future for this nation. That -- seems, you see, for a superficial thing it seems to be then the golden mean to do absolutely nothing, and keeps it -- canal open so that in five years it is blocked.

Let us open this {Ancilla} today and do something very practical. I would like to impress you with the history of the Greek philosophy. Do you have this? Well, gentlemen. Don't be so lazy. It only weighs not even a pound. If you open the pages, gentlemen, of the table of contents, what I would like you to do -- ask you to do, and since you don't have it here, do it for the -- to the next time, add to every one of the names given in this table of contents on the page Roman vii, viii, and ix, add the city, the homeland from which these people came. You remember that I spoke at some length of the -- and great emphasis, I hope, of the catalog of the ships. Now if you fill out the -- your own table of contents in this book here, you may find that the philosophers respond by their -- by their springing up in all these many places in Greece, to the catalog of the ships in a peculiar manner. That -- what there was anticipated by the poet as a political unity of Greece, which probably never existed, it's a dream of Homer, you see, that they ever went to Troy together. I don't think for -- ever, you see. But he had this vision and projected it backward, you see. It's a kind of -- of -- a -- prophecy in reverse. That the response was not ships in the physical sense, gentlemen, but ships of the mind. And the ship, the navigation of the Greek philosophy amounts to a kind of seafare in the physical sense.

And there's a great poem in German by the greatest German poet of the 19th century, Hölderlin, which he called "The Archipelago." Now "pelagos" is the Greek word for "sea." And "archi-" -- I have not to translate it, that just means "arch." And these -- the lake -- the sea between Greece and Asia Minor has this official name, the Greek Archipelago to this day. You look at a map in a -- which distinguishes the various parts of the Mediterranean Sea, the part between Crete, Greece, and Asia Minor is called the archipelago. The arch sea, the -- the most genuine sea, so to speak.

And you can say then that these philosophers, gentlemen, formed such an archipelago. Whether you could -- compare them to ships or whether you compare them to islands, it is the catalog of the ships come into that shape, incarnating -- taking -- becoming embodied in thinkers who impart as associates, as -- as allies to each other this mental power in every generation, one coming from Asia Minor to Greece, and one coming from -- from Italy to Greece. And we have to distinguish here three -- this is Sicily; this is Calabria; this would be Italy; here would be -- let's put Naples, by and large; this would be Tarentum; this would be Elea. Naples is this meant to be. Pardon me, but I'm a very poor designer. You have here Greece. This would be here Corinth. This would be Athens. This would be Argos. This would be Sparta. This would be Olympia, where the famous Olympic Games were started. But up here would be the

Olympic Mountains, where the name comes from of the whole -- of all Greek religion, including Olympia.

So the story of the Greek spirit -- and then of course here's Asia Minor.

Here are all these islands in tremendous numbers. Here is Crete. And here is -- is the coastline of Asia Minor with Miletus and Ephesus.

Now, in order to understand the history of Greek philosophy, I think you have to understand this table of contents. You will be surprised, if you really try to follow out from Orpheus to -- to the anonymous writer, quoted by {Iamblysus} on Page 162, how in -- on 160 pages, you find 90 people, no more, because you see some of them are two in one line. You find -- as Number 10 the Seven Sages. You find under Number 19 {Califord} and {Dimocedes}. You find in 39, {Pelleas} and {Hippotamus}. And you find on 4- -- on Page 46 {Archipos}, {Lipsylesus} and {Opsimus}. I -- you find on 53 even more astonishing: one, two, three, four, five names. And Page 54, one, two, three names; 55 two names; 56 seven names. You will kindly then furnish me the next time, every one of you, with a list -- I only have to ask you, because you -- otherwise you won't do it for yourself. And put it -- put the -- the cities in -- in your own table of contents. I think you own this book now -- by now, don't you? On the installment plan, I suppose.

Write this in. For a history of Greek philosophy, this march through the cities of man, through the cities of Greece, is of first-rate importance. You should see, you see, that the lines of force of Greek philosophy mean a constant exchange from Elea to Miletus, or Ephesus. Here is Heraclitus, here, on one end, you see, barely holding his own, the city of Ephesus, against the Persians. And here on the other hand is Elea, facing the Tyrrhenian Sea, and Rome, very near to Rome, being the northernmost post just north of -- south of Naples where there also is then later the famous Paestum. You may have heard of the Temple of Paestum, the one temple in Italy still visible from antiquity. That was called Poseidonia in antiquity. Today it's called Paestum. And it's -- Elea is -- is very close by. Here is -- who has been to Italy? Have you been to Naples?

(Yes, I have.)

Well, you know where Paestum is? South of Salerno. Then you go further south, you come to Elea. Wie?

(I didn't get that far south, unfortunately.)

Oh, no. Nobody does, you see. Nobody studies philosophy.

Here is Reggio. That is on the -- the transit to -- from {Messiana}, you see, the Greek -- the Sicilian city of {Messina}. here Syracuse, is which is famous because Plato went there and tried to convert the tyrant of Syracuse to his philosophy. And there is {Agrigen}, where Empedocles, you see, lived, and -- and jumped into the -- the vol- -- into the -- Etna trying to investigate the -- the earthquake.

Well, why do you laugh? Modern man is vaccinated and dies from yellow fever. Have you heard -- seen The Yellow Giant? Who knows The Yellow Giant? Isn't that the same heroism? Why do you laugh? The Yellow Giant is a play by Sidney Howard, in which he describes the victims of the first vaccination against yellow fever, which was -- enabled us to build the Panama Canal. And some doctors volunteered for the vaccination and died in the process, and thought it was all in vain. Ja? You had a question here?

(Where is the -- on Italy there -- where was it that Pythagoras founded a col- -- colony, the Orphic colony?)

Pardon me?

(Where was it that Pythagoras founded the Orphic colony in Italy? It was a colony that was found- -- patterned after the -- to Orphic religion. Somewhere in Italy, I think I remember reading { }.)

Better inquire. Why should I tell you? { }? Who -- you mean Pythagoras or whom do you mean?

(It was Pythagoras. Yeah, I'm fairly sure that it was Pythagoras that found -- he -- of course, he's known for his numbers { }.)

All right. You are right, Sir. The city is called Croton. Here. There are many such city-states by -- through philosophers. Croton is the city of Pythagoras.

Well, it seems, you see, not philosophy to dabble in -- in geographical problems. Yet it does. Gentlemen, the -- the great flowering of the Greek spirit in its renaissance in Europe depended totally on the existence of these many independent spiritual centers in Europe. If you take Heidelberg, of which even you have heard, and -- and Leipzig, and Prague, and Vienna, and Innsbruck,

and Padua, and -- and Perugia, and Bologna, and Paris, of course, and Bordeaux, and Cambridge, and Oxford, this map, or in the Middle Ages, drawn between 1200 and 1600 or 1650 by and large, corresponds very exactly on the continent to these island philosophers, you see, who had the ocean instead of the railroad. Modern man doesn't have to live -- to develop his philosophy, so to speak, on islands. But they had to, because their communication depended, of course, on the sea. On the -- the continent, if you look at the prairies of Kansas City or -- no mind has ever existed there and can never come to fruition there. You can build -- grow wheat there, you see. And now they drill oil in Kansas. And -- but no mind of any description. They haven't even a competitive newspaper in Kansas City. It's a very great place, you know, where one paper has a monopoly for 3 or 4 million people. Very significant for the Middle West. No competition -- no mental competition. Just -- economic competition they have there. But nothing mental. The -- what's the name of the famous Kansas --?

(Kansas City Star.)

Wie?

(Kansas City Star.)

What?

(Kansas City Star.)

Quite. It's quite an enterprise. If you don't -- { } always the Kansas City Star, you're just out of luck there, you see. They declined even to accept advertising -- advertisement -- ads from people they didn't like. That's the typical state of any continental prairie, gentlemen, any big -- that's the problem of Russia; that's the problem of Siberia; it's the problem of European Russia. Where you have just continental -- vast land masses, gentlemen, mental competition is out of the question. The -- the great invention of the Middle Ages was that the gaze of the Mediterranean and of the Northern Sea and -- the Baltic Sea were, so to speak, impressive enough to -- to force even the people inside Europe to treat their universities in such a way as though they were islands. And that's why you had 1500 independent principalities in Europe in the year of the Lord 1800. That's unknown to you, gentlemen. There were 18- -- 1500 states in Europe. And that has made Europe great mentally, because every one of these university centers, you see, was in a different state, and therefore enjoyed relative independence. If you can criticize 1499 principalities because you are situated in the 15th -- 18th, you see, you can understand how mental life can flower there. They couldn't

criticize the own prince, but they could criticize all other princes. So that Catherine of -- of Russia didn't give a damn what their own -- her own nobleman ever said in the 18th century. She was a great tyrant, as you know, but she thought she was a very enlightened princess. So she said, always when she passed a law or did anything, wrong or right, she said, "What is {Schlatzer} in Göttingen going to say?"

Now Göttingen is a little -- is the university of the Hannoverian dynasty in the kingdom of Hannover. And we are again Hanover, you know. And of course, here is no mental dynasty. But there was. Göttingen was an independent mental center, and still a great center of ma- -- higher mathematics. All the leading men who have designed the bomb here come from Göttingen, and got their mathematic training in Göttingen, including Mr. Oppenheimer, by the way. And he would have never amounted to anything if he hadn't studied in Göttingen. And -- and of course, modern America lives still by these people who have been brought up in Göttingen. Heaven forbid, what's going to happen if these people grow up in Princeton, directly, you see. { } place where nobody can think. The climate is just subversive to thinking in -- adverse to thinking in -- in Göttingen -- in -- in Princeton. So you are here for this reason. You can be very proud, we have a man who is really living -- his family is living in Princeton, but he preferred to come to Dartmouth.

Now I'm not joking. Gentlemen, this is your problem, it will be the problem of the next 50 years, whether America is going to kill science and thinking, or whether it's able to preserve it. You can't do it by money. Don't believe for a minute that Rockefeller and Ford can do anything but kill science. Money is not inducive to thinking. It's the opposite. -- With money, you cannot buy thought. That's -- but you believe you can. And that is the great mistake. You can only buy thought by a noble competition of free spirits. And you can only do it by political plurality. As soon as you have a -- a one-gov- -- -world government, gentlemen, out goes thought. That's why it's such an abominable thought, that there ever should be a one-world government. I'm all against it. That would be tyranny. And fortunately there is no prospect that we'll ever get it. But you all dream of it. And -- you -- you think all mathematically correct that one government is -- is more economical than many governments. Gentlemen, governments are nothing that have to be economical. It's one of your funny ideas that you judge the great -- issues of the spirit by money. You say it is cheaper to run one government, perhaps, than many. Gentlemen, that would also lead to the abolition of the sexes. It would be much cheaper if you wouldn't have to buy a diamond necklace for your wife. But it would be very ugly if you would have to love yourself.

Life has -- is anti-economical, gentlemen. And philosophy bears me out on this. The higher life of the spirit, these higher institutions of learning will never be economical. They'll never pay, because life is something that is beyond pay.

And therefore I think this map begs for your understanding. I think you will understand this perhaps a little more clearly than all theories I can put before you. The life of Europe and the life of Greece have flourished because of this fantastic polyphony, orchestration, the endless competition, you see, between hundreds of little centers. If you abolish these -- these -- this, gentlemen, if you get state colleges and state universities, like your -- your Ohio State, which to me is the -- is -- who's from Ohio? Cleveland? Well, that's a better place, because it has no real schools. But I mean, the University of Ohio is, you see, is -- is going to destroy all higher thinking. And I'll tell you why. There is one building now constructed by the University of Ohio. And it shelters 350 professors of English. If you have 350 professors of English in one university, you see, you abolish English, you {abolish} professors, you bol- -- abolish all nobility of thinking, you see. You can have here a professor of English; you can have there a professor of English. But you can't put 350 professors of English into one room without -- in one house without reducing the dignity of teaching English. It's a necessary thing, but if 300 people teach the same thing, glorious subject as it is, in the same house, every one of them thinks of himself as a little smaller.

And therefore we reduce constantly by these large numbers of our state universities the dignity of this being -- this teaching. If you are -- have to teach 10 students, you see, and are the only philosopher on campus, you can think that is tremendous. But if you have 10,000 students, you see, and 500 professors teaching philosophy, it's worth nothing. This is the opposite from your mass production.

And I have to open your eyes to this fact, gentlemen, that these philosophers in Greece were so terribly important because they lived in very small centers in which -- were the only representative. And that makes a man big. If you have to represent the whole of wisdom, you probably make an effort to be really wise. If 250 -- 49 other people do the same thing, you see, you don't feel that is very important what you're doing. Can you see this?

And you don't know this great danger, gentlemen. You smother people today with bigness because you -- the business community, gentlemen, lives by

the opposite principles, and must live by the opposite principles from the mental community. And you try -- here, in this -- in this college -- the trustees of Dartmouth College are selling us down the river by saying it would be good to have 10 -- 10 professors with 10 -- 1,000 students each in his classes -- in their classes. And they have these "yes" and "no" examinations. This man is -- well, I won't say who he is. But you all know it, I suppose.

(I'm just wondering why -- having only one philosopher in a community would be any -- why wouldn't it be just as bad as having one newspaper in Kansas City?)

You see, the great thing is that Kansas City has too much territory. Four million people. If you had one philosopher in Norwich, and the other in Hanover, no harm done. It has to be small, can't you see? But weak. It's like a good flower, you see, like an orchid. One orchid is enough. And you don't have to have a big collection of orchids. If you give your -- your friend an orchid, you see, or a gardenia, it isn't improved at all if you give her a hundred gardenias or a hundred orchids. Anything precious, you see, is precious by its singleness. Anything useful is precious by its mass. -- You see, since you come all from mass production, you carry over the values of useful things to the value of precious things, you see. A diamond necklace is not improved if you have 99 diamond necklaces. You must have one which is beautiful. As soon as a wife -- your wife has a hundred necklaces, she will be blasé, and she will not be as fastidious, she will not give a damn for any one of them, you see. Because overeating does no good.

But from the point of view of the factory that turns out diamond necklaces, all these { } now, you see, it's of course "the more diamond necklaces the better." But that's a very wrong viewpoint. One diamond necklace is much more precious than a hundred diamond necklaces. If you can't see this, I can't help you. That's why one wife is better than a hundred wives. That's why a harem is not an ideal, you see. It's also very hard for you to understand. Most of our businessmen are all Moslem, and they wouldn't have -- like to have any number of wives. It's not a good idea. Why is that so? Why are a hundred wives poorer -- poorer -- {ruling} than one? You can't prove it to me from any economic viewpoint, because the -- your and my life, Sir, is not ruled by economics. It isn't.

Economics are for the earthly things, but neither for you or for me. It's better to have one friend on this campus than to be on good terms with 2,999 students. Why that is, so, I can't tell you, Sir. But it's the law of the universe. One

friend is better than 200 -- 2,900 chums -- chums.

Prove it to -- I mean, you can ask -- say, "I don't understand." Then I have to say, "You live -- on another planet."

That's why the -- the essence of thought is its rare- -- rarity, you see. You must appreciate one truth as -- so that you can stand still and say, "I can't rush on to the next truth. I can't buy the next New Yorker. I'm still occupied with repeating this one tremendous truth all my life." And of course my -- my act -- I have tried -- I'm -- I'm sure I cannot succeed with you, to sell you this idea that to be astonished, you see, has this great beauty that you never have to end to be astonished. You have abolished astonishment. You are astonished over nothing. You say, "I don't care." "So what?" anybody who says, "So what?" has to rush on the next. Anybody who says, "Indeed?" gains time, because he will stand there and still think about it and the next day, and the next day, and the next day. All this is connected, as you will see, you see. It must be rarity in time and rarity in space, in place. You have 350 professors of English in Ohio State, English goes out of the window. It just sounds silly, why, you see -- this is mass production. It's -- Shakespeare loses all importance. It is just the result I mean of observation. You will -- you can see it around you.

(What -- would you suggest in a case like that, where there has to be a big English department, there in a big school like that? Merely the housing of them in separate quarters, or something?)

Well, I mean, obviously, Sir, this should be -- even in California, they have decided to make three colleges. There is no reason that Ohio State has to be one school.

(There're five of them.)

Wie?

(Five of them.)

What do you mean? They overlap? The university of O- --?

(The university system, yeah.)

Where?

(Athens, Miami, Kent State, they're all { }.)

Divide them again. Send them out again. And certainly I would then form units in which one professor of French or 10 professors of French, 10 professors of English, you see, would be housed in the same group, and would form a -- a kind of humanities center, you see. And I would never think that 350 professors of English would be together, you see. I would then make some French, and some English, and some history professors, you see, so to speak, get together so that they can exchange, that they can become more fruitful in their -- you see, in talking to each other. Because 350 professors of English, every one, you see, dealing with one page from Keats or from Wordsworth, different pages, must just go -- nuts. And they will become smaller, and smaller in their thought, you see. They'll just talk personalities and in {editions}, and footnotes.

(Presumably, though, if they're professors, they're going -- they're going to not be limited by the -- by the physical environment in one building. And they'll be able to cross the street to the French department building where there are 300 professors of French. It really doesn't seem to make very much difference whether they group them together this way or in another way?)

Oh, oh, oh. I am not sure { } you underrate the effects of all this, of environment, of -- on me and you { }.

(In -- in Europe now, Sir, there's this new university of Europe that's dedicated to {ruling} Europe under one -- one government. Do you think it's better to rule, in this case, Europe under economic {principles}?)

I think that our economic unity of the future of which we all are convinced is { }. I don't think there will be an economically independent Europe, you see. We are part and parcel of it. And most big factories in Europe are owned by Americans anyway, as you know. That's all American money. We -- I think that economy doesn't have to be tyrannical. The difference between a state and a church, and an economy is, you see, that business doesn't have to claim this mental obsession, this mental power. We { } see from Mr. Khrushchev, you see, even if they want to be liberal, can't. I mean, just crushed, instead of Krupp.

Economy is at this moment, at -- at the crossroads. The Russians have totally misunderstood the economic issue. They have built a state instead of an economy. And they said the state would wither away; instead the economy is withering away. That's really the funniest thing { }. The Russians are very

much concerned with this {deficiency} of their own theory that they have built up a tremendous government instead of building up a tremendous society. It's anti-Marxian. I mean, the only anti-Marxians in Europe are the Russians. Ja, because they have not emancipated the economy from their -- o- -- from the overweight on the state. You haven't seen this, this contradiction. It's very strange.

Economy in itself can be pluralistic. -- And by pluralistic, I mean it doesn't have to be take- -- religion, or -- or -- or conviction, or world view, or philosophy in itself. And we are on the crossroads at this moment, you see, before mankind there is the tradition that there is only state and Church. People finally here have separated them. But we haven't yet settled the question where Mr. Charles Wilson {goes}. So we put him in the -- defense industry. I think that's a big misfortune. I think that Mr. Wilson is perfectly disqualified to be in politics. And he is on the best of destroying the power of the United States. To give you an example: as an economist, he wa- -- knows the large production centers are economical. He produced tanks. And he was warned by the experts that -- the production of tanks must be dispersed. That would be more expensive, but it would be -- be secure, and if the United States were bombed, obviously one -- the destruction of one tank factory wouldn't matter so much.

He instead said, "I'm Charles Wilson of General Motors, and therefore, I have to be economical -- I have to economize." So he put all the tank production of the United States into one place. In normal times, such a man woul- -- should have -- would have been impeached for high treason. Because he couldn't do anything more advantageous for the enemy. He's, you see, a man in the wrong place. As an economist, he's wrong -- he's right. As a statesman -- absolutely { } absolutely different viewpoints. For a national policy, economy is a very poor advisor. For an economist, it's the right advice to be cheap. If somebody else has to tell him that for the security of the nation, cheapness is no argument, absolutely no argument. The opposite is true. He had prevented all decentralization of industry in this country, saying it was too expensive. Gentlemen, for the future of America, nothing is too expensive. You are all siding with Charles Wilson against me, gentlemen, but I think he is a great -- a great { } to this country. And we will have a terrible awakening. { } see that.

It's very bad that such a man is allowed to have anything to do with the state. He doesn't understand anything of government. He understands { } production. And these are two different things -- absolutely different things, absolutely -- contrary principles, because the statesman has to look for the existence of the United States in the year 3000, of which you cannot -- are not {fit} at

all. Does it represent { } that deserve the sacrifices of men -- free men for centuries to come. That's the only good reason for the existence of a republic. The production of motor cars is of absolutely unimportant { }. That's good for the economy. That's not good for government.

There you have a very clear instance, gentlemen, that we are also in this country at this moment undecided where economy stands. If you get the three things, gentlemen: the state, that is protection against foreign enemies; the Church, that is the setting up of the goals for which we should strive against enemies, despite enemies, you see, where we {get} direction of life; and then you get the economy, that's the know-how. You see, our problem is this: the state was, since ancient days -- let us put it here, into Athens, or into Croton, where Pythagoras lived; or to Elea, where Parmenides gets up; or into Syracuse, or into Ephesus. Here, I have put in the wholeness of cities. And the Church was strictly local and became wider and wider through the movement of the spirit, criticizing the local government, criticizing human sacrifice. And in the person of Christ, this inroad against any political, limited set of values became universal, and we have today the idea that all churches are larger than all states. No state can afford a real state religion, because the religion of any state today must also be able to please another state. Christianity, you see, you can have a Roman Catholic Church in Spain, but the -- even the Spaniards have to say that -- they hate to say -- admit it, that the pope in Rome is also a Christian. I mean, if the Spaniards had their way -- they have, through the last centuries, always denied that the pope in Rome was a real Catholic. They always said the archbishop of Toledo was a better Catholic. And -- they have. It has been a real battle. You don't understand this, but it's just as bad as with Protestants, you see, in the Roman Catholic Church. It's just an illusion of yours that you think that the Spaniards obey the pope in Rome. They don't. They force his hand. When Phillip II of Spain died, the pope in Rome had a -- the greatest joy of his life. And all the chimes -- the bells of St. Peter were chiming in to celebrate the death of -- the king of Spain. That's an important fact. You see, that was an act of deliverance for the pope. And it would be good for some Irish people in this country to know this.

Now gentlemen, the economy was never run in Pythag- -- in -- in the days of Pythagoras in Athens. It was run in homes. And all economists, you see, they we- -- were home economists, in antiquity. The -- that is, gentlemen, the economy was smaller than the city. You could run a farm which was self-supporting. You could run, you see, a -- a business, which seemed more or less self-

supporting, with your fruit garden, and your vegetable garden, and your cow, and your pig, you see, in the back yard.

Gentlemen, the -- one thing which has happened, as you can see, in our time is that the economy today is larger than Church or state. We are interested in Afghanistan not because we share their statehood, or we share their churchhood. For Heaven's sake, we don't. But we share their economic problems. The economy has risen from being the smallest unit in the universe, you see, to be the largest. And in antiquity, this didn't exist. So if you compare antiquity and the times--1900 on one side, down to 1900, gentlemen--it is so that the economy is smaller--you know the mathematical sign for "smaller than"--is smaller than state or Church. Our problem has -- is that for the first time in the history of the human race, gentlemen, state and Church -- or Church, whatever you turn to, also the Christian churches, also the Buddhist churches, you see, also Mus- -- Islam, they are all smaller than the economy. And therefore, philosophy is in a new -- in a new chapter today. That's why for the first time, the Greek way of -- the -- questioning the universe is no longer, you see, in order. Where you -- we have to think "new." It's a new situation. Can you see these two -- these two entities? Can you see my scheme here? I don't know.

This is quite important for your understanding, gentlemen. Before 1900 A.D., and in this sense, all modern -- so-called "modern" philosophy in this country or in Europe goes on the Greek side. Plato, Aristotle, Hegel, Nietzsche, William James are still all thinking in such terms that the economy, in their mind, at least, was smaller in its area, than state or Church. After 1900, we cannot afford this fiction, because today we know -- you -- just have to think of the oil in Arabia, it's a very practical example, you see, the economy is larger than state or Church.

Therefore, gentlemen, I give you a history of philosophy which is in this sense obsolete. That is, I think it is not obsolete. It warns you that all your terms: democracy, freedom, education, universities, philo- -- idealism--they all come from a time in which man's economy was smaller than his state and his church. You have to coin a new language today. We -- we are working on this. And my -- I have -- that's -- has been my problem all my life. I grew up like you with the naïve idea, you see, that one thinks in political terms, and one thinks in religious terms. And then one masters the economy. Now this is impossible.

We first live under a worldwide economy. And inside of this, there are some remnants of Church and state, which are smaller, you see. And we have to -- then to try to find a language of philosophy, of criticism, of freedom, you see,

which stands up under the impact of one economy, you see. -- We have already one world order, which is not one state, and it is not one church, but is one economy. And that's already there. It is still in a -- in -- and one economy doesn't mean, gentlemen, that one administers his economy. But if you hear this -- this talk about oil, you see how united it already is, you see.

The -- the same is true of the Suez Canal. You see, one economy means that the Suez Canal is a function of one economy and has nothing to do with the state of Egypt, or the state of England anymore. You can't judge the Suez Canal in terms of politics. If you do, you get into trouble, as we are now, in -- you see. The -- on the map of the globe, gentlemen, the Suez Canal i- -- ha- -- holds a functional place as allowing Europe, Asia, and Africa somehow to have traffic. That's its importance. Whether this is called Egypt, or whether it's called Palestine, or whether it's called France, or whether it's called India is an absolute second-rate matter compared to your and my problem to think of the Suez Canal as a function of the universe. And I think you should know this.

The one phil- -- man who -- who anticipated this, who entered a new chapter in the life of -- history of philosophy is the famous Count Saint-Simon. We owe it to Saint-Simon that the Suez Canal was built. These -- disciples of Saint-Simon were not bankers, and were not socialists. But they were -- they were called Saint-Simonistes. And they had this great idea that the Panama Canal and the Suez Canal would force the people of this world to think in terms of one economy, you see. Not of one state, and not of one church. But of one economy, you see.

And therefore, the Panama and Suez are really great motors for revolutionizing your and my thinking. It doesn't help you at all to think of the Suez Canal as part of Egypt, you see. And it will not help you to -- to -- to call it later a colonial enterprise, of the people who built it, you see. It is something new, utterly new, you see. It's one place on the map of the world that is functional, you see, like -- just like your larynxes, or your pharynx, you see. The pharynx cannot say, "I am alone," you see. It has to breathe. And the larynx has to -- the pharynx has to eat, has to swallow. And if it doesn't, you see, it is not a pharynx. And all the other questions are absolutely minor, the self-consciousness of the pharynx, or the self-consciousness of the Egyptians -- it's absolutely second -- second-rate. Not important.

Now we can't think this out today, but I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that the old, ancient philosophers, gentlemen, took that place which modern economy does take. They stood for the unity which the economy did

not yet offer, and which they anticipated in their mind. I come back to my demand on you, gentlemen, to be very critical against your use of the word "nature." You all think that nature is given, that nature is first and that the laws of the city are second. And I've tried already to impress you with the fact that -- quite the contrary, your society, your family is your first impression. And that nature is what you see outsi- -- out of the window when you look out of your family living room. That which is not your immediate self you call "nature," which is separate from you, which you can only see with the help of your family through their eyes, through their education, and through the faith they have implanted in you.

Here you see that the -- that ancient philosophers, gentlemen, did anticipate the unity of the universe, which we today call the economy, or the globe, where -- when they spoke of no- -- nature. Nature was an imperative to be achieved. And the first people who tried to conquer this unity of an economy in which all men were to participate are the Greek philosophers. They did it through the mind, while we do it with oil tankers. Therefore everything today is different. You live without philosophy, but with the World Bank. The Greeks couldn't live without philosophy, because the philosophy gives them direction. The -- the philosophers were the first to s- -- to tend -- to tell us what to do with the nature. That is, with that part not yet inhabited, not yet politically ruled, not yet, you see, unified with the outside world, as we also say. Gentlemen, today there is no outside world. You have no outside world left. Where there is economy, there is no outside world, you see. If you take oil, today that's not outside anymore. It's economized. Anything that enters the ecos, the household of man, gentlemen, is no longer in the outside world. Of course, the whole declamation of the Russian Revolution has been to this extent. They said deserts should be treated for their content of sand, you see. You shouldn't rant, and write poems on -- on deserts, you see, but you should say, "What can I do with the desert?"

Now in this word "nature" then, of antiquity, gentlemen, there is always this tremendous program: what is man demanded to do with nature? What are these things implying? And they imply that the little state is too small, that the gods are too narrow, you see, that the world has to grow. So nature is a growing concept, a dynamic concept { }. And as long as you treat nature as a growing concept, you won't -- you will be in the Greek tradition; and you can't go wrong, because then you will welcome this change -- transformation into an economy, that man is the husband-man of nature. But if you think of nature, as most of you still do, as something to be just looked at, irresponsibly, enjoyed,

exploited -- like the American farmer who afford -- could afford to buy one farm after another and squeeze it dry, and then throw it away, and live then in his old age in -- in Los Angeles, on his -- on the -- on the -- on the income which he had wrested from these poor, destroyed farmlands, then you mistreat the Greek term "physis."

What I'm trying to do is to show you that the march from -- from nature contemplation, of -- from Thales of Milet- -- on philosophy to the realm of practical economy is the true fulfillment of, you see, the -- this -- this adventure of the Greek mind. Whereas if you get caught in the word "nature," you are in great danger today to keep -- take it as a cold, unchallenging, purely descriptive, you see, thing that doesn't make demands on us.

Well, all the natural sciences, of course, in their application of our findings, show you that I'm right, because natural science has led to technology. Technology has led to the doc- -- to this economy. So practically, the natural sciences have exactly acted, you see, in treating nature as that which was not yet under the sway of economy. That's why I'm stupefied when I see that people immediately build now planes or rockets to go to the -- Mars, so that this poor, unsullied nature immediately is treated as something to be projected into, to be shot at, to be aimed at, you see, which is certainly not contemplation, you see, but conquest, is it not?

But the fiction of your -- of your poetry on nature is -- and your use of the word "nature" is as though nature was something not as a challenge, but something lying there in quietude, so to speak, and calmness, and without arousing in you immediate action. This is not -- not so. The -- the -- the so-called objective statement about science, gentlemen, is the unphilosophical treatment of this. Nature, the concept of nature in the sciences is that nature looks at things and tells you how they are. Practically, if you re- -- what really happened is: nature is the challenge which has asked men what to do with it. This is something quite different. Can you see the difference? Physis is a command much more than a fact. And for the Greeks, the -- nature was not fact, gentlemen, but it was fiat -- fiat -- fiat. Let us do something to it. And you are very badly put -- as regard to facts. I mean, you believe that science deals with objective facts. It doesn't. And it gives -- offers you opportunities. It offers you the possibility of shooting a rocket to the moon. What the moon is for, science doesn't tell you at all. I know more about the meaning of the firmament when I at night look up at the stars and admire them. And I have a much deeper insight than all the astronomers put together, if I allow myself to be astonished. These astronomers already -- they are far too practical. They are already on the way of conquering the stars.

And I doubt that by conquering the stars we do them justice. -- That's obviously not their -- the only purpose, that we should fly to these stars.

I always think that the deepest insight you can gather from wondering at the stars is that we also should form such beautiful constellations on this earth, that our free associations should also be constellations miraculously and rhythmically performed. And if you could construe and dissolve all your human associations in such noiseless manner as the stars, there would be great peace and harmony on this -- on -- earth. As you know, people break up their homes, and get divorces, and certainly don't constellate with their beloved ones.

And I only throw out this, that there is a way of dealing with the universe as part of you and me, if you don't treat it as nature, but if you treat it as -- as -- as teachers, if you treat it as home. You can at every moment, gentlemen, treat the -- the cre- -- the -- the world outside as your homeland, as creation. God's creation -- you are creature. These are creatures. We are already at home. All you can do as a Greek philosopher who say, "I have a homeland. That's my city. And I set out to conquer the rest of the world, to subdue it and make it into my homeland," you see.

And you must see, gentlemen, that the Greek mind is a conquering mind, that the scientific mind is a conquest of the u- -- world outside, to make it a part of the inside world. In as far as -- with the philosophers of -- which we have in this book here, they have tried to tell you of the universe. They have told you what to do with the universe, so that it may become inside. And our world economy is the result of -- of this tremendous mental struggle to subdue it. But there is an opposite attitude, the Jewish attitude, the Biblical attitude, which always has to strike a balance, gentlemen. The Jew- -- Jewish attitude says, "I'm not interested in the laws of gravity. I'm not interested in the law of chemistry. I'm not interested in the astronomical arithmetic. I'm interested in the fact that God created first the stars, and then me. And that therefore I and the stars are both His creatures."

That's equally true, gentlemen. And it means that in the historical sense, man is the latest, you see. And therefore if he could only behave as harmoniously as the sun, he can learn from the sun, you see. And he has to be, therefore, grateful that he is the newcomer to this whole galaxy of stars and creatures. So if you put man in the middle, gentlemen, you can look back at creation and say man is the latest creature. Or you can -- take the opposite view and say, "Man is a political animal. Here is his polis. He looks out of the window of this

political -- his polis, and he tries to subdue nature." He goes out and tries to make nature--we can translate with "outside world"--he wants to transfer the outside world into his polis. So everything in the world becomes a political issue. Coal becomes a political issue. Oil becomes a political issue, you see, the space over your head is a political issue. Can you keep a jet plane out of your -- of your land, you see? Unfortunately, you cannot, you see. It's a purely political question, isn't it? A hundred years ago, if you had asked a man, a lawyer, he would have said, "Of course, you can shoot him down. It's your private property. We have a new notion of private property even in the United States, the most reactionary country in this respect in the world. You cannot exclude a man from the airspace over your own land. But I assure you, when I grew up, all the lawyers in the world decided that you could. You could forbid an airplane to fly over your heads, you know. You have given up this right just like that. It has never really been disputed, by the way. Very interesting, the new invention just brushed aside all old concepts of air space, you see.

So in any moment, you and I, gentlemen, are therefore standing between your -- our cult in our own community, where man has to know that he is a creature among other creatures, or -- and between the conquering mind which says, "There is an outside world which hasn't yet come under our servitude, under our service, under our understanding, and we technologically will, you see, take it in. So you see, the two worlds, political and physical, are in constant -- in constant antagonism. If the political is the analogy of the created world of God, then we have peace of -- so to speak, we are not in a hurry. We are already -- Heavens! There are thousands of years that have gone by and we are the latest, you see. If the technological world takes over, we are in a terrible hurry, so that the oil isn't wasted, and that the -- the -- everything is made use of, the masses, people, and that the stratosphere is filled with our noise.

What comes first is decisive in your own life, gentlemen. On Sundays, we think that the right treatment of our political behavior is what we should, so to speak, be taught. That's the -- meaning of the church service, you see. On weekdays, we are taught how to -- go out and get the physical under our domination. And this is today the real -- the real -- has been the problem between Church and state. And all this today is new.

I had to -- had a -- lunch with one of you just now, and he asked me how to study theology. Well, I think the answer is, you can't today, because today the ministry of the Word is against the economy of the world, you see. And to be a minister within a state or with -- within a church is a very minor matter compared to this great question, you see, what has anybody still to say when all the

wheels are spinning all over the world as -- though we were -- were just one big machinery, you see. Where machines hum, there is nothing to say. They are too loud. You can't speak in a factory, you see. They're too loud, you see. They're -- they're performing.

And the voice, gentlemen, of philosophy therefore has never been so weak as it is today, I think for this very reason. In a state, you could still have a philosopher. Franklin D. Roosevelt would still listen to philosophers. Our president doesn't. He's in this big -- big wheel within wheels already of a world economy. The Second World War has -- has unified the world to such an extent that we -- people move just under the impact of a tremendous machinery, tremendous juggernaut, the -- tremendous change. And you live in this clim- -- new climate, gentlemen; and I have to tell you that between you and me, there is a total chasm in the educational feeling and the feeling --. We still thought that by our talking philosophy, we could influence the Church and the state. I think in your generation the economy has really become such a giant, that you have a deep feeling that talk won't help, you see, because these -- these big machines -- the -- the -- the bulldozers just won't listen to human voices. This is, I think, the real -- the real issue of our time. The Greek philosophers have won at the price of going out of existence themselves. They have unified physis. They have unified nature. And the ci- -- cities from which they have sprung, these tiny little islands, you see, in which they became vocal, are all swallowed up. We said last time about Hungary.

And Heaven -- if you know this, gentlemen, you will be very serious about the future of the human race. You have to start -- there are great issues before you, very great issues; and your generation has to -- to do a tremendous job all over the globe. It has not even s- -- been started. And you go and think that you -- that you are -- have an education. Quite a new education has to be -- has to be begun. We cannot rely on the old ways at all, because what you learn as an American, gentlemen, or as a Presbyterian just isn't good enough today, you see. You have to be able to -- to speak, to criticize something that is already as big as the universe for -- at least for human conception, you see.

I have sinned because I didn't give you a break. And I'm very sorry for this. I intended to. I will not repeat this onslaught on your health. But now, it's too late. So you allow me, I -- we may break off a little earlier. I'll go on another 10 minutes. Because I want to show you now why I had to deal with this.

In the history of Greek philosophy, and in Empedocles or -- and in

Parmenides, and all the later ones, there is one word which plays a tremendous part as the goal. In this goal, they tried to reconcile the smallness of their political outlook and their political system, and their political boundaries, and the challenge of the created universe. And this word was the word for universe, the word {"pan"}. From {"pan"}. Perhaps you take this down, whether you know Greek -- letters or not, it doesn't matter. You need this word at least once { } {"pan,"}, the whole. In Latin, the universe--"universum," and now today, "the universe"--was the war-cry of the philosophers after Parmenides, gentlemen, with which they definitely -- definitely changed the traditions of all their fellow citizens, by the simple trick of calling it "the universe." In -- in Latin, and Greek, and German, and French, as you know, there is a difference between -- not French, but Latin, and Greek, and German -- there is a difference between the three genders of a word -- noun. You have "he," and "she," and "it." As have -- you have -- and it is very important, gentlemen, that whereas the polis is feminine, and the gods are masculine, the {"pan"} -- {"topan"} is neuter. It has no life. It is an object. And all what you call today "objectivity," and "object, comes from this little trick, that since 500--not in Heraclitus, who is an old, still-believing pre-Christian Christian and non-Jewish Jew, so to speak--but in all Greeks, all of you, too, there is this surreptitious little sneakily -- sneaky step. By speaking of the universe as though it was a neuter. It was neither "he" nor "she." You cannot say -- say, "the universe who," and you cannot say, "the universe," you see, "she." You say "it."

And that's a very little trick, gentlemen, because the word physis is still feminine. In -- in Shakespeare in 6- -- before 1650, also in English, the word "nature" was feminine. It was not -- it doesn't cease to be a -- feminine before 1650 in English language. What does this mean, gentlemen? It is alive. Something that is "she" and "he" is as much alive as you and I. And therefore, it can serve as an educator, as a -- as a -- as a brother, as a sister of you and me. If it is "that," if it is a thing, it is an object of my exploitation, of my engineering, of my planning.

And today, the Greeks have -- philosophers are -- have so completely flooded your brain that most living processes, gentlemen, by you are qualified as "its." Now any -- anything which you call "it" has no right to talk back. If you say, "God is something," God has ceased to speak. You can never say of any speaker that he is "it." That's impossible. The word "infant" in Latin is neuter, because an infant is he who does not speak. "Fari" means to speak. "Infant" is somebody who does not speak. And that's the word for child, you see, the non-speaking. Therefore it is "it."

That is, gentlemen, "hes" and "shes" have voices and know better who they are than you and I. "Its" have to be investigated by you and me, and examined, because they have no self-consciousness. Therefore, gentlemen, the scientist who deals with an object knows more about the object than the object. But if you deal with me, Sir, I will always talk back and say, "But I know better what my interest is than you do," you see, "even if you 10 times tell me that you really have only my own interests at heart. I simply won't believe it, that I shouldn't know, too," you see.

This is the whole problem of human freedom today. If you have one economy -- Mr. Khrushchev said, "I know what's good for these Hungarians. They don't know. They must have a socialist government." Don't you see, that's the logic, if they are just "its." If the universe is "it," gentlemen, then all events in the universe are also objectively knowable. And most of you are dedicated in a way to this superstition that everything can be treated as an object. And you try even to treat your own body as an object. You will always go wrong on this, gentlemen. Your body is yourself. It's not an object. It's sacred. If you treat it as an object, you will kill it. It will -- you will go schizophrenic. Your body is not an object. You can't treat it objectively. It's just no way of doing this. The body is just one form of your own existence on this -- in the -- on this globe.

So you see, it has tremendous consequences, what I have tried to show you. If you -- if you treat nature as that outside world which has -- be -- to be brought under the -- your domination, very appeal- -- of great appeal to any human -- to any male, to any man, this conquering attitude, you get very far, except for the fact that the -- you choke -- this genuine life and the highest life of any such object is its own speech.

You have now all the Indians on the reservations, gentlemen, because you have treated them objectively, but they have no longer anything to say. They are without real speech. It's just a -- a patois, a lingo which is { }. You have deprived them of their vote, in the deepest sense of the word, of their vocality. They haven't been asked. They have been driven out, into their reservations. The treatment of the red Indian is a result of treating them as objects. Any -- { } whether it's maternal care or whether it's exploitation, the -- Department of the Interior in the United States, as you know, has tried to help these people as objects. And others have tried to destroy them as objects and exploit them. It works both ways. As long as they are objects, they will wither on the stem. Their life will leave them and they will become deader and deader all the time. Now they are so dead that nothing can help them, I'm sure. We have killed them.

The -- the treatment as objects, gentlemen, is then--will you take this down?--a decision. What we treat as object, and what we treat, you see, as vocal, as "he" or "she," is the perpetual decision which we make about the purpose, the destiny of the universe. And you can do it with flowers. You can do it with wild animals. It's the way we now exploit the tigers and the lions, and allow these Chicago businessmen to shoot down all the lions in Africa means that we think they are objects. Are they? I think they are part of our creation for whose survival we are really all responsible. There have to be tigers. You can't shoot them down. Why? It's very hard to say. It's a decision, you see. It's an intimate belief that we know only of ourselves if they are our brothers, our antecedents, our ancestors. I mean, all people are good Darwinians in the sense that -- do you think that Mr. Darwin invented the idea that we have pedigree? The Bible says that first the plants were created, and then the animals, and then men. And always we -- have people respect for the lion, and for the elephant as tremendous protagonists of men.

You -- if I may here today -- listen to an American boy, you really think that Mr. Darwin discovered that there was -- creation, and that these great animals and mammals came before us. -- Everybody knew that the gorilla -- that most people are just gorillas. That's nothing new. The problem of -- before 1859, was only how to avoid of remaining a gorilla. And after 1859, the great {question} was how to become as rapidly as possible a total gorilla. Yes, that's all. This is your decision. You have managed very well. I mean, most people I meet strike me as gorillas. And you know The Hairy Ape. Who has read The Hairy Ape? That's the application of Darwin to -- to modern times. Who wrote it? (O'Neill.)

It's a very good play. It's a very serious play, gentlemen. But this is not new. The funny thing which is hard for me to understand is that Darwin today strikes you as the discoverer of man's embed- -- you see, being part and parcel of the natural universe, because that's old, you see. But the great dignity of man was that he had to show that he was the last primate, you see; therefore, had to do better, and to outgrow the gorilla. And couldn't be reduced to the -- to his previous form, because that had -- he had left behind us.

So you perhaps see now, gentlemen, that to call the universe "it" meant that -- everything met within the universe was in danger of becoming an object of the mind. And as soon as my own sister, and my own mother, and my own sweetheart, and my own child could be treated in this sense objectively, the

Greek philosopher was in great danger of going -- becoming a pervert. And as I have tried to tell you, they all were perverts, because homosexuality created for them this -- the second world, in which for themselves the laws of the universe did not apply. They were a law to themselves. They lived in this academic ivory tower, which was pestered with vices of the most terrible kind. And that's a condition of treating the universe as the universe.

You will find it true inside yourself, gentlemen. If you go all out for philosophy, the whole rest of the world, including myself, including your friends, will tempt you as though you could treat them as analytically, you see, as objects of your understanding, or of your statistics, or of your mastery, or of your exploitation, or of your treatment. You will psychologize; you will say, "This man I treat with this psychological trick," and "The other man I impress in this way," you see, and "I'll show interest in his business, and I -- then -- I'll make friends this way," you see. "I only make objects, because I take it upon myself, you see, to treat all these things."

The universe, gentlemen, then is the sum of all these things. And things are a method of treating the universe as being outside of me. The polis -- the political treatment of the universe is the opposite: treating even the stars as part of me. If I look up to the sun and say, "Dear Sun, shine," you see, I call the sun, as St. Francis did in his famous hymn to the sun, "my own brother," and the moon "my sister." Now you are not in this poetical mood, you may not like it. But gentlemen, a flower in the garden, you will admit -- or a bird whom you protect against the -- your cat -- you do treat as a -- as some living being that has as much right to exist as you yourself. You see the difference?

In a political treatment, gentlemen, we ask ourselves: how much right have I to exist? And I can't have any more right than all the brothers and sisters around me. In the naturalistic approach, gentlemen, in the physicist's approach to me, you see, I think this is an outside world which has come under my domination.

So the word -- use of the word "universe," gentlemen, is the choice of a method. It is a decision. It is not an objective fact itself, to use the universe as something objectively given. My protest against this is that this is not so. Anybody who speaks of the universe therefore says, "I can deny the living soul around me," he denies God. And the other who -- who affirms God may deny the -- the -- the laws of the universe, of nature. Both obviously is impossible. Gentlemen, life consists of breathing out and breathing in. It consists of

constantly shifting between treating the outer world as object and as subject. There is no other way of living, gentlemen. In any one moment, here -- here, the -- I speak to you, I treat you as fellow creatures. Next moment, I run into you, we are just bodies colliding. Obviously, you see, I cannot afford then to forget my own body. I have to save it. I have to save my skin, you see. They are outside each other. And I treat you as an object that has to be gotten out of the way. And I shall.

But that's your difficulty then, gentlemen. You are inclined not to see the dilemma of life. The dilemma of life is constantly to change between treating the outer world as object and as brother. There is no way of treating it as one only. It's impossible. You { } constantly here. Obviously this furniture is so much less alive, it doesn't matter. We stand it up and put it in the chimney, and get a good fire { } to keep warm. There would be very little { } for this. Of course, the treasurer of the college wouldn't like it.

On the other hand, you people and I, we are in the same boat, in the same sense we are fellow oarsmen. So I cannot treat you -- I cannot throw you into the fire to get warm -- keep warm. So the decision between universe and divine life, gentlemen, is of course a decision which draws constantly lines within the outer world. And all the time we have to distinguish what is on our side as living beings, as vocal beings, as having as much right for existence as we, and those things which we have to make subservient to our existence like fuel, and coal, and air, and such things. And then there is no preliminary, dogmatic decision possible. At any one moment, you may sing to the air a poem with just as much sense as you may breathe it in and use it for oxygen. Your idea is that -- there are certain things that are constantly dead. You think -- it strikes you as funny, that a poet shall write a poem to {the air}. I'm sorry for you. You must take up in yourselves this creative power that even the air and the stars deserve a song. {Even they} deserve to be spoken to. If you cannot practice this poetical being, I will not trust your philosophical or your scientific one.

You must keep this -- this quest in your heart that at no moment is it clear to you where life and where death is. Gentlemen, the thing is the decision over life and death. That's the gist of the matter. The word "universe" is a decision in favor of death. If you say "universe," you say, "I preferably now treat the universe as deader than myself, as object." An object is deader than the subject. But if you sing to the air or to the gods, you treat the universe as more alive than you yourself. And I think sometimes that's very much in order, because I feel very often that I am deader than the rest of the world. I hope you will find -- feel

this, too, at times, because otherwise you can't come to life. You have to reject your own decadence, your own stupidity, your own boredom. And you can only do this by coming down on you and saying, "I am dead, and the rest of the universe is much more alive." Now I -- I don't see that I can convince you of this so easily. But anybody in love knows exactly what I mean, because the first thing a -- a lover says is that he feels he is not sufficiently alive, and he cannot compete with his sweetheart with regard to her {loveliness}. He doesn't deserve to be loved. Anyb- -- lover -- I challenge anybody, that he cannot be in love if he doesn't admit that he des- -- doesn't deserve to be loved. Now God deserves to be loved, because He's only life, without death. But you and I are so much death, and dirt, and filth, and what-not that we feel very definitely that we don't deserve to be loved. How can anybody love us? You say by this, "I am a mere object. I'm not sufficient of a -- of a person that I really deserve to be loved." So in this sense, I think every one of you makes this experience as a very practical matter. If you only could see the word "universe," gentlemen, is -- comes from a logical dichotomy. There is no objective universe {always}, you see. But universe is an attempt to look at the reality around us, you see, in a certain manner.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...{ }, Constantine are the big cities in Thrace. Quite right. So Orpheus would hail from this part of the northern sphere, and it would again be an out -- outside -- outlandish part of the Greek mainland. Now the next, {Museus.}

Where does he come from? Mr. -- ja? No? Mr. Mandaville?

(I haven't got it, Sir.)

Oh, you only know Arabia. I see. Is there anybody from Arabia in this?

Hm? Have you found anybody from Egypt in this list?

(Oh, of course, Egypt is playing an important part in all these { }.)

Who -- one of -- one of these names comes right from Egypt. Who is it?

Who found out about that? Gentlemen, you have -- don't do any work. I can't -- God help you. You see, if you are not interested in the history of Greek philosophy, I won't make you interested. That's your own interest. Why don't you do the work I have assigned to you? Which of these men comes from Egypt?

{Dwight}?

(Well, the man from Samos { } was, wasn't he?)

Ach, ach, ach. You think Samos is in Egypt? Very interesting. That's quite an achievement, you know. Really appalling, you see. Polycrates -- Croesus come from -- from -- comes from Samos. Pythagoras comes from there. The -- the Greek of the Greeks. It has nothing to do with Egypt. It's one of the fundamental centers of Greek -- the Greek spirit. Pure Greek.

Where is Samos? Where is Samos situated? Well, I gave you an outline, didn't I, last time? I -- here, I put Italy; I put Sicily; I put Greece, vaguely; and I put Asia Minor here. Here's Egypt, put room here. Here is Crete. Here are all the islands. Now where is Samos? What is Samos? City?

(An island.)

An island. Where is it situated?

(Outside of Athens.)

What?

(Outside out Athens.)

That's Salamis, yes. But not Samos. Heavens! Have you never learned any -- any such geography? What?

(It's near the Turkey -- the Turkish shore.)

Sure. It's one of the main islands in -- in face of Ephesus and Miletus.

Here. Here is Samos. And Mr. Pythagoras then went from here to Croton, Italy, and that is the great line from -- of communication. Why do you laugh so much, my dear man, huh? Sir, in the blue shirt, huh?

(Why am I laughing?)

Ja.

(I'm laughing at "Mr. Pythagoras.")

What did I say?

("Mr. Pythagoras.")

Ja. Well, he was a gentlemen. He had a daughter, Thea. He was. Yes.

Now, Mr. {Bollus}, Page 125, Number 78, he comes from the delta of the Nile. But he's a later man. He shouldn't be in this book, anyway. But he is an Egyptian-Greek, who already lives under the Ptolemys, when Greek -- the -- Alexander the Great has conquered Egypt and made it into a Greek subject country, and when Alexandria is founded. So -- the -- the story of -- the name of {Bollus} appearing here as from Egypt bears out, so to speak, the whole story that -- the story of Greek philosophy is also one of expansion into newly conquered country. The -- Alexander the Great brings Mr. {Bollus} about, so to speak. He lives in {Mende}. The old Egyptian city of {Mende} had a -- had a religion of its own, a -- a goat-god was its -- but this man Bollus just belongs to the -- I think to the Pythagorean school. Now, go back.

{Museus} comes from which city? Nobody has done this work, obviously, except myself. What?

(Athens.)

Athens, yes. And that is remarkable. If we now go through the list quickly, I'll tell you who is from Athens. There is one among the seven sages, Solon. I won't say "Mr. Solon," otherwise the gentleman laughs again. He is on -- Solon is not listed as specifically. He should have -- as under Number 10, or 73A, the seven sages. There is one man, Solon, coming from Athens. If you go on, you find how small the contribution of Athens is. {Armanias}, 27, supposedly comes from Athens. We aren't quite sure. Damon -- Damon, in 37, is Athenian. Archelaus, Number 60; 65 supposedly is -- {Catilus} is -- is Athenian, {Catilus}. We'll talk about it in a minute. He is a -- a pupil of Heraclitus of Ephesus. So I don't feel very sure about his homeland, be -- here called -- in my -- in the source is now called Athens. And then there is Antiphon, 87, and Critias, 88, Athens. And the 89, the anonymous writer quoted by Iamblichus, might be Athenian. He writes in the Attic prose, in Attic style, but more -- we don't know his birthplace. I think it is very important for you to put down the fact, gentlemen, that only six of these men are Athenians. Isn't it right? Six. So Ath- -- Athens is a -- is a great center on the crossroads of the Greek world, but it isn't, by no means, the birthplace of the great spirit of the Greek culture. And you -- you mistake the two things too easily. Therefore it is -- I think this is a good list to show you how eccentric the contributions really lie arranged, of the Greek mind. If you see there is only -- there is one Spartan and perhaps Number 90, he may come from a Spartan, Doric environment. And the other man, from Argos, Polyclitus, Number 40, smaller mind. Nothing very -- very great.

You find anybody else from the Peloponnesus? Peloponnesus contains Olympia, Ak- -- and Elis, and Sparta, the great Prussia, the great West Point of Greece. Who else is from this Peloponnesus? Have -- have you anybody? Wie? Ja, {Helis}, very -- actually, very good. Thank you very much.

And so it is to -- to be sure a very small percentage of people who do any thinking of this type, of this independent type, as a reason for this scarcity in Athens and -- and -- and -- and the Peloponnesus, gentlemen, is the well-functioning of the political unit.

Gentlemen, for philosophy, there is only occasion if you have to reconcile the existence of your homeland with the rest of the world. If your homeland however is very secluded and very, very { } as in Switzerland, you see, the Swiss have not produced philosophers, because they have produced great leaders in their little mountain cantons. You see the difference? And -- to this day, if

you try to -- to philosophize, don't go to Switzerland. They are an anti-philosophical nation, because they are politically sound. And strong. And you don't understand this, gentlemen. There is a cor- -- a constant correspondence between political -- integration and philosophical necessity. If you are in a small political community, and have to live in a big universe, then the question of the universe, you see, is so preponderant that you cannot be satisfied with the ways of -- of daily life in your little state of Podunk. But if the Middle West -- people in the Middle West think they can be isolationists, and if you are an isolationist, you don't have to philosophize. Philosophy and non-isolation are connected, because then you have to have ideas, you see, which transcend your native political action.

And this -- is of course the -- there is a struggle. Why is the Republican Party today so boring? Because it has no -- it is isolationist at bottom. And it doesn't want to have a future about -- a philosophy about the future of the universe. Now gentlemen, we already live in a universe with one economy. I tried to tell you this. And therefore this so-called modern Republicanism is still simply isolationist. It's nothing else, because it hasn't digested the doctrines of the war. You can still -- even the president of the United States says we can go to war. Now gentlemen, we can't go to war. With the atom and the H-bomb, war is out of the question for any reasonable man. The idea that we just can go to war or not is nonsense. You have seen it in this -- there is no -- you can have police actions. You can have riots. You can have -- you can have bush-fire, so to speak, wars. But this country can -- cannot go to World War III. It cannot. And it won't. And the sooner the Republican Party learns this, the more ch- -- it has a chance ever to elect a president again.

It's very strange, you see. This is all talk here, co-existence so. The question is, what kind of co-existence? In one world? In one economic order, you see? Or side by side as in isolationism? All this is to -- sound -- everybody is sound asleep in the United States now with moral -- indignation as a substitute for thinking. We are back to 1914, because you actually think we can do as we please. We cannot, gentlemen. The United States live in one world in which World War III has become impossible. That's a new -- you have to think very boldly, and very differently from what you think. There is already one economy, as the oil flow shows, and there is still sovereign nations. And they can't get together.

And the talk that go- -- going on now, I mean, over the Voice of Europe -- Free Europe and so, is in total contradiction, as you know, to our real policy. We haven't done a thing to help the Hungarians, but Free -- the Free Radio Europe

has told them for 10 years that we are going to do something. So split are we, so torn to pieces. We don't know what we shall do, because there are two different ages in our politics today. One is Herbert Hoover, Sr., who calls himself "junior"; and the other is -- because I think he's much older than his father, and -- who just thinks in terms of America and nothing else. And he's perfectly hopeless and helpless, therefore. He has no policy, as you m- -- read in every report. The good man probably went to Princeton or Yale. And the other problem, the other people who -- see a little deeper, the -- they have no voice at this moment in the matters and we have no solution. But if you deduct from our real situation, gentlemen, the -- the problem of one-world economy already in existence, and the possibility of -- of war, practically for a practical statesman, out of the question, because you -- he cannot will the total destruction of tre- -- third of his country, then you see that we are living today in one world.

Well, I said this before. I only wanted to explain the -- it's a very strange lie of the land in this whole list. If you come to Southern Italy, you find -- who are the people from Italy represented here? Wie? Ja? Please? Where do we begin, which number?

(45.)

Wie?

(45. 43.)

Ja, I should say. {Abicharmos} is 23, isn't it? Yes, and Pythagoras goes from Samos -- from -- from Asia Minor, he goes across the whole Mediterranean Ocean -- you must think of it as an ocean in terms of those little yachts and -- and sail -- the sailing boats, obviously. He goes over to -- to Croton. Then we come immediately to {Caracops} and {Petron}. They are all southern Italy. {Brantanos}, {Hippasus}. That's -- the numbers 15 -- so -- from -- beginning with 14, you have all people living in southern Italy. Down to 19, {Callifon}, and Demo- -- Democedes live in Croton. They are father and son, {Callifon} and Democe- -- {Parmeniskus} is from Metaponte, which is also in the so-called boot of Italy. You know, this is called the "boot" because of the heel on the one side, in the -- in the -- at the Bay of Tarantum, and {Appolia} forming -- Calabria forming the -- the toes. Xenophanes is -- {Parmeniskus} is from Metaponte. Then comes Xenophanes and Heraclitus, they are not. But {Epishamus} -- Alcmaeon is from Croton. {Echus} is from Tarant. {Paron} probably from Croton. Croton is also in southern Italy. And then comes Parmenides and Zeno, the great heads of the Eleatic school, as I told you, south of Naples. Then

Empedocles, we find on Sicily, in Girgenti -- today Acragas. Sybaris of course is again southern Italy. {Ministo} comes from there. Of {Xudos} and {Boidas} we know very little.

Now would you draw a list of -- figure -- just figure out how many on this first page come from southern Italy and Sicily. Also Theagenes, and Number 8. My information says he's from Reggio. That is -- you see, at the -- at the Straits of Messina. What is it? Sir? You have no book? What? Nothing? Absolutely nothing. All right. Your neighbor, will you kindly tell me? How many names did we find from southern Italy on the first page? Wie? No, no, no, no.

(13.)

Six, seven, eight, nine, 10, 11, 12. I have 13. I have 13 on the first page. And my -- Pythagoras, Number 14, who transfers his loyalty from the East to the West. I think it's then quite important if you then look at Asia Minor, we have how many, on the first page only? Samos is {Phokus}, Number 5. Tenedos, that's next to Troy. Number 6. Syros is {Parakides}, by the way, a very important man. We'll talk -- I may say the word of -- about him. Thales, of course, our great beginner, our pioneer, is Number 4. Anaximander, Miletus; Anaximenes, Miletus. These are 6. Pythagoras is Number 7. {Chalcops} is Number 8. We don't know -- aren't quite sure of this; so very little known about him. Xenophanes is ni- -- is that Number 9. Heraclitus, 10. And there -- and -- and {Millisus}, 11. So we have -- ja?

(Isn't { } -- wasn't he a member of the Pythagorean school?)

What?

({ }.)

Well, the school certainly is in southern Italy. Is not -- wie?

(Weren't they centered in Syracuse?)

Oh no, no, no. Croton. K-r-o-t-o-n. So we get 11 names here, gentlemen.

How many names did we have in southern Italy?

(13.)

Now, so you see this 24, and the whole center has only then given us 10.

And that co- -- contains this very fabulous man { } who really also belongs to the outskirts and should really rate with the people in Tenedos. This is Tenedos lying right here in front of Troy. Here is Troy. And this would be -- {Allorphus} then would come from these shores -- from the Dardanelles. Here are the Dardanelles. And therefore I think we should put him off and give this man -- these people 9, and these people 12, and these people 13. And you see therefore that the two wings, you see, really crush the center.

Now I think that is something which we -- we now can follow up on Page 8 -- Roman viii once more. The names partly there are printed. I haven't found the principle of this lady. By -- with some people she gives kindly enough the -- the birthplace, and with others she doesn't. Reason is unknown to me. Let's go across. {Pitsicus} is near Tenedos and Troy. -- Let's go up from Number 74. So will you kindly -- somebody kindly help me figuring this out. {Pitsicus} is east. Abdera is where -- where is Abdera? Where are the Abderites, the famous -- the famous funny people of antiquity, the people of whom every -- every joke is told, so to speak? It's like Podunk here, you know, the stupid people of Abdera. You don't know where it is? Macedonia, in the north. So it is also eccentric. It is like Thrace -- Thrace, not a country really of the genuine Greek character. But there the great come. Democritus comes from there. If you -- look at -- Number 68. {Anaxasius}, 72. Who else?

{{ }}?

Quite. So -- so the great men of the Democritean school, of the atomistic school.

So we put them on a special list, these three. Then we have {Pitsicus} for the easterners; Smyrna, Theognis, Number 71; Chios, of course. {Nessas} is of -- from Chios, Number 4. Ephesus: Antisthenes, the Heraclitean. -- {Ideos} -- does anybody know where Apollonia is located?

(Black Sea.)

Ja. So far away, too. Eccentric. Then we come to Lampsacus. Where's Lampsacus? Also in Asia Minor. {Cleidemus} I think is unknown. Apollonia, we have. Will you keep count of this? I won't. Anaxagoras comes from Clazomenae, also Asia Minor. Lycon comes from Eas- -- from Italy. {Simus Mionidas} { } from Poseidonia. That is modern Paestum. We talked about Paestum the other day. That is north of Elea, on south Italian ground, very near Naples. So Number 56, Poseidonia. Damon and Phintias, 55, come from Syracuse.

{Protos}, {Amiklas}, and {Klineas} stem -- they are quite important. One from Tarentum, the other from Kyrene. Does anybody know where Cyrene is located, or Ky -- Kyrene, as the Greeks called it?

It's very strange, gentlemen. -- In the whole archipelago, in this whole cosmos of the Greeks, of which there were cosmopolitans, in this wonderful galaxy, we might call it with an appropriate word, of this archipelago of Greek colonies, there is of course in France already at that time Marseille, Massilia. That's a Greek colony, you see, of which they are very proud. It was founded from a country in the east, of Greece, from the -- Euobea, from Phocae. And the other -- colo- -- Greek colony of which they were very proud is in Libya, Cy- -- Cyrene. The Cyrenaica--you have perhaps heard this term in geography--the Cyrenaica is the bay at which also the Pu- -- Phoenicians had Carthage, you see, and at which the -- the modern Libya is -- is lying. Cyrenaica is this big part of the Mediterranean shoving in from the East into the African coast, so that it bowls out a -- a big bay window into the coast land. Cyr- -- Cyrene, then, is a Greek colony there. And Pindar, the Greek of the Greeks who sang the Olympic victors, you know, one of his most famous odes is in honor of a man from Cyrene. And it tells the story of the Greek settlement in Cyrene by divine guidance, how the gods decided that this north African colony should be -- you see, should come to pass.

If you -- if you read these stories of the Greek colonies, then you understand a little bit of the story of Israeli, gentlemen. If you are -- here, I wa- -- had to moderate a very strange meeting two days ago. And people have no idea how life is carried on, on this globe. It is col- -- carried on by migration, by colonization--like this country, too--and not by legal papers. And the idea of these Arabs, that there can be no change on the map of the world strikes me as very impractical. Effort, and bloodshed, and sweat, and toil -- that's what colonizes countries, and nothing else. And the idea that -- that somebody says, "This is my country" is just foolish. He can defend it. Then it becomes his country. But by sitting tight, and doing nothing, and having a desert left and right, you are not owning your country.

So to me, Mr. Mandaville, your -- your viewpoint is just childish. And you should know better, having lived in these countries, that by sitting in a desert, you are not the ruler of this desert by a long shot. I was very depressed that this is all you had learned in the Near East. If you just read the Bible, you would know a little better. It's just nonsense, what you have seen. Illusions. Colonization, Sir. The whole Greek adventure was one of -- of -- of sacrifice and risking their lives, and doing something, and building cities on foreign soil. The Greeks

didn't own one inch of all this country when they began. Not one inch. They were everywhere, however. And they were there, and they colonized this country, and they all became Greek and began to speak Greek. All our -- all the -- southern -- southern Gaul was Greek and -- for 800 years. But you have to do something. And these Arabs in Saudi Arabia have just done nothing. Absolutely nothing for a thousand years, and very definitely so. Ja?

(You advocate then that the -- that the Arabian { } the Phocaeans and the {Syrians} should attempt to integrate themselves into the Mo- -- the Islamic religion?)

I don't advocate anything. I only describe how changes on this globe have happened for the last 50,000 years. And I bow to the evidence, you see. And I know that this is the way life goes on, on this globe. And there is no other. And you won't have life. You just want to have dead order. An order that doesn't exist; empty spaces are not in order.

Well, that's a long story. We may sit down and thrash it out. But I want to say that the whole Greek colonization is a -- is a fairy tale, and you find it especially in this -- in this school in Cyrene, and this was quite a considerable school. The man of whom I'm speaking here at this moment is Theodorus, Number 43, who lived in -- in northern Africa. But I think your picture of Greece is quite wrong, if you do not see that that what you call today "Greek civilization" has very little to do with the motherland only, you see. But it is -- has had this tremendous force because it went outside and there had to face a hostile universe and therefore had to justify the existence of any one city, you see, by a philosophy common to the conquered and to the conquerors; or the colonizers, you may say, and the -- the natives. That's perhaps more friendly expressed, and I think also in a way, very true.

The -- Number 35 comes from an island in the Mediterranean, {Thesos}, near the -- again, near the Asiatic coast. Chios, of course, again, an island like Samos. And like Thasos. Then Damon is from Athens. {Hippon} again is from Samos. Hippodamus is from Miletus; and {Frilius} is from Chalcedon. So {Anopodes} is from Chios. Hippocrates is from Chios. Theodorus we said Cyrene. Then we come to southern Italy. Tarentum is Philolaus. {Arrodus} is from Italy. {Archipus}, {Lyssus}, and {Opsimus} are from It- -- southern Italy. Archytas is from southern Italy. {Ochelos} is from Lucania, which is also near Tarentum. There are three parts in southern Italy: Calabria, Apulia, and Lucania. And then Timaeus is from Locri. That's in -- in -- in southern Italy, a colony. There were Locri of course in Greece. But this Locri is a colony, you see, like --

like the cities here. Hartford, Connecticut, gave birth to Hartford -- Hartford, Vermont. So of course, the names have been carried around.

{Hikates} and {Ekphantus} are from Syracuse. {Xenophilus} is from the north, from the -- where Saloniki now is, from the Chalkidiki, where the three fingers point into the Mediterranean Sea. And -- the -- the people in 53, however, they are a little colony in Phlius, and that's north -- south of -- of Argos. Not south of Argos. That's the -- north -- it's near -- between Cor- -- Corinth and Argos, on the Corinthian gulf.

{Choros}, from Cyrene. I told this al- -- told this already. Now, would we take then the sum of this all? How many do you put east, and how many do you put west, and how do -- many -- have we in the center? What is the statistics? Did anybody kindly check it?

(12 east.)

Wie?

(You've got 12 on the east side.)

East side. Lower East Side. And -- on the west? Wie?

(I was keeping 10 in the East.)

What?

(10 on the east.)

Wie? Only 10? And in the middle? How many?

(Are you counting the islands as part of Greece or --?)

Sure, sure. Asia Minor, not Greece. Because that's -- you see, that's -- are considered -- they felt themselves as being so near the Persian Empire, you see, that they never rated with the -- with central Greece before Athens stepped in and conquered them. So Samos, Chios, all this is -- is -- we have always figured to be on this side, here.

(There must be more than 12.)

Quite.

(You got -- you got seven more islands over there.)

Well, let's -- let's do the -- Thasos, 1; Chios, 2; -- Hip -- Samos, 3; Miletus, 4; Chios, 5; Chios, 6; then for quite a while nothing. Anaxagoras, 7; Metrodorus, 8; Antisthenes, 9; Apollo- -- 9 -- Apollonia, 10; {Nessas}, 11; Metrodorus of Chios, 12; Smyrna, 13; and {Pitsicus}, 14. Here is 14.

So on the other side, in Italy, how many there? Made the count by now?

You understand, I'm anxious to -- to spend some time. All these things will slip your mind. But I think this very primitive work which we are doing here should nail down in your mind the fact that the history of Greek philosophy has something to do with the sociology and the politics of the Greek people, that it is a problem of mental colonization, and that philosophy has something to do with dynamics of political migration. It's no use of looking -- your looking at these philosophers, impractical men living somewhere in a brown study. They didn't. They represented the way in which these new cities and new foundations tried to find their place, through a decent respect of the opinions of mankind in the universe. When there is already a settlement in a certain -- and new, additional settlements are needed, then there comes a need for a philosophy, for a critical assessment of what the new order should do in comparison to the old. Then ideas play their part.

So what -- how many on the left -- on the -- on the western side?

(Thirteen.)

Wie?

(Thirteen.)

Thirteen. That sounds reasonable. Ja, we had this already. Fourteen and 13. And in the middle? How many are left to the middle? Wie?

(Twelve.)

Now see, as we -- as we go on, the middle part is strengthened. The -- the -- the effect of the movement on the wings, on the sides presses home, to the homeland. And of course, you get in 400, when this list ends, you get the center of thought planted into Athens. And you get the acad- -- the academy of Plato.

But you would do wrong to this Platonic Academy if you simply said, "Plato is an Athenian, therefore his school is an Athenian thing," you see. It is the result of pressures from the wings on Athens that finally Plato comes to the -- you see, to the decision not to become the mayor of Athens, which he could very well have become, you see, or the prince of Athens, like Pericles, but that instead of being the sec- -- Pericles II, Plato becomes Plato I, and founds this philosophical school, which then can rule the -- the world empire of the Greek mind in Athens, you see. But with all the other cities having made their contribution, so that Pl- -- Plato, as we shall have to say -- state then in considering his works a little bit more, that they -- all these cities from West and East are represented in his Academy.

Gentlemen, the speakers in the great political dialogues of Plato are non-Athenians. That's very important, you see, that the contribution is made: one, by Crition; in his *Timaeus*, the man is a Pythagorean from southern Italy, you see, who speaks. This we have to understand, because the Academy is the antidote against the parochialism of the Athenians, against the 100-percent red-blooded Americans of our days, gentlemen. You can't have an academy supported by Mr. McCarthy. That's against the academic spirit. The academic spirit is that element, that -- what I tried to show you, you see, there that reaches into a nation, into a polis, you see, as a responsible voice for the larger universe. And the story of this table of contents then therefore is a very dramatic story, because if you read the end, the last four names -- 87, 88, 89, and 90, they probably are at home in Athens, and the last in Sparta. That is, at the end of these so-called pre-Socratics, before Socrates enters the scene, you see, the philosophy does come home to the center of Greece, you see. But only under this gigantic pressure from the wings.

If you look at the last page now, you see, you find that Mr. Protagoras, and Mr. Gorgias, and Mr. Prodicus, and Mr. Hippias, that they all visit Athens. And we know of their visits through the Platonic dialogues. And of course there is before, already, Anaxagoras, that's a little older, 59. And it is the visit of these people, and the -- the information from these -- of -- from the existence of these people, which brings up the center, the homeland, the Greek homeland to the level of discussion, and to the -- to the fiery life of the philos- -- philosophers who first woke up to their task at the outskirts of this Greek civilization. And in this sense, you perhaps now understand why I feel that you understand this history of Greek philosophy, if you really compare to the military dream of the catalog of the ships. That was -- here was once done in the body of soldiers, a great vision of unity, you see, was now once more accom-

plished by a great unity of minds over a vast body of sea and land, under the most un- -- unpropitious circumstances of separatedness, from island to island. And these islands there were -- of course, were far apart. It was each time a journey with a question of life and death. It was like coming to this country in the 17th century. You didn't know if you would arrive. It was dangerous. Yet they established this great unity of the mind, these great philosophical schools, and this common approach to dividing man's thought into logic, physics, and ethics, in such a way that the living generation would know what laws to pass, would know what uni- -- what physical parts of the universe to discover, and what gods -- what the ritual should be by which we should worship the gods.

And therefore, I -- you must look at this history of Greek philosophy perhaps better as a history of Greek philosophers. And the philosophers were bold pioneers in action. And they were the wonders of the age. And you remember--this is all perhaps now coming back to you--I tried to tell you that the wonder in philosophy is always threefold. You wonder about the man who philosophizes. He is the first wonder. The reason for aston- -- Pythagoras is a mighty mind, and you stand in -- in admiration before such a man, who thought that the whole universe could be explained by numbers, and by harmonies of numbers. That's a tremendous idea, and we still dream of it. And I think it is an eternal idea. It's a wonderful idea.

I had a friend who was the son of a man who published in 1878 a book. He was a great mathematician. And it was called The Divi- -- The Laws of the Divine Order of the Universe. He was a professor at a technical institute in Germany. And has the same name as Mr. Wiener -- Norbert Wiener, this man in cybernetics in MIT. His name is also Wiener. And this man Wiener in 1878 published this book which is strictly Pythagorean in an attempt to explain the universe and all its laws in purely mathematical terms, as very harmonious and very beautiful. Gesetze der göttlichen Weltordnung. Laws of the divine order of the universe. Written still in the style of Lucretius, you know, "divine" and "universe" put together in -- as though they were, you see, compatible.

Now, so, if you see the -- the one miracle, gentlemen, which you can get here from this table of contents, the philosophers themselves, that there should have been this electrifying stream that every one of these philosophers represents a new combination of the three problems: God, man, world; or the -- the cult of a city, the society of man, the laws of -- outside nature.

All -- every one of these philosophers, so to speak, has another key to open this door of the relations between the three. So he is a miracle. That's the first miracle. The second miracle is the universe around us. And the third miracle is the formation of a public that is willing to listen to the truth, and willing to reform, and willing to be te- -- taught. And they are represented in -- in the case of Parmenides and the later schools by this group of young men, like yourself, who fall in love with truth and sacrifice everything to truth, and cease to be in the first place either jewelers, and blacksmiths, and miners, on -- or hunters, or soldiers, or citizens, you see, or sons of their parents, but become something other: students. Students of the truth. That which we try to make you into, and which we do not succeed, because your extracurricular activities prevent you from being real students.

Nobody in -- in our Dartmouth is a real student, because the intellectual endeavors here are held in contempt. You are playboys, gentlemen. You are not students. Because a student is -- what is a student, gentlemen? By definition of the word, a student is a man who is willing to do more than his teachers ask him to do. And you all try to do less than I ask you to do. You are pupils, 6 years old. Because you all try to do less than I expect you to do. You can never be a student, because "student" comes from "studius," from being -- being excited. And to study means to be excited, and to be so excited that what I say is only half of the story. The other thing is what you do. But you all expect me to be more interested than you are. Gentlemen, that I cannot achieve. It's a misproportion. So, three reasons for wonder, gentlemen. The philosophers, the universe, and the student group, this free republic of studious people who are anxious, eager, and excited enough to forget their immediate interest. Gentlemen, a student who cannot forget is -- his immediate self-interest certainly cannot be a student of the truth. You have to--and, of course, in any good moment obviously you are able to do that--you have to forget your immediate aim, your immediate goal. The goal -- which you are devoted as students are not what you get out of this course. That's always the ruin of all your st- -- studies that in all your naïveté, you put this impertinent, infamous, and criminal question, "What do I get out of this course?"

Gentlemen, you have the great honor of becoming -- forming a new public for the next truth, for the philosophy of the time now needed. And therefore, you are needed, gentlemen. You are in demand. Therefore, you have to give yourself. You have to surrender. Unconditional surrender. And if you cannot unconditionally surrender your mind to the truth, gentlemen, I have nothing to offer you. Philosophy has nothing to offer you. The history of the --

Greek philosophy makes absolutely no sense. Perfectly worthless to you. It's perhaps nice for a -- smattering at a dinner table, or at a -- in a club, but that's a -- different.

Like the businessman from Chicago who was asked by a friend of mine in Harvard why you -- why he went to Harvard, and he said, "It pays to have been to Harvard when you live in Chicago."

Of course, you see. Who is from Chicago? I have nothing to add.

So this list for you -- antecedes the -- the central philosophers of Athens: Plato, So- -- Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. And you must never forget that these names, which overshadow today in most people's mind the prehistory of Greece -- of the Greek mind, are not greater names in the sense that they were greater men. They stood on the shoulders of these achievements of 200 years, from Thales of Miletus to Hippias, to {Trasimachus}, to Prodicus. And they are unthinkable without the greater sacrifices of these founders of Greek philosophy, gentlemen. In -- under much greater danger, many of these people were persecuted like Socrates, and executed, by the way, too. Had to flee for their lives. And the pioneers, the founders, gentlemen, always have a more heroic task than the classics.

I have written a pamphlet, "A Classic and a Founder," in trying to distinguish the role played in any movement between these two phases of life. Ma- -- and the -- I treat there the founder of physics and the classic of physics. The classic of physics is Michael Faraday. And the founder of physics is Paracelsus. Know -- you don't anything about Paracelsus. You know very little of Faraday, but you swear by Mr. Einstein. Now Mr. Einstein is not a hero. He's a classic -- a late classic. Very late classic, as a matter of fact. Faraday is the greater man in my mind. And Paracelsus a much greater man, and had much greater hardships to -- to -- to overcome.

In the same sense, I want you to understand that these first 90 names here in this booklet, gentlemen, are the hall of fame of Greek philosophy, you see. And the classics get all their halo, Mr. Plato, from the sacrifice of these people. And you will never understand then Plato or Aristotle if you look at them not at the harvest of lives lived before them, you see, but as -- are, so to speak -- independent thinkers. They didn't want to be.

The difficulty for you is to -- that's why I've wasted so much time seemingly on this geographical business. I didn't mean the geography, gentlemen; I

meant the spirit. The -- the concentration of the Greek sp- -- mind in Athens, is only of one moment when Plato's name shines brightest, and Socrates is executed there, and so -- so to speak, Athens itself tries to become intellectual, which it had never been.

The inheritance, or heritage, gentlemen, of glory by such an outstanding figure like -- well, like Goethe in Germany, like Shakespeare in the Elizabethan age, you see, like -- like Plato in the -- in 400 is a phenomenon which you must understand in order not to fall into some idolatry. I think the great danger today is that you say, "Greece, that's -- Plato, a great man." Then you better should know anything of Plato. Because if you do not see the tremendous economy of -- and patience of the spiritual history of mankind, you think there was -- just one man who had a great genius, you see. I think you -- you will waste your time in reading any of -- one of his dialogues. And there is no direct access to Plato without seeing him in the middle of this ocean of thought, emerging and trying to organize this thought -- these thoughts, these various schools. The work of Plato, gentlemen, is the attempt to organize the miracles of the human mind that had -- had gone before, into one galaxy. It is like the calendar of the saints of the Church, where all the gui- -- feats of the first 300 years of the Church are collected, you see, from All Souls, to All Saints, to Christmas, to Easter, to Pentecost. So Plato is the mental -- not the calendar, of course, of the mind, but the mental star, or constellation in which all these stars, you see, are placed. And that's why his various dialogues take up one of these great stars after another. There are the Pythagorean dialogues, there are Eleatic dialogues, there are Heraclitean dialogues. There are dialogues from all the digesting, the contributions made in all these various cities, from southern Italy to Asia Minor, to Macedonia to the north. And therefore Plato himself is an encyclopedia, but not in your sense of the word, of an alphabetical character, gentlemen, but of a -- well, it's a kind of symphony of biographies, symphony of lives of thinkers. You understand? It's an attempt to force into one inherit- -- one heritage, into your and my mind something that had happened in various cities lying apart. And of course probably living in -- in splendid isolation, more or less, you see, having not enough intercourse, yet.

Plato li- -- tries to put them all in one field of force, and make them all fruitful so that they could beget each other, could -- how do you say? not "beget" -- how -- fruc- -- fertilize each other. That's the -- cross-fertilization, that's what Plato is. He is a cross-fertilizer, his philosophy. And only if you see this can you understand the daring of the man to settle in a city like Washington, D.C., certainly the most demented city of -- bureaucrats I have ever known. Where 1

million people do nothing but write regulations for other people who live elsewhere -- yes, it's an -- perfectly unnatural city, you see. It's an -- it's a purely idealistic city, I mean. It is -- it has no basis in fact, has only basis in government. It's a very strange city. One million people, you see, writing rules and regulations for others.

And -- well, Athens, at that moment of 400 was ruling a big empire. It owned the islands from which these philosophers came, more or less. It was at that moment dreaming of going to southern Italy and conquering Syracuse. And that wa- -- that broke down, however. But it owned the whole Mediterranean east of the mainland of Greece. And it was in the -- and it owned the north. It went up to the Khalkidhiki, to Abdera and those regions. And we have now excavated Olynthus, and other cities of the north only in the last decades where Athenian colonies were established on the way to Macedonia, from where later Aristotle educated Alexander the Great.

So you must think that Plato is a counter-move against the political domination of Athens. It is the recognition on the part of a man from Athens that this vast empire contained germs of wisdom, and germs of thought which now had also to be, you see, made available in the center, in Athens itself. And there in a school, in a university, fertilize the thinking of these very, very egotistic bankers and farmers of Attica. It wa- -- it would be as if the Chase National Bank and Mr. -- Senator Aiken from Vermont, who is a farmer, would try to govern the Near East, the Far East, South America, the -- Middle America, as we try to do, and without any instruction, without any enlightenment. And then somebody like John Dewey, or other, would come and say, "Now let us digest all the wisdom from the East, and the South, and the North, before we put over our government over these outlying territories."

With -- with this, I think I -- I can only recommend you that you read fragments of these -- this book here as you go along--for example, Democritus and--yourself. You are very easily understood. {Loicoepus} and Democritus form one school, that you also look into the tradition of the Pythagoreans. Those of you who write on the Pythagoreans anyway in their term paper, will of course have to do this anyw- -- anyhow. But I think it's no use for me demanding any one of you to read this whole book in a -- one stretch. One cannot do this fruitfully. But consult it. And you will find that if you take some trouble, you may not succeed in every one case, but in 70 out of these 90 cases, you might find that the fundamental position held by these people is still today valid. It is valid within a larger concept, just as it is valid on one moment to laugh, and the other to weep, and the other to be indifferent. These are mental

moods, I told you, that recur.

The Greeks discovered the mental appetites and the mental attitudes which are part of a normal human mind, of a full-grown complete human mentality. And you will find that not one of these positions can be forgotten. The history of Greek philosophy is not in your sense history, be- -- that it is bunk, and that it is dust, and that it is in the Hades. You can today read a prophecy from Isaiah and it strikes you as absolutely valid, and tomorrow you read Ezekiel, and the same; and then you read Amos, and you are struck that all these prophets have something lasting to say. This very -- the same -- much the same with these philosophers, gentlemen. Every one of them has, for a certain problem of y- -- ours, today, still to -- something to say. You cannot say that they are wrong. You cannot say that they are obsolete. They are still important. They are -- still give you a cue.

I mean, this whole modern physics, gentlemen, you have to go back to Democritus or to Pythagoras again and again to sharpen your wits and to know what you want to do when you explain the electrons, you see. On -- you know, on Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, they are waves. And on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, they are corpuscles. And that's already the problem of the -- Democritus, and it's the problem of the Pythagoreans. The Pythagoreans thought they were harmonies of -- the numbers; that would be the wave theory, you see. And the Democritus said it is the corpuscle theory. But we haven't decided it, yet. We are still half between the Pythagoreans and the Democriteans. And you will never decide it, because the human mind discovered there its own operations. "Electrons" is just your and my way of looking at the universe. Don't believe for a minute that the universe consists of electrons, you see. It's only our necessity of ex- -- of speaking about the universus. But what the universe is, gentlemen, don't believe for a minute that it is electrons, you see. It's you and me. And I am not an electron; you are not an electron, you see. You are just who you are. And you are much more complicated than is good for -- for the physicist.

All simplifications, gentlemen, today, in trying to say that a man can be explained by electrons, ha- -- the people have tried to do it. After the -- atomistic school, and after the Pythagorean school, you see, which tried to run politics on -- on physis- -- physicists' lines, back comes some ethicist and says, "That's all nonsense." You see, "The laws of the city," you see, "are the first -- we have to revise. And then we have to give laws to the universe, as though we were legislators of the universe."

So you find this all on these pages. And I can only whet your appetite. But these few lines -- after all, the whole book has 150 pages, you see, are just as important as the bigger and the smaller prophets in the Bible. They are the whole history of the human mind, believe it or not. Nothing can be thought that these people have not already started thinking about, because they were exposed to serious thinking, and you only fool around. I mean, for you it's just a plaything in your bull sessions. It's not a question of life and death. But to these people, for their political survival, the question: what is the small community and the large universe, you see, to me? and how do the two fit together? how much have I to be loyal to the laws of my country? do I have to go to war for my country? do I have to become a citizen of the world?--all this has been thought out here -- very carefully, and much better than you think it out. And you better dip then into these pages, if you want to sharpen your wits, gentlemen, because your wit is very blunt. Compared to these Greek people, you cannot think. There has been a great regress. The -- the intelligence of the American and of the European at this moment is I think at an all-time low. The primitive way in which you consider the questions of the universe can't be beaten. It's just all trash. It's on the level of -- of things that can be sold immediately by the millions, gentlemen. A -- a newspaper that says by -- 5 million copies like Life, can only be stupid. So the miracle of these men is -- remains very great, gentlemen. In antiquity--may I say this before we have a break, gentlemen?--in antiquity, the individual achievement is greater than in our time. Our time, our -- the last 1900 years have the -- have the task of combining. Here you have to combine the Old Testament and the Greek philosophy, for example. We -- we combine. And you have -- Hindu and Greek philosophy, and German, and -- and French, and so on. Combination is all we can --. We can do many big things by combination. But the original thinking, gentlemen, the stroke of genius is much greater in antiquity. There has been no progress as to the quality of genius. It is the same at all times. The man who brought fire down from Heaven, Prometheus, certainly was a greater mind than anyone in this room. Your idea is the opposite. You think that you are a greater mind than Prometheus. You are not. We are much smaller, gentlemen. But we cooperate better. These people were more isolated. They had not the men and the machinery to make their -- you see, to fertilize millions of people with one thought. They had to be satisfied to -- to -- to -- tell 10, or 20, or 50. That's the only difference, gentlemen. The quality of mind, gentlemen, is to this day -- and I -- anybody who knows the Greeks will agree to you -- the genius of the Greeks, gentlemen, is

greater than any genius of our own era. And that's why we have to deal with them, you see. They -- they couldn't come to fruition, because they were isolated. It was just this little Greek -- was these little cities. And that's why I tried to place them in their -- in their tiny, small environment of islands in the sea, in the Mediterranean. It's all just to you now specks. You fly over them -- over 20 of these islands in two minutes. That doesn't alter the fact that the quality of the minds, you see, who lived in these islands, was -- was a tremendous one. The fundamentals have all been thought there. If you think that modern physics had just to go back straight to the discussion of the Democritean and the Pythagorean school, only to know what they were doing.

Mr. -- Mr. Mayr, of the department of biology from Harvard came up two years ago. You probably haven't heard him speak about the -- the problem of species in zoology. And -- it was pathetic. My colleagues in the biology department, and all the students, were not up to his question. His question was the question of Aristotle, "What is species?" They had learned something, what species is, but they didn't know what they were talking about. It's a question of questions. What is a species, gentlemen? And you may speak about the origin of species, and not yet know what a species is.

And -- so we are very great barbarians, and the discussion was, as I said, quite tragic. Here was a whole department of zoology. They knew all about the individual animals, but they hadn't idea what they were talking about with regard to the philosophy of their zoology. They didn't know what a species really ought to be. And he spent a whole evening trying to explain to them that the problem already had been put very clearly by Aristotle, but it had been forgotten.

Let's have a break.

[tape interruption]

...could solve this problem. And at the end of Greek philosophy, I think it's a very fitting climax. We have said we know only as much as we love. You cannot love -- know things of people without loving them. This the Greeks did not want to know. And because second impressions are not the loving, but the indifferent impressions, the ones by which you are sober, by which you are objective. Objectivity, gentlemen, does not know lo- -- la- -- lend you -- lead you to knowledge, to real knowledge. It leads you to exploitation. You can use things which you know by your reason. But you know -- don't know what to do with it. It's purely pragmatic.

So my -- Mr. Mandaville, the -- the answer to Mr. Somerset Maugham's student would be, you see, that it isn't enough to study under a Hindu teacher, and it isn't a study -- enough to study with Plato, you see. But you have to do things. You have to serve. You have to sacrifice. You have to love. You have to abandon -- renounce. Where you love, you know.

(Yes, but the point is this fellow { } abandoned the -- he loved a woman, he considered that part of his life, he gave himself entirely to { }, he sacrificed everything { }, and yet he still wasn't completely satisfied.)

Ja, the question is whether the search of truth is not bigger than your personal satisfaction. Why do you have to be satisfied? I hate people who are satisfied. They are disagreeable people.

(In other words, happiness --)

I mean, the real people are the people who are very dissatisfied, first of all with themselves, don't you think?

(How can you be content?)

Wie?

(How can you be content? You were talking --.)

I say you mustn't. You must never be content. No reason why you should be content. Wie?

(You said at the beginning of the course that you can't be -- that you shouldn't always run after happiness. But you said also that people can be content. When { }?)

Oh, as a by-product. I said you probably will be content if you do what is right. But to -- to -- to be -- to -- the attempt to be happy, or to become content, you see, is silly. It's just silly.

(Running after { }.)

It's a by-product. It's a result. Or, it's whatever it is. But certainly we can't aim at it. Anybody who aims at it is like the man who goes to 50 doctors in order

to be healthy. He can never be healthy as long as he doesn't throw out the 50 doctors.

(Well, the story of John Stuart Mill's life, he was brought up by his father and { }. But I suppose the -- the type of education is closer to what you call seeking the truth, very strictly { } school and all the Greek philosophy { }, and as a matter of fact, strongly {schooled in} everything, mathematics at that time. And when he reached the age of 21, he almost had a complete and nervous mental breakdown because of this. And I was just wondering, if you don't think that there is also something besides the search of truth necessary for {wholeness} in human life.)

Well, I mean, there -- there are victims on the -- on any battlefield, and if 20 people study and two go nuts, that's the usual price. Well, I mean -- what do -- what do -- you mean? Here you see that poor {Lamnes} has given up running the mile. I mean, he is a victim of the -- of the -- of the track. What -- what does this say against the running track? Do you see it in the paper? He broke down, all right. Let him break down. Victims, everywhere. It's ridiculous what -- the question's perfectly worthless, with regard to the -- obviously, anything we do we can do wrong. Anything we do we can exaggerate. Anything -- there are always victims. And you have to have victims in order to get the -- run the -- reach the goal. Some reach the goal. Franklin perished at the North Pole, and was never heard of again. And the pole was finally conquered. I mean, what else is there in life?

(Well, what I'm -- what I was trying to point out, Professor Huessy, was that these men, who were not victims, was -- necessarily had something else in life besides what they were famous for. There -- that balanced out their life. I don't think -- I -- maybe I'm wrong, but I don't think human nature has so -- has changed so much that they, unlike us, would not have something else --.)

My dear man. I may say some triviality. But nature is terribly wasteful if you look outside into the natural world. In order to fertilize one -- one pl- -- flower, you mean -- any number of pollen is wasted. And so it is with all our enterprises, gentlemen. Hundred have to try so that one may succeed. There's just no other way of doing it. All these hundred find their satisfaction in the heroic task of participating in this venture, you see. They also run -- ran. But the -- the one man then who is -- that's what I tre- -- tried to tell you about Plato -- without these hundred heroes here, you see, no Plato. Yet you don't have to -- now to learn the system of any one of these men, you see, at full length. We don't even have their writings. And we harvest where they have sown.

Life is, in this sense, tragic, because obviously the better man may be killed. And the less-good man mince their laurels. We have to be aware of this, so that you never must despise the victim. What is so terrible in this country is that you identify the successful man with the martyr and the saint. And you won't have -- you don't wish to have -- think of the martyrs; and you then glorify the cheap heroes, so to speak, who only harvest what the other have sown. And therefore, I -- I want you to understand that in God's eyes, I think, in our maker's eyes, these people who don't have success are just as much loved by Him, much -- as much His children, perhaps even more so than the ones He allows to reach the goal. And they -- if they were not greater souls, they wouldn't have stood the agony, you see, of perishing, and of missing out in the eyes of the world. And they probably reached their goal in -- in- -- inwardly, so to speak, you see. And I think in the eyes of God -- in the eyes of the -- His faithful, they deserve a niche.

That's why I think some relation, gentlemen, to the spirits of the past is necessary for you. I'm so sorry that you don't have it. You have no ancestors, no spiritual forebears, because you don't dare to read these people with the earth-shaking and heart-shaking experience. Heavens! What greatness to sacrifice, to go through this darkness, you see, and to hope -- to come out and -- and to -- not to fe- -- you see, not to give up, not to feel frustrated.

But life is serious, gentlemen. You may say tragic, in this sense, that the individual can only find his peace, you see, by knowing that many must run the race, and only one wins. This is your problem, isn't it?

Before we now turn next time to the story of Socrates and Plato in somewhat more detail, I would like to say one thing about the Pythagoreans. I have tried to tell you that the problem of the Eleatic school is to make the mind independent from first impressions to such an extent that the laws of the city, the laws of Elea, or the laws of Samos, or the laws of -- of Miletus cannot be anything but illusion, or transient, or--you may say "trash"--compared to the lasting truth which the philosophical group tries to face -- as the laws of the universe.

I tried to introduce you to this notion of a universe which was so -- pan, all, you see, that it would not be shaken by any phenomenon of a purely local, or a purely temporal character. And Parmenides put these two worlds one against the other, and says, "The language, the talk of the town, the logos of the

city, the words of the co- -- religion and of the intercourse of the citizens must not influence our study of the laws of the universe." And I told you that against him Heraclitus rants, because he says, "This man destroys the loyalties of citizenship, the loyalties of piety, because he says this is all just limited, temporal, and local. And I -- have lasting and universal truth only, not only with regard to the dead, physical world, but even with regard to my loyalties towards this city, and towards the gods of my city." And, for example, take the very practical question of service in the war. From the Parmenidean standpoint, there is no way of ever explaining that a soldier should fight for his country, because that is not being, you see. That's unreal; it's illusion.

And so the Hindu attitude, for example, of nonresistance, of nonfighting which you love so much, goes very well together with this Parmenidean philosophy, because it says that wars are illusions. The parts of the universe are already united, and if we don't -- can't unite them, we go to war; we misunderstand our position with regard to the true laws of the universe.

What I'm driving at is, gentlemen: the destruction of the normal language of man is the first result of philosophy. And in my paper, I have tried to show you that Heraclitus is opposing this destruction and this replacement of pronouns like "being" and "that" and "this," and "the thing" for the named orders of this city of Miletus, or Ephesus, or Elea, in which I say, "I'm a -- not a citi- -- a citi- -- zen of a city, but I'm the citizen of Elea, and I'm very proud of this." And if you say, "I'm -- Eleatic," you act differently from when you say, "I'm just a citizen of one city," you see. If an American says, "I'm American," he's proud. If he says, "I'm a citizen of a little place in Illinois," that's quite a different feeling, you see, because he even suppresses the name, because he assumes that you don't even know the name.

So you see, you -- we today have this experience: always the philosophical is, "I'm a citizen of a little town there -- there." That's one out of many. But "I'm an American," that's of -- not one out many. That's what you are, you see. You can't get out of this, by saying "I'm a citizen of one of the nations of the world." You'll never say that. You always say, "I'm" -- you are an American. Philosophy put -- making every city, only one out of many, reduces patriotism, reduces religion to relativity, and reduces also the love of family, and the love of friends to something which can be exchanged for a hundred other things. And it weakens man. And it makes you into these mental decadents, which you are. In your head, the abstractions rule. You really think that a nation, a city is as good as your nation, and the city -- my city. It isn't, gentlemen.

It's something totally different. For your city, you have obligations. For a city, you can do city planning. You can be hired as a city planner. But you can go to any city to plan it. And it isn't your city. Something quite different. And your family is one thing, and families in sociology quite another thing.

But that's a constant thing introduced by Parmenides into the world. And it destroys the first language of mankind, the native language, the idiomatic language, and -- which is always -- religious, which always begins with the word "God," with the word "prayer," with the word "devotion," and then goes onto praise, and thanking, and scolding, and judging, and so on.

Now gentlemen, Pythagoras -- this is what I'm driving at, steps into this dangerous zone. He says, "If we could find a language of the universe, we would not have to have an idiomatic language in our hometown. We could abolish Greek and Egyptian. We could abolish Doric and Attic. We could not and would not have to speak dialect, because there may be a universal language of the universe." And the great temptation of Pythagoreanism, is, gentlemen, is always that you can perhaps hope to find numbers, and to express the secret of the universe in numbers only.

If you say that an octave relates as one to two, you see, in music, you feel there is no contradiction possible. It's valid, you see, for all. And therefore, gentlemen, I thought I might make this point, that whereas Parmenides destroys language, Heraclitus tries to save it; Pythagoras tries to replace it. He is the only -- or the first man of rank who sees that when you abolish your first impressions--and that is your native language, and its power over your heart and mind--then you have to find a second language. The -- Parmenides doesn't find the second language. He abstracts to -- to say being is not a language. That's just thinking. That's inside language, so to speak. It is without force, without -- into the outside world. Well, you can never hope to tell a farmer what being is, you see. It's only for philosophers, so to speak, the Parmenidean language. The language of thinkers is a language of thinkers. But the language of Pythagoras, that's what Pythagoras hoped, might be expected to penetrate everybody, if it -- and as far as it is possible.

So Pythagorean teaching of numbers is a remarkable venture. And it has the great temptation in our time again. And Pythagoreanism has never died out and will never die out. And it is a very wise -- it has great wisdom, under one condition that you understand it a little better than it is understood today.

Pythagoras says that everything can be expressed in figures. But the second sentence is always omitted from your brain. You don't know that figures have

qualities. I've written a whole book on this, The Multiformality of Man--some may know it--in which I've tried to show that 2 is not just 1 and 1. It has a quality of its own; 3 has a quality of its own; 4, 7, 9. You laugh at this. Today, it is considered a superstition that the -- there are nine gifts of the Holy Spirit, or that there are -- the Church has always considered seven sacred, like the Jews, with the seven-day sabbath, which has very profound reasons that it should be seven days. And -- you laugh, and call "superstition" the quality which the ancients felt to be in the various numbers.

In order to explain to you what I -- what this means, I have great hardship. Give you an example of the Pythagorean thinking, which is adopted, by the way, in the Catholic Church to this day, that if you want to speak to the world, of the nondivine part of our experience, the -- the created world, the universe, in the -- in the sense of -- without the -- the logos, without God speaking, what you call "nature," that it can only be covered by the figure 4, and not by 3. Divine is -- is the Trinity; 4 is the world; the two together are 7. To you, that is mere bunk. If you talk to a Unitarian, if you talk to a modern rationalist, if you talk to a Free Mason, they cannot understand this. To me, it -- has simply the full ring of truth, gentlemen. It means not that 1, and 1, and 1, and 1 make 4. And then you should stop and say, "Worship 4." That would be superstition. The -- the reason for the Pythagorean, so-called tetractys--who has already read about the Pythagorean tetractys? Who's writing on -- on Pythagoras? Who's writing on Pythagoras? Well, you'd better get going, Sir. It's very exciting.

If you have the word "God," gentlemen, the Trinity means that we have to make three starts before we understand what can be meant by God. If you do not bring yourself into three different positions, the best you can say of God -- that is, in your mind, like a man. A man you can conceive of by { }. Ja, I meet you, and that's one. Now obviously, the divine majesty, who has created the world before we were, who lives at this moment, gentlemen, who is to be at the end of the world en- -- accomplished, will use us as His instrument in the process, cannot be had in one breath. You have to allow yourself time, before you are aware of the divine majesty. It's just disrespectful to deny the Trinity, and to speak of God as one which you can have in one concept. God is not a concept. God is more alive than you and I. And He is at least three -- what you think of three different people: your -- the founder of your race, perhaps; your best contemp- -- best-loved contemporary, that's your wife; and the final product, the last man. They together may give you an idea who God is. That's a minimum. So the Trinity, gentlemen, is not really God Almighty himself, but it is that minimum--perhaps I should put it this way to explain my thought--before you can dare to say that you have a right to take the name of God into your mouth

without -- without blasphemy, is that you may -- take the trouble of giving it time. And you have to make three starts.

That's a very simple explanation of the Trinity. Before, you haven't breathed three times, you -- you aren't even near the divine spirit. For human affairs, you can spit out all your words just at once. But if you deal with something -- somebody so superior to ourselves, we have to give it this amount of time that three times, we have to break down our little logic, and are willing to see the same truth in three different sides and three different manners: Son, Father, and Holy Spirit.

Now, the same true -- is true of the world. The Church and the Pythagoreans agree, that before you could know what the universe was, you had to look into four directions. That comes from the very primitive experience of north, south, east, and west, you see, that there are four directions of the globe, and it comes from the very interesting fact that nobody, except man, can move in all four directions of the globe. The sun can never get north. The moon can never get north. The stars in the -- in the North which you see, never move. They are the polar stars, you see, who move around the pole. And therefore the cleavage in the real world is, gentlemen, that its parts can never get to each other. Only man can bring -- can, so to speak, move in this universe.

That's one of the reasons why the four was chosen. The other reason is, of course, that we have one -- the world is -- is not God, because it contains death. And God is not subject to destruction, to death. The world is. So the element of death, you -- you see, is -- enters -- wherever you want to distinguish "world" and "God," it's very simple. That which is mortal belongs to the world. That's -- another consideration.

What I'm driving at, however, is simply this: reality has to be looked upon at least in four parts before we are -- can be sure that we have reached its tremendous abundance, its multitude, its plurality. William James has rediscovered this. He was a { } Pythagorean. He said, "I'm a pluralist." It is impossible in one system, in one mathematical equation, in one physical, you see, theory to exploit the wealth of the universe. It's just nonsense to say, "all is electron." I -- one of you asked me why it shouldn't all be electron. Well, if it -- I'm also electron, but I'm so many other things, too. I'm vocal, Sir. Electron doesn't speak. If you describe me as being electrons, you omit the best feature about me, you see, that I can prattle.

So the four means that a whole, a total, a globe, a -- a universe can come

to your and my experience only if you make four attempts, you see. Four then is the minimum for understanding holism, as General Smuts in South Africa has called it, a whole. You understand. the problem of the four then is that it is that minimum of effort to get hold of a universe, of a whole. You can't have it just by going logically, as you think you can, in a system, in a nice system. Most physicists think this, too, most so-called philosophers. Begin with A, and then come to B, and then by syllogism, you see, work it up to C. And Pythagoras said, "That's good for logic. That's for your brain," you see. But your brain never gets into reality, if he doesn't break away from your -- this inner logic, you see, which is dualistic, you see: object-subject. The reality is illogical. It is translogical. It is so { } that you certainly are only containing yours- -- confining yourself to brain operations inside yourself, if you do not look out of the window and say, "There are four directions of the globe. There is life and death." That's perfectly logical, you see. One thing is here today. It isn't there tomorrow. Perfectly logical, you see. In logic, I saw this thing here. Why isn't { } us again, you see? Because it died. What's death? I don't understand. The first thing the philosophers try to say, "Death doesn't exist," you see. "You are immortal." Just fiction, you see. Very bad philosophy, but it has been held by many philosophers, like the Stoics, for example.

By which I mean then that Pythagoras was very superior to the logicians.

Pythagoras wanted to limit logic. And so he said the tetractys is the beginning of wisdom. I may say a word about this next time.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(This is the second side.)

[tape interruption]

...respect, or reverence for the great power that is in numbers. They -- they are brazen enough to say, "If I can number a thing, I -- so what?" Anybody who deals with the Pythagorean paper should think twice before he delivers it to me, because I will not accept any impertinence, or brazenness, or insolence. It's a very solemn thing to hear the harmony of the spheres. And those -- who deals with Pythagoras? There's only one? Well, he -- ja. You do well to read in -- in a translation, of course--this is a very brief thing--at least the Timaeus by Plato, once through. It's a short thing to read, but there you find the response to Pythagoreanism in -- by a mind like Plato. He wasn't a Pythagorean, but in his old age, he -- he heard also the harmony of the spheres. And as a matter of fact, the greatest expression of the Pythagorean secret is today for us in the Timaeus, a -- a dialogue of the latest years of Plato.

With regard to Aristotle, the opposite is true. There is so much we have about -- from Aristotle's pen, that I have never thought that you sh- -- could read everything -- that would be even useful to recommend an extended reading. I would suggest that you take up two books in full. Either Politics and Poetics, or the Constitution of Athens and the Nichomachean Ethics, or the pol- -- book on politics. But there have to be at least two full-fledged books which you analyze in your paper to get to the method. You can also get his books on animals and plants, because he created, as the first man in history, the power to describe something objectively.

And so it's a question of your own selection. And I don't want to make any -- pre- -- prescribe anything, I -- because Aristotle is really of an amazing universality. And if I would cut out a -- a certain book, I would prejudice your own taste. Anybody who is interested in the natural sciences will go to his natural sc- -- scientific writings. They are, as -- with regard to style and representation I think, just as exciting as the political writings or the literary writings. I don't think there is -- in my mind, any one writing by Aristotle in which his greatness is greater, so to speak, than in the others. If you always keep in mind that in -- with Aristotle we reach this moment of quiet contemplation of the width of the universe, of the famous Greek "pan," including man, including the variety of states.

Also if one of you writes a pa- -- who is a -- dealing with Aristotle? What I -- all of you want to do is to meditate on this tremendous undertaking of his that he had 158 constitutions of different states worked over, and represented objectively, not swallowing them all up in a ni- -- neat system of politics, as we write our textbooks on government today, but expounding carefully the workings of 158 different systems, so that every one would -- could be done justice, and could stand out in its own light, so to speak, and on its own merits. We have only one of these books today. But the principle of his -- of his assortment, of his selection, of his undertaking deserves your -- a clear statement in your paper, because in addition to the -- to the -- you may say, notes his students got from his lectures, which we now today call his books, these -- many s- -- of his real writings, which he wrote himself, dialogues and others, are lost. And it's very unfair today to compare Aristotle -- the Aristotelian bulk of literature with the Platonic, because the proper doctrine of Plato was never written. And his dialogues are sideline books. And he says so himself in his Seventh Letter. Who is dealing with Plato?

So first, to finish my word -- words on Aristotle. So be careful not to -- not to be dismayed, so to speak, by the lack of beauty in Aristotle's books. Most of it has been preserved by notes, you see, taken down by his students. What is it? (How should we { } with Aristotle?)

Well, as much as you can. He is the real -- the real son of Aristotle. And by -- you see, he adds to Aristotle the -- the dealing with characters, with human types, you see. So he tries to go on from the animals and plants and even follow this into human nature. And his characters to this day are outstanding descriptions of temperament, you see.

I think there is -- I must leave this to you, just as I leave the selection of the writings of Aristotle to you. I think in Theophrastus, it becomes clear where the -- what the ultimate, so to speak, is. The highest. Most -- gentlemen, most great men reach their achievement in their best students, in their best pupil, you see. You cannot understand Christ without Paul. It's the -- has been the fashion of the last hundred years to say that Paul spoiled Christianity. But he didn't. He made it understandable, and he has saved it. And nobody understands Christ who doesn't understand Paul. And this habit of killing Paul in order allegedly to love Christ is a very bad habit. And I think it's waning -- wearing off today. It has been done with a great ruthlessness, and -- and great lack of taste. So with Theophrastus and Aristotle, it's -- similar, you see. He's his best stu- -- pupil. And

the real man, you see -- the man who got it all from Aristotle, you see, and where it stands out very clearly.

With regard to Plato. Every one of you has to deal with the Seventh Letter. The Seventh Letter is his own statement about the relation of his writings to his teachings. If you don't read the Seventh Letter, then you do not understand the place which he gives himself to his literature. And you are all so paper-minded, and paperbound-minded, that you think when a man writes a book, that's the man. Far from it, gentlemen, you see. You don't know Plato if you -- don't see his life. His achievement is the -- the great 80 years, which he lived from 4 -- what are his dates? Who knows the life dates of Plato? Well, then I have to assume that you haven't even started on your paper on Plato. That's the first thing, after all. When a man writes about another man, the -- he goes and looks up his dates and learns them by heart. Otherwise you can't know anything about the man. Funny idea. Do you know when you have been born? Well, without it, you are lost. If you don't know whether you are 15 or 28, you don't know how to behave.

You -- this is not -- not ridiculous, gentlemen. I assure you that as long as you haven't put down the li- -- dates of -- of Ari- -- of Plato and made clear that he was 28 years old when Socrates died, in his absence, to his great dismay--and that is the real tragedy of Plato's life, as I told you--then you don't understand Plato, how he spent the rest of -- 42 more years of immortalizing Socrates. That's a very strange relation. Twenty-eight is 4 times 7. These are four phases of growth. And there were left to him how many more years?--42 years, is that right?--and that's 6 times 7. And you can see that his life consists of at least six stations after the death of Socrates. And these stations are very important, because he changes constantly and finds new ways of doing what he -- the death of Socrates obliges him to do. He's under the spell of this event for the rest of his life.

So the dates 428 to 348 are of utmost importance. They are also of such importance because you must take down the date when Aristotle was born.

When was he born? Does nobody know that? Wie?

(427.)

That's Plato. And Aristotle?

(385.)

What?

(385.)

Are you sure?

(385 or 384.)

Ja, I think it's 3-8-4. Well, that's very important, because the -- the Academy is founded in 3-8-7. So you must think that Aristotle is born into a going concern. And that he is such a classic is that he hadn't to pay the penalty, the -- hadn't given his blood for the blood bank of founding the Academy. That's a great difference, gentlemen. If you are a founder, you have to waste your time to make people see what should be done. If you are born into something, you see, you can proceed to do it. You see the difference?

And there- -- that's the real break between Plato and Aristotle, gentlemen, that Plato's whole life is consumed in making to the Greeks this point clear that there should be a center of free studies not subservient to any one city. That's the Academy. And we have led up to this. All the time, I've tried to explain to you that although Plato is an Athenian, and although he is founding a school in Athens, the school is not of Athens, but is the heiress, the inheri- -- the heritage of the achievement of all of Greece, like the Trojan War. Just as all Greeks waged the war and came to common consciousness in Homer, you see, so a second time the Academy brings together all the achievements from all the cities of Greece, including the colonies in the Far East, in Afri- -- and in the Far West, in Africa, and Cyrene, in Italy, in Sicily, you see. And it's a homecoming of all these, you see, stormy petrels. And that's a great scenery, isn't that? It's a -- much different from what you learn. Plato founded the Academy in Athens. If I had let you believe this, you see, you wouldn't understand what's importance. Any Podunk in America today can found an academy. And if you just take the words "academy" and "city," you haven't -- you have no idea what Greek philosophy is about.

Now with Aristotle then, the dates are again terribly important. And when he dies, the whole western Mediterranean, gentlemen, is no longer governed in cities, but in -- by kings, in big states. Alexander has come, has smashed up all these hundreds of cities. And he has been the new Achilles. And whereas in the Trojan War, Achilles dies and the Greeks return home, you can say that in the Alexandrian empire, the cities, with all their named heroes, you see, die, lose their independence. And what is remaining is the Hellenistic, one

world of the Mediterranean inher- -- to be inherited later by the Romans, as you know it. What you call "classical civilization" is the gift of Alexander and the Romans to us.

So, gentlemen, perhaps you see now the tremendous way in all your papers, you will have to be aware that -- who is dealing with the Stoics? You see, the Stoics only come into their own after that--Epicurus, too--when the world has already become one, you see. When nobody can hope to live in one city, because you already live in tremendous territories. Alexander has come and -- and learned too well from Aristotle, you see, what to do. Alexander is, you know, the -- the pupil of Aristotle, and -- you cannot say the "student," because he certainly did not carry out Aristotle's dreams or visions. It's a -- he is a dis- -- he is not a disciple of Aristotle. He's not an Aristotelian. He's a young god who -- who sows the relativity of this academic and peripatetic knowledge by doing the very opposite.

So the -- the -- the greatness of this century, of -- of the 4th century, gentlemen, is then in these very dates. Socrates is born when?

(169.)

Is it -- 340? I thought he died in 348. Isn't that right?

(347.)

And Aristotle dies when?

(342.)

Now, here is the real- -- reign of Alexander. Here is the famous Peloponnesian War. Here, before, goes -- go the -- the tremendous battles of liberation of the Greeks of -- for freedom against the Persians. Which are the two great battles?

(Marathon and Thermopylae.)

Quite. So from the outside, Greece is saved for another 150 years. But then, from the north -- from their own Prussian North, from Macedonia, which is very much like the Prussians in Germany, comes the unifying force, Alexander overrides all these hundreds of cities, unifies them, and pays -- the payoff is that he makes all the other realms around the Mediterranean Greek. After -- this

is the battle again- -- against the older civilizations, here. Persians--and of course that includes Babylon and Egypt--all the pre-Greek empires, you see, are smashed, or are stopped here. Then Alexander comes -- as you know, marches into Persia, defeats the great king of Persia, and what remains after 323 in the Mediterranean world, down to Babylon and down to Assyr, is Greek. So he replaces the pre-Greek empires with a Greek empire -- Greek-speaking empires. They are kingsh- -- kingdoms subdivided under, but they all speak Greek. When the Romans come, it's like a natural rehabilitation of the Alexandrian dream. Alexander the Great carries, as the pupil of Aristotle, the Greek thought of the Academy, of the Stoics, of the Epicureans, of all the schools of Greek thought -- also into non-Greek, you see, the non-Greek world. And we have it for this reason today. You may say that as a -- as a Saks- -- vaccine has to be vaccinated first on a little culture--and then it can be sent to all the schoolchildren, you see, in America--in the same way, gentlemen, in antiquity, Greek thought was vaccinated in a test case on the whole Mediterranean, and today if you tol- -- go to the United Nations, that's very Greek indeed. And our Olympic Games in Melbourne, and our United Nations in New York are the Greek aspect of the world--isn't the whole aspect of the world. You can't live the United Nations alone. And you can't live by the Olympic Games alone. But it's an essential part of our existence. And it has all been exercised or trained into us for the first time 2,000 years ago. And that's why the games in Melbourne are called the Olympic Games, you see. And that's why the -- the term which is used in the United Nations incessantly is "politics," that's the Greek word "polis." We have not taken over the word "em-" -- "empire." We have not taken over the word "theocracy" from the Egyptians or the Babylonians, you see. We speak of "politics." That's Greek.

And if you could see this -- these dates, gentlemen, in their true light, you should learn them, gentlemen--well, as you learn skiing, or as you learn any practical thing. These figures are full of significance, because it shows you how much it -- long it takes, to develop a new serum, a new vaccine to immunize any one city of man, you see, against seclusion. To open it up, and to make it -- put it into connection, you see, with a mental process, you see, that is bigger than McCarthy in Wisconsin.

Socrates dies from the hand of Mr. McCarthy in 399. The accusation is that the gods of Athens do not suffice for him. And I think the accusation was true. And I think under the laws of Athens, he was justifiably -- you see, condemned. And this is for you a hard lesson, gentlemen. But the story of Greek philosophy is that the intrusion of a new dimension of thinking, this universal

dimension, that you think for the whole world, has to be bought at a price. What you don't -- not understand, gentlemen, is that in a tragedy, both sides can be right. And in the death of Socrates, to which I now -- wish to turn today, especially, the main problem is and -- is acknowledged by -- by Socrates in his Criton, and we spoke about this before, you see, is that -- progress in humanity does not come about in the simple and silly way that one man is wrong -- your parents are wrong, and you are right; or you are wrong and your parents are right, gentlemen. But your parents are right, and you are right. And then life becomes interesting. They defend something important, and you defend something important, you see. And at one moment, it isn't yet decided how the two can live together. And therefore, both sides are right. And both sides, you see, are too narrow. They haven't yet found a way in giving room for this other life. So the Athenians, from their point of view, I think, can be called blind men--just as the Jews, when they crucified the Lord--narrow men, deaf men, but they were not in the sense unjust, according to their own law. The law has to be fulfilled, even if it hasn't yet been abolished. You can only conclude from 399 that the Athenians now had to open up a place in their suburb, called later the Academy, in which a Socrates, you see, could exist without being accused by the citizens of Athens of heresy, and of defying the Athenian gods, because he was trying to make the Athenian gods rhyme and square with God in the universe. So the main point I wish to make about Socrates is, gentlemen, today that he was the tragic figure in which the new element of universal thought, of a thought of second impressions, of critical thought, came to blows with the world of first impressions. To you, who live in such a loose world of only second impressions, you live by abstraction, your head is full of abstractions like philosophy and politics. And that's all abstract, gentlemen. And your -- you are full of theology. If you analyze the vocabulary of an American senior in -- in college, out of nine words which you use, eight are abstracts, and one is concrete. And you don't even know what an abstract is. You -- most of you think that the abstract is concrete and the concrete is abstract. You know what con- -- how to define concrete? What's the difference between abstract and concrete? Pardon me?

({ } the other is more his ideological idea { } .)

Well, I would go so far to say that a full concrete, see -- you are not a concept. You are concrete, you see. So the -- the complete concrete, you see, cannot be covered or explained by a -- a concept, you see. A concept always takes some generalization, you see. You can only conceive of something if you

abstract from its specific, you see, thing, and put it into some class. You have to classify it. And already -- when I begin to classify you, I do you wrong. You see. You are quite unique, Sir. You are a human being, but I haven't said very much if I say you are a human being, you see. And your wife can't do anything with a human being. She -- can only do something with you. I mean. We marry one, you see, person.

So a person is concrete, you see, and is not abstract. And persons, of course, are the most -- the holy resisters against abstractions, and I tried to show you that in Greek philosophy, the saving grace has always been the philosopher. He is the one concrete miracle, you see, which remains undissolved. The -- Pythagoras himself, Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, you see. Unshaken, he is a person. And you remember that I tried to show you that there are three miracles, and not one. Instead of what you think, yes. I wish to -- can be -- have intellectual curiosity. I may be surprised why the earth turns around the sun. That's only the objective miracle. That's a fact, you see. But the first who can discover this, that this is a miracle, is more miraculous. The big brain of Mr. Einstein is miraculous, much more miraculous than all the laws of relativity. I had to deal in a -- in my Sociology which just appeared with the problem of -- of the Freudians, for example. And I say that there should be in every generation a man like Sigmund Freud, or like Karl Marx, or like Plato -- is much more important than the doctrine of Freudianism, because it is more important that in every generation, a new doctrine can be proclaimed. You must see this. If -- if you say, "Psychoanalysis is everything," the result might be that there might be no heroic men, because we think of every great man later than just as a lunatic who has an Oedipus Complex, you see. And if you declare every great man in the future as a man who -- deal -- who comes, you see, out of inhibition, repression, Oedipus Complex, inferiority complex, superiority complex, you see, et cetera, then out goes greatness. Out goes innovation, because you -- you have then analysts who put these people in their strait-jackets. That's all that happens to the great man then.

So the person of Freud is much more important, from my point of view of life, in the community, and the future of this country, that there should be in the next generation freedom again for a man to teach -- I don't know what. I don't know it, but I must make room for his -- appearance. Can you see this? Same with Marx. You see it now with the trouble they have in Russia, you see. By having deified one doctrine, you see, they can't go on. You see, they are absolutely hamstrung at this moment, a dead-end street, because they have declared that a doctrine developed in 1847 is the ultimate doctrine, which is utter non-

sense, obviously, you see. And that's the nonsense about Bolshevism. Not what they -- what they teach, but that they teach that this is ultimate doctrine.

So gentlemen, you can only cure yourself from this, if you see that the Greeks in Socrates, in Plato, in Aristotle, in Pythagoras, in Thales, in all these sages have names to conjure with, to save themselves from the mere admiration of the objective statements of these men. Can you see this? So to admire the philosopher, gentlemen, is the corollary to admiring the philosophy. If you do not admire the philosopher, the creative spirit who has brought up the philosophy, you will admire a makeshift, a manmade mannequin, a -- philosophy. Whereas you have to admire the tremendous brain that is able to develop such a philosophy, you see. And these we need at all times. This is the real problem of freedom.

Gentlemen, we owe our freedom as -- as general citizens of the world, as -- as millions only to the deep conviction of any im- -- civilized group, that they have to make room for genius. You see. It's genius that saves you and me from being herded to the polls in a one-party system, because in democracy we say we don't know the next leader, you see. We give -- must give the minority a chance to become the majority. Now that's exactly the same story as Mis- -- Mr. Freud's life story, who was for 30 years rejected by everybody, you see. And now in this country, you run amok with him. But that will wear off, of course, and there must be room for somebody else who contradicts Mr. Freud or has something else important to say. I don't know what.

So the -- third miracle, gentlemen, then is: the currency which greatness and genius is given in a community that hates it at first, that the ethics of the pro- -- process of teaching of knowledge, of education, you see, that we have to learn that Socrates executed for high treason and blasphemy in 399, in 387 can become the god of the Academy -- or the good spirit of the Academy in the suburbs of Athens. And that people, although they have strangled his physical existence, bow to the evidence, are overcome, you see, by a new ethics, and therefore, the logos of Socrates becomes the ethics of the Greeks, you see, on the physics of the universe. You remember my constant repetition of these three items?

And therefore there are three miracles in the world, gentlemen. The logical miracle, they are great minds, in seeming contradiction in every generation renewing the life of our race. The -- ethical miracle, that although at first they are -- sound impossible and madmen, we finally bow and make room for the current which they create, for the stream of life which they impart. And

third, that the universe looks different when we bow ethically to the logical power of these spirits.

You will find it again and again that without this careful division of the logical, and the ethical, and the physical, you have no philosophy. Today man in modern society has no philosophy, because he treats genius also as physical, and God also as a fact. God is not a fact, gentlemen. It's a power that makes you say something new. That's something quite different. That's the best I can tell you about what we know of God. The first thing we -- we know is that you can make a declaration of love today where you haven't made one yesterday. That's such a tremendous fact in your life that you know that God is the power who allows you this freedom. Yesterday, you said, "I'll never marry a girl from Cleveland. It's a terrible city." Tomorrow you go and propose to her. You are overcome by a new power, a new affection. I mean, that's a joke, you understand. But you might have said that you will never marry a Jewess, or you will marry -- never marry a Muslim girl, or a Negro girl, you see. And tomorrow, you'll go and you are overcome, you see, by the new truth that you have to do just the very thing you have defied before, you see, you'd never do.

This is the -- the new logos. This is the logos in action. That's not what you call "logic," of course. And I warn you, what Americans call philosophy, and ethics, and logic, has nothing to do with Greek philosophy. What you call "ethical" is what your Aunt Elizabeth thinks is ethical. That's not ethics. And what you call is -- "logical" is what an -- a man -- an accountant can -- can do in arithmetic. Of course, arithmetic is very good, but has nothing to do with philosophy, gentlemen. Philosophy is the discovery that in every one moment, new truth is breaking in, and that you may be the vessel of this new truth. God speaks through you, every minute, unexpectedly, against our will.

Most people, gentlemen, who have proclaimed the new truth, have been very reluctant to do it. The people who are very eager to -- to proclaim something usually don't proclaim truth. Walter Winchell doesn't proclaim truth. He's very eager to proclaim something every day over the radio, you see. But just isn't truth. Don't tell him, because otherwise he'll attack me, too.

Well, such a scoundrel -- what have you, I mean? There is no truth in this. There is no logos. That's sadism. That's black joy, the misfortunes of other people.

So this is and remains then the -- the -- the key to our -- your treatment also of your term papers, gentlemen. You must always see that the coming in of

this philosophy at a certain time, as a power, integrated into the life stream of all our thought ever since, is the problem to be respected. It isn't -- can't be brushed aside as, "Oh, he just says this. So what?" You have to say, "Imagine! One day a man discovered the sanctity of numbers -- the quality of numbers." And with -- at this point, I'm now back to Pythagoras.

I -- we ended the last time, as you remember, with the tetractys. And what is remaining in Plato in the Timaeus and in Aristotle, out of the Pythagorean thought is something that we have to re- -- reconquer today, the quality of numbers. The quality of numbers. You only know that numbers have -- are quantities. You think that 4 -- you remember, we talked about this before -- are only 1, 2, 3, 4 and then you go on, 5, 6, 7. But gentlemen, a century even has a quality of its own. A century is not a hundred years, or 3,600 -- 524 days, according to the astronomical calendar. But you and I are members of a century that overpowers you and me. Because we belong to a certain century, you see, we can't think -- differently. When this century ends, it will dismiss our posterity from this same hypnosis. But we poor people are in the 20th century. So we, obviously, if we don't discover the -- the power of the quality which a century has over us, you see, by some truer worship of truer gods than the g- -- spirit of the times, we are just contemporaries.

Most of you, as you know, at this moment deny that numbers have any spell or -- yet you all boast that you are Class of '57, or Class of '56, or Class of '58, Class of '59. And the greatest example of this was given in 1940 in this college. A friend of -- here, a colleague of mine, Professor Bartlett, gave a paper to write on St. Augustine to a student. And he got the amazing reply, "Here I am, a senior in Dartmouth College in the year of the Lord 1940. I think that my predecessors in this college who went to war in 1917, were pretty stupid. They were taken in by warmongers. And I feel very superior to these people who went before me by 23 years. How can I be asked now to write on a man who died in 430 A.D.?" That was his logic. That's a typical, you see, contemporary, boasting, you see, of the spirit of his own day, and not seeing the quality, the limitation of only being a spirit of his own day, and being unable to understand the importance of a man who -- who wrote -- who lived 5- -- 1500 years before him. The total impotency.

And I think it has hit most people today, they are impotent to listen to any truth that has nothing to do with the spirit of the times. You are quite sure that you know everything you have to know from reading the newspapers. But they stifle your sensibilities, gentlemen. They make you deaf. They do exactly what the Bible says, "They have ears and they don't hear. And they have eyes,

and they don't see." That's the business of the newspapers. They make such a noise, you see. And they have so many pictures that you cannot see a little more on the long wavelength, you see, of the -- all the times.

Therefore, I go back to something simpler, gentlemen. I tried to tell you that the so-called tetractys of the Pythagoreans meant that in -- when you deal with anything in the world, you must never be satisfied by reducing it to two or three. Like capital and labor. I have written a whole book, *The Multiformity of Man*, to say that if you do not take in the man- -- the salesmen, and the engineers, the inventor in the business of industry, you'll never understand industry. Industry is not management and labor, you see. It's sales, as well as inventions, innovations, technological change, you see, which is neither labor nor management, obviously, but grows in another potato field. And there again I have made the -- who knows *The Multiformity*? Some of you must have read it. Well, it's just another attempt to be a Pythagorean. That is, not to deal with anything worldly, with -- fewer instances than at least four. Only -- when I take four different points am I sure that I am not forcing the issue by my little logic here, up here, you see, by my -- the play of my mind. The outer world, gentlemen, is not logical, but has to be experienced in its vastness and four is the protection.

Now in -- in Greek philosophy, this played a tremendous part practically then, with Plato, with Aristotle, because of the four cardinal virtues. Already in the 5th century, before Plato, and before Socrates, it was recognized that you cannot describe a man's virtues by saying "He's virtuous." That would be empty, you see, or "He's good." As soon, however, as you try to -- to analyze, you found at least four qualities, which may not be sufficient, but at least four. And you know which they were. Everybody knows the four cardinal virtues, don't you, of -- of the Greek. Please.

(Temperance, justice, courage, and -- { } word.)

Prudence. Let's put them here. They can of course be expressed in different terms. Courage and--what's the { }--justice. Now you can say justice is the distribution of prudence, temperance, and courage. That is, you can pru- -- put prudence -- justice, if you like to, in the center, and have the three, you see, go out like rays. Or you could put them in a square. The important thing is, don't try to reduce one to the other. You see. Don't try to say that you can say courage is temperance, and prudence is justice, you see. As soon as you do, resist this temptation of all the little logicians. To have lesser, and fewer, and fewer things, and reduce everything to this big monism--number 1, everything is water;

everything is this--then you are a Pythagorean, because you have given the number 4 this quality to deal with reality.

Will you take this down, gentlemen? The number 4 has this great merit that it forces you to stay within ex- -- empirical experience, and never get out it -- out of it with neat, logical tricks. You can, of course, argue, argue -- by argument everything has been proved, you see. You -- I can prove that you don't exist. And you can prove that I don't exist, gentlemen. But then I slap you in the face and you suddenly, empirically realize that I do exist. The whole argument hasn't proven anything.

And it -- therefore, gentlemen, don't take this lightly. Through the whole of Greek philosophy, we have inherited to this day this assumption that there are three virtues: prudence, temperance -- four virtues: prudence, temperance, courage, and justice. The argument has only been what they are, how they relate to each other, how you should deal with them, you see, when you should be courageous, when you should be prudent, how you can combine them, et cetera. The -- the great achievement of the Greek mind has been to let them stand. And if you think back to Thales, whose first -- power was to reduce, to unify, to generalize, to say, "There is a common denominator, water" in 582, you see suddenly that the answer now is: Don't reduce too much. There are certain source qualities, genuine, primary elements which must never be reduced.

And therefore, if you read now up on Pythagoras and on the number -- the theory of numbers, you must understand that there is something that has nothing to do with mathematics, but with your best logic. I warn you to try to develop a system in which the -- the flourishing, luscious universe is ever brought under too few articles of faith.

As you know, there are, on the other hand, in dealing with the gods, the three supernatural virtues. There is hope, and faith, and love. And there is a deep reason why God can be explained by three terms. All wor- -- what we call the world, gentlemen, contains death, contains corruption. And the world therefore has always the elements of four. What you call -- when we are forced to speak of forces that rule this world, create this world, restore this world, regenerate this world, judge this world, three is enough, because death is not contained in our description of the Trinity.

So I want -- have promised you last time to show you that the numbers 4, and 3, and 7 are not arbitrary at all. They are not to be gotten by your little brain by numbering 1, 2, 3, then 4, 5, 6, 7, you see. They are only gotten by coming

down from the infinite, to -- infinite of your own spirit, of your wonder -- sense of wonder, and trying to peg numbers on your experiences. And the minimum peg you have to hang onto the word outside of your senses, you see, is 4. If you don't, you go and go -- become a lunatic in a lunatic asylum. Most lunatics with megalomaniac ideas, you see, have systems of thoughts that have given up this important respect for reality and talk just of one or two principles.

In the whole 19th century, you had this bias of the so-called {monists}.

{They said} God is -- just {an excrescence} of your brain, everything is just soap bubble, and everything is {energy}, or everything is atom, or everything is wave, or everything is electricity, you see. These are very stupid people, but they had a tremendous following in the 19th century, because people had given up this spirit of observing their own existence. In as far as you can say something that is true, gentlemen, in hope, and in fa- -- out of faith, and in love to your -- to the person you want to convince, to save by your {saving} word, three is enough. The divine--that doesn't take up space, that doesn't corrupt like the living word--can be -- enter the -- the -- your experience in this form of three.

I can't go into the whole theology of the -- this, but I only warn you:

don't poke fun at the Pythagoreans, and don't poke fun at the Trinity. As long as you poke fun at it, you don't know -- know even the problem that has given rise to these -- both statements. These both statements come from a real experience. And your statements comes from a silly reflec- -- reaction of a schoolboy who learns figures in a -- in arithmetic. That's not { }. That's not experience, what you learn in school, that you can count up to a hundred. You see, that's repetition. That's an echo of other people's numbers, isn't it? You have learned after all just empty words. And you think -- as long as you think that numbers are quantities, you have not entered the problem: what's the relation of numbers to thinking? The relation of thun- -- of numbers to thinking is that 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 are qualities of empirical, you see, living.

I can't say more at this moment. I know that you will not agree with me at this moment. It is beyond your own experience, probably. But all I can do is to put this up as a warning. Despise the people, the grownups who poke fun at these mysteries. They say there are no mysteries. What they only say that they are shameless and that they have lost their sense of wonder.

The very fact, gentlemen, that Socrates, and Plato, and Aristotle were needed to fill the Greek wor- -- the world with Greek thought is miraculous.

And you can't get out of this fact that one man couldn't do it, that you had to have three generations. And for example, the three-generation principle of the

life of the logos, you see, is a tremendous principle. You have it in Christianity. You have John the Baptist, we have the Lord, and the Apostles. Without this, there is no revelation possible. You -- Jesus alone can't do it. He has to have somebody who announces Him, so that people can wait for Him, and promise -- be promised. And He has to have somebody who takes Him up on this. And without the apostolic church and the prophesied church, there is absolutely nothing to Jesus. He is just then out of place, and out of time.

So believe me, the -- the -- the deeper you study the history of Greek philosophy, the more you must look at the march of these great spirits through time, and you must understand. So far, we have given -- I have given you this abstract list of 70 or 90 philosophers here. At this moment, however, we are turning towards the centerpiece of Greek -- the history of Greek philosophy, from Socrates to Aristotle. And the first thing then I want to say is, there had to be three. There had to be three. You couldn't have it cheaper, you see. You couldn't have it in one -- in one man. If you understand it, you will understand that there is an element of admiration, of miraculous ethics in the relation of Socrates to Plato, of Plato to Socrates, of Plato to Aristotle, of Aristotle to Socrates, and of Aristotle to Plato.

So -- when you have three, you have already a very complex relationship, you see, of minds and spirits. And it has -- still debated. But the people who debate the relations of Aristotle, and Plato, and Socrates, always only figure out: what did one say? I'm overcome by the miracle of their collaboration, of their mutual influence, you see, that the -- the spirit did flow, that what one man did, the other didn't have to repeat. He could do something else.

So Socrates, gentlemen, and Plato, and Aristotle represent the first, and you may say also the last, success in Greek philosophy for a division of labor. In the -- in -- in these classical -- famous century from 399 to 322, you may say, Greek philosophy -- for once had this great, miraculous experience, that three independent spirits acted differently and thereby created a unity, something that after this is always exemplified by these three names. If you speak of Greek philosophy today, you cannot -- simply say Aristotle; you cannot simply say Socrates; you cannot simply say Plato. Isn't that very strange?

I hope that what I have -- what I am trying to do is, gentlemen, I have invited you from the beginning to admire these great geniuses. Today, I'm admiring -- asking you to admire something that brought three of these geniuses into focus, into mutual dependency, you see, into something that is more than just sequence in time, you see. It's a division of labor. And that is very

miraculous. And I -- it remains miraculous. And you can ponder for a whole life, whenever you read any of these writings of these three men, you can never forget that the two others faceted, and varied, and made more meaningful one of these three men's sayings. They belong to each other. One begets the other, you see. But it is in a way, it's so -- as though Aristotle and Plato were already contained in Socrates, and as Socrates had to linger on in -- in Plato and Aristotle, you see. And as soon as the Socratic quest died in these Aristotelians of later time, and -- Platonists of later time, and they just repeated their being Platonists alone, { }, they remain sterile.

You have to contain today an element of Socrates, an element of Plato and Aristotle in your -- side yourself if you want to philosophize. Nobody today can say he's "an Aristotelian." Nobody can say he's "a Platonist," and nobody can say he's "a Socratic," gentlemen. This is utterly stupid. An element of all three, you see, is necessary to get yourself moving, to get yourself into -- into real life. Let's have a break.

[tape interruption.]

The greatest miracle in these philosophers is beyond your reach. The -- the form of their lives -- I tried to tell you that the -- Plato's biography certainly is a very miraculous display of a spectrum of colors out of one light. I mean, the consequence of -- of his life, the -- the logic of his life, of his biography is very great. And yet it is constant transformation. He is every 10 years a new man in order to be the same. The motto on my own books -- in my -- my own book sign reads, "Mutabor {tamen manebo}." That means "I shall be changed, and for this very reason, I shall remain the same."

Now I think any living person, gentlemen, has this problem. In order to be the same, you have to be different in every age of your life. That's very strange, but that's how it is, you see. In order to be the same, because an element of your sameness is that you are, for example, vital. Now you can't be vital if only do for 20 years long the same thing. So in order to remain vital you have to do after 20 years something different, you see, so that you are still the same man of whom people said, "He still had some vitality left." Isn't that true?

Now most people don't understand this, that in order to remain the same, we have to change. That is, of course, the greatness of a man like Aristotle, or Plato, and of Socrates. And I can't ask you to do this. It's beyond, I think, your -- your art, and your skill, and -- you have perhaps to have a dim impression that the greatness of this man is in his fulfillment of this tremendous task, to do as

much changing as is necessary to save his aliveness, his vitality. For this, you have to change.

And in Plato's life, it isn't very -- as difficult to grasp, as with Aristotle, because we know Aristotle also had a highly dramatic life. To be the teacher of Alexander the Great is not a minor matter. And to go to a foreign court, and to go to Asia Minor and then return to Athens, and so on and so forth. So you can also dramatize the life of Aristotle. But to see it in connection with his problem of saving the heritage of all the previous thinking from Homer to Socrates, that in a -- that I think is beyond your ken. And therefore, I'm perfectly satisfied if you -- I've given you the task, just to describe for what Plato stands as the founder of the Academy, and not in what phases of life he produced these results.

The second thing, this -- this biographical miracle, I think you should keep in mind that we worship these people as mir- -- miraculous revelations of human power -- of human -- the human art of living, but I think that has to wait. And I hope you will not give up the Greek philosophy, because you have unfortunately taken a course, and written a -- finals in it. That's always the end with you, with any subject matter that you think, "Never again." Greek philosophy is something to be -- to be -- to accompany you. You can take any of these dialogues of Plato and read them with the greatest amazement for the 15th time. It's just like Homer. I read Homer every year, and I read a Platonic dialogue every year, and I've always totally forgotten that I ever read them before. And that does not mean that I haven't read them very attentively and very fruitfully, but there is some -- so -- they have this freshness as a Shakespeare play, or the Bible. You can read this sto- -- first chapter in the Bible as though you have never read it before.

And that's the problem of living, you see. You must meet your wife after -- the silver wedding as though had never seen her before. If you can do this, you can say that you really have loved your life -- wife. If you say after 25 years, "I know her by heart," you'd better get a divorce.

So there is always still something ahead of you. If you describe Plato's philosophy as expressed, for example, in *The Republic*, I shall be very satisfied indeed, if you can do it. This is obviously, gentlemen, on your part only a first attempt. And you treat it as a first attempt. And I hope the -- you don't have to write a second term paper on the same man, but you should know that it is just an attempt to come near these men. And you are not through with them after you have written the paper, obviously. Therefore, it's so hard for me to say --

from what point you shall approach it. I have given you great leeway. You can pick out two or three symptomatic and outstanding contributions of these men, and you can't misread them totally, and something will stand out.

To this I must now turn. I'm -- turn back to Socrates and then we shall -- we shall not devote too much time to Socrates himself, anymore, and then after the vacation next Tuesday, we will settle on reading the fourth book of The Republic here together. Not that this is all you have to -- you have to do. I hope you will read the -- the rest of this -- the three books preceding it, yourself, in the process. But we -- I want to give so much time so that the strange text is -- comes up word by word here in class. So next Tuesday, please bring the Platonic dialogue.

Today I -- have to repeat and to brush up on the problem of Socrates.

Socrates is a legend. He was a legend in Greece, and he's a legend today. That is, there is more talk about Socrates than we possibly can know. That's a legend.

We know very little about Socrates. Or you can say we know so much that we haven't the faintest idea what is really fact, you see, and what is imagination.

The cue to Socrates which you must never forget, and which is very hard for your to understand, but which -- on which you must build your thought, in -- in future years, and I -- I take it there will be in future years on your part the desire perhaps to understand what it is all about, this -- this getting out beyond the commonplace -- is that he asks the questioner. I told you that the problem of Socrates was to turn the process of questioning, you see, so far that he questioned -- would question those who questioned.

If you do not see this second power, this asking to the square, you will always mistake the il- -- the curious question of a child, "Mother? How are the children born?" Or "Is there a God?" Or "Has God a white beard?" for a Socratic question. That's not a Socratic question, gentlemen. That's just a stupid question. In this country, every question is admitted. As long as you cannot cut out and excise stupid questions, gentlemen, there can be no progress, there can be no education, there can be nothing. The -- the best answer to a stupid question remains to this day not to answer it. Nobody seems to have the courage in this country to say, "That's such a stupid question that I won't answer it." You answer every question, and thereby you always get into deep water. That is all you expect. If you ask a stupid question, that somebody is stupid enough to answer it. Never forget that one fool can ask more questions than hundred wise men can answer. That's the first rule of all thinking processes, gentlemen. Why? I remind you. I told you: questioning means the desire for participation of the

ignoramus in a going concern. You ask for the road in a foreign country. You ask for the -- for the cost of a ticket at the -- at the booth, you see. He knows, you don't know. All questions presuppose an {expert}. You can only ask as long as you think there is somebody who knows.

If you -- if you drop this -- this qualification of questioning, you see, that it is an attempt of the outsider to get inside society, you cannot understand the limitations of all asking. -- A question only makes sense if there is a preestablished answer, which this man doesn't know, but which all the others know.

That's how we all move in a foreign country. That's how you move in a foreign -- world of grownups. When you enter a new {thing}, you have to ask. And people are ni- -- kind enough to show you around, as we say.

And as long as this is the relation of question and answer, everything is safe and so -- sane and so. But of course, a child, for example, asks many -- too -- questions, because it just doesn't know where it wants get into. It is so far away from the way of the grownups, you see, that it asks anything. So the one condition for the question, and for the questioner is that he is seriously loving the group which can answer the question. If you are not -- haven't the real desire to ask for the road to the harbor, because you want to go on this road to the harbor, you don't deserve an answer. Can't you see this?

The child that asks, you see, about the white beard of God doesn't deserve an answer, because he -- doesn't intend to pray to God. It shouldn't be -- it's blasphemy. Don't answer it. It's a stupid question. The -- the condition of a question is that the questioner wants to join the community. That's a very simple rule, gentlemen, and explains the whole Platonic, Socratic, and Aristotelian -- ic obsession with the city of man. All questions must remain related to the city of man. Otherwise they do not deserve an answer.

Therefore, Socrates comes in and asks, and tries to prove that the questioner has to be asked if he is really serious. Does he really mean business? Does he want to be good, courageous, prudent? A good citizen, you see? Or does he just ask to show off as a sophist, just to show that he can prove anything, you see, for the sake of argument? The whole of Parmenides is written about this topic, for example. Or the Gorgias, you see, or the Protagoras, the -- the Ion, you see. For the sake of argument, you can argue anything. But you must remain related, as Plato then formulates it in his dialogues, to the good. The good is the sum, so to speak, of serious participation.

If you do not remain seriously ins- -- have not the desire to get inside, or

to stay inside, whatever the situation is, you see, your question is not a good question. We are full of this nonsense today, gentlemen. This is the era of the sophists. And -- never have the sophists ruled this country. They call themselves, I don't know what they call themselves -- broadcasters, or intellectuals, or -- or quiz kids, or what-not; \$64,000 question. The only good thing about the \$64,000 question obviously are the \$64,000, but not the question.

The question is a nonsense question. They are all nonsensical that questions they ask on this idiot quiz game { }. { } entertainment, so I -- I -- you can't get excited over this, you see. But obviously you are much better off if you don't know the answer. It's -- like this yes-and-no examinations, gentlemen. I mean, it's not important to know these "yes" and "no." Any term paper on -- written on the Stoics, it can't be -- just that bad as these papers that you have -- where you have to guess 50 percent of -- of right, you see, with "yes" and "no." That's not worth answering, because it isn't -- you are not serious. You don't want to know the good. You won't -- the help of the -- answering this question join the community and contribute something to the communal life. You don't find -- want to find a road into the good life.

Now, it's very important, gentlemen, because you open a book by S- -- by Plato, or Xenophon on Socrates, or -- all the traditions on Socrates. He is parroting { } questions as a -- like a stupid child at first sight. So don't get annoyed. Make this distinction clear to you, gentlemen, that Socrates -- the Socratic method sifts the questions. You are absolutely lost if you mistake the form of question as being the same between Socrates and a child. But this is today the average error, because everybody in this country thinks that he is a philosopher, and that everybody is as stupid -- every philosopher is rated as -- to be as stupid as the man who reads up on philosophy. But philosophy is a vocation, gentlemen, a very disagreeable vocation. And in the case of Socrates, it ended with death. In the case of others, it ended with exile. In the case of others, it ended with madness. In the case of others, it ended with persecution, or with poverty, or illness. Because it is the attempt to throw down the usurped questioners, the intellectuals in a community, the sophists, who at that moment, you see, will not -- will not, if they are aesthetes, and celebrate poetry for poetry's sake, or art for art's sake, or politicians for politics' sake. They will not give answer to the question: "What's the good of your question? Why do you ask this question?" You see. And the Socratic answer is that you must thereby be led to lead a better life, otherwise the question cannot be answered, because you have no st- -- yardstick. Mere -- the mere jumbling, juggling -- of tossing-up and tossing down of words makes any answer possible, gentlemen. The difference between the sophists and Socrates then is that Socrates -- wants to be a sophist who tries

the sophists.

And I think it isn't -- only natural that therefore he should have been crucified. It's a very disagreeable -- a very unpleasant task, and nobody is liked, you see. Mist- -- my friend, Mr. Samuel Eliot Morison now made a -- some -- gave some lectures on the trash, and on the hypocrisy, and on the insincerity of American education. And he had to go to Canada to deliver these lectures, because in America nobody would have listened to his provocation.

The sophists are always in command, if not somebody sticks his neck out and risks to tell them -- to ask them, "What are you doing with the mind, with the brain, with your logic, with your quizzes?" You see. Who is stopping Walter Winchell? That's the question. And it's a very serious question. Who is stopping these obscenities? Who is stopping the comic strips? Who is stopping the nonsense that's going on in television, and what-not? Who is? The philosopher. If he doesn't exist, if such a -- such a healthy force doesn't develop, you see, the country must go out of hand, obviously. And you have then some mental, moral, or financial crisis. In -- you just have to read the behavior of the people in the '20s, when they said that all the laws of the universe were successfully abolished. Saving was ridiculous, you see. Death had -- would yield. People would go -- become 150 years old, you see. And you had to live on the installment plan. Well, the doctrines are nearly -- as equally mad at this moment. But not quite. In the gay '20- -- -8, you had -- you prepared the crash, because there was nobody who was listened to.

Sinclair Lewis came home from Europe in '28. He went on Fifth Avenue to the -- his publisher's office. He looked down on the street, and the publisher said to -- "You -- how do you like it?"

And he said, "I think the world here is insane. Absolutely insane."

And Sinclair Lewis, after all, a man of quite superior intelligence. You may have heard of his name. And -- and the publisher, of course, thought that Sinclair Lewis was mad. And he thought that the world -- Sinclair Lewis thought that the publisher was insane. Well, a year later, the issue was settled. But a man like Sinclair Lewis was the Socratic element in America.

There's no doubt about it. From Babbitt on, you see, he has acted as a Socratic element questioning the people, you see, with -- who -- who put all the silly questions into people's mind. So to speak, the daily philosophers of the moment. Because it was a philosophy in '28, you see, that saving was ridiculous, that

tomorrow would be better than yesterday, et cetera, you see, that death was abolished, sickness was abolished, you see. Children didn't have to behave -- their parents, you see -- everybody had to sleep with everybody else, constantly. A friend of mine in '28 -- was in New York when a man in a cocktail party went to him, "Oh, you know, I have a funny feeling my wife's just sleeping with a Negro."

He said, "What do you say?"

"Well, you see, we -- after all, we are civilized men. I couldn't forbid it.

She wanted to have the experience."

Well, she had the experience. That's by and large the -- life of -- the age of the sophist. You always get this, gentlemen. You always get this tremendous temptation by argument from the outside -- outside the polis. If you have this, you see, this abstract thinking, you can prove everything to anybody, if you for -- forget the good life, that the generalization, gentlemen, the general thought must create a better city.

So now you see perhaps that the Socratic element tries to bind together second impressions, second thoughts, critical thoughts, you see, with the force and authority of primary ethics, of primary truth, of the cult of the city, of the div- -- worship of the true gods, you see. And make sure that what's going on in this more general room of schools, and thinking, you see, of the Eleatics, or of the -- Miletus, you see, always remains within the fruitful process, so to speak, you see, of landing as a { } into something concrete and real. Can you see this? This is the -- the service rendered by Socrates.

And since the city of Athens, of course, hated the sophists, his being the super-sophist, Athens -- the sophists, too, around their suspicions. They couldn't understand what he was doing, because he did it for the first time. On the other hand, gentlemen, Socrates seems to have fully understood -- I say this tentatively, because everything we say about Socrates is tentative -- he seems to have fully understood that you could not turn the clock back, that Athens, as the capital of the Greek -- the whole Greek world, had to digest these sophists, as they came from Sicily, from Italy, from Asia Minor, you see -- and so that he had a certain amount of tolerance.

It's a combination -- then of criticism of the -- these critics, you see, and of tolerance which seems to have impressed all contemporaries. As -- the great

thing about Socrates is: he never wrote a line. He never wrote a line. And therefore, we have no authentic utterance of his -- of his own thought. We -- we only have him in the descriptions of others who had their own philosophy, who built on his questions already answers. And therefore, we do not know how much in Plato's dialogue is Socrate- -- Socratic, and how much is Platonic, you see. Because Pla- -- af- -- So- -- Socrates had given the -- the an- -- the question, you see, then Plato then gives the final, composite answer, you see. And -- what I call the division of labor is -- put into a high degree in Platonic dialogue developed there to -- with great skill, that the desire, the zest for questioning, all these critical positions of the Eleatic School, of the lo- -- of the Pythagorean School and so -- is then driving Socrates onto a positive solution which he obviously has never given in his lifetime, but wh- -- which is the Platonic solution, you see. And I have to -- perhaps to put one word here at the end, before you -- I dismiss class, in: the Platonic obligation to clear up any misunderstanding about Socrates' intent forces Plato to go one step further, to go beyond the question of the questioner, you see, and to create a utopia. It is very hard for me today -- you may be different -- but for me to be patient with Plato's utopia. I think he -- his utopia, his polity, and so are terrible. I want to tell you frankly that I couldn't live one day in the Platonic universe, and it's a terrible utopia. But I can do justice to his necessity of saying that he meant business, that he wanted not to be -- remain a critic. Therefore, he said, "I wish to prove that there is a best city, you see, a better city." And the word "utopia" is needed for us. "Utopia" means nowhere. It is not a Greek word, gentlemen. It was invented in the year 1560 by the great British Chancellor Thomas Morus. And it means nowhere. No-where. "Topos" is the place. In no place.

Now today, everybody speaks of Plato's state as a utopia. It is not the word of Plato. His word is the "best state," which is quite different, you see. You see, you have Athens. You have the better states of all these critics, of the critics who questioned the -- the individual states. And you have then Socrates proving that none of these critics really had a complete picture of the city. Socrates proves -- will you take this down -- Socrates proves the incompleteness of the responsibility in the critic. He argues some point, you see. We shouldn't have election every four years. We should have only -- only have them every eight years you see. But the whole of democracy is not in their minds. They don't care for the existence of the city for their survival. They only care for their immediate criticism, you see, for their {witticism}. You can criticize any little particle of a system, you see, of a whole order. I can criticize that I call my parents "parents," if I do not understand what the whole family is all about. And people have done this in the last years, as you know. They say, why call father "Father"? You see.

Call him "Charlie." And they have done it, because they didn't know what the family was there for. That the family was a representative -- created in the image of God. Well, you can't call God "Charlie," therefore, you can't call your father "Charlie." That's a real answer, gentlemen. I mean this. It's not a joke. If you don't understand, however, that the family is created in the image of God, then you cannot understand why your father cannot be called by his nickname, you see. "Chinaman" or what-not.

And they have driven this in this country, the sophists, so far, that the families have been destroyed by this. Therefore, Socrates said, "The critics don't have this city of man at heart. They don't want to return into the community." And Plato says, "Therefore I have to give them the best state." And that's his obsession.

Now, there is a relation between the good state, the better state, the better individual items -- I shouldn't say "state" here. That's not right. The better -- better measures, "better laws" perhaps is better, or better customs, and the best state. Plato is the first Greek philosopher who feels obliged, you see, in order to dam up these wanton criticism of -- of single teachers, to give out of the mind a full-fledged picture, you see, of our destiny. That had never been done before: an unreal city, you see, to be developed out of -- of philosophy, so that all the witticism and criticism could fall into -- into a special pattern, you see, and not be any one exaggerated.

And so Plato was the first utopian. It's a great topic now in Europe to write on utopias. I have several friends who at this time are concerned with producing books of 600 and 700 pages on utopia. And of course the Bolsheviks have a utopia: the classless society. That's a utopia, you see, a nowhere, a best state. But you must understand the Socratic problem is bound up with the final solution of Plato. If Pla- -- Socrates says, "All these people who know better, you see, know nothing, because they don't know the good."

So Plato comes in, "Then we must know the best."

Will you kindly try to -- to put down this strange climax: the good, the better, and the best, you see? It is -- I must invite you -- otherwise you will never understand the relation of Platonism, you see, to the good and to the sophists. And never -- you will always remain Greenwich Village intellectuals otherwise.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...you can still -- who has seen Indian reservations? Only so few. You can still -- you know a little bit about their religious ceremonies, and their dances. It means that 24 hours of the day, the tribe tells the individual what to do, what is right, with regard to the spirit, to what they have to say, what is expected from them to say in prayers, in songs, in ceremonies. And today there is a great interest in these -- after all, in these -- this ritual, in these dances, folk songs. Everything today is up and coming.

Now in any group that is secluded and complete, my mind, my -- political behavior, and my physical environment are on all fours. The tribe goes hunting, so the deer belongs to the tribe. Then it is -- and is sliced up and distributed among the tribe, so the woods and the ter- -- the -- the outer world, sun, and moon, and rain, and snow, everything is shared as the physic- -- physical environment, of this group, you see; and the spirit of this group inspires the individual to s- -- report, and to say, and to judge what this group needs.

Therefore, this tripartition, gentlemen, of logic, and physic, and ethics, is not pronounced. As soon as you get the Trojan War -- and that's the first time in human history that this happens. And you must know that Homeric man is a new invention, -- that Gree- -- the Greek mind is something that hasn't existed before.

Sir, put out your pipe.

That is, that in this Trojan war, people were forced to separate their logos, their physic, and their ethics. That the physique, the physical environment created by the Trojan War, was much wider, and approached a universe. And I think you can say that a Greek who read Homer was more universal-minded than Mr. McCarthy, or Mr. {Briggar}. They are isolationists. That is, they still hide in Central America. Called the Middle West. And -- their -- an isolationist dreams of this good life which you can have when ethic, logic, the -- and physics coincide.

You must see then, gentlemen, that the awakening of the mind is a cleavage between the area covered by physics, by my ethics, and by my logos, by the -- the speech, the spirit that fills me with enthusiasm so that I can go to war as an Athenian, or take -- today, as an American. You see it very clear in the Suez

Canal business, and the oil business, that we have an economic way of reasoning which is worldwide, by which we equate physics, you see, and economy.

You have high tariffs, and a Chamber of Commerce, and junior executives, and options for -- for companies, and -- outstripping the -- the other countries in foreign markets. And there the ethics, you see, are coinciding with the United States of America, and they contradict the physics of our knowledge, you see, of our geography. Because after all, God created the universe, and not the United States. Or at least the U- -- the United States only under the condition that they admit that God created the earth, you see, and everything that therein is.

So your physics and your ethics do not coincide. In this very moment, the -- gods of the America, the red-blooded good American, you see, with the little school -- red schoolhouse, and the little white church is suddenly confronted with the question of, "Who is the real God? Is this -- is this church still praying for God Almighty? or only for God Incorporated?"

Oh, my dear m- -- people. Most gods to whom you pray are incorporated, and very limited indeed. You are quite sure that they do not hear or see you outside Sundays from 11 to 12. Very few people believe in God Almighty. The -- most people believe in God s- -- from 10 to 11, or from 11 to 12 as the case is -- for the Catholics, at 9. That's limited. That's incorporated, you see.

So you have made the gods members of the -- your city. So the logos, whom you seem to represent, is quite of a different expanse than the universe. Now my whole course of lectures has tried to show you that philosophy is the attempt to equate the questions raised by ethics, by physics, and by logic. Logic is the power that makes us speak. Will you take this down once more, gentlemen? Ethics is the power that makes other people listen. And physics is the order by which people behave as we say, and as we are told. The atomic bomb you can construe. That is, physics is what we think it is, because it explodes, you see. That is, the physical universe can, by our reasoning processes, be recognized and understood, interpreted. And so the physics is that which common reason can interpret as being so.

But if -- to whom do we talk about the atomic bomb? Gentlemen, the physicist talks to the Germans and to the Russians who construe now the next satellite, the new moon around the earth. They don't talk to you and me, you see. They have a family of -- in physics which -- differs totally from the family on -- on Thanksgiving dinner, in their home. So they live in several communities. And we all do, today. You take it for granted that in your own field you must know -- in medicine, for example, or in chemistry, you see, what people in other

countries know. With regard to how- -- -ever President Eisenhower's policy, it's much better not to know what the other nations think of it.

So we live today in three worlds. Every one of you is a battlefield, gentlemen, of conflicting -- facts, of conflicting processes, of thinking, of acting, of -- of living. Most people, of course, go to the country club and forget all about it. And then they are very surprised when they wake up next day and have to go to war, or something like it, or -- or the stock exchange is off 10 percent since August 9th. How -- how strange. What wicked people -- must live in the world to cut down on brokers' income.

So if -- there is philosophy only as long as this dialectic exists. As soon as we would live in a universe, you see, in which the physical environment, the political environment, you see, and the functions of all people would be made to be congruous, all thinking would stop, as it -- did stop in the United States during the last -- last two years. We had prosperity, we had a -- a seeming peace, we had no danger -- immediate danger, and therefore, people st- -- stopped to think. This happens always, gentlemen. The same happened in 1928. People do not want to philosophize. And it is unnecessary for those -- part of the population, you see, for which, like for a baby, these things are congruous. For a baby that lives in a -- in a -- in a cottage in the woods, there is no philosophy, you see. His ethics, his logic, and his -- and his physics coincide. There are no -- is absolutely no reason, no discrepancy between these through circles. As soon as these -- circles, however, do not coincide, man has to begin to think.

And now I tried to show you, gentlemen, that the great step into philosophy was done by Parmenides, because he says, "Let us think about this conflict outside the city." And he settles with his staff of juvenile disciples, outside the walls of any one individual community, and begins to think about the community as though this was just a semblance, a transient thing, what he called "an appearance," a phenomenon.

Today we have a school of thinkers still in this world -- we had several members of the department now -- they are no longer here, who call themselves "phenomenologists." You have heard this term? Who has heard this term? Well, it means that we have the power, like Parmenides, to look at the world as a world of appearances. And we are more clever -- we look behind the appearances, you see. Or we are at least not compelled to do anything about this appearing there. These are just phenomena. Like rain or shine. And -- very tempting for the -- human mind always.

Phenomenology is nothing new. They invented this Greek term. But it is the constant attitude since 500 A.D. to try to get outside this -- these terrible cities where men are slaughtered for the war -- for the glory of the city in war, or where they are condemned for injustices by -- for athe- -- eism, like Socrates. And you can therefore say, gentlemen, that philosophy lives by this, what I call today the liberal arts college, by insti- -- institutions that carry into every nation general thought, and remind the people in the city that the environment inside which they live is greater. And never is there any congruity between nature, you see, ethics, and the spirit that makes them speak, themselves. And I told you there are -- these are the three miracles that man discovered. The miraculous world, the bewitched world, the enchanted world in which the old Egyptians, or the old Assyrians, or the Chinese lived down to 19-- --11, you see, the Chinese had sorcerers. This bewitched world had not split into these three divisions: the power that makes me speak, my god, you see, makes me say something new, which nobody has heard before. I suddenly have to burst out into a song, or a curse, or an oath, or something, you see. That's the power that overcomes me. Any power that overcomes me is such. Look at the Hungarians. These poor people didn't know six weeks be- -- before that they would ever all be shot dead or refugees. They had no idea. But they did it, didn't they? And you can't understand them. They are miracles, you see. Probably you would never have done this, you say. You wouldn't resist tanks, Russian tanks and blow them up with your bare hands. You couldn't have done that. They didn't know that they could do it, you see. They didn't plan this. They didn't know that they could do this. That's always a power, gentlemen, that is stronger than my preconception, you see, than my reasoning, which we call God. God is the power that makes you do something yesterday you thought you couldn't do. That's the only definition of God that holds water, gentlemen. Everything else is -- is, I think, valueless. But every one of you, when he proposes to a girl, I hope, only proposes after he has said to himself the evening before, "No. I won't be such a fool to get married." The test of love is, gentlemen, that you have to do it against your will. Anybody who wants to love, shouldn't ever get married. He can go to girls other way -- another way. Marriage is a torment, because it's a sacrifice; it's the renunciation of new inventions. And you cannot marry, gentlemen, really, and you get a divorce, if you, like a boy of 18, say, "Oh, it's so nice." Gentlemen, marriage is not nice. It is -- I prefer the bridegroom who has a splitting headache on his wedding day to the boy who goes into the wedding dancing. A wedding is too serious. That's -- bad as a funeral. I mean it. I prefer a man who sweats

agonies on his wedding day than to the man who thinks it's all wonderful. That isn't so simple, gentlemen. Your mother-in-law isn't wonderful. Let alone the father-in-law.

Really, gentlemen. You are absolutely silly, and what you call idealists, or -- or -- or -- or -- to me you are funny. Because when I state such a thing, I just talked to a boy in a -- hotel, the Hanover Inn, and he asked me how I could believe in God. Just so, after lunch, before class. And he said, "How can you be so dogmatic?"

And I said, "How can you be so funny?"

Now, gentlemen, if you take this year 500 as the appearance on the scene, after a hundred years of groping from the -- {Ionian} philosophers onward, and Pythagoras, to put forward a constant attempt of harmonizing for every generation these three challenges according to the environment, according to the challenge of the day, then you see that in 399, this comes to a head in the trial of Socrates. This old city here, of Athens--this being Athens, this being Sparta, this being Miletus, this being Elea, this being, let us say, Syracuse, we need these cities as examples--they are still strong enough to mistake Socrates for a man of this century, a sophist. That is, a man who tries to live himself outside the city, and only teach the city, correct the city, criticize the city, without playing the game himself, without saying what he believes, only criticizing, only saying, you see, that his ethics are better. And I call this, the li- -- the century of the better state. Well, the -- the -- the -- the mudrakers, the debunkers, the Charles Beards, or whomever you take -- the -- the Lincoln Steffens, they are people of this sophist character. They say, "We know of a better state."

I told you that Socrates comes into Athens when all these attempts, from all these other states have been made, hundreds of sophists swarm over the -- Greek Isles, Italy, and Asia Minor, and bring into the cities the word -- that the world is indeed larger than any one city, that people must try to exchange in a second language between the Spartan dialect and the Athenian dialect some general truth, that they must become in a way citizens of the world, or of the universe. And they planned this new word -- the "whole." I told you that -- Latin, we only use unfortunately the word "universe." The Greek word for this is "pan". A very important word. And I -- the important word, the fact about this word, "the universe," is that it is "it." That, gentlemen, it is the victory of physics over ethics and logic that is proclaimed in the term "universe," because if you and I live only in a universe, then there is no power that can command me with the -- the still, small voice. "It" cannot command. "It" is dead. And if "it" is the

only reality, and if I and you are only parts of the un- -- particles in the universe, you see, then you are an atom. And I can treat you as an atom. I can smash you up, and you can smash me up. And it's a fight from all against all, you see. And all Greek philosophy, gentlemen, has this weighed preference for the neutral universe. You can say that Greek -- Greek philosophy places the greatest stress on the fact that it wants to explain the universe, and that every ethical and logical problem of the gods and of man takes second seat. Now what's omitted in this dream of the universe, gentlemen? And why is the death of Socrates, with whom we are now dealing in *The Republic*, such a great event in the history of the human mind? Why is -- everybody knows that -- Socrates drew hemlock? Gentlemen, much better men have drunk hemlock, and have been burned at stake. The Inquisition, and the Protestants, and the Catholics have killed many more wise men than this one man in -- in Athens. Why is Socrates such a great man? Why is it such a great case? Because it is the conflict, gentlemen, between life and death that occurs here for the first -- the universe is dead, and it cannot die. And the whole promise of Greek philosophy is to say, "Death does not matter." Will you take this down, gentlemen? Death only matters for the spirit and for man. The spirit can die, and we can die. And we do not want to die, and the spirit must not die. They -- we shall not. You see, we -- we proclaim that we are in agony. Now, all Greek philosophy and all Dartmouth students pretend that they have no fear of death, that by philosophy you can eradicate this fear, because you speak of the universe. In the universe, dead and living things are not distinguished. The sun is just as good as you and I. But I don't care for the sun, to tell you the truth. I care for my own life, and I hope you do, too. And to have to die is a very serious business. It only happens once, you see. And it isn't helped any by saying that all men must die. The existential proclamation of Mr. Sartre in France has been -- or from Kierkegaard -- it is not interesting to say that all men must die, you see. But it's terribly interesting to say that I must die, you see. That's the whole distinction between philosophy, gentlemen, and living. In life, the whole difference is that I must die, or you must die, in person, you see. In -- for the universe, it's just expected. All men must die. Therefore, gentlemen, if we speak from the universe, we put reason on the throne. If we speak of men, we put the heart on the throne, because the heart is frightened by real death. The mind does not look in the direction of the death of the person who has this mind, in whose mind these pictures of the

universe are -- are floating around. All modern talk is so ridiculous, and psychology, because they do not begin with the fear of death. They dismiss it. They investigate your retina reactions, and they investigate your muscle. And they speak of insecurity, and such little things, gentlemen. But the general experience of humanity is that we must die. And all wisdom, gentlemen, comes from the fact that we must die. What you call the "soul," gentlemen, is the power to anticipate your death. The soul is the power in man who, from the very first days of a child being spoken to anticipates the death of the child. The soul is not born at birth, but the soul comes into you as anticipation of your death. That's what we call the soul.

Now Socrates, gentlemen, is the one philosopher in whom the relation of the universe to death becomes actual. Far -- he has not written a book. He's only famous for his death, because he has shown people how to die, how to die. That's the greatness of Socrates. And therefore, gentlemen, of logic, physics, and ethics, the logos, the {demony} of Socrates, the spirit of Socrates retains its sovereignty, because in addition to being a philosopher, that is, to have asked questions, he has shown people how to die. Jesus teaches something quite different. Jesus has not taught people how to die. But He has taught us that we die, fruitfully. The meaning of death He has revealed, not the circumstances. Socrates had no fear. He was very pleasant. He said it doesn't matter. And he showed people to -- to be unafraid. Jesus didn't play with such things. He was sweating agony. He thought that God had forsaken Him. But His death is the most fruitful action that any human being has ever undertaken.

So the relation of Christianity to death is totally different from that of Greek philosophy. There's no equation between Socrates and Christ whatsoever. It's absolutely miles -- worlds apart. But the thing we have to retain from Socrates is that it is possible to die fearlessly--but meaninglessly, too. The death of Socrates is not meaningful in itself, but it is -- it is the -- the instrumental -- so, the instrumental -- the -- well, you can say it's pragmatic, or how should I say it? -- the -- the -- the how, the circumstance, the condition of his death are model cases of virility, and sobriety, and temperance, and courage. That is, of the four cardinal virtues of -- of Greek philosophy.

And therefore, we may say, gentlemen, that in Socrates, the school of Parmenides, the school that took man outside the city, is reconnected with the city, because the man who is treated as a sophist erroneously, you see, although he did take the sophists themselves to task, this man showed that he also is a

citizen, even in a negative sense. If the city puts him to death, he will not grumble. He says, "I still am grateful to the laws of the city." And the death of Socrates, gentlemen, restores the equilibrium between his own city, his own -- the laws of his own country, and the world outside. Not in his statements. We have none -- you see, none which is authentic. But in his life -- does he remain the -- connected with the very city from which Greek philosophy departed, which it wanted to objectify, which it wanted to put into the universe, you see, as an inanimate matter, so to speak, as something ob- -- to be objectively studied. Now objects, you see, do not talk back. But the laws of Athens did talk back, and Socrates said, "I can only objectify philosophy like Parmenides and the Eleatic school, or -- Thales and the Ionian school, as long as I am also allowing the city to talk back, and to misunderstand me. That's the risk I have to take. I have to belong to a city, while I am dealing with the universe."

As long as you do not understand this cleavage, gentlemen, of you and me, using here in the classroom a universal reasoning process, you see, and still remaining faithful to the laws of this country, you cannot understand the reason why we have to philosophize, because there is a conflict. There is a real conflict. And that's a conflict lived to our, I think, to men's -- to the mind's satisfaction, lived to the -- to the utmost by Socrates. Socrates doesn't allow the mind to flee into -- into stratospheres of mental screwballs and brown ivory towers, you see. The ivory tower remains a taxpayer, and he pays the tax -- Socrates, you see -- as the inhabitant of his ivory tower, and says I -- he is glad to.

Most philosophers, as you know -- try to brush aside this, and -- just either they try to remain anonymous, or they say, "I haven't said anything," or they say, "Don't quote me," and that's a -- they are noncommittal when it comes to public utterances. And therefore the door is locked to these escapists by Socrates. He says, "At the same time that I am looking for absolute truth," you see, "I admit that I am under the temporary, absolute law of my city." If you can understand it, understand it. But that's the cor- -- crux of Greek philosophy, gentlemen, to this day.

There's a book in our library. It's called Caliban. It's a very terrible book. It's the book on a Swedish sculptor who came to this country, and defies all the laws of Sweden and America, and is very proud of it. But at the end of his life, he had -- has -- he writes his own life, he at least has the good taste to call himself Caliban. And he is. He is just a human monster. He has broken all the laws of humanity. And the only repentance, so to speak, is not in the text of the book, but I think in the title, you see. Like Mr. Drew Pearson, who now writes as

"S.O.B." Well, I think it's quite serious. I hope Mr. Winchell will do the same. So, perhaps you take this down as our formula. Socrates represents the conflict between the universe and my time and s- -- place. "My country" is perhaps the best expression today, and "my own time." Any man's own time, and any man's own country is ethically and logically, you see, still upon me. That is, they speak to me, while I am dealing with the universe, you see. And if Mr. Oppenheimer has Communist -- affiliations, he is just dismissed from the defense program, and sits in Princeton, you see, and doesn't get any information on the atom. That's a similar case. It's in America, where there are no tragedies, it hasn't ended in drinking the hemlock. In Socra- -- in Athens, of course, Mr. Oppenheimer--or in Russia--would have been executed long ago. That's not mea- -- saying that Oppenheimer is not the better man than all his accusers, you see, but it says they have the right to misunderstand him. You understand? They can misunderstand him, and he is under their sovereignty. I think he has been misunderstood largely. But that doesn't alter the fact that the decision is not his, but is theirs, you see. To be an authority is also to have the right to make mistakes. Can you see this?

Therefore the city in Socrates' case was given the right to make a mistake, because Socrates was not -- is not the overlord of his god, and of his -- of his co-citizens, you see. The ethic and the logic never put man into the -- up as God himself; whereas, to the universe, I can prescribe the laws of my mind. I can make them speak mathematic, so to speak, you see. The dead things have to obey me. But my neighbors and God Almighty just don't happen to do so. I get leukemia at the very moment that I think I am, you see, at the top of my life, and I die. What about that?

When William James, gentlemen, had a terrible heart disease, and was going to die, and was one year before his death, he said, "But God can't let me die, now."

And his wife asked, "Dear Bill, why, why do you think so?"

"Because I -- I'm -- just now feel fit to live. I just now, after 69 years, learned how a man should live." You see? It didn't help him. He died.

Well, you never take this seriously. Yet you really think that when a great man is a good thinker, that there is no conflict in his existence. The same thinker is, of course, very humiliated by the fact that about the -- the lifetime that God gives him, he knows absolutely nothing, you see. So what does it

amount? All's -- I know all the riddles of the universe, you know the psalm: "If I go to the end of the earth," you see -- you know the psalm? Which psalm is it? "If I take wings of the morning, and flew to the ends of the earth, and" -- or "hid in the depths of the sea, what would it help me? God will still find me out." Which psalm is it? Oh, gentlemen. You find it. Who is going to study divinity? {Do}, you'd better look that up.

So please don't believe that this problem is not with Socrates. Socrates solves it, however, in his -- in his taking his place between his physics, and his ethics, and his logic. If the gods say, "Obey the law of your city," you see, that's the -- certainly against his intentions. But it has to be obeyed, because he is in the midst of a conflict between these three items, gentlemen. Physis is that which my mind can dominate. Logic is this, which -- by which my mind -- or logos is that by which my mind is dominated, you see. And my neighbors are -- I can treat them -- you can say that all other men are prejudiced, you see. That doesn't alter the fact that they will exert their prejudices against you. You see. It doesn't help you at all that you sit -- sit pretty and say, "Oh, they're just prejudiced against me." Unfortunately, they don't know this, you see. They think they are right. What -- what is -- what you call "their prejudice" is in their eyes of course their privilege. Isn't that right? And that's the real problem -- constant problem of ethics.

So in The Republic, we enter the fourth book straight away. There is -- Socrates is the hero. It's a -- the -- the centerpiece of -- of Plato's year -- founding years. You may divide Plato's life into the years before founding the Academy in 386, and afterwards. He was then exactly 41 years when he founded the Academy, when it dawned on him that there had to be in Athens--or in the suburbs of Athens, before the walls of Gre- -- Athens proper--there had to be a constant reminder of the death of Socrates. That's the story of the Platonic Academy, a constant reminder of Socrates. And all his dialogues, as you know, deal with this strange figure that represents himself a miracle of freedom, because he shows how to die, that shows the abuse of ethics against a man who's misunderstood, because he's taken to be the very thing he tried to combat, a sophist. And the third thing, he's asking valuable questions about our -- your -- la condition humaine, as they say today, about the human condition, about the fate of man in the wide world.

Book Four -- you must -- know that Socrates is -- is the speaker, is saying "I" in this dialogue. The Republic is -- has been later -- centuries later has been divided in 10 books, and that's not the Platonic division. For example, he made the division on Page 202, and there we would today -- we would have to re-

divide The Republic. We would probably make the division on Page 202. That's just an example, how careful you must be with those ancient texts. The -- many -- later librarians have done this textbook -- this division. Be- -- the conception of Pla- -- Plato himself is much more artistic.

So we begin in the middle of nowhere, in Book Four, but that's just for lack of time. Would you now kindly be- -- read -- read the text. Do you have it? Who has the text? Would you kindly show me how many are here? So who gets this copy? Page 217.

Now this is 386, in which this by and large is written. We don't know the date of The Republic. All this is under argument. But I think it is in some way coincident with the founding of the Academy, with this knowledge that the best city had to be discussed in order to get rid of the mere criticism of the sophists, of the -- about the better city. And so Socrates is dead long ago. He is dead for 13 years when this book is written. That's -- or more than a decade.

So on the other hand, Plato wants him to speak to us, so the scene is laid out 40 years -- 50 years backward, you see. And -- so what we read is not a text. It is artificially archaic. It's laid out in a past that probably has never occurred. So will you kindly now read?

("Adeimantus broke in here and said, `Defend yourself, { } if you can, Socrates. Suppose someone says that you are not making your men very happy. And they have themselves to thank for it. The city is better than truth. But they get no such joy of it. As others who have gotten laws, and builded houses beautiful and large, collecting furniture to suit the houses, and making sacrifices of their own to gods, and became { }. Yes, indeed. It's exactly what you have just mentioned, gold and silver. And all of this is { } expected of those who are living {in bliss}. But these, he would say, appear like hired mercenaries of the city, sitting still and guarding nothing more.")

Now let's pause here. He speaks here of the government of the best city. And I wanted to avoid all the first three books, because that's all leading up to this. And he says right away, suppose it's a problem which the Bolsheviks had to face in 1919, when they fixed the salary of all the guardians, the Bolsh- -- members of the Bolshevik executive committee of -- for -- on \$227 a month. And they said no Bolshevik -- who was a member of the party was allowed to earn more.

Now this is the famous Platonic principle of separating happiness and government. Govern -- to govern doesn't mean to be happy, because it is a duty that can only be filled by people who don't care to be happy.

And so the first law, gentlemen, of the best city, which I wish you to contemplate is: is it a good idea that you have a cabinet of millionaires and one plumber? It's certainly anti-Platonic. He thought it wasn't a good idea. Now, I'm not a Platonist. And I -- you can debate this. It's a very interesting point, however, that the best city for Plato is only a city in which the government is immune against money, against wealth, in which the people prefer to be poor. This will plague us in the future, gentlemen. To you it is normal that it makes people happy to be rich. Sophie Tucker has said this, you see. She has said, "I've been rich; and I've been poor. But believe me, rich is best." That may be true for Sophie Tucker. But I don't care to be Sophie Tucker. That's the whole problem. Is Sophie Tucker your standard? If she is -- it is, then you have to get rich, and then you have to use government for contracts. And then the oil people must run the government through the person of Mr. Dulles, and Mr. {Aldrich}, et cetera. Yes, we are governed by oil. The whole story is oil.

This is -- the first paragraph, gentlemen, then is unreal. As you see the whole unrealistic approach of Plato, because it is certainly easier to understand that government is by the rich, and for the rich, and through the rich, than to understand that it is by the poor, you see, for the rich. That's a little complicated, isn't it? Because he had the idea that monks should govern the city. They are a kind of monks, with regard to property. As you know, one of the three monastic vows today is poverty. And that's taken from the philosophy, and from the -- gymno- -- from the -- from {India}, from the even more developed ideas of -- of {India}.

Our monks, gentlemen, have a combination of three vows: chastity, obedience, as you know, and poverty. Now poverty comes from the Greek source. Chastity comes very much from India. And obedience comes from Judaism. And our modern -- our three vows are a very interesting combination of three influences, three streams. But poverty in the -- is already here in Plato. And you have heard of Cardinal Woolsey, perhaps, the contemporary of Henry VIII. Who has? Well, Jeanne d'Arc is another great -- in the whole 15th century, gentlemen, the European nations were in great difficulty of finding rulers, and they tried it with monks. And the deepest reason was -- Woolsey was not a monk, but others were -- the reason was that they were the only people who, you see, who, by their vows, came near to the guardians of the Platonic city. It was tried. It wasn't done -- executed. I mean, it was given up again. But you

have this constant problem: is the better statesman not the man who is poor, and who has no interest in money? Lincoln certainly is a case in point. Washington is on the opposite side. We have both specimens, you see. You can decide one way or the other.

I only want to raise the question. It's an eternal question, and I think every generation will have to philosophize on this, because you can be -- you see, have too much austerity, if you have a bachelor who has no interest in money at the helm of the state, and you can go to the opposite: if you have only big business as government, something may go wrong, too. { } -- because big government is -- big business is very timid, and has no sense of honor. It has too large financial interest ever to do anything for honor's sake, or for keeping friends. They will risk nothing. The poor man, you see, will have -- be moved by quite other considerations.

Now, only to show you that we are in the midst of an eternal question.

And perhaps you also see, gentlemen, that in ethics, there has to come forward in government a -- a philosopher in every generation. Because in every generation you can pervert the best state, you see, the good order, by going too far in one direction.

The -- it is worth your while, gentlemen, to put here in your margin, this 200 -- 2 -- \$227 for the Bolshev- -- members of the Bolshevik party, as a reminder that Plato is with us. And I don't think -- I won't prophesy wrongly that in 50 years it would be impossible, it would be impossible in this country in 50 years to have this cabinet which we have today. It's -- would be impossible, because the people would not stand for this wealth on the top. Because then you get such creatures as Mr. {Stevens}, God bless him. Yes, and all that is expected for those who are to live in bliss. He even trans- -- uses this same expression, you see.

So Plato himself is -- is aware of his paradox, and it is an eternal paradox, gentlemen. I don't offer you any solution. Don't -- understand this. But you must see that it is a great question. Who is the best man to rule a city, you see? Because he must rule the rich and the poor. And so he must be in some third condition. And the whole crux of The Republic written -- is about the best. Because the best, gentlemen, is outside reality. It's utopian. And therefore, since in fact you only find rich and poor people, you see, they are here, am- -- with us, you see. If you want to construe government, the best government, you will always dream up something that is outside that what you find. You want to have something better.

Now what's the solution of Plato? What does he say? Who should govern? The philosopher, you see. So that's a third man, you see. He's neither influenced by poverty nor by riches, you may perhaps say. "Yes, I said..." go on, please. Will you take it?

("Yes, I said, and all serving for board and lodging, not even getting pay with their board like the others. They can't even go abroad on a trip if they wish. They can't make a present to a pretty girl if they wish. Can't spend a penny on anything else, and { } to or thought to be having a good time. All this and more like it. But a lot of things you leave out of your list of complaints.")

Now the next, please. Make the dialogue real. You have a copy? Who has? Here. You take over. And you.

("All right, said he. The soldiers, too. What defense shall we --.")

No, the next. Ja. You, Richard.

(I have a different text.)

Well, you go on. "What defense shall we make, you ask?"

("`Yes, let's walk along in the same old path,' I said. `And we shall find --'")

No, that's -- you are the "I." Hunh? You remain Socrates, Sir.

("`First -- first of all,' I said, `There must be a fight. I suppose our men will be athletes of war amassed against { }.'")

What? What? Where are we? They glued together, yes. You have sweaty hands. So. He wouldn't have noticed it.

("`Let's walk along on the same old path,' I said. `We shall find what to say. This is what we will say.'")

Come -- turn around. They can -- cannot possibly -- those who have no copies can -- can't possibly understand. Get up and -- and speak. Yes, get up.

Sure.

("Should not be surprised that these also would be most happy in its way. Yet what we had in mind when we founded this city was not how to make one class happy above the rest, but how to make the city as a whole as happy as it could be. For we believed that in such a city we were most likely to find justice, and injustice again { }. Then we might examine them and decide the matter { } searching all this time. Well, then, now if you believe we are holding the happy { }. We are not separating a few minutes, and putting them down as happy, but we take it as a whole. By and by, we will examine the { }. Suppose we were painting color on a statue, and someone came up and found fault, because we did not put the finest colors on the finest parts of the figure. For the eyes, the most beautiful part, { } dark { }. Did you think it a reasonable answer to give him, if he said, 'Don't be silly. { } such a beautiful pair of eyes, that they don't look like eyes at all?' So also the other part. But look and see if, by giving all the parts their proper {treatment}, we are making the whole beautiful. Just so now, don't force them to { } happiness as the guardians, as will make them anything but guardians. We couldn't --")

That's a very good comparison. You see the point. You couldn't give the guardians crimson color -- that is, make them happy. But then they would not have, as little as the eyes, their function. Red eyes are just not good eyes, you see, but they should be blue, or brown, or black. Therefore -- or gray. Therefore, you cannot give the guardians happiness, as little as you can make the eyes crimson. That's the -- the composi- -- comparison. Go on.

("We could indeed just as well order the farmers to dress in purple and fine linen, and hang gold chains about them. And till the land to their pleasure. We might make the potters put their wheels away, and recline on couches and feed, and have drinking matches { }. And make their pots when they felt so disposed. We might make all the -- all the others live in bliss in that sort of way. And { } expect the whole city to be happy.")

You see, that's by and large American Common Sense philosophy: make the people happy, and then everything will be fine. Now that's -- Plato's, you see, reply. If you say, "Make the people happy," you can't make the city happy.

Ja. Ja. Just -- dear Mandaville, what's the -- problem?

(Well, I was just thinking, didn't the -- wouldn't the people be happy doing what their -- function is best for the city? I mean --)

Pardon me?

(Well, wouldn't the people -- since the city would work best with everyone doing their own pottery, wouldn't the people therefore be {actually doing} their function? If you let certain people do what they wish to, won't { } to do?)

Ja. But you see, the condition of this is that they are already fit to be goldsmiths or -- or poets. I don't think anybody is when he's born. I think he's very li- -- pliable and plastic. The question is, you see: how -- what do you do with the people the first 30 years so that in the end, they believe that they have to -- to turn a lathe? My dear man. You see, your fiction is that already at birth, a man is a lathe-maker. -- Most functions today are not natural. That's your problem. I see -- and your -- your -- your optimism, you see, would mean that God creates as many distinctions, you see, or variations, as we need. Far from it. (Well, Sir, if one person who had gotten into a field { }.)

Oh ja. We come to this, but he is aware of this problem. He is aware of this in a deeper sense than any other philosopher I know. That is, Plato says that all must get everything, a little, you see, so that you have specialists then out of the best, because you test all, you see. So you get a common education even for women and men. And -- at that time was quite unheard-of, you see. The -- he -- he knows your problem that the amateur is necessary for the professional. That's really what it -- what you mean -- are driving at, if I understand you right, you see. You have to have a greater supply, a greater selection. Isn't that what your question is?

(Well, partially. But also it's { } for a man who is a potter then { } decides he doesn't want to be a potter. He really wants to be a farmer.)

No. That's so gruesome. That's why I -- I am -- think today The Republic is a very dangerous book. You see, I'm ver- -- have very mixed feelings about reading this book with you, you see. You can abuse it like the Bolsheviks. It's a Bolshevik book as much as it is a book of wisdom. Just what you stress. -- It's dynamite. Plato's Republic is -- is not a tame book, is nothing -- you think it is something that -- that's just a good book, or a Great Book, as Mr. Hutchins cared to call them. It -- it is to this day, you see, the -- a -- a tempting book. You can totally abuse it. Ja?

Let's have a break here. Five minutes.

[tape interruption]

Shall we -- gentlemen, I have been asked a very pertinent question: Did Plato approve of Socrates' death in the sense that he would have said, "I want to die the same death"? Now I think this question can be answered very frankly, gentlemen. If any event, any tragedy in -- in history is rightly understood, understanding means it must not be repeated. There is a great sentence of George Santayana, "Those who remember the past need not repeat it." Perhaps you take this down. And therefore, the fact that Socrates died implies that this must not be repeated, just because it has happened. That is the idea of making -- of making death pro- -- fruitful. If you say, "It doesn't matter to slay the righteous of the Lord," then you will repeat the Crucifixion. And therefore Christ then has died in vain. And it happens in every generation that Christ has died in vain. But He must not. Now -- no, no, I'm in the midst of an argument, Sir. How can you interrupt such a statement? Really? How can you throw me off balance in this manner?

The -- simple thing about the -- The Republic is, gentlemen, that Plato writes in answer to the death of Socrates this book. What is the best city? The best city is that city in which Socrates would not have had to drink poison. That's the whole story. For this the book was written. That's your answer. That's all we know, because we have -- I haven't spoken to Plato, you see. He's not a relative of mine.

So now, your question.

(A little while ago, several lectures ago, Sir, you mentioned that there was no validity in learning from the past { }. And wouldn't this statement by Santayana seem to say that we must learn from the mistakes of others?)

Well, it is only a minority that learns, gentlemen. The un- -- liberal arts college is the place in the nation in which this is attempted. Since you don't do it, I'm sure that the liberal arts college will disappear as a functional thing in this country. It is already disappearing. And your question proves that you are not so sure that you learn here not to repeat the past. You of course make all the same mistakes. That's perfectly true, because you are silly. But the question of education is an attempt to make people -- remember the past, lest it has to be repeated. That's the whole sto- -- why we read this, my dear man, so that you

will not kill either Socrates nor crucify the Lord. But of course, it happens all the time that this is -- this is forgotten. You may rightly say that the attempt is very weak, has very little prospects. But it has to be undertaken, you see. It has to be undertaken. If I see how many of you -- few of you brought this book to class, and that not one of you has read the fourth book in advance, before coming to this class, I certainly have every intent to give up and to say, it's all silly, it is perfectly meaningless. You don't deserve to be educated, and you certainly will repeat all the mistakes of the past. I'm sure you will. But that doesn't mean that somebody has to make the desperate attempt to prevent it.

So, please.

I mean, the only stumbling block, my dear man, you see, to the validity of Mr. Santayana's { } is you. The student at Dartmouth College. Nobody else. You are the great handicap -- against which this country is fighting: the students of the liberal arts colleges. These not -- do-nothings, do-nothings. Here. ("Don't preach to us like that.")

Very good.

("For if we obey you, farmer will not be farmer. And potter will not be potter. No other class of those which make the city will have its proper {force}. The { } are really no great matter. The cobblers who are {bogglers} may work badly and pretend to be what they are not and may go to ruin with no danger to the city. But if guardians {of the city} and laws are not what they ought -- are thought to be, { } they destroy the -- city utterly, and they alone have the opportunity to make it well-managed and happy. Then if we are making real and true guardians of the city, not marauders, and if our critics talk to the farmers and sometimes having jolly time at a dinner or a feast, not in the city at all, we must be talking of something else, not a city. Consider then, with this in our minds, whether we shall arrange that our guardians may have the greatest possible happiness, or if we shall keep in view the city as a whole and see how that should be happy. Then we must compel and persuade these assistants in all the guardians to do as I've said in order that they may be the best possible craftsmen in their own work. We must do the same with all the other craftsmen. And the whole city will increase and be managed well. We must leave each class to have the share of happiness which their nature gives to each.")

Now gentlemen, may I draw your attention to the sentence in our const-

-- in the Declaration of Independence -- or is it in the Constitution, about the pursuit of happiness? It's in the Declaration, isn't it? The pursuit of happiness, gentlemen, was a compromise between the Jeffersonians, and the Washingtonians, or the Adamses. You know what the idea behind the pursuit of happiness was, the religious idea? "Pursuit of happiness" is a secular term on which Moha-- Moslem, and Free Masons, and Rotarians, and Catholics all seem to be able to agree. Happiness is individualistic. The cobbler be happy -- just what we argued, Mandaville, at this moment. You see, everyone individually happy makes the people happy. Against this, Plato is fighting. And he says the guardians must make the city happy, not themselves.

Now what is the category, what is the aim then of the guardian for himself? He is not aiming at happiness. But what can justify his sacrifice, his austerity, his poverty, his vow? Gentlemen, that was called for the next -- 2,200 years, till 1776, with the very simple term. What would a man do, if he did what he was asked to do by his destiny, by his God, { } God's will? What would he be -- his reward? Not happiness. Something different, which today is not -- is in a -- is, so to speak, in discredit, but which is a necessary category about which Plato is talking here. And I think therefore, we have to restore it so that you see that pagan or not pagan, Christian or pre-Christian, there is a category of functioning right, which doesn't ask for per- -- private satisfaction. What is this? Wie? No, salvation. Very simple. Salvation. The guardians work out their own salvation because they make the city happy. Any doctor, you see, who -- saves his soul, because he gives the -- all his service to his patients. He's not happy, you see, but he certainly goes to Heaven.

This is not a silly thing, gentlemen, for pious old ladies. The question is: if you served within a given order, your happiness is no concern -- of no concern. Why should Mr. Eisenhower be happy? They have made him president for the United States. And I hope that he will be strong enough to be very unhappy personally. He hates to be president. But he undergoes it because he thinks that it is more important that he should be president than he should be happy. Otherwise he would not have accepted a second term.

It's very simple, gentlemen. Now what does he strive -- at? Knowingly or unknowingly, this is not happiness. You can't have a president of the United States who wants to be happy. That's silly. And I -- the only thing I can tell you, that is -- if you ever should elect a man president so that he might be happy, you have no president. You have a nightclub entertainer. Sophie Tucker.

Ja, this is very serious, gentlemen. You have in your thinking, by saying

"Make the people happy," abolished this higher functional order of the universe in which we do not care. Since we want to be good physicians, or good strategists, or good generals, or good presidents, we do not care for happiness. That's taken in our stride. What do I care that I am happy, gentlemen? As long as I do my duty here to you, I -- I certainly shall not be happy, because I meet with very much hostility. Because I tell you the truth. Who do -- who likes the truth?

Nobody likes the truth. The first experience that you will make when you begin doing anything in the world is that people hate the truth. And that's a Platonic sentence, you see: they hate the truth. You can take this down, gentlemen, at the bottom of the whole problem of philosophy. People hate the truth.

People -- I have seen you, gentlemen -- you look into any family. Any outsider can know the truth about their problems. You cannot tell them. Most tragedies, most conflicts in any human family--look into your own--is that the people won't -- do not wish to know the truth.

I had a friend -- a lady, an Italian lady who was married to a lawyer in Germany. He was the greatest gambler in the city. Everybody knew it. She didn't. Nobody told her. It was impossible to tell the truth, because it would have broken up the -- the -- he went out and she didn't know that he was gambling away their fortune. One day he shot himself. And then she knew that he was a gambler. That was all. That's a very simple story. By and large, that's the truth about most people. You don't know -- want to know your own truth.

And certainly you don't want anybody else to tell you.

So gentlemen, since truth is hated, these guardians are very unpopular, and they will have to undergo all kind of hostility, of course. And they won't be happy.

I read an article on the modern executive. And they said it boils all down to the fact that these people have sleepless nights not because of money, or not because of production, and not because of taxes, and not because of war, but because they have to deal with human nature, and they have to meet with so much hostility, you see, and jealousy, and begrudging, and -- and that's their problem. They lie sleepless, because they don't know how to tell the vice president what to do. Without losing his -- losing him perhaps, you see, to another firm. They don't know how to do it. The truth is not liked.

You live in this optimistic climate, gentlemen, since you do -- not only deal -- deal with silly truths, with platitudes, that you think everybody wants to know the truth. Gentlemen, the whole problem of the truth is that it is not

wanted. Who discusses any serious issue to -- at this moment about this government? They're all propaganda speeches, or on things that are on the -- on the -- on the -- on the -- on the outskirts. I told you, the real problem is oil. There's too much oil in America.

Now, what did I say, gentlemen? Salvation is a necessary concept of Plato's philosophy. The righteous man -- or the wise man, or the just man is a man who cares more for justice than his own happiness. Therefore, the term "salvation" is a necessary term. You cannot replace it by anything else. And since 1776, gentlemen, the compromise was reached: translate it into secular terms, call it happiness. The United States of America have been a moral power in the world. It will be a moral power, gentlemen, as long as behind the term "happiness" there -- you can still hear in your own heart, when you read this term, the true meaning, salvation. If you read the word "pursuit of happiness" with this glorious background of the churches of America, that it meant "salvation" originally, you see, you will interpret "happiness" in no obscene terms, you see. It will not be Mr. {Jaeger's}, or some -- somebody like that. But it will be salvation, you see. If you say, "I'm happy in the fulfillment of my duty, although it leads -- leads me to the -- to the scaffold, to execution," I'll shake your hand and say, "Well, what do you mean by happiness is salvation. We all agree." Don't you understand? It's -- all -- the question is: what happiness? And in American English, which is different from British English, as you know, the greatest distinction between English English and American English is in the use of the word "happiness." For an American, happiness is inclusive of salvation. But in England, that isn't so. Happiness is just happiness, you see, on the secular side, and there you would have to speak of salvation, you see. Here, you can gloss it over, because in this democracy, we try always to use the lowest common denominator. Happiness is the lowest common denominator of all the religious denominations, you see. That's the whole story.

So once you begin to open your eyes, gentlemen, to American sla- -- to language, it is full of miracles, because a -- the religious content is hidden behind a kind of shorthand. And if you wake up to your own city of Athens, to the United States of America, it is a much better city than it appears on the surface. I assure you. And it is your privilege to read into "happiness" the meaning of the guardians, salvation; or to steep down to the night-entertainer levels of Hollywood, who misinterpret it, you see, as beating the income tax.

This is, I think, alone worth this page, gentlemen, that he is struggling -- what is he struggling for? -- with -- the ambiguity of the word "happiness." And he says, "The city is happy"; you are not happy, you see.

Now we have enlarged this in Christianity. The Cross, instead of Socrates, means that we distinguish between the salvation. Jesus worked out His own salvation by going to the Cross, didn't He? You see? And in all practical terms, that's not happiness. So He -- He made the distinction very sharp, you see: Forgo happiness and you will be saved. Can you see this?

Functional, gentlemen, fulfillment of a man's life has nothing to do with happiness. You can be childless, and you can be blind, and Helen Keller is -- has worked out her own salvation. But it is very terrible to talk today, because you people have abolished this wonderful background of the -- your own language. You -- you try to only let this -- the -- the flatness, the soundlessness, the echolessness, the -- the lack of sonorosity of the word "happiness" stand. And then it is impossible. Then one has to contradict it. I have no objection against the wording of the Constitu- -- of the Declaration of Independence. But you must know that happiness has two degrees of depth. The happiness of the city -- or of man, of mankind is one thing. And your private citi- -- happiness, that's of no concern to anybody. And shouldn't be your own concern, because the safest way of ending in a lunatic asylum is to try to be happy. Ja?

(Then if salvation is to be preferred to happiness, why { } towards happiness on the city? Why { } salvation?)

Well, the city, after all, is an instrument, an institution, is it not? And therefore, the people in the city, if the whole city is, as we call it "just," you see, then they will fulfill themselves, you see. They will fulfill their own nature. So I would say your private happiness, my dear man, is a by-product, you see. But if nobody gives to the whole what the whole needs, you see, if you aim at happiness directly, you can't get it. He who wants to save his soul, you see, to win -- earn his soul, must lose it. Can you -- this is a simple thing. It's a detour, you may say, but without squinting. You mustn't say, "Oh," you see, like the alms giver, you see, "It will stand me in good stead. You see, if I give now the poor, they will make me a deacon of the church." I don't think that's a way of using your alms. We had a man in our church who bought himself in this way -- in the -- into our church, by making a high -- great contribution to the poor, which we didn't have. And -- the poor, I mean. And -- and he was made deacon, and I nearly left the church in disgust, you see. That's the wrong way, you see. You must not consider the -- the -- the consequences.

(Well, if you had walked out, wouldn't that have made it even worse { }?)

But I didn't. Now, go on. After all, I'm still a member of this church, unfortunately. So, go on. You will never know, you see. This is the question that can never be answered. Go on.

("Indeed,' he said, 'I think you are right.')

("Very well, there is something else -- there is something else akin to this. And I wonder if you will think it reasonable, too.")

("What is it exactly?")

("Consider whether it will ruin the other craftsmen also, and make them bad.")

("Well, what is it?")

("Wealth and poverty.")

("In what way?")

("In this way. Let a potter grow wealthy. Do you think he will care about his craft?")

("{' },' said he.")

("Then he will become idle and careless, more than before.")

("Much more.")

("He becomes a worse potter then.")

("Yes indeed,' he said. 'Much worse.'")

("Yet again, if he is too poor to provide himself the tools or anything else needed for his trade, his goods will be worse, and he will not be able to teach his sons and apprentices so well, and they will be worse craftsmen.")

("Of course.")

("Then both poverty and wealth make the craftsmen worse, and the things they make as well.")

("So it seems.")

("Then we have found other things which the guardians must guard against. They must prevent, by all means, from creeping unnoticed into the city.")

("What are these?")

("Wealth and poverty, too. Because wealth creates luxury, and idleness, and faction. And poverty adds meanness and bad work to the faction.")

("Certainly, but consider, Socrates, our city will be able to make more without having wealth, especially if we force the fight against the great city which has wealth.")

("It is rather difficult to fight against one, but against two -- but against two such, it is clearly easier.")

("How can that be?")

("First of all, if there must be a fight, I suppose our men will be athletes of war matched against men of wealth.")

("Yes. Yes.")

("Very well.")

Well, you should say "yes" to that.

("Yes to that.")

To that point. Ja. Ja?

("Very well, Adeimantus. One boxer is well trained as he can be against two non-boxers wealthy and fat, don't you think he would have an easy battle?")

Israel against Egypt, yes. Go on.

("Perhaps not. If they came on both at once.")

("Not even -- not even if he could retreat and wait {till} the first man up, and then turn back and strike him, and did it again and again, in the stifling heat of the sun. Could not such a boxer beat a lot of men like that?")

("I should say so. That would hardly surprise me.")

("But don't you think that rich men have more knowledge and experience of boxing than they have in the art of war?")

("I do.")

("And it would be easy for our athletes, in all likelihood to fight twice or three times their own number.")

("I will grant you that, for I think you are right.")

("Then again, what if they send an embassy to one of the two cities and tell them the truth, saying, 'We use neither gold nor silver, and that is for- -- and that is forbidden for us, but not for you -- then join us in this war and get what the others have.' Do you think anyone hearing this would choose to fight against the pack of hard, lean dogs, and not be joining the dogs and tackle fat and tender sheep?")

("No, I do not. But if the wealth of the others be collected into one city, does not that bring danger to the one which is not wealthy?")

("Oh, blissful ignorance! Do you think any so-called city is worthy of the name except the one which we were constructing?")

("Why not?")

("We must have a bigger appellation for the others, for each one of these cities -- for each one of these greater cities is, as they say in the game, 'Cities, cities everywhere, but city {none for me}.' Each of the last two cities, one of them poor and one of them rich, enemies to each other, in each of these two there are very many smaller. We treat them -- if you treat with them as one, you will lose everything. If you treat with them as many, and offer to give the wealth and power, even also the people themselves, one or more groups of men {from} the other group, you will always have many allies and few enemies. As long as your city is managed with soberness, as was laid down just now, it will be very great. I do not mean in fame, but in real truth very great, even if it has no more than a thousand men to fight for it. For a great city, one in this sense, you will not easily find, either among the Hellenes, or among the barbarians, but many you will find which are thought to be as great, and many times greater than this. Don't you agree?")

("Yes I do.")

("Then here we might find { } for our rulers. You decide how large our cities should be, and how much land they ought to enclose for a city of that size, letting the rest go.")

Let's stop here. Bring it again, and I hope, a few more. We'll bring copies of this.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...dealing with Plato as the climax and heart of Greek philosophy. Why is he this? Because in him, the whole of Greece, with all its questions already asked, comes to Athens to try to synthesize all these fundamental movements, all these doubts, all these misgivings about the relation of the local religion, the local law, and the natural universe.

I was asked last year -- yes -- I think it was yes, yesterday, I think, Mr. {Foerster} was it? is that right? he here? -- the question is -- he's majoring in science, and so he is bothered with the problem of -- by the problem of physis. For you, gentlemen, in your -- in your abstraction, and in your strange mental uprootedness of any modern man who goes too long to school, it is -- always seems that nature precedes society. That's the Rousseau gospel. First there is a wonderful natural world, and then comes man who spoils it with his legislation. Your experience, in Oklahoma City, or wherever you come from, is the opposite: that you first live in a society, and then you look out of the window, and go to -- out to the Grand Canyon, or to Beehive, and that you call "nature."

The whole problem of the relation of physis and nomos, of the law and nature, is: which is your own first experience of law? And your first experience is at home. The experience of what a law means is -- must first be made, before you can learn and understand physics. And that's against all your tenets, gentlemen. And that's the struggle of Greek philosophy in antiquity. And today we have to unwind the clock, so to speak, we -- that is, you are so -- philosophized, you only live so much by second impressions, that you have lost sight of the fact that you wouldn't understand what a natural law is if you hadn't had parents who brought you up in a lawful order in society. And you don't believe it me. I am sure that in all weak moments of -- or most moments of your life, you will re -- re -- relapse into this, what the Bible calls "original sin," that man is hipped on thinking that what he thinks at 20, what -- at your age, is his first impression. That he can think these truths about nature, you see, and doesn't owe them to an empirical -- way of life, in which he -- it was dinned into him what a law is, something that has to be followed, and -- which has dire consequences if it isn't obeyed. Spanking. Now, nobody is spanked in this country; so it's very difficult to understand what a law is.

You believe -- that is, a majority of -- of people today believe, those who are not real Christians -- believe that 99 -- 99 percent, that is, of the living people in this country believe that nature is their first experience, and society their

second. And they want to measure society by nature. This cannot be done, gentlemen. Because, what is nature, gentlemen? Nature is that reality which we view, all -- when we are already joined together. Nature is a common experience of mankind. All second impressions, which goes through the -- your mind, your -- your reason, are general experiences made by the commonwealth of man. If you are a physicist, you do this in the service of the community, who allows you to study physics, who has divided labor in such a way that you can go into a laboratory, and the fire department in the -- in the meantime looks after the fires. If they didn't -- wouldn't make -- man the fire trucks, you couldn't possibly study physics. It's impossible. You are their delegation. You have already agreed then on the commonwealth, and on its functions, long before you can agree on any fact in nature.

So this is the -- for Plato, gentlemen, and for the Greek mind then, the turning point. Discussing the best state, he's hit by this tremendous question: Which is first -- physis or nomos? Or if -- that is, the polis. What is first? And in Plato, it is in a strange equilibrium, his -- what you call his ideas, his famous idealism--that's after all Plato's invention--was an attempt to make the city and physis of the same quality, of the same quality of being original. Plato, you see, is interested in two things: in the mathematics and the good. And he wants to equalize them. In his last -- oration was on the mathematics and the good. Physics -- physis is to be dealt with in -- with numbers, like the Pythagorean. And logos and ethics put together, being the world of the nomos, must be dealt with, with goodness, with "best." This strange word "best" comes in.

Plato is an aristocrat, because the word "aristos" means "best." You think "aristocracy," means, you see, "the few." That has nothing -- no meaning. "Aristocracy" means the rule of the best. And he's haunted -- that in humanity, gentlemen, the best corresponds to numbers in physis. And if you put them both back against their origin, they come from eternal ideas of the good, and the beautiful, and the true. And the ideals then, gentlemen, of Plato are an attempt to establish -- will you take this down? I think it's a good formula I offer you -- find it in no book. Plato's idealism is an attempt to create the -- an equilibrium between our political experiences and our physical experiences, to make them of the same original quality. The modern -- the modern American, being purely pragmatic, thinks that his glands come first, and then history.

I've heard a man talk about universal history of mankind and say, "It's all a matter of the glands." Now, such an idiot is allowed to speak in this country. He's feeble-minded. Yes, he made a public appearance on the American Historical Association in 1934 and he said, "Now we know!" It was just the -- the days,

you know, where everything was glands. "Now we know that all world history comes from the glands." Well, of course, we know, since man has a stomach, and genitals, all our history of course has to do with our physical existence. It's nothing new that we have glands. And I have always known that there are certain glands very necessary to produce children. So obviously history has very much to do with glands, but it is absolutely meaningful to turn to physics, to physis, to the things outside speech, the things which cannot speak, the universe which is mute, and say, "The speaking universe, you and I, you see, is produced by the mute universe, by our own objects."

So gentlemen, the question of -- of questions is: Which is the object of man? Nature or he himself? If you are a naturalist, you say, "Nature has as its object the production of man," you see. If you are a spiritualist, or -- or a logi- -- I mean, a Christian, who believes in the fact that the word creates, that the word is creative, you know very well that you cannot perceive the sun or the moon -- there is chaos with you, before you have given these things names, before you have looked out the window together with your fellow man.

Nature is the common observation of mankind, gentlemen. There is no nature for the individual. The individual, gentlemen, put in nature loses his mind, goes panicky. And if you have ever been in a desert, all by yourself, in the burning noon sun, you collapse. You -- you run wild. You -- you lose consciousness. You are found then, because you have fainted. A man who is really alone in the universe is unable to stand it. I mean, you have to -- just to think this through not with the example of a messenger who is sent through a known way through the desert, you see. That's of course -- he's still on the apron strings of society. You can see this. He's just a delegate into this desert. But a man who suddenly feels that he's cut off from the rest of mankind, really cut off for good, is unable bec- -- to -- to remain conscious. He loses consciousness, because consciousness, gentlemen, is the representation of the kind in us. You have no consciousness. I have no consciousness. But we have consciousness. And when you think, what do you think? You try to think the truth. What's the truth? That -- that which I also have to believe.

So the truth, gentlemen, is always that hold you -- holds you and me in its common grip. The mind is devoted to the -- a common denominator, to something general. Otherwise your thinking is a delusion. Most of you are deluded, because you think you have an -- a mind of your own. Nobody has that. I certainly have not, gentlemen. That's why I have a very good mind, because I have never the illusion that it is my mind. I -- the -- I have privilege and you are privileged to light up, as an electric bulb lights up in this -- here in this -- under this

glass. And can only light up where there's the cable and there is a common power plant. The light in this bulb is not of this bulb; and the light in your brain is not of your brain.

That's Plato, then. Plato has -- makes this heroic effort to stabilize, gentlemen, the relation between physis and nomos, the law of man and the law of nature, in such a way that there shall be, so to speak, no preference for one or the other. That is idealism in Plato's sense. Both are of immediate divine origin. We have in ourselves an idea of what is best between men; that's called goodness. And we have an idea of what is best in nature; and that's called truth. And we have an idea what's good in both; and that's called beauty. And that is the idea of Plato's goodness, truth, and beauty. And perhaps you understand now why I have tried to give you a history of Greek philosophy. This is not a course on Plato, you understand. It's a course in which I want to signify Plato's place in the history of what is called Greek thought, which you also could call "human thought." Whenever human thought tries to respond to a situation of time and space in limited ways with regard to reality, it has to reconcile these -- the first and the second impressions of it. The disharmony. Ja?

(Would you please repeat that -- what you said about the good, and the beautiful, and truth?)

Ja. Goodness is the ethical relation between men. Truth is the relation of reality with regard to nonspeaking, neutral objects, to the world of what we call "physis," the nonspeaking universe, or the world considered as not speaking, but as just being observed, or as being objectified. You can say good is between persons, you see, and truth is between objects, between things. Beauty is the harmony which permeates the whole universe, for Plato. A Christian would reject this. For a Christian, truth, beauty, and goodness are not the standards. But for the Greeks, that was the highest they have ever achieved. The harmony between the world of first impressions--so their society--and the world of second impressions.

Now after Plato, gentlemen, the balance shifts to a preponderance of nature that seems to them possible, following the Ionian first attempt to say that if we understand nature, we then can place the city of man inside nature, according to natural law. But that's not Plato's concept. Plato, who's exactly the middle, he does not decide in favor of nature, or in favor of the city, you see. But he says he has the im- -- matrix of both of them in his access to the good, and the beautiful, and the true as the eternal ideas in some background, in some {Kusch}, in some bed of reality out of which they come. When you have the

Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in the -- in the Christian tradition, that is, the life of man through the generations -- Plato is not interested in time, but in space. He sees the inner world of man and the outer world of nature, and he -- as the Christians realizes, that he has to reconcile the age of the Father and the age of the Son through the Holy Spirit, so that the beginning--Adam and Eve--and the last day of judgment are reconciled, you see, as one story; so in -- in Platonism, gentlemen, the world of men, the inner world of the mind, and the outer world of things, of the bodies, you see, is reconciled by a similar trinity. I always wonder why the humanists are so much down on the Trinity, and say, "That's abracadabra," and "That's a dogma." But when you talk to them, they never admit that "to the true, the beautiful, and the good" is a dogma. I think it's a very -- much more questionable dogma. No -- no -- not one of you has experienced the good, the beautiful, or the true. It's in a -- it's -- cannot be experience. It's an idea; it's a mere faith.

All humanists, gentlemen, believe much more un-understandable things than any Christian. But I'm very glad that they are my brothers in the fact that they must believe something. And they believe in space, in the eternal order of a universe written large--Universe--as I told you, in Greek, the -- the all, pan, in which there is life eternal, undying. There is no death, because things are true -- can be known as far as they are true--"are known how they are in truth" would be the correct sentence. Men are good. And the universe is beautiful. And the word "beautiful" then pertains to the nice bodies of young men, and the stars, and the organization of society; it all can be beautiful.

"Beautiful" then gentlemen, ties together, as you can see here, the political world and the natural world. Ja?

I think what most people in -- who live in Greenwich Village by and large have the same code. That is, they would also say the highest standard, as for Ezra Pound, is beauty. Beauty is so decisive, yet if something is beautiful, it cannot fail to be good for the city, or to be true in nature. You see. The deepest insight of -- in nature for a great poet or artist would be, "That is beautiful." And the greatest insight probably of an act of heroism would also be say -- to -- be to say, "How beautiful."

As you know, the Crucifixion came into the world so that nobody could say this anymore. The Crucifixion was atrocious, horrid. The blood of Christ is not beautiful, and His sweat, and His tears. They are horrifying. The Christians hold that beauty has nothing to do with truth. And -- beauty has nothing to do with goodness. A man can be very good and very ugly indeed.

But the Greek idea is always to paint Christ as beautiful young man. When you see a picture in which Christ is beautiful, you know it's by a Greek painter. And we are -- most people today are Greeks.

I had a friend here in town. And he rejoiced very much when the young minister of the church was called by -- by his -- the -- his confirmation class, "the living Jesus." He was a very beautiful man. So next day, he got a divorce. That comes from such idolatry, you see, of beauty. The boys called him "beautiful," because -- and they thought, of course, that -- that Jesus of Nazareth had also to be charming, you see. He wasn't charming at all, gentlemen. He would have made a terrible figure at any cocktail party.

The universe, gentlemen, however, of the Greeks is purely in space, not in time. It is eternal. And therefore, gentlemen, the universe of the Greek philosophy, of Greek idealism--or materialism, makes no difference--of the Stoics, of the Epicure, of the Pythagoreans, is construed as a deathless, as a deathless universe. Because, gentlemen, death is ugly. Death is -- makes you despondent. We talked about this last time, that anybody who has to die in person cannot tap himself on the shoulder and say, "Old boy, it doesn't matter." It matters terribly. And fortunately, you see, all the -- all your wonderful at- -- superior attitudes as Greek young men, that "I don't care," I mean, you are just deluding yourself. Because if there's nothing for which you care, you will end as a louse. Somebody will step on you, crush, and you can't complain. You have said all your life, "I don't care." So why should anybody else care for your precious life? Then what about it? You say all the time, "I -- it doesn't matter, I don't care." And then some police chief, Mr. {Sherlock} arrives in Budapest and crushes all these students who have said, "I don't care." Well, what of it? Where's your complaint? "It makes no difference," you always say. To the most vital decisions, you always -- I hear you say, "It makes no difference, it makes no difference."

Gentlemen, that is the danger of -- of the philosopher, as you know, who is in constant equilibrium, and who doesn't want to go out in a -- on a limb and who says, "This is all wonderful. It's an eternal order. Everything is wonderful. Nothing can be destroyed. We are all imperishable." Gentlemen, I am perishable, and you are perishable. And we are even corruptible, which is much worse. You see, we don't hold our own. Once you are good or beautiful, you cease to be a {tomorrow}. This is not foreseen in Greece. In Greece, the picture of philosophy is always that once you have attained a certain status of perfection--of truth or beauty--it stays with you. You can hold onto it. It isn't every moment again in danger of total collapse. And that's why the humanist loves the Greek picture of

the world or the universe, because he finds there the release of -- of the -- his real fear that nothing is permanent. We -- you and I should know that nothing is permanent. But the mind, you see, once you declare your mind independent, and once you say, "It's my mind," then the first attempt is to stabilize one's own mental picture, and that's -- in your mind, that's called a philosophy, you see, the stabilizer of one mental picture as lasting.

Plato isn't that stupid. Plato is not thinking that man's mind is his own.

Otherwise he wouldn't be an important philosopher. This is the common-sense philosophy, that my mind is able to stabilize the world around me. You call this "rationalization." The -- Plato's idealism is of -- of a much more refined type, and a much wiser type. He says that there are from eternity to eternity certain ideas: the good, and the beautiful, and the true. And that if man uses his mathematical mind, as in his dia- -- Plato's dialogue Theaetetus, or in the Timaeus, he can find out the truth of things, of stars, and of -- of all outer processes. And if he looks up to the idea of the good, and stares long enough, he will know what the good is.

So will you clear -- kindly, perhaps, as a -- as I think it's a useful -- useful handbill for you to -- say, all Gre- -- all philosophy gives the picture of the world -- in antiquity a picture of the world in terms of space. The ideas are somewhere up in Heaven, or in the sky. And man is here -- down here. And the things are outside, and the city is inside. These are all space -- concepts of space. First. Then the equilibrium between the physical world and the ethical world are the great problem, and they are solved in Plato's idealism by the equalization, the equality between the good and the true. And the mediator is the beautiful. Beauty is found inside and outside. Good is only found inside. Truth is found outside. The harmony of the good, and the beautiful, and the truth is the trinity of idealism. And whenever anybody pokes fun at you because you believe in the Trinity of the Church, you can always reply that the other trinity is much more arbitrary. Why is it arbitrary, gentlemen? Because there is never any agreement possible on the good, and the beautiful, and the true. Not possible. You can -- agree merely on the true. You can -- agree on the true -- on the good. But there is no reason to believe that two people who agree on the good, you see, like -- the colored woman who nurses your baby, you see, and you can -- agree on the good. But she'll never understand { }. You can't make her understand it, you see. It's too much for her. Therefore she'll never understand the -- the elements. It's too difficult for her -- in the universe, in this respect, { }. It takes a specialist to understand the universe. And it takes a specialist of the human heart to be a good {nanny}. And therefore, the people who are good together and the

people who know the truth together are not the same, and never will be. So idealism, gentlemen, is for a -- aristocratic group of people, for the chosen -- few, who have as much brain as they have heart, who know -- who will be in harmony between heart and mind, you see. But the average mortal is not able to study relativity, and -- and be a good witness. It's just asking too much.

And the nurse who is a good nurse, and the -- the -- the mathematician who is a good mathematician certainly are not held together by what is beautiful, gentlemen. They are held together by some quite other quality, gentlemen. If you come to know -- to know what holds together the physicist and the colored nurse of his baby, then you know why Greek philosophy is not the whole story. It is always only for the chosen few.

Philosophy Gre- -- gentlemen, philosophy is the assignment of the common conditions for thinking in all the fields of human knowledge. It's for men, especially for young men, and it is the unity of human research. And I can now define, gentlemen, what -- what this story of philosophy is. Philosophy is the process by which the human mind is renewed under the pressure of disharmonious environment. We have seen that's what it is, you see. The human mind is renewed under the pressure of a disharmonious environment, contradictory environment.

I feel also bound once more to repeat, gentlemen: I do not pretend that I have here in this course to teach Plato as he is for all his own sake. I have announced this as a course in the history of Greek philosophy. And history has its own laws. History of the Civil War is not a biography of Abraham Lincoln. You understand that. And that's the reason why I feel that first of all you should take another course on Plato alone. And second, that I know very well what I'm doing. I think it is more important for you to understand the march of history of the mind--it's much more difficult to understand--than to do something you can always do privately, sit down and read these writings by Plato, with a commentary, which is -- which is very good to do, indeed, but which is not the purpose of this course.

Let's now go to the text, please. Will you -- you have your copy? You have? Have you one? Have you? Here. It would be pos- -- true if I show it to you, but it wouldn't be beautiful. Or it would be good, I mean, but it would not be beautiful. Ja. It would also not be physically correct. Where were we?

(221.)

221. We were just -- yes: "...how large a city should be."

Now, gentlemen, you see how bold a step it is to deal with best. I'm very much interested. This is a new chapter for a new aspect of the Greek conflict, gentlemen. As you know, in Christianity, there is a thinking about first and last things. And that is called "eschatology."

Now, from Plato's point of view, he deals with a utopia. And no -- nowhere in -- in -- has anybody read Sartor Resartus by -- by Carlyle? Who has read that? Not one. I'm sorry. Well, utopia, as I told you, means "nowhere."

Now gentlemen, the difference between the Christian eschatology and the utopia is very much like the difference between the Trinity and the good, and the beautiful, and the true. And it is just as -- much worth your while to understand the difference between these, as between the others. The three ideals are: good, beautiful, true. And the Trinity was: Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit. Now, perhaps you will admit that you can experience a father and a son, or a mother and a daughter, but it's very hard to experience the good, the beautiful, and the true. They are things of the mind. They can be thought. They cannot make the experience. You cannot meet the good in the street. But you can meet images of fatherhood, and of sonhood on -- on the street of life. You can love them. But you can only aim at the true. It's only here in your mind that you can find it.

So in the same sense, gentlemen, the utopia is aimed at by our mind. The eschatology is an expectation of something -- what has already happened. That's why the eschatology is the second coming of Christ. Christ has already come, and He'll come again. That is, you all only repeat by expectation what your heart has already been shaken up by: the horrors of the judgment of the human race for its crookedness, for its wickedness, for its hardness, for its obstinacy, to see God come down to earth, that we won't -- we don't wish to see that.

All utopia, gentlemen, aims from the point of v- -- on which I live here into some unknown, fantastic space. It's "nowhere" in the literal sense that I am somewhere, you see, and what I think is nowhere. Eschatology is the opposite, is an attempt to make you see that the worst has already happened, and that if you do not anticipate it, you see, it will overtake you. It is already in reality there.

There is no eschatology as an idea, or as a thought. Then it is utopian. I d- -- I don't doubt that many Christians are just Greeks in -- when they speak of "the

other world," or of -- or of people going to Heaven. That's just another space for them, a really -- utopia.

So today it's very difficult, gentlemen. Most Catholics today are Platonists; and -- they call themselves Catholics, but they aren't, because they have ceased to be Christians. They are just scholasticists. They have a -- they have in their mind a utopia. That has nothing to do with Christianity, gentlemen. When a man tells you he is a Thomist, you can tell him, "Then you are no Christian." Because that's all Plato, and all Aristotle, later too. This ideas -- my ideals in space. So the utopia of Plato comes out very clearly in this sentence, which we read: "We shall determine which is the best city." The best city is not created somewhere as a creature, like -- you see, like any human being, or like -- like the animals, or the trees, like a redwood, that's the best tree you can think of. The -- at least the longest living. No, Plato is going to decide this from where he stands, you see, pro- -- projecting in- -- into nowhere. As you know, all modern philosophy tries to persuade you that you have to live in this disastrous projection business, that we all project our desires, and our wishes, you see, into these pictures. Gentlemen, we can, but we don't have to. I mean, projection is the first attempt of anybody, a fairy tale, a -- a utopia, to construe. But I think you and I can very well distinguish between projection of our own desires, you see, and forceful imposition of God's will on us, which is very different, indeed.

So, let's read there, 221. "Then here is another"--will you kindly--"Then here is another --" Yes, you, Sir, without the copy.

("Yes, I do.")

Where are you? No, we are a little later. We are a little later. "Then here is another injunction."

("Then here is another injunction we must lay upon the guardians. { } guards in every way that the city be neither small nor seem to be large, but be just great enough as a unity.")

The next, please.

("Quite {attractive} injunction for them, I should think.")

Now, Mr. Socrates.

("And another thing--it is more trifling still, I

suppose--which we mentioned before when we said that if a trifling kind of son should be born among the guardians, he was to be sent off to the others. And if one showing excellence was born among the others, he should be sent to the guardians. This was meant as a rule, but other citizen, also. One man, one work. They were to bring each man to the work that was naturally his, so that each might practice his own work and be one man, not many men. And thus the whole city might grow into one city, not many cities.")

("Yes. This is a smaller injunction than the other.")

("Really, my dear --")

Now, you see. You see immediately that mentally speaking, philosophically speaking, this is a hard doctrine. He calls them playfully, "trifles." Yet there is the rub -- that's the rub, there's your utopia. Has any man the r- -- the power, the right, you see, first to say that "I appoint this man guardian, and the other," that's the whole crux. We are here. Whenever Plato says, "This is trifling," you may be sure that he means the most important. And you have to learn how to read, gentlemen. It's like America, when they say, "We won't go to war." You may be sure next day they are in the midst of it.

Say one thing, and do the other. Especially when you minimize, as you know, what the Greeks called meiosis. Understatement, you see. Where there is an understatement, there's a very important statement. You can be sure of that. And this is a kind of this. The -- here we are, in your and my central point of decision: Do we follow Plato? Can we be Platonists? And I think in these two sentences is the whole crux of the matter. If you want to be a Bolshevik, then you say, "Hundred thousand Hu- -- Hungarians can be deported." That's what he says here, you see. That's in this sentence. He can deport them, if he thinks fit. That's what he literally says. You -- you, please read this with open eyes. Here is the seat of the megalomania of the human mind. "Just a trifle," he said. A trifle, most important thing. We'll never concede this. Ja?

("Really, my dear Adeimantus. These -- are not { } or great injunctions laid on them, as one might think, but all trifles, only they guard the proverbial one great thing equal, or rather not great, but sufficient.")

("What is that?")

("Education and training. For if they are well-educated, and become orderly men, they will { } see the way through all these things, and others, too that we have not mentioned yet--the pos-

session of wives in a marriage, and begetting children. They will understand that all these goods, as the proverb goes, must be held in common.")

Wonderful. Gentlemen, if nature is that which the mind perceives for the commonwealth, if I say 2 and 2 is 4, you all have to believe it, because it's mathematics, you see. My mind operates for all minds who are healthy and normal. You -- remember, I said: nature is that which the mind must think in all who are bound together in their observation of nature, in their exposure to a common nature. Now here you see, if you carry this over into the city, then all women must be held in common. Because if you treat the ethical realm, the realm of goodness in the same way as the realm of truth, you see, since you perceive that all things are equal with the mind, there is absolutely no halting, no barrier to concluding, you see, that since all women are there to produce children, any woman is as good as anybody else to produce children. And the famous -- the famous poly- -- how do you call it? polygyny?

(Polygamy.)

Polygamy. Well, no -gamy. Just many women -- of Plato has its -- seat here in his attempt to equalize the outer and the inner world so totally. And that's again a terrific sentence, gentlemen, which of course all our eugenists, they love to -- ro- -- to read. All women -- where is it? what did you read? -- "the possession of wives and marriage, and begetting children, they will -- will understand" -- "understand," wonderful! "They will understand that all these goods, as the proverb goes, must be held in common."

Now the next. "Yes," he said, "that would be --"

("Yes, he said. That would be quite correct. { } when a state once had a proper start, it grows as a circle would grow. Training and education being kept good, engender good natures. And good natures holding fast to their good education become even better than those before, both in the power of breeding like the lower animals, and in other ways.")

("That is likely.")

("Then to put it shortly, this one thing needful, training and education, is what the overseers of the city must cling to. And they must take care that it is not corruptly -- corrupted insensibly. They must guard it beyond everything, and allow only innovations in

gymnastic and music against the established order, but guard it with all possible care. And when someone says of songs--what is it people always want to hear? the latest tune that's warbled through the air--they would be anxious, lest men may think perhaps that the poet does not need new songs, but a new way of singing, and may crave this. So we must not praise such a thing, or take that to be the meaning, for to change to a new kind of music is a thing we must be aware of, as risking the whole. For the methods of music cannot be stirred up without great upheavals of social custom and laws. So says Damon, and I believe him.")

("Then you may put me down, too, as one who believes.")

("Then the { } safeguard for the guardians must be built somewhere hereabouts, it seems, in music.")

("Here at least, lawlessness creeps -- lawlessness easily creeps in, unseen.")

("Yes, in the form of play, when it seems likely to do no harm.")

("And it does no harm, if it were not that it makes itself at home, little by little, and gently overflows upon matters and practice. From these, now stronger grown, it passes to man's business agreements. And from business it moves upon laws, and constitutions, in a wanton flood, Socrates. And so at last all public and private life is overwhelmed.")

("Really? Is that the case?")

("It seems so to me.")

("Then, as you were saying at the beginning, our children must hold fast to play of a more law-abiding type than the first, since when play becomes lawless and the children likewise, it is impossible that law-abiding and serious men can grow out of such children.")

Who has taken Philosophy 9? Well, you recall our problem of play and serious life. That's discussed here. And the interesting thing is, gentlemen, that in play and -- you need fashion, you need fads, you need the latest hit, you need the new play on Broadway, the need a new -- need a new comic strip, et cetera. And the problem that we discussed here is that of novelty, as you can see, you see. Plato tries to arm against novelty for novelty's sake. I don't think -- so far we have seen how he is going to do it. But that's what he's up against. Novelty for novelty's sake -- sake. Playing is appetizing, because you can in play change all the time without any danger. But can you play in the military estab-

lishment, you see? Can you suddenly say that Charles Wilson should be in command of the American army instead of General Eisenhower, you see? Can you delegate to the secretary of defense the -- the commander-in-chief function? That's -- would be something that -- that you could expect to happen in a play arrangement, where the old coach, you see, cedes to a younger man on his -- for the time being and says, "I go home."

Now, go on.

("Certainly they must.")

("Indeed it seems that when children begin by playing properly and receive it into themselves law and order through their music, just the opposite happens. Good order goes with them in all things, and makes them grow. And raises up again whatever of the old state was lying in ruins.")

Ah ha. We have then the worship of the old, the restoration, gentlemen, of the old against -- against that which is changing all the time. Ja?

("True indeed.")

("Then we discover again the custom, even {playful} which they were {thought}, which goes before them and wholly destroys.")

("What custom?")

(Such as silence of the younger in the presence of their elders, which is { }. And giving place to them, and rising before them, and honoring their parents. The cut of their hair, the manner of dress and { }, their whole bearing and comportment, and everything of that sort. Don't you think so?")

("I do.")

("But to legislate about such customs would be silly, I think. For they are not observed, and they would not last if laid down as laws in word and writing.")

("How could they?")

("Anyhow, the fact is, Adeimanti- -- -tos, that whatever way their educations start them, their future ways are of like quality. It's a case of like always causing to like.")

("What else can happen?")

("And in the end --")

You see, here we have already this terrible -- really terrible habit in the end of Plato's dialogues that the poor interlocutor is only allowed to say something totally empty. If you read at the -- these two sentence: "How could they?" and "What else could happen?" I mean, if they weren't there, we -- much happier. But the whole dialogues are filled with this -- these trifles, you see. It's really trash. There the form runs away with -- with, so to speak, with the content, you see. Once he has laid down the form of the dialogue, he has to fill it out, you see, even when there is no requirement for any response, or answer, or -- and there are very few dialogues in Plato which make you feel that the form of the dialogue is a -- really necessary. We'll read later as a contrast later the Symposium in which this is true. The Symposium is a real dialogue. And this is not. Ja? This is a book.

(Sir, I was wondering. I noticed that { } one section where Adeimantus begins to talk about -- about the infiltration, you might say, of -- of -- of innovation into -- into tradition, while they're talking about { }. He doesn't { } I was wondering if there's any meaning involved { } does seem to be an exception.)

Oh, that's a very great sentence by Adeimantus, sure. Here, on page 222, what we just read. Oh, I hadn't said that every one of these answers is meaningless. But I gave you two examples, where they're really just fillers. And the proportion, I mean, in The Republic is already that two-thirds wouldn't be missed, you see. But there are other dialogues, of course, in the end in the Timaeus, and in the laws of Plato, in the old work, it is nothing but a stereotype what the -- in the answer, or in this interrupter is -- done. So you may say the story of Plato's dialogues is a story of using up a form, and in the end, it no longer is more than a form. In the beginning, it is necessary. Here we are in the middle, so to speak. Part of it -- I would agree with you, Mandaville, that this -- on Page 222, "And it does no harm if it were not that it makes itself at home little by little," is con- -- is con- -- is elementary, is of great importance. It's central. He -- and probably he wanted to put it into the mouth of this -- of this young man.

({ } I was wondering why it seems like { }.)

Well, I think it's a flattery. Do you know who Adeimantus and Glaucon

are?

(No, Sir.)

They are two brothers of Plato. So it's a very nice way, don't you think? It remains in the family.

Now, let's read one more page and then have a break.

("In the end, then, I think you would say it would turn out to be something complete and bold, either good or bad.")

("Of course.")

("My opinion, then, let me tell you, is that for these reasons, I will not try to make laws about such things.")

("With good reason.")

("Ah, but for goodness' sake. Do say what you think about all this market business, contracts which different -- with different -- which different classes of people make in the margin and contrast with Artesians, if you --")

Oh, oh, oh. Artesians?

(Oh. "Artists." Thank you.)

Artesian wells exist, gentlemen.

("And slander {and assault}. And filing of the declarations and finding juries, for there may be dues to exact or to pay, which have to be enforced sometimes in markets or harbors. The whole multitude of marke- -- market rules, or police rules, or the harbor rules, and all other such, shall we allow ourselves to make {new laws} about these?")

("No, it would not be worth the trouble to give orders to cult- -- cultured gentlemen. They will easily find out themselves, I suppose, most of the lawmaking {needs}.")

("Yes, my dear { }. If only God grants them safe maintenance of the laws which we have described already.")

("If he does not, they will spend their whole lives making such laws, and amending them, and expecting to find perfection.")

("You may { } six men who are too undisciplined to give up their bad manners { }.")

("Exactly.")

("Oh, what a charming life they have, always doctoring themselves with the sole result that they make their diseases worse and more complicated. And if anyone recommends a medicine, always expecting to be cured by it.")

("Yes, that is just what happens to men who are sick in that way.")

("Yes, indeed; and here is another charming thing about them. They hate worst of all -- worst of all the man who tells them the truth, who tells them that nothing in the world will do them any good, not medicines, or burnings, or cuttings, no -- not { } or amulets, or anything else until they stop drinking, and gorging, and wenching, and idling.")

("Not so very charming to be angry with one who gives good advice. There's no charm in that.")

("You don't seem to approve of such men.")

("No, I do not, I do declare.")

("Nor will you approve of the city then, to return to that we were saying, if it does things of that sort as a whole. Do not cities appear to you to do just the --")

Now, that's an important sentence, gentlemen. And we'll go on from there. Please read this paragraph now. Mandaville, there's the case, you see -- who says this? This is Socrates, which is -- this is central here. "Do not cities appear to you --" ja?

("Do not cities appear to you to do just the same as these sick men, when they are badly governed, and forewarn their people not to meddle with their city's constitution, on penalty of death to anyone who tries to do this? But whoever serves them most pleasantly, governed as they are, and heaps favors upon them, and cringes, and forestalls their wishes, and shows himself clever in fulfilling them, there is their good man and true. There is their fountain of wisdom. There's is the man they will honor.")

("They do seem to me to do just the same. And I do not approve of them at all.")

("Then what of those who are willing and eager to serve such cities? Don't you admire them for courage to carry it off so lightly?")

("I do, except those who are really deluded and believe themselves to be real-born statesmen, because they are afraid for the mob.")

Let's stop here. Thank you. Five minutes.

[tape interruption]

As you can see in -- on Page 223, there is -- is a phrase on the bot- -- at the bottom of the page, "Yes, my dear friend, if only God grants them safe maintenance of the laws." Now to any humanist, this is very shocking that his beloved Plato still has the obsolete superstition of mentioning God. It's not necessary if you b- -- have ideas. Then why speak of God? The difference between ideas and gods is, you see, that we have to pray to God if He is alive. You can't pray to ideas. You just have them. You may stare at them. So you may take down, gentlemen: the distinction between the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit on the one-hand side--and the true, and the good, and the beautiful--is that the good, and the true, and the beautiful can't be spoken to. They can't be spoken. It isn't meaningful to pray to the good, obviously, you see. It's something you look at, but the good cannot look at you. And the beautiful cannot look at you. And the true cannot look at you. With the ideals, man is all in an -- immobile, speechless universe. In the universe, there may be these guiding stars. But these stars do not perceive you. You are not seen. In Plato, you are not loved. In Plato you are not understood. In Plato, you are not embellished. But you see the beautiful. You see the truth. They are in this sense -- you may say beacons, or aims, or stars, or ideals.

What you call an "ideal" is something very handy, gentlemen. That's why you sh- -- and I cannot be idealists in seriousness. Idealists don't talk back. Ideal -- an ideal is what I make it to be. And no contradiction allowed from the part of the ideal. I say, "I have ideals." Poor ideal isn't asked any questions, you see. It just has succumbed to my will. That's why idealists are funny people, because they first make their god out of their mind, and then they say, "That's a god." It isn't. It's just an ideal. What you call -- we called a projection. Ja?

(Can this -- can these ideals somehow get around it by the process of empathy?)

Of emphasis --?

(Empathy -- empathy?)

But -- but it's arbitrary. You may think it's empathic. But how about -- what is empathic about the good?

(Well, I mean { }.)

Didn't we talk about this communion with nature -- my friend here on campus who would interrupt my -- our social intercourse and stop on -- in the midst of campus and say, "Pardon me, I have -- now have to hold communion with nature." I think he was a silly ass. And arrogant, too, because he wanted to be alone. He called this "nature." There's no communion with ideas, or communion with nature, gentlemen. Don't be betrayed. The simplest answer to an idealist is always that he meets no resistance, you see. If you meet Jesus, or His Father, they tell you exactly that you should be ashamed of yourself. But an ideal is of your own making. If you talk long enough of -- to the ideal, it will allow you any crime. Absolutely -- it has nothing -- it's no resistance.

But there's a very -- something very important still to be said. On this -- end of the page, I looked up the Greek text. Gentlemen, the Greeks have of course names for their gods. There is Zeus. And it has always been felt in antiquity that if a man really believed in God, he would speak of Zeus as a father of gods and men, and not of God in the abstract. Do you know what the difference between the Greek word "theos" is, which is -- is -- which goes around in the word "theology," to this day, you see -- and the word "Zeus"? It's a very simple difference as between ideas and between -- a living person. Zeus you can invoke. But the word "theos" -- "theos," which already is old, which is a sum of the gods, whose special name doesn't matter, has no vocative. In other words, gentlemen, the Greek word used here at the end -- bottom of Page 223, is the weakest word for the gods, because it -- it is that god who can -- who is not invoked. You will not understand this because -- only perhaps if you think of the "Our Father in Heaven." If you think of the most common prayer of Christianity, you will understand that if -- if there wasn't this invocation, "Our Father," you see, there would be no prayer. It is perfectly enough for a man to say in an agony "Our Father," or "for Christ's sake"; that's a full prayer. All the rest is just execution, so to speak, you see, of a minor character. The logic of the prayer does not -- matters much less than the invocation, because you put yourself face-to-

face with your Father in Heaven.

The Romans felt this very sternly and very heavily. You know the word "Jupiter" is the vocative. The word "pater" is abbreviated in "piter," in "piter," and the word "Jovis" is abbreviated in "Jup". And therefore Jupiter is the form of the prayer. And then it becomes -- became to be the final name of the god. That is, gentlemen, a true god can only be spoken of in the vocative, in the shortest form, in this form, "Jupiter," or "Our Father." Why? Because if you believe in God, He is present. If He is present, you cannot speak of him as though He was absent. If we really believe in God, gentlemen, you must behave all the time as though He is present.

Now, to any present company, you have to address your word directly. I cannot speak of you with -- as "he." It is very impolite while Richard {Siles} is in this room to speak of him instead of taking him into our conversation and turn to him and say, "You will agree," you see. I must not say to you, "He agrees." That's very impolite. And many people make this mistake in conversation, that they speak of present company, you see, as "he." It's -- you mustn't do this. That's always an insult. And it hurts to be called a "he" in your own -- in my own presence. While you're talking of me, here, when I can hear it, you must turn to me and say, "Am I not right, Professor?" you see. That is, by saying "Professor," you reconcile me to hear -- overhear your talking of me, you see, because then you agree that I'm still alive then -- and a part of the spiritual -- conversation that takes place.

All this is lost on you, gentlemen. You live in an inanimate universe. You have been ruined by your schools, and you think that to speak of God is decent. Gentlemen, it's indecent. You can speak to God, and you cannot mention Him. You can be silent. But you cannot speak in bull sessions about the existence of God. That's just funny. And it is insane. And it leads nowhere. Has absolutely no meaning, this discussion about God, because any discussion about God has already made the decision that He doesn't listen in. So it's a -- forgone conclusion. You have already decided that there is no God, then you discuss Him. The result is that everybody goes home and says, "It can't be proven." Of course, not. Because you set out already in a situation in which you had decided that He wasn't there. If you assume one thing, you cannot be surprised that we never get to the -- as a result the other.

That's why all the discussions about God Almighty are so very strange -- meaningless. Any man who opens his mouth believes in God. He may deny it. There are decided atheists who say it's very harmful to speak, and to -- to -- to

allow other people to -- to pronounce this fact. That's atheism. But the atheist believes that he is right, and he believes that he is true. And so he always believes that there is a common spirit among men.

You see, anybody who speaks and tells the truth to somebody else is this man's father. And anybody who listens to the -- somebody else and learns something from him is this man's son; because father and son is still -- just the relation of hearing and speaking, of learning and -- and teaching, of instructing and -- and -- and receiving. Whatever you take, I mean. In any relation, you read a book. This author is your authority, you see, and you are on the receiving end. You are in this moment his son. You can be 20 and I can be 70, if you teach me something, you are my father and I am your son.

That is, in the relation of speech, of speaking and listening, there is always the relation of older and younger, because the man who says something knows one minute before the man who hears it, hears it, what is true. You cannot change this, you see. Who says something first is always leading on. And who hears something second is always following. There is nothing to get around about this situation of speaking and reading. And all you people who want to become writers, or teachers, or lawyers, or whatever it is, or salesmen, or advertising men, you always assume that there is in reality father and son, as an eternal category, that we all take turns. Sometimes we are in the position of the son. Sometimes we are in the position of the father. And as long as there is life, you will constantly be switching between these two positions.

[tape interruption]

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

In all your papers, gentlemen, and I'm going to read them; and even if you copy from somebody else, I'm going to find out. The -- I've just to -- to separate three boys into the other course because of dishonesty. So please be careful. They have to leave college. It's really stupid. But a man who -- who I think who -- who thinks that his teacher is so stupid has to be severed for lack of intelligence.

I come back to the one thing which I would like you to learn, which seems to be impossible however for you to understand, that there is at every moment when a man's mind is at work, that is, when he ceases from sleep, we are after all -- all, gentlemen, in several states...

[tape interruption]

...will not understand that while you are in the morning awakening, go -- have breakfast, and then you -- before you go to sleep, all day long, your mind is at work by associating with the living -- preferably with those people who seem to you more alive than yourself, like a beautiful girl, or a wise man, or the opera, or the radio -- or whoever you listen to. That is, you try to find life, you join up with life. And you try to agree in the process of joining others -- peo- -- friends, of looking at the world together, because you are quite sure that it cannot be true if you only think of the world this way. You want to have agreement on all these sta- -- your statements and ideas about the world; before the other people -- your comrades have not agreed, there is no world in which you can trust.

That's just your own imagination, wishful thinking, you call it, you see.

So anybody who wakes up and takes breakfast, gentlemen, makes a decision: here are the people in whose judgment he has to trust. I -- we call it -- this "community." You call it your "friends," because you overlook the fact that these friends and you speak American, slang. They speak English, and that's a political order, inside which every word you speak makes sense. Democracy. Nobody in Iran understands "democracy." They think that's a Cadillac, when you say "democracy" in Iran, because that goes together with "America." But you understand democracy because you live in America. So even though you don't speak to all Americans, you still are within the logos of America, here. And you speak to the people who are in this logos ethically, owing each other the truth about the world.

So in every minute, gentlemen, the -- the frontiers between logos, ethos, and physis are changing. You get up, gentlemen, and you shave. As long as this -- these whiskers are on you, they are part of you. Once they are shaved, they are thrown away. They are dead. Therefore, you have carried, from the living to the dead, something. It has become purely natural, whereas before it is an integral part of your -- the painting, the portrait which the painter paints of you, your own beard.

And so with everything, gentlemen. You throw over Europe and you say, "Ooh, Europe is dead," or you say, "England made a mistake now; Eden is just finished." He's finished. Well, you can only say "finished," you see, of somebody you bury, you declare to belong to the realm of the nether world. You do it all the time. You are very cruel in this respect. There are any number of people whom you declared to have died already long ago. And -- probably in some cases you may be right. But I also think that most of you haven't yet been born, so I also would consider you pure nature, and I have to treat you this way. Any man who copies from another man--is separate from college--is treated as an object of dismay, and dismissed, because he cannot be a member of this community. That's the whole story.

Would you then kindly resume, I mean, our approach now to Plato, to this quandary of every human mind who is honest with himself, and who is not dealing with the -- the trash which most of you use, in -- in your daily -- language. You are not aware, gentlemen, that every word that comes out of your mouth moves the frontiers between the things that are less alive than you, and the people and the forces that are more alive than you. In every moment, you try always to join up with the powers that be, or the powers that you think that are -- that are important. And you are going against those forces of -- of deadness, and boredom, and -- and mere quantity, which you think you can exploit, and which you can cheat, or which you can manipulate.

Ask yourself, gentlemen, you think of course, you can manipulate your professors. You can perhaps also manipulate Dean Mc- -- {MacDonald}. But there are certain people in the -- in the world, I'm sure, where you know very well that if you would try to manipulate them, they would lose their ultimate importance for you. People you love, gentlemen, if you would try to manipulate them, you wouldn't love them. You -- know this very well. You can, of course, rape a girl, or persuade a girl to sleep with you; but you know exactly, too, if you do wrong by her, that you don't love her, and that you have treated her as an object, you have treated her as physis. You have not treated her in the spirit of love.

And therefore it is your own temptation, gentlemen, your own decision how you treat this girl. In any moment, you can treat any girl, God Almighty, too, just as a thing to be manipulated. You can go as a hypocrite to church, and say, "It's good for my income tax if I go to church, because I can deduct so -- 10 percent of my income for charities." Well, you then know that you have treated God as though He was just a part of the world. And you know very well that you have deprived yourself of the possibility of living with anybody who is a little better off, a little more alive than you yourself.

My whole point today is, gentlemen, that logos, ethos, and physis are your own experiences. This is important for our approach to this book, because in Plato, you see, he officially deals with everything as physis. And he wants to know the physis, the nature of the state, for example. But on the other po- -- hand, he puts this in the form of dialogue. And so, the funny thing is, gentlemen, the content of Plato's philosophy is nature. The form is ethical. A dialogue is an ethical form of thinking, because there are more than one person involved. And you owe each other the truth.

Where is Mandaville? He isn't here today. I'm sorry, he -- because he raised this question yes- -- last time, when we read one sentence -- or one paragraph of Adeimantus, and he said, "Isn't that a real contribution to the dialogue?" And I had to admit it, that this was more than just a stilted form, and that more than one man were needed to know the truth.

Now that's a big recognition, you see, of Plato -- Plato's relation to his -- to the -- humanity comes out in the form of his philosophy. Plato's ideas about the world come out in the content of his philosophy. And most of you do not know, gentlemen, that form is already in itself an act of faith.

If you take your hat off before an old lady, that already is an ethical act, of course. You see, you don't have to say anything, and you -- I -- don't have to give me your creed that old people, you see, deserve to be kept alive, and n- -- don't have to be shot, as in the { }. Or -- or given over to {salvation}. Because you took off your hat before this lady, I know you have some reverence before old age, you have to say nothing. And I have to know of any philosopher how he behaves to his neighbors before I know his full philosophy, don't you see? What he says and writes is only a little part of what he really thinks.

Now in Plato, it should be obvious to you that he is the ideal friend, because his ethical code demands that the truth is conveyed to us by several

people bringing it out together. So the cooperative fellowship is constitutional for his -- you see, it's fundamental to his ethics. And though he may not have written, like Aristotle, ever any treaty -- treatise on -- on friendship, that he is a good friend is in -- implicated in the form of his works.

And therefore the Ethics of Plato can be fathomed in his approach, in his -- in his -- the form of his writings. And I thought I should try, at least, to convey to you my conviction that Americans think that the ethical things should be stated in blunt sentences: "Be good," and so. I doubt, though, that this form of -- of indicative statements of ethics ever work, because ethics is not something that you can write down as you can write natural science. You can say, "2 and 2 is 4," but what it is to be good is so doubtful. Good is such an abstraction, you see, that if you don't give a living example how you treat your neighbor, I don't know what you're talking about. What's good? Good is what everybody thinks is good. If -- we wouldn't know what Plato calls "the good." We talked about it yesterday, you remember. We wouldn't know what is his good. Somebody else stopped me on the street--who was it? ja--about the absolute good, you see. We wouldn't know about goodness if we wouldn't see this goodness at work. And if -- you don't see goodness at work by abstract statements, gentlemen, by systematic { }. I can only believe that the man knows what is good by seeing him in action. Can you understand?

Now the action of Plato is the style of his works. And the thought is something different again. That's the content. It's very hard for you to understand--and to believe me--that ethics cannot be expressed in abstract statements. It is the curse of America that this is not -- that this is still believed. The result is then in the Orozco fresco of the schoolteacher who makes all these little children sexless, you see, and repeat stock phrases, you see. Have you -- this picture in mind? It's so awful, because you don't see them behave, you see, cordially, or neighborly. But you only see them stand there and being -- filled with these silly doggerels, so to speak, on morality. Morals cannot be stated in the same way as natural facts. You can state, "The rose is a flower." All right. What of it, you see? But you can never say, "Be good." It's -- Mothers say it, and they ruin their children, they get a repress- -- a complex. Yes, a mother who slaps her child in the face and gives her candy the next day can educate a child. But a ch- -- mother who constantly says, "Be good," to a child spoils the child, corrupts the child, ruins the child. We don't know what is good, except concretely in one action. "This is good, and the other thing is bad" is a wanton addition to the act, you see.

Good is the -- if you have A, B, C, and you write around this "good," then

you only say it that in your family these three things are done every time. There is breakfast, there is lunch, and there is evening -- evening supper, and then you say, "This is good." But without your having experienced that breakfast is, you see, appetizing, and -- and -- and nourished you, and that luncheon is there, and supper, you wouldn't know what -- good is, as in my paper called "Being," you see, where I tried to tell you -- where Heraclite tries to tell Parmenides that being is only meaningful if you already know what it includes. In the same way, goodness is not meaningful unless you have acted in various ways and you remember all the positive actions, you see, and say, "This I call good." Otherwise you don't know what -- what goodness is.

Now in Plato, there is this realization that in every moment where he says something about physis, he must act ethically to the people whom he wants to convince of the truth of nat- -- in nature, you see. The truth in nature and the goodness to the people who want to -- share this truth must always be congruous {in him}. And today, I mean -- throw all the books on ethics -- written in America in the last hundred years into the fire, and they wo- -- they won't be missing, because they are all trying to express ethics in terms of natural knowledge. You cannot express ethics in terms of natural knowledge. It isn't natural, because it wells up in you, because you are face to face with a human being. And with this very definite human being. I'm good in my -- behavior towards my parents and I'm good in my behavior towards you, or I'm wicked in my -- { }. But in every moment, I have to behave differently.

Ja?

(Yeah, but this is -- this is okay for the first impression. But what if you and I come from different societies? And you've been taught that this is good, and I that is good. And then we try to generalize, we try to say something that's true for all of us, you see, for both of us? Then don't we have to become abstract? In general?)

I would be very careful in this. I would say if an American and an Englishman meet, or -- I have to go through this proceedings now, gentlemen, of reconciling my American citizenship, and my stay here -- and my feeling of home here, with my German relations. And they know this very well -- very acutely, that I'm balancing. I shall very much avoid to have any generalization for all the world. I must -- it must be concretely between Americans and Germans. And it is this immodesty that Mr. {Malik} tries to sell you a world ethic, instead of -- it should be -- a Syrian-American ethic, which makes me, for example, not trust Mr. {Malik} of Syria, who is a very good man. I mention him

because I have great respect for him. But I think -- do you know who he is, {Malik}? Who has heard of him? He is very -- made himself quite popular, but it is an illusion to think, you see, that goodness between two concrete people, you see, can ever be expressed in generalities for the whole of mankind. I give you two examples, and it's terribly important that we should now keep from Plato, in this discussion just of the state, the difference between the natural aspect of any city -- where people have to eat, and to live, and to get married--that's all natural, after all, because they are animals who have to exist--and goodness. The dialogue of Plato, I say, is his ethical contribution, his immense friendship. And Aristotle expressed it very beautifully; he said of Plato, "This man was so good, that the wicked ones do not even have the right to praise him." That's a very wonderful saying. You see, he wanted -- he -- he had this impression that on the highest level, not everybody has the right to talk. Not everybody can even judge, you see. And therefore, a man who says, "Plato was a good man," is already taking upon himself to insist that he has a right to judge Plato. And Aristotle says, "Nonsense; the wicked ones have no right to praise him."

The emperor of Austria, the last great monarch of the world, Jo- -- Francis Joseph, used always to say when the -- when the papers praised him for some utterance, or for some act of -- kindness, he said, "An emperor must not be praised, ever, because then also these same people have to -- the right to scold him. And an emperor must be beyond," you see, "good and evil, or he cannot be the emperor of 14 different nations," as he was. And therefore, the praise of a man also includes the right of criticism, and so he ceases to be beyond the parties, you see.

These two sentences -- examples may show you -- Aristotle saying on -- of Plato, and the emperor Francis Joseph's own insight into the dangers of praise, that this presumes that the man who praises has any understanding of the quality which he praises, you see. That would abolish the -- would make every idiot the critic of every highest spirit in the world. It would abolish awe, and reverence, and respect; and it has been, of course, cauterized out of your existence very largely. America perishes because it has no respect. And so it always -- since people cannot live without respect, you distribute your respect always to the idiotic values of Broadway, or DuPont, or rich people, or some such silly asses. They don't deserve your respect and your reverence. There are other people who reserve your -- deserve your reverence, like Helen Keller, or some such -- people.

But you have been told, "Be independent," "Every man is as good as everybody -- other man. I am critical. I cannot be taken in." But you cannot live without awe. You cannot live without authority. So officially in this country, the most terrible people receive celebrity. If you read the book, *The Power Elite*, who has seen this book? *Power Elite*? Haven't seen it? It's quite an interesting book, because it -- it shows how the abolition of true superiority, gentlemen, has led to the necessary substitute of false values. Nobody can live, gentlemen, without ethics, that is, without recognizing that you have people who are better than you. That's what we call ethics. And the people who are less good than you. The scale of values is in ethics always necessary.

So we put this, this way, gentlemen. All physical facts can be expressed in the form of indicatives. But all ethical facts can only be expressed in emotional form of "yes" or "no," in the sense of -- of "Let us do this," or "Let us avoid it." If you get a murderer, your reaction is: "God forbid that I should ever be found in this situation." So a crime creates an ethical reaction in every healthy person, that you don't want to be found in the same predicament. And any glorious action--like the Hungarian people now--gentlemen, that cannot be stated in the form of report, that they -- that they -- this happened. You have to say, "I'm proud of them," you see, "I admire them."

You'll remember what we said of admiration, that it is the fundamental fact that human beings are either to be admired or to be despised. Therefore, I call this not an indicative sentence. But that's a -- always a subjective sentence. All ethical problems are problems of "Let me be this way," or "Let me not thi- -- be this way." That is, they are always movements back and from -- away or towards. That's perhaps the best expression. All ethical statements, gentlemen, are movements away from this feature, this event, or towards this event. As long, however, as you live in your -- under your physical cloud -- your physicist's cloud, you don't believe this. You think that ethics is a science, which of course, it isn't. Ethics is the decision on who is on your side -- or on whose side you are on, you see, and against whom you are. -- Against, not in any inim- -- hostile sense, but what is less important, so that it can be manipulated. All the means, for example, all automobiles are just means. If a child is born, you must forget about the sale of your automobile at that moment. The child comes first. You can express it in a very simple way. First things come first. You have heard this at home, probably. Your mother may have told you that first things come first. I hope she has.

If she has, gentlemen, it means that in all ethical decisions, there is a

hierarchy. There is something more alive, and something less alive. And it is true in every minute, gentlemen, that you have to decide who is more alive, so that you have to serve him, and help him. If you find a great genius, or a poet in your community--like Robert Frost, who's going to speak to us on Thursday--obviously you go there. You flock there, I hope, because it will be your last opportunity of seeing this very great man. If you go there, you act ethically, because you acknowledge that the higher attracts the lower. You see, you don't say anything about it. You don't make a statement. And you don't say much. You say, "Robert Frost is -- is a great poet." The only thing I will believe in your judgment if it -- he makes you go. Because you take -- you see, your heart and -- and allow your heart to speak. That's ethics. That's all it is.

I want to give you two more examples, because that's the terrible misunderstanding around Plato. Plato has said in his Seventh Letter that he never said the deepest secrets of his life in any of his books. And so I have to, at this moment, what do I do? I draw your attention to the fact that his life was his ethics, his life with his friends, and that he impressed people as a saint, as the greatest spirit of antiquity, because of this sincerity of his dealing with his friends, or with his people. And we know from his Seventh Letter that the best is not expressed in his dialogues.

And I would therefore say the best, however, appears in the form of these dialogues, at least. We have an idea how smiling, how cheerful, how merciful, how ironical, how edu- -- how -- how sympathetic, how sharp, how he could be when he was speaking with his friends, you see. In the dialogue, he gives away his dramatic secret of being a person acting out his role in life within a comp- -- godly company of men.

Gentlemen, I once was in a difficult position in the army in the First World War. I -- it was in the Battle of the Somme. And I was -- suddenly got the report that my youngest officer -- was only 18 years old and u- -- an ensign -- had been found sleeping on guard. You know you are spelled every two hours on military guard. It was -- battle was raging, and so of course it was a very terrible crime. And in normal -- under the code of -- penal code of any army, a man who is found sleeping on guard has to be shot. At least he has to be court-martialed. And he wa- -- certainly would, as an officer, be immediately degraded, lose his qualities. So life and honor both were at stake with this man.

And he came before me to report his case, because he had been reported before, with a helmet on, and all the bandoleer, and everything -- as we say, in full -- in full glory -- battle dress -- glory. Dirty, it was. It was very -- it was

November. It was a very hard time for everybody. And here was this boy. And his whole future was at stake. And if I had acted out my simple military duty, he would have been ruined for life. On the other hand, gentlemen, it was serious business, and something very drastic had to happen. I couldn't let this pass. And I couldn't say, "I shall use" -- I shouldn't -- couldn't say an indicative sentence, as you would think, you see, from the morality of your little schoolhouse teacher: a sermon would do. No sermon could make up for his crime, because he had let down, after all, the army in a battle.

And I want to repeat, gentlemen, ethics is never to be stated in the form of a proposition. Wake up to this fact, and you suddenly cease to be so superstitious, as you all are. And you think that ethics is a part of your worldly knowledge. It is the knowledge of your -- the community, the polis, this com- -- in which you really think to live. And in the community one does move and is moved but -- never makes reasoned statements and judgments, because "Judge not, lest ye be judged." It is not my business to judge such a man, gentlemen, but to do something with him. If you could only understand this. You are all judges of the whole rest of the world all the time, because you are so frightened that you might be shaken out of your li- -- intellectual security. As long as you think that I am under your judgment, gentlemen, you treat me as a piece of nature, you see. Because you put me in -- outside of you, somewhere. I'm not then a part of your own life.

Comes to my -- well, I first finish -- no, I may interrupt this by -- by a kind of excursus -- on last Thursday we had the installation of a minister. And the charge -- such an installation is given by another minister, trying him -- telling him what to do. The other minister had -- been his co-pastor in Keene, New Hampshire, and -- for the last three years. And he said, "Thank you, Roy, for the kindness which you have shown to me. You were asked to pass judgment on me to the board of -- ministers -- appointments for the ministry in Boston. And they asked you -- gave you a questionnaire. And you wrote back, `This man is an integral part of myself at this moment. We are brothers here in arms. And as long as we are together, I shall not pass any judgment on him. I shall not answer any of your questionnaires. It would be a break of the unity inside of us, where I must not even try to reason what qualifications he has. He's just part of me, and I am a part of him. And just as little as I know really to judge myself, I shall not give you any such qualifications.'"

And that -- then the minister also mentioned that his comrade in Keene had done this after some consultation of myself, that we had been cahoots and had been thinking, could a man in moral -- in honesty serve the con- -- congre-

gation as a minister, with another man, and at the same time, sit down and say, "He is -- such-and-such," you see? "He's good and he's bad." And the -- and the result was that he cannot. If you pass such a judgment, the man is outside you. And then he is a part -- has become a part of nature.

So it's morally very important, gentlemen, that you understand this. Then you wouldn't answer such questionnaires as Mr. {Bender} here used to put out: Whom do you love more, your father or your mother? That's -- you see, that's the devil's question. In the moment you answer this question, you have ceased to love either your father or your mother, or both. If you cannot understand this, you see, you are lost to philosophy, because philosophy knows of this separation of the ethical attitude and the worldly, the physical attitude. And if you think that your father and your mother are part of the physical world, then you can say whom you love more. But then you neither know what a father is, nor do you know what a mother is, nor do you know what love is. You think love is a fact. Love is something that at this moment you have to battle for. You have to pray that your love doesn't give out. And how can you pray -- continue to love if you dissect it and try to know who is deader. One of the two you put on the dum- -- dump, by making this decision. And I hope you will never know whom you love more, your father or your mother. I couldn't tell to this day whom I have loved more. They are both dead. But do you think I know? And I don't want to know. There are things that you must not know, in generalizations, Sir. This is what, you see, tried to think, that there could be general statements of this nature. They must not be. They must not be tried. But you must move back and forth, towards and away from things.

Well, what did I do in the battle -- on the battlefield of the Somme in 1916? Gentlemen, I slapped this man as heartily as I could into his -- in his face. And there was the staff sergeant, and there were several men. And they saw it. And that was his redemption. And I decided that by slapping him in the face, I could get him -- I treated him as a boy. He was 18, after all, and you can treat such a man as a boy. And therefore I declared him -- simply not to have been of age at that moment, of his action. And everybody was very happy. Seven years later, the boy brought me his wife and said, "Here is the man who saved my life," to her.

And that is -- may have been -- may be qualified as a -- ethical truth, which I discovered at that moment, that I had to create a new relation to this man. In treating him as a child, as a boy, I could get him out of his position as an officer. It was of course, in a way, a momentary degradation, because you don't slap an officer in the face. But should I wait until he was degraded in -- in actu

by the authorities, by the mar- -- the martial court? Would this has been wiser? You would, of course, done this, because you think it is unethical to spank a person. Now I assure you, gentlemen, it is much more ethical to slap a man in the face than to have him degraded and put for 10 years into prison. But you don't understand me, and that's why you don't understand the Suez Canal. Yes, you can't. You have ethical statements that it is always bad to hit a man. It is not always bad to hit a man. It is sometimes bad. I don't say that you always have to hit a man when he has slept on guard. I claim, gentlemen, that any ethical act is unique, singular, and can never be repeated. And -- you must never recommend an act because it has happened before, you see. It's no reason to repeat any such action. But that doesn't abolish the fact that it was necessary to do it at that moment.

If you can begin to understand it, you see why an ethical act cannot be generalized, Sir. It loses its character of a -- ethical action when it is repeatable. Then it is a legal action. And the law, you see, is the first naturalization of a unique action. If you say, "I can write something into a law," and it becomes repetitive, then I treat it already as an external thing, of outside nature, you see. The way from the act into the law, gentlemen, is the way from ethics into physis. Would you take this down? The way into the unique act into the law is the way from ethics into physis.

And so we get quite a series of things, you see. Here is the spirit, the logos. He says to me, "Save this man," you see. And I try to s- -- find a way out, and I treat him as a child. I slap him in the face. If this could for me -- found out to be an excellent way of saving people's lives by a momentary act, as in school, for example, that I haven't to dismiss the man from college, because I have -- justice has been done and he can stay, then I would make it a -- a habit. And then I would make it a law. So you have the act, you have the habit--or the "precedent," is perhaps better--and you have the law. And finally you have the natural law. And you see how important it is -- then is, that you see the connection between the ethical world, and the -- world of nature. By the concept of the law, ethics are always transformed into physis. Law is experienced act, respected as precedent, transformed into rule and regulation, you see, and finally applied to outside -- the world outside as always having this implication, you see. For example, you say, "Of course, the people reacted in Hungary." Now, there you take it as a -- as a natural phenomenon, you see. But of course, if people none -- not -- hadn't once rebelled with this glory -- in this glorious way, as they do now, you see, you wouldn't know this. They -- first had to happen in

an ethical context, you see, that you could admire it.

You think the other way around. You think, first there are laws in the universe and then there are acts. And that's why you are not -- no longer free men. The -- my slapping this boy in the face is such an example of freedom, because it was nowhere in the context of any natural -- or mar- -- martial law, or civil law, that there was this response possible to such a serious action.

If you cannot see this, gentlemen, that all actions in the New Testament are invented by Jesus on the spot, you don't understand the New Testament.

When the adulteress is brought before Him, what does He do? He says -- what did He do? How is He -- has He judged the adulteress?

(He { }.)

Yes, and what happens?

(They go away.)

They all go away. They all go away. He creates an absolutely new situation. Nobody accuses her anymore. Don't you understand? So the -- she -- He creates suddenly a sphere of peace and protection for her, because all the other people withhold, you see, and withdraw. You must just see this -- lively, that He creates this new dimension which hasn't existed before, the dimension in which people see suddenly that they themselves, you see, have tried to judge, instead of knowing that they also are judged. It's always the same thing in ethics, you see. As soon as you say that you are under judgment, you stop judging.

Gentlemen, the gist of the matter is this: the only ethical com- -- law which is adamant, is that a man who is of age has to listen to the experience of the ages. Before you elope with a girl, you are not competent to cope with the problem, if you cannot hear the voices that contradict your move, that warn you against it, you see. If you are just in a frenzy, you -- you must expect the full fury of the law, and of wisdom, and of precedent coming upon you, because you have acted, you see, without listening.

So gentlemen, the logos is the ruler of the ethos, because to listen means to let the intellect, the spirit enter your mind. You must be willing to bring your ethical action under the word. And that's why the whole Bible is written around the word of God, gentlemen. The word precedes the act. And the act begets the law.

The words of the past, the words of wisdom, the words of experience, the words of suffering, the words of love and sympathy a man must listen to. "Listen"--or "hearken Israel," it's called in the Old Testament--"listen" or "hearken" is the one ethical command that is true, that is permanent. I had at that moment to consider, had I not, that it wasn't an action of -- of mine of mere rashness that I slapped this boy. It was an act by which I tried to contradict the authorities who said, "He has to be court-martialed." This -- I mean, if you can think this through, is an -- intellectual act on my part, is it not? I had to face up to the rules of the game as they had existed so long and so far. This is intellectual. This is logos. Can you see this?

Before I have made my own original contribution, I had first to weigh whether any of the precedents would have done the trick, the same trick, you see. Perhaps -- then I would have had to fulfill it, you see. If court-martialing would not have entailed his utter ruin, I would have -- and in other cases, it does, you see. Think of the Marine sergeant. There was not way out. You had to go to court with the man, you see. But then it could be pardoned.

So it is the hardest thing for you to understand the relation of logos, ethos -- ethos, and physis. And I tried to do it today, because I think if you could see this, you understand Greek philosophy. The Greeks had always this relation between the knowledge of what is good by precedent, by what already was known to be wise men's acts. The problem of friendship, that is, what to do to a person you are in sympathy with at this moment.

Now just take Prohibition era, and a man who gets drunk. And you are for Prohibition. That doesn't -- make -- help you at all when the man is drunk. You have to take care of him, have you not? Take in 1922 or 1923. You are against drinking, you see, but your best friend gets drunk. What do you do? Can you simply say he shouldn't have got drunk? Doesn't help you at all. There you are. You have to treat him as your friend. So ethics, you see, must say, "Too bad. Prohibition really should have been followed." He must -- "You must listen to the law." But you can also create for this friend, you see, a refuge from the law. You must -- so all the time, gentlemen, the word in the sense of already intellectual preparation, of foreknowledge, of anticipation, is with us. Everything has already been thought through in some form with regard either --. The existing so- -- social order tells you about any action: this you can do, or this you cannot do. It does not however help you at all, because you must know: when do we have to break the law? And when do we have to follow it, you see? Any

minute you have to create actions which -- which are far beyond anything that could have been foreseen before. But you have to have listened to the words of the wise. You have to be a law-abiding citizen in the sense that you must know what the law is.

I once challenged oth- -- another student in a -- in the University of Heidelberg to a duel. I went to a very fine man. His father was prime minister of one of the German states, and he -- so he was quite high up in the ranks of authority, and loyalty, and good behavior. And he had just received their -- been made baronet, and was quite proud of the new title of "Baron," or "Freiherr." And I asked him to be my second. You know, you have to send to the other fellow whom you ch- -- you challenge a man, and he is in your stead, can't see him yourself, and he has to organize the conditions of the battle. And so he said, "Well," -- I said, "Would you do this?"

And he said, "Yes." And then after everything was -- was settled, he said to me -- before leaving the room, he said, "Well, you have studied the law. I" -- he was a medical student. "So you tell me, that's punishable under the law, is it not? It's an infraction," because duels were forbidden, you see, officially in the penal code.

And I said, "Yes, it is punishable."

And he said, "It doesn't make any difference to me, but I still wanted to know." And I think that was a very good and sober statement. He wanted to know that he was breaking the law, and then he decided to do it, just the same, you see. So he has never been rash in his life. It was a very -- still alive and a very, very slow, meditative, and important man. He's the greatest doctor -- considered to be the greatest doctor of Germany at this moment. And he said this very wonderful saying, "It is punishable, is it not?" you see. "I'm going through with it just the same." That's ethics, gentlemen.

So please take this down, gentlemen. The relation of ethics to logos is that the logos comes first. It must be -- you must listen; before, you -- otherwise you are a wild animal. If you then feel co- -- urged to act to the existing code, you are -- acts in -- of freedom, you see, you have not broken the law, you see, in the same sense as an animal, which has to be punished, because he didn't -- it -- just was out of bounds. It's very strangely unknown in this country. You see, you think the ethical command is both: intellectual, truthful, you see, and good. The true, and the good, and the beautiful aren't so simply -- unified. Old -- the -- the stream of consciousness reaches you through what is said, as order. Then your

neighbor suddenly impresses you with the necessity of sympathetic -- or antithetic action, whatever it is. And that provokes you to your new response. And that is up to you. And you never know whether you should follow the law, or should not follow the law. In 99 cases, you may be perfectly safe just to do what the law requires. I don't say at all that in many cases you will never feel any conflict between what the law requires that you do and what you have to do. But the one case is important, which explains what is ethics. Ethics is when it is upon your conscience.

Here, where is this man {Forrester} -- {Forrester}?

(Foster?)

No, you are the wrong one. Well, he isn't -- he has left? Well, I just had a discussion with a man who called -- spoke -- called the conscience a dynamic thing. A dynamic conscious. I said -- well, here you are. Wie?

(Porter.)

Oh, pardon me. Porter. I should say. So Mr. Porter, you see? Now you know why there is no dynamic conscience. There is conscience against sci- -- knowledge, you see. Your conscience, you see, must be informed, you see, about the existing law. And then your conscience is creative at that moment, you see. Under the impact of what has been said, and the conflict with what is there, you see, to make your decision. Can you see the difference?

Let's go back now to the text after a little break. Five minutes.

[tape interruption]

(...{ }.)

("But really, I should not have thought the true lawgiver ought to have the trouble of working out things of that sort in laws or constitution, either in a badly or in a well-governed city.

In the one, because they are useless and do no good; in the other, because sometimes they follow naturally from former conduct. For it's not anyone {to} find out what to do.")

("Then what more could they {want for} in their legislation?")

("For us, nothing. But for Apollo and Delphi, the greatest,

and finest, and { }.")

Now, just to show you the absolute indifference. This we have read already, and nobody told me this. Terrible.

("The founding of temples, and sacrifices, and the worship of God, and spirits and heroes besides. { } began. And whatever services are due to those in the next world to keep them gracious, for these are matters we do not know ourselves. And in founding our city, we will obey no man {if we have sense}, and we will use no interpreter except the god of our fathers, for this god, I take it, is the ancestral interpreter of such matters for all mankind. And he sits in the middle of the earth, upon the navel, and interprets.")

Well. There's an old saying, gentlemen, which you just as well may retain: "{Repetitio mater studiorum}." Repetition is the mother of studies. So we have read this last time, so we read it here again. I told you something about the center of the universe.

Gentlemen, in the Bible, and in Christianity, the middle of the universe is in time. Christ is the center of history. In Greek thinking, since time is cyclical, and just moving in cycles--and in circles I'm afraid, too--the problem is to find the cen- -- the navel of the universe, the center, you see. And that's why you know that we have a Greek book which is called the Encyclopaedia Britannica, which means the knowledge in a circle. "Encyclo" -- that's "encyclopedia," you see, to be educated -- { } means -- with the Greek word here, of Plato, education. And this is then, gentlemen, the seat -- the center paragraph, in the heart of The Republic, by which you can get hold of the Greek -- organ- -- mentality. The idea is to be in the center of the universe; in Boston they call it how?

("Hub.")

The hub of the universe, you see, as -- is considered a wheel. But the whole problem is always thinking in terms of space. You are in the middle of something you can mentally overlook.

This is important, gentlemen. You must get hold of the fact: what is the Greek? what is mind?, what is humanism? You are all thinking that humanism is something that can stand on its own legs. Humanism is the arbitrary half of reality. It's time to organize the world as space. You are sitting in the middle of the universe, and you look at it -- into -- out into the -- out to the periphery. And you buy the Encyclopaedia Britannica, as though this was the periphery of all

your knowledge; and inside of this you sit in your museum, or however you call it. And anybody who -- who ha- -- looks through this Greek thing, knows of course that this is a strange abstraction, that it is much more important to have the Book of Books, which is written in 15- -- through 1500 or 2,000 years, and can be continued to the -- backwards to the beginning of the -- history and down to the last days of judgment. The title of the Bible, gentlemen, is Book of Books, as you know. The Bible is not a book, but "biblion" in Greek means "book," and it is -- means "the book of books." That is, all the books written -- ever written have their meaning in this. That is the anti- -- the antithesis to the Greek mind. And you and I, gentlemen, we are condemned to deal with two ment- -- possible mentalities. One thinking in terms of time, and one thinking in terms of space. And Plato is only, I'm afraid, one-half of the -- approach to reality which you always try. Oh, Mr. {Batchelder}? Oh, pardon me. Please, by all means. That's why -- at this point here, we may stop and -- because we have reached the center -- naïve -- very naïve statement of Plato. He thinks that this is not ridiculous. To you, to speak of the navel of Delphi as the center of the orb, it's just -- we have no approach anymore. But in this sublimation of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, we still all believe in it. And here you can see the difference, gentlemen, between the conditions of the philosophical mind -- first impressions, where there is -- Apollo in Delphi sitting on the -- or the priest is sitting on the {tripod} and it's called the navel of the earth. The Greeks made out of this an ideal world. The very word "ideal" is -- comes in here, you see, and says to you and me, "Let's have an encyclopedic knowledge."

Gentlemen, an encyclopedic knowledge of the universe makes -- does paralyze us. You take a man who knows the -- a -- Encyclopaedia Britannica by heart, what about his ethics? Can he act? Can he be a statesman? You see, he cannot, because he knows so many things that he cannot possibly know what to do next. It's impossible for him, you see, because he knows too many things. The problem of a statesman is to do -- to know what next. In other words, to rule a state, you have to know the timing. The problem of timing is the essential political quality. And therefore, philosophers must never be kings. And as you know, Plato has put in The Republic before us the -- the -- the -- s- -- solution, that if philosophers could be kings, then the state would be in the best of shape. This is the ultimate in space-thinking that has ever been thought of, and -- and whenever this comes true, gentlemen, you get the cruelty of the Bolsheviks. The -- in -- in Bolshevism, the philosopher is king. And you cannot breathe. There is no {freedom}. You are just a part of the system, of his system, you see. He has thought out every law. And the natural relation of logos, ethos, and

physis is destroyed. As soon as a philosopher is king, I'm afraid ethos and physis coincide. In for- -- one form or other, you see, the physical law and the mental law of your own mind crush any freedom of -- between friends. This you must see. And it is -- the strange thing is that on Page 225, which is usually overread by most of you, gentlemen, and in America--nobody pays any attention to this sentence about Apollo, it looks so perfectly silly, and who is interested in Plato -- in the navel of -- at Delphi?--yet you have the heart of the matter. To think that a philosopher can be king is exactly the same as thinking that you can know the center of the universe, because then you construe a world inside of which, by total knowledge, you know everything potentially, what has to be done.

The only thing, gentlemen, that a man in life must know is what next.

You -- you will -- be very happy if you know what to do next. I assure you, nobody knows what to do after next. Nobody, you see. Even the wisest one doesn't. And -- so it is much more difficult to do -- to know what is next, you see, than to know everything, because next is not everything, and everything is not next. Next does not exist in Plato's philosophy, because all philosophy cuts up the reality into space. An outer world of nature, an inner world of ethical conjunction, you see, and in a -- a world from above, of inspiration from logos, which tells you what you are up against with regard to your comrades in arms, or your co-citizens, or your family, and with regard to the plants, and stones, and mountains, and enemies outside. But it never tells you of history.

Plato is anti-historical, gentlemen. Plato is utopian. And therefore today, gentlemen, The Republic I think is a very dangerous book. If you would take The Republic literally, you would become slave drivers. You would become administrators of -- forced-labor camps, et cetera. And all the Russians--Mr. Lenin and -- more than anybody else--are Platonists. But it is a tremendous temptation. I think most of you are under this spell.

Shall we now go onto the Fifth Book, please? Please. Page 246.

("Then with good enough right, I call such a city {an institution} in such -- in such a man. { } blundering the others. If this one is right both in the managing the cities and their manner of furnishing the -- the soul of individual citizens that are classical -- four conditions of wickedness.")

("What are these?")

("I was going one -- to give a list of them in order as they appear to follow one after another when Polemarchus, who sat a

little way from Adeimantus, stretched out a hand and caught hold of the upper part of his brother's wrap near the shoulder, pulled him towards himself, and leaning forward, whispered something in his ear. I did not catch what it was, except this. Shall we put them off, then, or what shall we do?")

You take Adeimantus.

("Let him off? No.")

Ja?

("Exactly why don't you two let off?")

Ja?

(You.)

("Why -- but why, exactly? You are -- you are shirking, we think. You are cheating us out of a whole chapter of discussion, and by no means the smallest, because you don't want to discuss it. Do you imagine you will get away with remarks you dropped in that like way? What was it about women and children { } anyone did you say, that friends will have all in common?")

("Well, wasn't that quite right, Adeimantus?")

("Yes, but just that. "Quite right" warrants explaining, like the rest of it warrants. How they shall be in common, there might be many ways, so don't fail to tell us which way you mean. We have been waiting ever so long, hoping to hear what you have to say about child getting. How will they get children? How will they train them when they come? And all this community of wives and children of which you speak, we think it will have a great and capital effect on the state, according as it is rightly or wrongly done. You are putting your hand to another constitution before you have proper- -- properly finished this, and so you have heard, we are now resolved not to let you go before you have discussed all these things like the rest.")

Now, somebody playing the Glaucon. Here.

("Put me down as voting likewise for that.")

And Thrasymachus said, "Oh yes, we are all decided on this, Socrates.

Take that for granted."

("Oh, dear me. What a thing you have done, challenging me like this. What a debate you are stirring up. It looks like doing the constitution again from the beginning. I thought I had finished now, and glad indeed I was. Quite happy if I could just be accepted, and left alone as described. And now you demand all this, too. You can't imagine what a hornet's nest of words you are waking. But I saw it and passed it by to prevent trouble.")

"My dear man. That's what these people have come for. They left all to come and hear words. Do you suppose they are looking for a gold mine?"

("Words, yes. But not words without end. We must draw the line somewhere.")

("Draw the line at the end of life, Socrates. For a man having sense, when words can be heard such as these. But never mind us. Just get on and answer our questions. Tell a story in your own way, only don't give up. What will be this community --")

Just stop here. Gentlemen, here, this is an example of the best ethics of Plato. You remember that I said the dialogue is the ethics of Plato, the form of the dialogue. Now here are four men coming in. Two first, and then Glaucon and -- Thrasymachus and Polemarchus joining him, isn't it right? Yes. And there are the first expressions of timing. If you look at the paragraph -- sentence I had to read -- of course, no -- today it's always overread -- these are the problems of waiting, of expectation. And he says the -- this may go on -- "draw the line at the end of life." These are all temporary notions. Ethics has always to do with timing. The whole problem of moral -- moral life between citizens, gentlemen, between good people, is when to tell your mother that you are going to marry this girl, you see. You can break the confidence and trust of your good girl if you say it too early. You can lose the confidence of your mother if you say it too late. The whole problem of say- -- telling your parents where -- whom you are going to marry--it is always tragic news to them--is to know when it has to be said. Never too early, gentlemen. Don't rush. When you have seen a girl once and tell your mother at home, "This is the girl I'm going to marry." Because you aren't going to marry the girl if you have to tell it too early. I assure you. Premature saying is just immature saying. And immature love shouldn't get married. So wait long enough until you -- your se- -- you have proven to yourself that you can keep a secret. And tell people so that you can show to yourself that you have the stamina to -- confess to the world what your -- opinion is. It has to -- be -- weighed both ways.

All the time, gentlemen, ethics have to do with timing. And in this dialogue, every good, ethical statement comes from the relation of the speakers. Here, these men say, "You aren't through. You made it -- too -- too much in a hurry. Dwell on this." He says, "Well, I didn't want to stir up a hornet's nest." These are profound, moral quar- -- quandaries. These are the real problems in life, gentlemen. Ethics is the problem of timing. Physics is the problem of spacing. We have to posit -- posit -- to place the thing is -- makes you -- makes you the expert on a thing, where to put things. Then you know how -- what things are. But when to say things, and when to silence -- be silent, shows that you are a human being.

A man who cannot keep a secret doesn't know what ethics is. You see, in this country, where everything is publicized -- when Mr. -- Mr. Hoover, Jr., lost his parents and had to be woken up at 2 o'clock or at 4 o'clock at night because of the Suez issue, and was trembling -- found trembling, Drew Pearson could write it up the next day in the -- his terrible letter. And we knew that there was panic in Washington. Gentlemen, a great nation cannot afford to appear as panicky in the eyes of the rest of the world. That's high treason. I would have said, "This is high treason." Because if the government was panicky -- I don't want to believe it -- then it should not be told. It is terrible that -- the Russians could then laugh at us and say, "We -- we have driven the -- the Americans," you see, "into a panic." Then of course, they can say, "We send volunteers to Egypt." That's what they said next day. If they hadn't known that we had lost our -- our good -- our courage, they wouldn't have said that.

So gentlemen, this is very difficult for you to understand, because it brings up the whole question of knowledge. If you have only physis and logos, then all knowledge is good. If you have any ethical situation, gentlemen, then knowledge has to be timed. And certain things must not be known, you see, by everybody. Knowledge, too, has its history. And knowledge has its timing. And if -- if -- we wouldn't have this terrible publicity stunt in this country, and the quiz kids and all this nonsense, if you hadn't the dogma that knowledge can be made known to all people at all times. Well, the result is that you can't have any foreign policy. And that we always lose the initiative, that we always are licked, because in a democracy, you have to tell everything to everybody, so you can only talk about unimportant things. What you can tell all the people, gentlemen, isn't worth telling.

Theodore Roosevelt had a postmaster general who wrote his memoirs. And he said that they -- when the Russians went to war against the Japanese in

1904 and '05, there was a famous battle of Tsushima -- you may have heard of this -- in which Togo, Japanese admiral, defeated Mr. Rozhdestvenski and his Russian fleet when they came into the straits between Korea and Japan. And Mr. {von der Länger} -- I think is his name, or something like that -- {Läng-} -- {Längacke} -- ja, {von der Längacke}, German descent he was -- writes in his memoirs: "We were all agreed in Washington, that in our case, in such a war, we couldn't have delivered this fatal blow to the Russian fleet, because the Japanese fleet had to be in the straits of Tsushima for six weeks in advance, because it was so uncertain when the Russians would finally get there. Now it is impossible in America to keep a secret--where the whole American fleet is for six weeks--from the public. Our democratic way of life just wouldn't -- make a victory, as in Tsushima, utterly impossible."

That is a good example, I think, of, you see, the problem of -- of ethics. Ethics always will divide the world of knowledge into silence, or secret and revelation, opening, you see. Knowledge about nature doesn't know this distinction. There is no distinction about what you know of plants today and tomorrow. Let's know all the facts, because they are dead. But the battle of Tsushima is a secret. And you can see how -- how the tragedy of the last 20 years -- Mr. McCarthy -- has been this naïveté that all the facts can always be known, and that the atom bomb can be given to the Russians, you see. Because why not? Everybody -- must know everything. From a scientific point about natural science, it's perfectly logical, you see, that everything can be known by everybody at all times. From the point of security of the United States, you see, it's high treason if you do so. The whole problem of the trial of the Rosenbergs is here involved, you see. From a purely knowledgeable point of view, what is knowledge, you can har- -- never say "Why not?" This is physics, you see. And in physics, there is no distinction between secret and -- and open -- publicity. And you try to treat politics as publicity stunts, and therefore senators have to -- to debate with quiz kids.

Well, if this is so, then the senator is an unimportant person, because we are -- I'm only interested in my good senator from Vermont -- Senator Aiken, and Senator Flanders, because I think these two men can keep a secret. And therefore I trust them. A representative government is impossible if you don't trust people that they can keep a secret, and that I can rely on their doing a good thing without my knowing it. If you have to tell everything to your -- to your constituency, you are unnecessary. You are just a mail carrier. And we have today, as you know, the system of mail carriers -- that they -- boy -- these poor boys in Washington have to count the letters they receive from the public. How can I know what these people know in Washington. I hope they know a little

more than I, because they have their secrets. In their committees, they know facts I do not know. And they cannot tell me everything at once, why they have to vote in this manner or in this manner. I can of course show them my trend of thought, but if they do otherwise, I have to feel they had good reasons for doing this. Don't you understand that you can't have representative government unless you assume that people going to Washington have a little more insight than you have?

But you don't believe this, and that's why you -- we practically -- the Congress has nothing to say anymore. As soon as you -- as the representative in Washington is only reporting that 1500 letters were in favor, and 200 letters were against it, he's absolutely superfluous, because if he then has to decide by the 1500 letters, why did you send him to Washington? You can have a referendum on this. And you don't have to have any representative government.

So ethics, gentlemen, have to do with these two things: timing, secret, and divulging secrets. And without secrets, there is no -- without pri- -- there is no life. Any life needs secrets. And people are so dead in the modern world because they have no secrets. They don't know what a secret is. A secret is -- something that has still to grow into public life, because it is immature. And it is as any bud before the bl- -- leaves open. Gentlemen, nothing can bud after all into -- into a flower that hasn't gone through this process of ripening.

A diplomat visited me a fortnight ago. And he said to me, "Nothing can grow anymore. We had it"--it was just after the Suez incident--"it all was growing up a nice, peaceful understanding between the various nations, but this damn publicity has destroyed everything." He didn't go into the details. He just came from Europe, after a number of interviews with -- or not interviews, I mean, conversations with statesmen there. And he said, "It is simply terrible. The general public has to be taken so much into confidence all the time, prematurely." You know treaties arrived at in public discussion and open agreements, this famous phrase of Wilson -- have you -- what -- what's the phrase? You remember?

("Open treaties openly arrived at.")

Yes. "Openly arrived at." Well, what can you openly arrive at, you see?

You cannot propose to your girl on Times Square with all the lights blaring, and the floodlights playing on you. But all life is like proposing to somebody and being -- being accepted.

I only may -- wanted to make you see an example of what I call "ethics."
The first two pages of the Book Five of the -- of Plato's state is, of course, they are always -- omitted, so to speak, from the picture. They se- -- don't seem to be important. Yet they give you the tact, the artistry of Plato, as a dramatist, as a former -- playwright, and poet. Plato had to have, of course, a de- -- a very deep understanding into the process of timing, when to say something. And here, this is one of the most famous places of retardation.

As you know -- all great art is retardation. That's why the movies are not interesting in -- as art, because they don't know how to retard. They always think they must promise you quick communication. Say everything at once, far too much, you see. Rush. Quick, quick, quick, quick. Shoot, shoot, shoot. Don't bore people. Don't stop them. Well, all great art begins, gentlemen, in such a way that you know the whole story in advance. In the first verse of Homer -- of The Iliad, you know the whole end of the Iliad. And then it goes on for 24 hours. And that's great art. There you are treated as an ethical comrade who goes -- undergoes the tension, and the expectation, and the disappointments. Although you know the whole outcome, you read it breathlessly. In a -- in a movie, as you know, you don't know -- detective story -- that's the most stupid kind of literature there is, mystery stories; only for idiots and mathematicians. And -- yes. You see, because in a mystery story, you are kept -- that's not -- no art. You see, you are -- in the last line, you finally know who murdered the child. I won't -- don't want to know that. I'm not interested. The murder shouldn't have been committed, that's all. And that's interesting. But who murdered the child? Heavens!

[tape interruption]

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Side Two. Thursday, December 6, 1956. Reel number 19.)

Obviously in the -- in the New Testament, when the Apostle Paul speaks of the -- we have our -- on this earth no permanent stand, but the eternal we are looking for, the future we are looking for -- he ha- -- who had gone to a place like Dartmouth College in Tarsus, of course, tried to inherit, or to supersede this Platonic utopia.

You -- we all live in the same predicament. At this moment, we are American citizens, and we know very well that God did not create America directly. He created man, and certain- -- obviously the -- the -- the destiny of man is not to be Americans, gentlemen. It's to be a man. And therefore, we have to admit that we are in a temporary stage of the affairs of the world, whether we like it or not. This is the eternal question of philosophy. This you have to -- therefore to use -- my tools which I have offered you are the three tools of logos, ethos, and physis. And therefore, these are the two demands made on you, to use these tools, so that you can make understandable the -- the drive behind any one of these schools. These are not luxuries. These are attempts which you all make, knowingly or unknowingly.

The other day, a man came back from Cairo, Egypt, and said to me, "Most American businessmen are Moslem. They think they are Christians, but in fact, Moslem is the most simple religion for men. It's -- of course doesn't take care of the women. Women have no place in Moslem life. But the American businessman, if he isn't under the thumb of his wife at home, and escapes into the dis- -- business district, and to Rotary clubs, and he -- and Dartmouth colleges -- I mean, we are no women ad- -- where no women are admitted, he immediately arranges a world of mind which is very simple: a mixture of Moslem -- Islam and Stoicism. Most of you are Stoics, gentlemen. In America, you find practically no Epicureans. Everybody's here a Stoicist, and -- or an idealist, or what he thinks, a materialist. Epicureans are -- you find them in France. That's an Epicurean country. The hope of the world is that they -- I think the French Epicureans and the American Isl- -- Moslem get together. Both are horrid in their insulation. The French, they have no government. And the Americans have no mind. They are -- go from one craze to another here. They are -- because they have not this center of the inner beatitudes, which is the gospel of Epicure, you see, that the city of man, politics should not influence your -- your salvation.

Well, in -- in any case, there are minimum demands. A representation of what these people really were doing in -- with the tools of logos, ethos, and physis as the eternal reason for philosophy. And I would take it as a complete bankruptcy of your paper if you would not give to me to understand that you understand why philosophy is in every grownup person a necessity. He cannot escape it. Philosophy is not a course you can take, gentlemen, as you can take zoology, you see -- or leave it -- or chemistry. It is -- you philosophize either poorly, or you philosophize well. But whether you li- -- most of you -- philosophize in imitation of some overhanging prejudice which is in the air of your time.

More I cannot say, because every one of you of course is left to his own devices to go to his -- to these philosophers -- himself. I will -- may add, however, today, one more problem. Yes- -- last time, as you know, I tried to clear you up on the { } -- ethics, and I tried to make you understand that in ethics, we deal not with a naturalistic code. And that your idea that ethics is a course, which you can take in a school as you can take mathematics, is of the devil. It's the Anglo-Saxon diabolical devil -- temptation to think that the rules of behavior, of moral behavior can be learned by heart, and you can learn the penal code, or as you can learn the families of {phylloxera} or of -- of lizards.

In the -- in the city of man, gentlemen, this is the -- this is the Latin word "civitas," and this is the Greek word -- and here, I put the Greek word, that's the Latin word. And you see, the Latin -- Anglo-Saxon word in this case would be "world," and in this case, we have no -- no English word for the political entity, because the Christian -- the tribes were Christianized so early that we say at best "city," you see, or "state." These are all words of Latin origin. There is no Anglo-Saxon term for the community. I don't know of any. Does -- do you know of any? Comu- -- "community" is Latin. You see, comes from "communis" in Latin. So it's very strange. Anglo-Saxons have no native term for the political order. Ja? (What about "town"?)

What?

("Town"?)

If you feel that it works -- I'm very glad. Very nice. "Town." Sure, good.

Yes. "People," you see, doesn't work, because it comes from "populus," Latin, again. So "town," very good idea. Thank you. I -- do you know the -- the root of "town"? Not sure, but I think it is --.

(French.)

It's not German, at all. It's perhaps -- Celtic. I -- I'm not sure at this moment. Wie?

(French.)

No, it's not French. But the -- the ending, d- -- u-n, in -- in {hautun} and so, that may be contained in it. You see, that's a Celtic ending. Most -- in -- in Gaul under Caesar, most cities ended in "-dhunum," with the ending "-dhunum." And I don't know if "town" had anything to do with that.

(I think it was originally "ton," or something, with t-o-n, which was a division of a hundred, which was a division of a shire in England.)

Well -- in any case, it's useful. Let's use it. Ton -- town. You can say "ton."

And it's quite important, because -- in this connection, I cannot deal with it explicitly. But you may take this down as a rule, gentlemen. Any word in our civilized language--in French, German, English, Italian--has three forms: Greek, Latin, and native. And it is only digested when you have it in all three forms. That's very strange. Why that is so, is a long story. I've written a whole book on this topic, that to digest a -- a process in the world outside, it takes the native approach, which is the homely one, you see, the familiar one, the -- the low-brow one; and it takes the high-brow, the religious one, which comes from the Christian Church, through the ages usually in Latin like "nature"; and then we found a special science like physics, and -- when we use a Greek term. So the -- the theologian speaks of "natura," nature, you see. We speak of "the world" in our -- in our native tongue. And the -- the specialist speaks of physics, or physiology. And so he makes out of this natura something -- something Greek. Well, that's -- leads us too far. But only to make you feel that it isn't quite wanton if I draw your attention to the fact that there are three terms for the same thing under a different aspect. When you philosophize, you use a Greek term. When you theologize, you use a Latin term. When you speak idiomatically at home, you use the Anglo-Saxon term. That's a good rule for you, you see. The religious language has come to us as Latin. We say "religion," "religio," you see. But if you have the Greek term, "theology," you see, you are in the learned bracket of the divinity school. "Theology" is Greek. You have this strange relation -- you see. Here is "religio," Latin. The Greeks had a -- quite a different word for that.

Now to come back, however, to the main problem today. The main problem today is the question of the appearance of the logos with regard to things and the appearance of the logos between people. I have tried to show you that -- ethics comes to people through action. You know what a man is morally worth, not from what he says, because he can be a hypocrite. And most people are hypocrites, because they have some standardized, ethical phrase in their mouth. And I don't care in the least what they say. Many will say, "Lord, Lord," and will go to hell. But you have to see what the man is doing. And I have tried to give you some examples last time of what ethical action is. The creation of a free, non-natural situation, gentlemen: that's ethical. If you treat your neighbor as a new person every day, and find yourself free to change, with regard for him, you see, then he is free.

I -- in the -- in my Christian Future, I have expressed it in a similar -- simple way: God re-thinks His creation every day in the light of the fate of His children. And when we make terrible mistakes, He allows us to find a new way. That's called "the remission of sins." And after your parents have seen that you can't go to college -- for example, they allow you to become a carpenter, because they rethink their prejudices -- the world -- from love of you. The same is done by God. Our creator always has still a way out. Here, we haven't made peace for 10 years, but that He will not perhaps find a way in which He will allow us to come to terms with the world. At this moment, that's in the making, as you know, in the most circumstantial way. With landing in Suez and such things, we are finally forced into taking seriously the fact that we must make peace. We never have made peace.

So will you take this down, gentlemen: that the word, in -- in the respect of the ethics of our town, has to be rethought every day because of the mistakes man makes, and how could we ever mend the mistakes if our maker would not then give us new opportunities? So because we do not do as our Father in Heaven likes us to do, He has to rethink His creation. Otherwise there could be no government of the world.

Then rethinking, gentlemen, is the essence of the logos. The logos is more free, still, than you and me. You -- we are handicapped by our mistakes. Today, the -- mistakes made in our foreign policy cry to Heaven. If Heaven responds, it means that He allows us once more to start -- although we have made this mistake. But they haven't been legal, so to speak. There is still a time of grace given to us. But the plan of God obviously was not to do the things. You just look at the Orozco frescoes, when God each time throws up His hands in de-

spair and says, "This world has to come to an end. It's just impossible." Three times in these frescoes, God, you see, says, "Finished." But there is a new start. And you wonder how long it can go on, how long He can find a new way of -- of letting this continent be peopled by idiots.

Now gentlemen, the logos is the power with which we speak to each other, and it is the power -- which we come to know the universe, the objects. And these are two different ways. And I want to tell you how to understand these--the eternal conflict between my dealing with the forest, or the stars, and my dealing with you. The stars I must first see. That is, the first thing is an impression made on me by -- through my senses. { }. Preferably the sight, the eye. But I can also hear a sound. I can smell a flower. I can touch a stone. Therefore, gentlemen, the first impressions on -- of the physis go through the senses. Now the materialist says to you, "All first impressions go through the senses." However, gentlemen, I tell you and I remind you of the fact: your first impressions as a baby in the cradle do not go to your five senses at all. They go through your parents' words, and their manners. That -- you are sat down at a dinner table and see suddenly that you don't have to grab for food, but that it's coming to you, that your mother distributes it, you lose all animal fear that you might be curtailed in your dealings. Think, that -- this is not natural for an animal. An animal -- if you have five chickens and you feed them, all the chicks, as you well know, try to get the food at the same time. It's no -- not possible to stop the other four, you see, be- -- because they have experience that they all get something; they will not wait. We do.

That is, gentlemen, we can understand in the city, our first impressions come through meaning. It makes sense to us that our mother should treat us -- our five -- her five children as equals. And should therefore not, you see -- quiet their fears, and they immediately understand that the mother is in -- in charge, and that they don't have to watch out for themselves. Somebody else does. Now therefore, our first impressions here comes through sense. It makes sense to us. And we are told this; that is, our first impressions in the city come through speech, and through being addressed. Now you do not deal with stones by addressing them. That's witchcraft. It doesn't work by magic. Stones have to be lifted out of the way, or you will stumble over them. The five senses tell us what to do with things, gentlemen. First impressions of things go through the senses. But first impressions of people, gentlemen, they go through functions. They go through speech. Because you have -- al- -- are -- hear from your mother that you are "Johnny" and she is your mother, you distribute the universe outside between your mother and you. What you can- -- she can- -- you cannot do,

she will do. And so you disarm. All speech, gentlemen, leads to disarmament. And all sensuous experience leads to armament. That's why the term "Moral Dis-- Re-Armament" is an idiotic term, of the {Cole} group, of the Buchmanites, of the Oxford Group. It is not -- you have to disarm between people. Not arm. (What do you mean by "disarm"?)

Well, you are disarming, Sir. So that's why we can talk to -- each other.

You -- now at this moment confess that you do not understand me. That's a disarming question. A -- a blusterer, a vain person would say, "I know everything; you see. You can't tell me anything." That's the relation of object and object in the universe. They try to remain impenetrable; they try to defend each other. If I try to -- to behave as an individual, you see, and you as an individual, we can never understand each other. It takes always an amount of humility, of disarmament in the sense that you can get under my skin and I under your skin, because otherwise we wouldn't talk to { }.

You must accept my word as a part of your truth. And I must accept your word as a part of my truth. You understand? This osmosis is a condition of speech, because every speech, you remember, takes -- you need the listener as well as the speaker. And speech is only complete if a speaker has made another person listen. Therefore, since the listening process is part of the word, speech, you see, it -- we can only get together by disarmament. You take two suspicious people, take now the Russians and we, we cannot speak to each other, because you always find ulterior motives. {While we} haven't disarmed, therefore we can talk, and talk, and talk, and every word is just inter- -- misinterpreted.

This is very serious, gentlemen. The -- nature is armed to the teeth, you see, and man is, in the city, disarmed. In your naïveté, you have a kidnaper and you go to the telephone and telephone the police, because you trust the police. They come in, armed to the teeth, but they won't use the arms against you, so -- because you trust them. You can also say, Sir, mutual trust leads to disarmament. However you put it, it's literally true that frigid women--that's a problem for all of you, you see--cannot disarm. Frigidity is the impotency of disarming. They have their willpower always {in} and they want to dominate, and the -- the frigid woman cannot love, because love is disarmament.

(We learned that the same is true { } our parents; we learned a thing, we learned to say, now "This is a stone, this is a book, and this is a light.)

Well, that's -- that's pitiful. Objects of nature you should learn by touch,

by the senses. It would be better if you first -- first experience the objects, you see, the object of the world through your five senses.

(Yes, but the point is though that we learned to -- to -- to name them through speech, and speech is a disarming ex- -- disarming process. Therefore already through speech are we not disarming --?)

But you don't talk to the stone, here, Stone. But you say to your mother, "This is a stone," because you trust your mother. She has put this idea that this is a stone into you and you accept it. So she can get under your skin and enrich your whole inner life, because what she has, you see, is like an ocean penetrating your shore, your dry shore, you see. The flood of the spirit is then -- welling up in her and in you. She has of course accepted this on good faith. And she imparts it to you. It's like waves of the spirit moving through you and her. Or light waves, you can compare it to this, you see. That's what the mind is. The mind is the community of people, you see, taking place in every newborn citizen, entering him.

(Well, why should we learn about the physis through our senses from the first, place, since we need this -- since we need this union from -- from a parent also?)

Well, because the meaning, of course, of -- of the nat- -- world outside, the physical world can only be complete if it -- includes the fact that the stone is something that must be known by contact. I mean, I name "rock," a "cliff," a "mountain" something that I can only learn in its condensation -- density through --. (Define education, then. You're not really implying anything, except just the fact that this becomes real when you -- when I touch it and not until I touch it. And --.)

Yes, well. I -- I don't quite see your argument. I would like { }.

(I'm a little confused, myself. This -- this business of having to experience the -- the physis through the senses is really only for the sake of -- of education, then -- then --.)

Ja, ja. And in danger of misunderstanding, if you only get the word, which you must understand. The mother has experienced the stone and knows what is called "stone." If you -- she only learns -- if you only learn by rote the term "stone," you might apply it to something that isn't a stone. Isn't that

right, you see?

Well, gentlemen, you learn that in -- in all philosophy today, which is all only natural philosophy in this country mostly, and not -- not at all moved by considerations of -- of the ethos and the logos--it's all glorified physis, is philosophy--you learn that first something is in the senses, and later it is in the concept. That is, the thing is, here at the blackboard. Now you try to form a concept of a blackboard. First, you see it. And then you may even grab it with your hands, and feel its consistency, and then you say, "I call this a table," and you call this "define your terms." And you are very proud when a speaker gets up and says, "I shall first define my terms." Gentlemen, that's only reasonable with regard to objects.

Terms can only be defined before speech with regard to physical objects.

Take -- take this down. It's very important. You don't believe it. It is perfectly hopeless for a man who speaks with -- to somebody else to define his terms. You cannot say, you see, "Sir, I consider you a gentleman as far as it goes in my terminology. Because I know gentlemen who are scoundrels." You just -- if you say "gentleman," you must mean it. Otherwise you are lost. And so -- on it goes. With any word you say to any audience, by addressing them, you cannot insult them by defining their terms and saying, "As far as it goes," or "You know what I mean." I mean, then they will say, "He calls us gentlemen, but he means we are scoundrels." That's innuendo.

You can only define objects which are neither the speaker nor the listener. The speaker and the listener must always trust each other. And if you define the terms of your -- your listener in -- in any of your own terms, you insult him. You insult him. You cannot define your listeners as -- well, "These are Americans, therefore they don't have the intelligence of Frenchmen, therefore they don't have the beauty of Italians, they don't -- they don't have the grandeza of Spaniards." My dear man, this -- American from New Mexico will stand up and say, "I have as much Spanish grandeza, and as much Italian singing capacity, and -- as -- as any -- man in Italy. I have just made a point to develop my human qualities beyond what you -- range of what you call 100-percent Americanism." Gentlemen, the -- you have always this tripartite situation. You speak to somebody about something. You can define something. You can never define somebody. Somebody to you must be as myste- -- mysterious, and as dangerous as your wife. Don't define your wife. If you do, you are divorced.

(Well, isn't it that the logos -- the essence of logos is rethinking, you said

Plato's logos is that -- that's the essence of Plato's logos is rethinking?)
 No. He tried to avoid it by this memory {idea}, you see. That's his lack.
 That's his -- his flaw. But that's why he finally avoided the word "logos," you see. He had {news} for the brain, and he had -- ideas. That's not the same as logos. The ideas don't talk, you see. They don't speak. Th- -- the weak point of all Greek philosophy is the idea that speech, you see, was something natural, like an object. If you want to know more about it, read The Cratylus, the poorest dialogue of Plato; it's on language. And you -- even you can -- readily -- readily understand by reading it that he just didn't succeed in -- in -- in knowing what -- what language was. Modern linguistics can do absolutely nothing with the Greek standpoint on language. -- It's just dropped -- superseded.

Here. Gentlemen, all speech in the combi- -- between real people, between the speaker and the listener of any description, mother and child, father and fa- -- and brother, soldier and captain, councilor and mayor, judge and police--wherever you have social relations in a community, what- -- whatever their relation be, boss and worker, slave and -- and slave owner, whatever it is, where there are human relations -- what they call today "human relations"--the way is from reciprocal address, gentlemen, from reciprocal address to rescue the other from loneliness and despair, to agreement. The way from here is -- from the senses to the concept.

You must take this down, gentlemen. You find this unfortunately in no textbook, because, as I said, all Americans are quite one-sided conceptualists. They believe in concepts as the only way of human understanding. They think that if you haven't a concept for a thing, you haven't understood it. Now my dear man, you understand very well the United States, but you will never have a concept of the United States. You must love it. { } way -- you must be a part of it. You can say, gentlemen, the community, or the town -- to Our Town of Wilder -- of -- of -- of Mr. -- ja, Wilder is his name, isn't it? Thornton Wilder. You know this. Who knows Our Town? Good. Well. Well, that's a -- you see, today the unfortunate thing is that the best things are only in literatu- -- in poetry, or plays, and not in philosophy. -- Thornton Wilder is an -- essential contribution to -- the philosophy of reality, you see, because Our Town means that the people in this town are not objects for each other, and that's why they call it -- we call it Our Town. Wherever you have the word "our," you see, all philosophy about things stops. There are no things. There are only brothers. "This happy band of brothers," as in Shakespeare's famous prologue of the -- is it not Henry V, or where is this? "This happy" -- wie? What? Don't you know it? Well Our Town is an -- similar attempt to bring you to your senses that between people in a town

-- in our town, there are no objects which we can define. Not one of the persons in the town can define the other person, because they talk to each other. Will you take this down, gentlemen? People to whom we talk, or whom we want to talk to us, cannot be defined, because we -- expecting them to say something beyond their definition. In as far as you can define a person, you know already what he has said. But since you meet him on the street, you hope he will say to you a friendly word. Now, you -- delivered a speech yesterday. If you meet a neighbor on the street and says, "That was a fine speech," if you could define a man in -- beforehand, the -- the value of his utterance would be nil, because he would just be a machine-object, and so out like -- in automation, there would come -- he would stutter out these empty phrases, "This was a nice speech." You mean, however, when you hear this about yourself, that it was really a fine speech. And you can only believe this one sentence if this is in addition to everything you have known by him before. If it comes as a wonderful surprise that even this old fox now says something nice about you, you will not devalue it -- value it at all, his praise, if he -- you treat him as a dead man. And if you say, "Oh, he says this to everybody," then you would already demiss -- dismiss his -- his word, you see, as not really living word. And there are of course such people who -- use these stock phrases. But we despise them. We say they have died, you see, long ago. They only can repeat these empty phrases. They are either hypocrites, or they are, you see, gone to seed. So you see the more a person is alive, the more it is impossible and harmful for you to try to define him. You cannot elect the president of the United States for everything he has done before. You must expect from him that he will do something that you couldn't do. That's therefore something beyond your comprehension. Therefore, I -- { } anybody with whom you live must remain beyond your comprehension. Because otherwise it wouldn't be worth living with them. The difference, gentlemen, between the wife of the president of a corporation and his workers is that from the workers he expects things he knows very well -- they -- what they consist, because he { } the labor { }, and he expects them to do exactly what he prescribes. But his wife, he cannot marry by prescription. He cannot put on a chart, "My dear wife, I expect orange juice every morning," because the first thing his wife will do -- {well,} she just tear up this recipe, and go off with the dandy, because she can't stand it. She is not with -- to be lived with by prescription. She is a surprise every morning. So please, the greatest heresy is all -- in all your minds, gentlemen, is that it is meritorious to begin a speech by saying, "I am -- shall define my terms." On no important thing can you do anything but speak English. And English is

much richer than the definitions which you can give any term. You just look up the dictionary; every word is a poetical word, and it has 10,000 shades of meaning. And it is your business to use the word so that the other person gets all the shades of meaning which you wish to stress. It's no business of yours to define it beforehand; that's making the speech {all trite}.

It's -- it -- but it is deep in you, gentlemen. And that's why you are very unhappy people. You are fed up. You are slaves of your concepts. Because you carry over the idea of conceptual living into marriage, into friendship, into politics, where they don't belong. And the Catholic Church I think is right when it thinks that -- that in marriage, this whole business of conception, and anti-conception is of the central order of your relation to the spirit. If a man thinks that he can live by conception -- concepts, he will also think that he can prescribe when to have a child. I don't believe that. That's not within your or my power, this -- this -- that's also defining your terms, the terms under which you wish to live, gentlemen. You can have this in -- in -- in certain limited things, as an hour of work. I don't think that in your marriage relations, you can -- you can do this without running the danger that when a child is born, just the same, to treat this child as a mere mischief. It isn't. The child that is born without plan is certainly more your child than the plan that is bo- -- born under -- according to plan. It's obvious. It fulfills much more the purpose of marriage that we should be self-forgetful there, to be allowed to forget self -- ourselves and all our plans. That's the meaning of marriage, the plunge.

These are very serious things, gentlemen. It all centers around the word "concept." If a man is thinking that he always must define his terms -- he may be a lawyer, a good lawyer, because what is a lawyer? A lawyer is a man who treats part of the community -- the other party in law, as nature, as ob- -- an object whom we want to -- conquer, to vin- -- to vanquish. Therefore, a lawyer must speak in concepts in the town, inside the town, you see. But if you go to Thornton Wilder's play, the town crier, and the -- the -- the man on the cemetery there, and -- as I recall it, you -- they -- they don't talk legally. Gentlemen, to speak legally means to speak inside the city in concepts. And concepts are for objects, for things against which we must arm. And you can see, the lawyer is moral re-armorment inside the city. There is a break of law. There is a criminal, there is a complaint, there is a defendant. You see, there is an accusation. There is a condemnation. There is a demand. There is a claim. For all these things you need concepts, because one goes against the other, you see. Where we stand against the world, gentlemen, we need concepts, because we want to define our terms against the world, and against people whom we treat as world. The lawyer must treat his opponent as a part of the outside world. And knows, you

see, nothing but that this other man here abused him. Therefore he must arm to the teeth. His legal brief is armed to the teeth. So {conceptual} that he can't understand him.

So gentlemen: the road of the -- of the nature is through the senses to the concept. Please. The road of nature is through the senses to a concept. The road of the community is through reciprocity to agreement. Because we -- if the mother says, "Son," and the son says, "Mother," they can agree. If the son says, "Do I love my mother?" there's enmity. She's an object then of psychoanalysis. Very important, gentlemen. As long as you give the -- the -- other fellow in the community the name he wants to be addressed with, and he grants you your name, you see, you are in -- at peace; you are in agreement.

So gentlemen, the communal logos is mutual address. The physis -- logos -- or for the nature is not mutual address, but conceptual interpretation of sense reaction. Something totally different. I cannot understand you, and you cannot understand me by any concept, you see. You're just Donald Prensner. Stop it. Period. As soon as I go behind you, begin to analyze you, you -- I -- you become an object, you see. And we are estranged, because you must be afraid of me. I may now, you see--like the Nazis, or the Fascists, or the Communists--I may now look for all your weaknesses, and I may try to exploit them, you see. I may play on any one of your, you see, objective, natural qualities. And you -- we have ceased to trust each other.

If you only could learn this, gentlemen, it would be the great boon for the birth of philosophy in this country. There is no American philosophy today. It doesn't exist, because people have made the logos one-sidedly nothing but the definition of terms. That's only one-half of the story. All the semanticists do this nonsense, you see. But you always ask them: how can they express what they do, if they don't speak anymore? Speech is mutual before it is definable. All these people must first learn poetry, and prayer, and song, and -- and drama, and -- and literature, before they can then legally, suspiciously, you see, put those things that are pure objects of sense observation into their place. Why do we have to deal with nature by concept, gentlemen? For the simple reason that the natural objects cannot talk back. But you can talk back. My -- your response is correct if you feel addressed, if this has an appeal on you. If I can say to this man, "Richard," and he comes, that's all we can -- can want. Then my word is -- "Richard," his name, is a better word than any concept I have of the man. Because the concept of the man is not between you -- him and me. It's -- just in my mind, you see. {Doesn't show us} anything. But his name is some-

thing I use, and he complies with.

Gentlemen, that's very fundamental. And you see, the logos then is broken up into two roads -- two ways -- two highways on which it travels. The logos travels through names of mutual and reciprocal validity into the human community, into Our Town. And it travels with regard to the chemicals, and the elements of the universe on the -- on the wings of concepts. If you take an atom, if you take a Faraday, if you take an volt, if you take an ohm, if you take all the terms of our modern physics, they, as you know, are defined terms by the Congress of Physicists every year. And you have ampere -- you know what an ampere -- you know volt. Well, who is Mr. -- who is Volt? What is Volt? That's just the name of the man who discovered, you see, volts -- voltage. -- Who -- what was his name?

(Volta.)

Volta. An Italian, yes. And Ampere was a Frenchman, you see. And Gauss was a German. And on it goes.

So there are -- you have clear definitions. Why? Only for the sad fact that atoms cannot talk. They cannot respond when we name them.

I have a friend at Harvard, in the political -- government department, who always harps on this simple fact that he says the natural science is much worse off than we. We can talk to the people, and by their response, they say if they have un- -- we have understood them, you see. But these poor people have to weigh the -- the things and measure, because they have no way ever to know whether the goal is satisfied. They can never get the vote of the things in nature. This is true. I have tried all the time to tell you that the real history of philosophy is from the city into the world. And you are all obsessed by the devil, because you think that nature is first, and man is second, and society is second. Communism, Marx, for example, is on my side. He rediscovered the great { } truth that the city is before the nature in our lives, that we first must talk to each other before we can deal with third things.

(I -- Plato mentioned that when he was developing the city in The Republic, that men got together in the city, because they needed food and -- and physical comforts. Well, I was wondering if he wasn't intimating in that sentence -- .)

Yes, { }. Yes, that's the Greek tyranny, although it -- it -- the real story is that the Greek city first -- contained people who could speak to each other. And he -- in Plato is already this lack of linguistic understanding. You see, all Greek philosophy is hampered, and Thomas Aquinas still is -- handicapped by the fact that they think speech is natural. And I say speech is political. All speech is ethical. And as long as you say speech is natural, then it is a tool of any individual's whim. But it is reciprocal, gentlemen. Any word of the human language is based on the assumption that I must say "Father," so that he may say "Son." Don't you see that as -- if I, the boy's father, had -- makes any sense, it is only on the basis of the fact that somebody is the son. This we have lost sight of, because we are dealing with third objects. You see, in our town, my father must speak to his son. In general, however, in nature, there are chickens who have, you see, a rooster as their -- as their begetter. So it is not -- the rooster cannot say, "My children." We can say, "my child," because we speak. This word "mine," and "our," and "your," you see, is the difference of ethics and physis. In physis, gentlemen, there are no possessive pronouns. There are no secrets. There are no inner and outer, you see, worlds. But there is only the outer world. Physis only deals with an outer world. And in outer worlds, there are no possessive pronouns. And nothing in the outer world has any name to its- -- by its- -- to itself. Therefore Ohm -- Volt describes things by human names, because these are nameless electronics. They have no s- -- no names of their own. Arbitrary. They can't understand them. We domesticate animals and then give their names from our -- inside our own community to attract them to our town -- into our town. If you -- if you take Our Town, by Mr. Thornton Wilder seriously, and if you stop smoking, then you will understand that our town underlies opposite rules from nature. In nature, you can always smoke, because the tree will not prom- -- protest. I protest, you see.

Now gentlemen, the logos then comes to us through concepts and names. And the -- both processes are equally original. And you don't believe this. And this is why this country for the last 150 years has not seen thinking, straight thinking, because it has not observed the facts of life. In a pioneer country, where a -- one man has to brace himself against the Rocky Mountains, you may easily understand that nature was so overwhelmingly strong, that you saw the objects in nature, you see, as the only thing that needed explanation. You can't understand it. Men were out -- so much on their own, they were so lonely, that they thought if they had a picture of, you see, of the outer world, of the cosmos and the physis, that was all that mattered. And the city of man, so to speak, came after that.

We must now turn around and see that every child of man becomes a human being only after it has been spoken to. Even these pioneers, of course, had been brought up in a foreign land from a mother, you see, and a father. But this was not, so to speak, made the basis of their investigation, of their thinking. Reciprocal naming, gentlemen, and sensuous conceiving: these are the two roads on which the logos travels. One into physis of general objects; and one into the city of my own--you have really to add this-- of our own members. Where I am a member, you see, of a community, these are my people, you see. This word pro- -- this possessive pronoun is totally lacking in the universe. In the universe, nobody owns a s - -- a farthing. Nobody owns anything. He's just himself an object in this vast universe.

So your mind is very troubled, gentlemen, because you start with the universe. Fortunately our Father in Heaven didn't mean it that way. He says, "Grow up in a community with brothers and sisters, and mothers, and pare- -- fathers, and children. And then you can -- together go out and look into nature. That's why I've tried to tell you, gentlemen: nature is the common impression made on the family of man. That's very fortunate. Nature is not the impression the world makes on you alone, you see. But you are only an ear and an eye for all men living together as a family of nations, or as a family of man, or as a human family, or as our town, or however you call this -- this inner world in which we can talk to each other.

The inner order of life, gentlemen, means that we speak to each other. And fortunately we -- every one of us is inside. And after we have spoken to each other, we are strong enough to arm against the universe, and a sea of plagues, and to look out of the window of this community and to observe the facts of nature. Ohm, volt, gentlemen, they are all common observations of any man who uses his reason. They are valid for all men. That's the essence of natural science, is it not?

So gentlemen, in politics everybody is placed in a different position. In nature, everybody is placed in the same position. Natural facts are facts that appear to everybody alike. Political facts, or ethical facts, or moral facts, or historical facts, or however you call these facts, are facts that appear to everybody differently. That's the result of these two roads on which we travel. The logos, gentlemen, gives you the power to have a different point of view on everything human, and to have an identical point of view on everything worldly. What a -- what electricity is, we can all agree on, you see. But what -- what Mr. Nixon is, nobody can agree totally with anybody else, you see. That goes from vice-presi-

dent to SOB. And we'll never agree.

You -- if you could only see this, the im- -- tremendous act of liberation that co- -- should befall you, gentlemen, that these two worl- -- realities can be now labeled the "inner world" and the "outer world." Nature is the outer world, in which everything appears alike to everybody inside the community of man. And the secrets of the inner society are those experiences, gentlemen, which must strike every living member differently, because he -- as a member, he holds a different position in this community.

It is not obvious, gentlemen, that if -- that my ear and my toe, as members of my body, receive the same impression in a different manner. Isn't that right? And that cannot be changed. And obviously, you and I react to the news from the outside world differently than -- as Mr. -- than Mr. Dulles, you see. He must see the dif- -- a different position in this body politic. But you don't see this. You have still this same terrible idea that in political life, we all also should see everything identically. There would be no life left. We would not form a real body of men. The real body politic, gentlemen, allows everybody to have a different reaction. That's so wonderful about real life, gentlemen, that your child has a very different response to the same event as you have. Don't ask it to have the same reaction.

So -- ja, please?

(Is that the -- is that the { } of all Plato's { }?)

That's where he falls down, you see.

({ } group.)

Because -- now comes the Greek -- the Greek one-sidedness. With -- Heraclitus had insisted on this very fact. He had said time and again that the logos appeared to everyone in the opposite manner, you see. One would swim up the river, and the other would swim down the river. The meaning however, was the double movement, and not the single movement, for example. He would always say, you see, that all opposites only are the way in which we respond to the same universe. Plato has wrested with Heraclitus. But in the -- in the dialogue Cratylus, which is not, unfortunately, in this selection, he deals with a Heraclitean, and dismisses the whole problem. It's negative, the solution. That's the last dialogue in which we feel a trace of Heraclitus in Plato. Cratylus is a disciple of Heraclitus, and he was so disgusted at the end with the world,

that he would only nod his head, and move his little finger, because he said, "Everything is misunderstanding." Quite a man. He probably was right. I very often have this feeling here at Dartmouth College. And I leave -- shall leave you, gentlemen, after this term -- this year with the firm conviction that it has made no difference that I have been here or not, that the misunderstandings are just as numerous as the understanding. And so the -- the equation is zero. Cratylus is right. Today the basis of understanding is lost, because you do not expect understanding in the city of man. You live in nature. And bo- -- nature boys, gentlemen, cannot be spoken to. You want to have definitions. You get what you want. Anybody gets what he wants, because he will not accept anything else. Gentlemen, you cannot give anything to anybody who doesn't want it. And since you do not expect living truth, but only dead truth, you get dead truth. This cannot -- that has been my fate here for 20 years in this college. Most of you expect, gentlemen, facts. You expect objects. You expect definitions. You expect something to learn by heart. You expect assignments, to read three pages a day. And that you think is intellect and mental life. You end up with these mechanic- -- mechanized examinations with "yes" and "no." Well, gentlemen, that's good for donkeys, and for horses. It is not good for men. I mean, you remain on the -- on the -- on the level of a trained animal, because the world of objects is for trained animals, because man is there alone with the world of objects. But we live -- the higher order of life, gentlemen, is to come to an agreement, although we do not see the same objects. We'll -- one lives in Colorado, and the other lives in China. If we can agree, you see, although all the objects outside are different, you see, then we have the same religion; then we believe in the same god. That's the question of mankind. That's the logos. What's the differ- -- why do -- you see, you insist that -- I -- I spoke to a student, and you know this story. It's always repeated. "I must marry young," he said, "because I want to play football with my son." That's not a good reason to get married. He wants to have the same object, the same ball in the hands of his boy. He has given up all hopes that he might give him the same religion, you see. An agreement, despite the differences of age -- of -- of objects and natural environments: that would be a father. He only wants to be the boy -- his boy's playboy -- playmate. That's a very poor logic. But that's -- here, today the best a -- a boy will -- will think of his son, somebody to play with, on equal terms. That's the -- the natural world, where the ball is everything. "Carry the ball." But speech means agreement at the heart, and at bottom, although the -- the scene daily changes. And in a changing scene, one in Europe, and the other in America, and the third in Russia, and the fourth in Africa, there to be of the

same faith, and the same love, and the same ethics: that's something. That's difficult. And your forefathers did it. They remained Christians in this -- foreign country. And if there is a greatness in America at this moment, it is that it is the one country in which the other countries find some eternity, you see, some eternal things, still. But don't throw it away, gentlemen. Don't get lost in objects. Don't get lost in concepts.

Gentlemen, the logos appears in Plato in great models, because the one thing that can be expressed through -- in any language is the name of the hero. And the myth in Plato, for example, plays this part, that it brings in some figures like Zeus or the gods...

[tape interruption]

...what you call something superhuman. The logos can only be imparted to you and me, gentlemen, as superhuman and as supernatural. And there are two roads then to -- to the logos: the supernatural, that is, it must be not simply objects of nature. "Supernatural" simply means "not an object." Don't be frightened by the word. I don't like it myself, but in this moment it's a useful thing. "Supernatural" means it consists not of objects which can be explained by concept. And it must be superhuman, gentlemen. You have heard of the many jokes that have been made up about Nietzsche's superman. Gentlemen, don't laugh it off. Superman is the most natural experience of the logos. Nietzsche meant simply that a man can be the carrier of enthusiasm, of logos, of divinity. And so he is a superman. Of course, he is. How can you deny that an- -- if you all are supermen, in all your light moments, better moments? When you summon a criminal to court, gentlemen, you are superhuman, gentlemen, because you are not just a human being, but you know what's right. And you have to say this.

It is terrible that this country has fallen -- I mean, below Benjamin Franklin even, and his practicality, and his utilitarianism, by saying that superman is funny; "Nietzsche was crazy because he spoke of superman." Gentlemen, anybody who speaks is supernatural and is superhuman. As human beings, we don't have to say anything with authority. But the whole human society is based on authority. Somebody has to say at this moment, "This is a crime," and "This judge is in authority." And I had to dismiss yesterday a boy for forgery, for plagiarism, and so I was in authority. It was very disagreeable, but there I was, saddled with this responsibility. And he will leave college, and I say so. And it is done. And that is superhuman.

If you don't see that this is superhuman, you do not understand what is human, you see. As a human, I have only one of you, you see. But as superhuman, I can put a human being outside the city. I can excommunicate him, you see. And that I do not do in my own right. I do it as bearer of an authority, you see, which is superhuman. It goes through my mouth. The logos streams through me, but I am not interested in it as a -- as a party. I am an officeholder. It is my office to do that. President Dickey is only interesting as president of Dartmouth College for us, you see. Not as a personal friend, not as another human being, you see, but for his superhuman authority, that what he says goes.

It is high time for you, gentlemen, to recapture your -- the sense of the divine in the very modest way that you say, "The divine is first of all not natural, because it is not an object." And it is secondly not human, because it has authority to change the order of things, to change the { }, to close the door, and say this { } to capitulate, for example. The man who can surrender a city and say, "Emerge," like Sam Houston when he -- when Texas was made a part of the Union, you see. God spoke through him, and so he couldn't go back on his word. In 1861, this same Sam Houston, as you know, resisted in the South as the only man -- governor in the whole South, he resisted Secession. And it will always be a point of -- my greatest admiration, that this old fox, and scoundrel, and drunkard, that he was -- divinely enough inspired that he said, "I brought Texas into the Union in 1800-" -- when? When?

('45.)

Yes. Sure. And -- "after nine years of independence. And now I cannot 15 years later say I secede from this same Union." That's divine, gentlemen, to bear the cross of one's own word, and to acknowledge that this word was not set by himself as a whim, as a -- from a salesman, as an empty promise. But that -- he meant it, that he felt he was in authority to have the -- Texas, you see, enter the United States. He couldn't go against the divine authority that had spoken out of him in 1845. And he went to pieces, and he perished ignominiously in 1861. But I'm glad to see that there is still a city called "Houston" in his memory. And this is the relation, gentlemen, to the logos. You know of -- use of the logos that founded the state of Texas as a part of the Union through the name "Houston." And in this sense, you have, because without this one name, "Houston," you see, Texas would have no history. Texas would just be an accident. So gentlemen, the logos remains in evidence, you see, through the names

of the people through whom the spirit has spoken. Very simple definition, through whom the logos has spoken. The logos cannot remain by -- with us through definitions. And therefore, gentlemen, the logos of Greek philosophy speaks to us through the name of Plato. Plato is the Houston, you see, of the Greek realm which corresponds to Texas here. Can you see this? You have to remember the -- the -- Plato and Plato's life -- name and life in order to know what the logos is. Logos -- Plato is -- sacrificed his allegiance to Athens. Therefore, we don't know him as a member of the city of Athens, but as a member of the Academy, of a -- that is, as a person who left the city of man, you see, and left the natural world, and became a -- a representative of the logos in his own right. What I am -- have tried today, gentlemen, to show you, why it is true that even with men like Plato, whom you would tap on the shoulder, and say, "Well, Mr. Plato, one more cup of coffee?" that Plato represents in this world of ours that what is not common, because it doesn't belong to nature, and it doesn't belong to this community. The trans- -- the word, gentlemen, by which the philosophers have always tried to ex- -- express this strange situation is "transcendence." We had the Transcendentalists in Concord. You have heard this word. That is, gentlemen, a man climbs higher than nature, and than his own city, if he wants to speak through the ages. The logos is that power which makes a man superhuman and supernatural. And perhaps for the first time in your life it may dawn on you why my division of ethics and -- and physis is still very modern, because you always keep apart "superhuman" and "supernatural." But these are two sides of the triangle on which we move, you see. You must -- when you speak with authority, gentlemen, in founding the United States, in writing of the Declaration of Independence, these founders, these signers were inspired. They said something for the first time. So they were not in agreement with anybody of an existing city. The British loathed them, you see. And it wasn't natural what they said. You can see this. And therefore, I plead with you, gentlemen -- you are such modest men, and such kind people that you say, "I'm just a human being," and so you decline to admit that -- that a man ever is superhuman. It just strikes you as silly. And also if I say something is supernatural, it strikes you as even more silly. You say, "I'm just natural." Gentlemen, by saying, "I'm just natural," you are supernatural, you see. And by saying, "I'm just a human being," you are superhuman. It is not a part of a human being to say, "I'm just a human being." This little word "just" is a humility of the God in your heart, of the divine. And if you would only discover that you all plead to be -- here, vessels of the divinity by saying "just." This -- these four little words -- letters: j-u-s-t, are a great arrogance, because it means you know. It means that you can judge your own place in life. Who can this?

Does the elephant know, you see? Most people don't know. You can. But that is superhuman, and that's supernatural.

If a man in the community only wants to keep up with the Joneses, he gets his judgment from everybody else. He doesn't say, "I'm just a human being." If I am -- judge the people in the Easter parade on Fifth Avenue right, you see, they want to be seen as one of the crowd, as one of the gang. They don't want to be told, "I'm just a human being." They want to be told that they had the best diamond necklace on the whole street. They want to be seen for what they are worth, and that they are on the Social Register, and that they are pious people and what-not.

And therefore, gentlemen, human beings add tremendously to their stature when they say, "I am just a human being." That's much more than the usual human being wants to be told. The usual human being wants to say, "I can be- -- may become president of the United States." That's a human being. Or "I want to --" you see, "I -- I -- I shall have an income of a million dollars a year," or what- -- whatever your ambition is. That you are, as "just a human being." But to say "I'm just a human being," that means to sit on a throne on which -- from which you can authoritar- -- -itatively, look down on your own humanity, and on your own nature, you see. And you all do it. And therefore you believe in some kind of divinity or devil. Whatever it is. Certainly in something higher than yourself. As a mere self. As self, gentlemen, and as member of -- as an American, you are on the level of humanity and nature. As speakers and judges, you are always sharing God's authority, the logos.

Sorry -- but this is, after all, as you see, very important. Now, I have -- allow me. I didn't make an inter- -- have an intermission. And I'm sorry for this. I -- intended to. But will you allow me simply to carry through? Perhaps you get up for a minute and get down again, if you stretch your legs.

[tape interruption]

We, as the historians of Greek philosophy, we have a great privilege. Plato had to speak of physis. He had to speak of ethics, of the city in general. And he had to speak of the philosopher. We are privileged to -- be specific. And I say to you, we have been talking of Athens, of Plato, and of the universe. That is, we have replaced the abstract philosopher, gentlemen, by the name of Plato, by which he -- we can talk to him, and he can talk to us. And we have -- replaced the word "polis" or "town" by "Athens" for his Greek word. Here, we should, of course, write the word -- the unspo- -- word "pan." The -- the {ord},

the whole, the word "universe," being the Latin word. And those who write on Stoicism, as Mr. {Pitzner}--where is he? ja--know that they are pantheists, because they worship the "pan," you see, as god, as the universe. In the word "pantheism," you see, the "pan" is the god. "Pan" is the Greek word for universe. And that's important for you to introduce this word "pan" perhaps into your vocabulary.

Well, gentlemen, by a stroke of genius, Plato himself has seen the -- solved the quandary between the city and Plato. There is a quandary, because Plato is the logos. The city is that part of the logos in which people speak to each other. The universe is that part of the -- of the -- reality, you see, of the universe in which we speak about things, where they don't talk back. You understand that when Plato is logos, the city is ethos, and the pan is physis. Now Plato, in his modesty and humility, and in his wish to impart the best city to all other men, and to make him--Plato, you see--only the first good citizen of the best state, by talking other people, so to speak, by persuading them into it, you see, by his eloquence, Plato had a stro- -- a very profound insight which is today still used, and is with us. And it is the greatest, so to speak, heritage, or legacy of -- of Plato to us. He said, "The city of man is organized like the human being. And the human being is organized like the city." If so, he could say Plato is the city, and Athens is Plato. And how did he do it? He said the city and Plato consist of mind, heart, and stomach. And the city of man, therefore, must also consist of mind, heart, and stomach. And there he obliterated the distinctions between the logos and the ethos, between Plato and the city.

It is very dangerous, gentlemen, to say that the city is simply nothing but man written large. But that's what Plato, and later Aristotle, did. Plato said, the mind or the head. He said in the Timaeus, the head; in The Republic, he said the mind. There are two terms for him. The heart in The Repu- -- no, here, pardon me. The -- in the Timaeus the heart, here the -- the courage. This would be reason, you see. And in The Republic, he says the passions, and in the Timaeus, he says the belly are in you and me. We all must eat. These are the -- the liver, and the bladder, and the genitals, we -- these are the passions. We must feel, we must have cour- -- take courage. We must breathe. That is the region between the neck and the diaphragm, the lungs and the heart. And we must think. And that's the head. And as you know, all Greek philosophy thinks that the head should be master of the heart and the passions. I think it's a very wrong philosophy, but all Greek philosophy has the idea that the mind is the head, because it's -- up here, is superior to the heart. Now the Du- -- Duchess of Windsor, as you know, doesn't think so. And I don't think so. And no Christian can think so.

Gentlemen, the -- the error of Greek philosophy is to think that because the high -- heavens are up, and the sky is up, and the head is the highest, that's why the head must be better than the heart. If you, however, analyze your own existence a little bit more carefully, you will understand why our -- our brains and the cells of our brain are the roots of the matter, we are rooted in the sky through -- it is as though we were standing on our heads, so to speak. We are not standing on our feet mentally, intellectually, and in our existence as being. But we are hanging through our reason in -- in a -- in an -- in an earth, in a soil. Because here is the nourishment which we receive, you see, in these brain cells. But we are free with our limbs, and our whole body to go into the world and create something new.

And therefore, it is very dangerous to use the Greek idea that the head is higher -- as high as Heaven over the earth, and therefore better. That's the Greek idea, however. And now look what it did. The equation of the individual, in *The Republic*, and *The Timaeus*, the individual's three great qualities, with the qualities any c- -- good city should have, enabled Plato to disappear behind the city, and to say, "The philosopher is nothing but the small edition of the city." And therefore, as you know, he organized the city with the head on top, with the heart in the middle, and with the passions below. That is, he said, "There must be always three parties," as in India today in the caste system. There must be the priests, that are the philosophers; there must be the warriors who have courage, you see. And there must be the craftsmen, and the peasants, and the artisans, who must take care of the passions, of the skills, of the body, of the merely physical talents and endowments of our physical nature.

Now this is then the most deep-seated legacy of the Greek political mind, gentlemen, and the Greek natural mind, that the individual is built as the city, and the city is built as the individual. I would say that even in the tripartition of the judiciary, the executive, and the legislative branch of the government, you probably still have a reminder of the three things. The executive, the military is for courage, you see; the -- the legislation is for the economic interests; and the judiciary is for the reason, for the jus- -- for -- for justice. And so you have still in Montesquieu, and in our Constitution, an echo of Plato's idea of government having to follow the lines of our individual human endowment. The individual for Plato is consisting of head, heart, and belly. And therefore, the state must organize itself in such a way that on top are the guardians. On top is reason, you see. Then come the soldiers, and below come the farmers and artisans, and the people who deal with the material world.

This is the thing that later already by Aristotle was a little transmuted. Who is -- works on Aristotle? Well, what's the theory, my dear man? He does not follow Plato so simply, but he says that the -- that the great empires, the Egyptians, and the Persians, they cultivate the skill in their temple building, in their medicines, and in their { }, and in all their arts, and they serve the belly. Because the individual is not free there, but it -- it works as in Hindu -- as a Hindu craftsman would work today. And then the tribesmen of the North, they are the courageous people. They are warriors. You have warriors, then Aristotle. And he says, the -- the Greek compromises between the two. He puts--as he always does with his happy mean--Aristotle puts the Greeks in the middle of the story.

Now this however in Plato is not the case. In Plato, the wild tribes are the courageous people. The great empires are the belly people. And the Greeks are the head people, the reasonable people, you see, the people who think, who can, so to speak, tower above the passions, and above the generosity, the movements of the heart, the -- the courage, generous -- -osity, what else would you say is -- is business of the heart, faith, loyalty, all the emotions of the nobler nature? But I think the exciting thing is that now for 2,000 years, gentlemen, every human being in the West has believed in this authority of Plato with regard to politics. That's quite a story. And there you -- I thought I should s- -- tell you this. Whether you read Plato yourself or not, you live in a constitution that is Platonized, that in a certain manner has tried to be- -- make us believe that head, heart, and belly must be organized in a city in three layers. The government must be reasonable, you see; the economic interests must follow passionately their self-interest, you see; and you must have an army that's courageous. And we haven't changed that much. Can unde- -- see this, you see. The secular society of today is still thought of very much in the Platon- -- Platon- tonic pattern.

(Did you want the { } the people at the top of government { }.)

Well, you are right.

({ }.)

Well, since he tries to persuade other people to found this city, and to make the philosopher king, therefore Plato, if he's the head of -- the -- the city, he himself is the best man, is he not? Then he represents the logos in the city.

{ }.)

You see, because the logos is connected with the city through him. That is, through Plato the logos would enter the next city, and it would therefore be the best. Can't you see this? He couldn't get out of this quandary. We all want, of course, to have children of our own spirit. And I have no objections against this, you see, that a man should -- should be the model. And I think he was a very noble, certainly, and generous soul. For Heav- -- Heaven forbid that I, you see, would -- would -- would belittle him. I only don't believe that the city of man can ever be -- be governed, you see, by philosophers. I -- we talked about this before, why that shouldn't be, because you have to wait until the last child can agree. And that's not the business of philosophers, but of servants of the public, I mean. It takes quite a bit of character to -- to be patient with people, you see. A -- a philosopher doesn't have to be patient with people; he has to think the truth. That's a certain different quality.

Well, I think this is a very great scheme which is -- has then been carried over into all form { }. The secret is, gentlemen: if you have -- ethos, you have a community; if you have physis, you have millions of objects, what you call "nature," you see; and you already really say more than we can prove that this is one world. You can { }, who say there are many worlds. Plato had already the idea of one universe, because to all members of one community, we can talk sense about the universe through mathematics. That was his great dream that nature was general, the same to all, you see. Not to the Hindus; that's not true. But to the Greeks it was. One universe for the citizens of the human family. Now the logos, gentlemen, is, so to speak, saved in the Platonic philosophy by saying that the qualities of the individual, perfect man are the same as the qualities of the perfect city. But I don't think we have any reason to believe that. I mean, I do not see this -- this -- this identity, that because I have a head, and a belly, and a heart, I have to believe that the city of man must have a head, and a belly, and a heart. I mean, it's the government of a city made -- be made of quite different { }. If I want to -- a compromise between citizens, you have still to prove to me that I myself, as a compromiser between the two, have to consist of the -- of the parts of the citizen himself. I think it's very arbitrary. And so I have never been struck by the truth of this thing, but by the genius which, through this identification, gentlemen, you get the power of philosophy over the city. Only if the individual philosopher has in himself the same order as the city can he claim authority to rule the city. That was Plato's discovery, so to speak, or saving grace, you see. Seeing his city goes to ruin, he

said, the best man, you see, is the model for the city. The city is man written large; man is the city written small.

Therefore, gentlemen, you should never use the word for the Greek philosophy, as you always read, that man is a microcosmos. That's a very silly word, it should be buried. Man is the micropolis; he is the small city. And the polis is the macroanthropos. The city of man is man written large, macroanthropos. And man is the micropolis. He is the city of man written small. But he is not a microcosmos. That's -- some other philosophers have believed this. But that is not true of the bulk of -- Greek philosophy. The real Greek philosophy is a little more profound. It says man is the city written small. And the city is man written large. Please take -- keep this. This is a very important thing.

Most -- to most people one cannot talk today, because they -- they take these slogans like "microcosm," and they have never thought it through what it could mean. Since we do to know the principles which -- which join the world, the cosmos, it -- nothing is said if you say, "man is a microcosm," you see, you would have to know the cosmos a little better for this. Today it would boil down to the fact that we have some electrons inside ourselves. And the cosmos has some electrons inside ourselves. You will admit that this doesn't make us into a microcosm, because you -- we function like the whole {cosmos}. But the city is a different story. If you say you function like the United States of America, then the United States of America functions as you, you can talk, you see, back and forth.

So, let's stop here.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...with a very poor word, "nature," which you should try to avoid in dealing with philosophy- -- ical problems. It's a misleading word today. These two words -- these two worlds do not coincide. The world of the United States in which you live is much smaller than the universe of all the suns, and all the stars. And the order which the United States proclaimed to you, by its la- -- laws, and its manners, and mores, and your parents, and your teachers, and the order of the universe are absolutely contradictory. This society in which you live is a soft society, and assumes that no wrong can be done by students. They have always to be pardoned. There is an eternal mercy, called "mornitis." And in nature, everything is hard, every cause has an effect; it's absolutely merciless. Now what shall we make of a nature that is merciless, gentlemen, and of a society which even calls the -- the ter- -- most terrible murderer still somebody who has to be pardoned and coddled, or at least fed for a lifetime in a prison, because you hate capital punishment? Absolutely contradictory. In the animal kingdom, obviously there is the survival of the fittest, and has been proclaimed as a tremendous truth. And you yourself behave as though you can be a misfit totally and you have a right to live.

This is the eternal contradiction of philosophy, gentlemen. And there must -- can be no day of human history where this trouble is not going to arise, because even if we have the whole -- the globe organized, there is still Mars, and there are still the suns, there is still the universe outside, the stratosphere. And never, never shall this dilemma end, gentlemen. The human mind is placed between two sources of information which mutually exclude each other and their conclusions. And as long as you do not see that physis and ethos are at opposite ends, you cannot understand logos. Because logos is an attempt to see the same meaning, the same truth, the same revelation, the same wisdom at work in the stars and in the human heart.

Now the human -- the -- the stars collide. You must not collide on the highway. So here is collision, God's law, or divine law, or natural law. Call it as you like, you see. And here in nature -- in -- in society, there is the law, no collision.

Hitler, commit -- falling under the spell of natural law, said, "Let's have all the collisions. I collect collisions, because that's natural law. Man is an animal." Concentration camps. Labor -- forced labor camps. Collision.

Give you an American example. Yesterday--who died yesterday? Saw it in the papers who died? Very interesting man. Who died? Gentlemen, that's unethical. You are just nat- -- nature boys. Nature doesn't care for death, you see. Ethics do. I'm sorry. Mr. Weyerhauser died. Who is Mr. Weyerhauser? Who is he? Ja? What did you say? Nobody knows who Mr. Weyerhauser is? (He was the heir to a large timber fortune, and a family out on the West coast, I think Oregon.)

Sure. He died in Tacoma -- Tacoma, Washington. Washington is even more his -- his domain, Oregon and Washington. Yes. Well, Mr. Weyerhauser, gentlemen, is of a family who plundered the wood reserves, forest reserves of the United States in the first generation so shamelessly that Congress published such a volume against them in 1913. Now they are the great philanthropists of America. And they have 9,000 tree farms and in 1941, the man who died yesterday at the age of 57, founded the first tree farm. So it took him 29 years to make amends for the shock he had -- he had given the -- the forests of this country, the resources of this country. And he today, of course, as -- as you love all these robber barons so deeply, he now to- -- today is worshiped, and revered, and of course heads the Republican Party.

And -- it's a joke, gentlemen, because for philosophers, gentlemen, the question is: Why couldn't Mr. Weyerhauser operate in the same way in 1913? This is the phil- -- eternal philosophical question with regard -- between ethics and physis, you see. In physis, no mercy. But if you have a country you live in, gentlemen, if you have "a gift outright," as Mr. Frost has put it about the American soil, and the { } -- you have heard his poem, haven't you? "A deed ou- -- gift outright." Who knows this poem? Well, that's, gentlemen, that's the Magna Carta of America. I -- you'd better go and -- and read it. I think it's -- preposterous that there is anyone in this classroom who has not read it or heard it. Be ashamed. How can you be Americans and not know this poem, gentlemen, which says everything about your relation to your own land? He should send back his two doctorates of Dartmouth. You don't deserve him as your honorary doctor.

It is not an honor to be the docto- -- honorary doctor of Dartmouth. But it is honor for Dartmouth if some people accept the degree. Because for your intellectual merits, you see, gentlemen, it is not a distinction to belong to your group. I'm serious, gentlemen. This is incredible that -- Robert Frost can live here on this campus, and here, you are seniors and juniors and you don't know this

poem, "A Gift Outright," which made him famous all over America.

The problem of American soil is a very serious one. As you know, it's shrinking. And we have not only the dust storm problem in Texas, but the whole problem of the future of mankind -- on this little soil is -- is still unsolved. Obviously with the -- humanity increasing as it does, we probably have to go into the deep sea to be fed and -- very soon. And the Weyerhausers, gentlemen, put a philosophical problem. Why? Physis, gentlemen, if it is just an object of men's exploitation, you see, it is under mercilessness, under the law of just struggle, you see, survival of the fittest, exploitation. You carry that to the extreme, Mr. Weyerhauser is absolutely right.

But obviously, appropriation, gentlemen, that is, the appropriation of a part of the universe entails an obligation to find out the will of its creator. The destiny of this soil. And this soil has to be reproduced. It has to be -- as we call it today in this country "conserved." "Conservation." "Conservation" is a very poor word, you know. But in this country, you -- you have no better word. But you must always know the real problem is that man is the mouthpiece of all other creatures, and that he has to deal with bees, and apples, and -- in their own manner. You cannot she- -- go from Chicago to Africa and kill all the elephants and the tigers off as they do now. It should be immediately forbidden. It's just an orgy today of --. I have met these millionaires. I was in Egypt studying and there they came--I have told you, I think, this story--flying in, and just shooting, shooting, shooting. And the lady sitting in an armored car just looking at her great husband. And that's done here on our -- you do it now, because you can't do it anymore in this country, where we have killed the bull moose, and the wild pigeon, and everybody else.

I say "everybody else," gentlemen, because you see what an ethical problem it is. At what poi- -- one -- at which point, gentlemen, does the sun, and the moon, and the elephant, and the trees become our own brothers and sisters? When do you have to call them "he," and when do -- are we allowed to call them "it"? That's a great problem. Your car is "she." The ship is "she." Because you know that your life depends on them. So you couldn't say "it" of your car. And you couldn't say "it" of -- as the Britishers couldn't in the -- on their island call it "it." That's the reasons why both are "she."

Now, gentlemen, as long as in this country we cannot speak of the forests as "sh-" -- as "hes" and "shes," as we speak in poetry today of the sun and the moon. You haven't done wrong -- right by these -- by this physis, because you have not taken it across the boundary of ethics into your city of man. It hasn't

become a living part of your humanity. And that's the whole trouble with this country, that the pioneering days allowed man to squeeze a farm dry like a parchment, throw it away and go to the next farm. And they said -- said so. I knew a farmer who said, "I have squeezed 25 farms dry in my life," and he wasn't sent to prison. In any other country, the man couldn't be a citizen. Now Mr. Weyerhauser was exactly this kind. It took him 20 year -- 9 years after the report of the Congress to recover his senses. And in 1941, he started the first tree farm. Gentlemen, what's a tree farm? Something -- it's a poor word for a good thing. It's -- we call it "forest" in Europe. It's a forest. And any forest in Europe is something that has to last a thousand years. Gentlemen, the percentage of woodland in Germany and Austria has remained the same until the French marched in, in '45, and took their revenge and killed the Black Forest. That was the most barbarous invasion of thousand years. Neither the Thirty Year War, nor the Peasant War, nor any -- or Seven-Year War, no war has ever killed the woods. Only when the French were permitted by the Americans to pose as victors did they murder the Black Forest. And they -- the -- the man in charge of the forest blew out his -- in his despair committed suicide. And the French were so -- so deeply -- felt so deeply menaced by this suicide that the man's death could not be announced in the papers in '47, that they forbade even to publicize that the man had killed himself, because it was, of course, a demonstration. They behaved like Mr. K d r behaves in Hungary, the -- because a forest is a living thing in Europe. You know, there are many songs to the forest. And very true feeling, that a tree has as much a right to -- to be -- reproduce, as a family. And in 1000 -- 1150, gentlemen, the percentage of wood land in Central Europe was 27 percent. And in 1945, it was still 7- -- 27 percent. If you think of this, gentlemen, you know that physis and ethics are in constant cahoots, in constant conspiracy. That it is a deep problem, you see, to know that physis poses an ethical problem, just as you and I pose a physical problem. We have to eat. So we are part of physis. And the earth is to be respected, so it's part of ethics. And therefore the lines are constantly shifting between ethics and physis. And perhaps I have now made some step forward to make you understand that philosophy is not a luxury, and not an invention of a department, but that every one generation is saddled with this relationship between lo- -- ethics and physis. It has to be said what the relation is, you see. When do you call a tree "it," and when do you call it "she"? That's a problem; and every generation has to put it differently. If you have an abundance of trees and a few people, you make -- burn all the trees as a clearing, as you did in -- 200 years ago here. No -- you see, very understandable. But it can't last. Now we

have, you see, many people and fewer trees, and the thing becomes quite serious. The logos then, gentlemen, is the apportionment, the apportioning of ethics, and ethos, and physis to reality. And to prove to you, gentlemen, that this is something you yourself are immersed in, let me now give you an example of the moment, of the present day.

A naturalist, gentlemen, deals with -- let's take a simple example: bulges, curves, waves; and he describes them so that anybody can see them. Now the historian, or the ethicist deals with the Battle of the Bulge. Has anybody -- heard of the Battle of the Bulge? Who has? Only a fraction. Well, gentlemen, when I and you deal with the Battle of the Bulge, which was fought in the -- at Christmas time 1944 and into the -- January, which was the battle -- the last stand Hitler took against the Americans, where the famous "Nuts" were said of -- at -- where?

(Bastogne.)

Bastogne, sure. Now we have here a very interesting problem. The high point was probably the resistance of the general in Bastogne. But the battle is rightly called the Battle of the Bulge. What's the difference, gentlemen, between bulges in physics and the Battle of the Bulge? Can anybody tell me the -- the situation of the logos, with regard to a physical event, that something bulges, like a dress, and the historical event that something is called "the Battle of the Bulge"? What's the difference? If you approach it in a -- spirit of investigation, what do you -- what is proposed to you, what do you have in front of you when you look at a bulge, and when you hear of the Battle of the Bulge? What's the difference?

If you can understand this, you come nearer to understanding another aspect of this eternal battle between ethics and physis. And I -- it must be my attempt to make you see that the -- all history of philosophy today, all the books, the popular books on philosophy are so nonsensical, so valueless -- they give you anecdotes. But they do not tell you that there is in every year of the Lord the same question necessarily asked, you see. Always the same. Philosophy has one theme and nothing else. And you don't believe this. You think philosophers are brown-study men who think of something. They don't think of something. They think of the one dilemma, in which ever son and daughter of man is immersed. That it -- you have to distribute your loyalties between bulges, gentlemen, and battles of bulges. Why?

I -- I'll give it to you, because you won't find it, gentlemen. If you speak of the Battle of Waterloo, the historian, the philosopher, the thinker, the man who comes later, it already has a name. And as this name shook the roof- -- -afters. The Battle of Waterloo makes the fortune of the Rothschild bank. It made the English put the monument of Wellington in front of their stock exchange. It brought about the restoration of the Bourbons. And therefore every Frenchman to this day who is a leftist trembles in re- -- with respect to the name of the Battle of Waterloo.

That is, gentlemen, historical, ethical, political events, events in the society of men, express their reality, their significance by names, which meet with mixed feelings, which create tremendous emotions and tremendous actions. If you name Kossuth, the name of Kossuth in Hungary at this moment, it inflames the workers' council against the Russians. And it therefore is a reality in society which, when you talk to the Niagara Falls about Kossuth, has no corresponding response. Nature, gentlemen, cannot be spoken to. Human beings, however, are ruled by words, by names. I can arouse your feelings by any wicked name I give you, or give something you love. I cannot call your father "SOB" without your coming out and say, "Take this back. I'll hit you hard." Right you are.

Names, gentlemen are that what moves human beings. Nothing else.

Nothing else, gentlemen. You cannot get any soldier to go to war if you cannot say to him, "Go to war." That's why you are so silly when you say, "War is murder." I hear people often confuse these things. Or when the Puritans -- not the Puritans, but the diseased Puritans thought that marriage was obscene, because you had to get children. Gentlemen, what you call a thing, that's what it is. Love and marriage are angelic, are heavenly powers. Prostitution is something quite different. It has a different meaning, and rightly so, because it is something different. It swings in a different context. I know that many marriages today are not better than prostitution. And there are very -- many honorable harlots. But the main thing is that even though -- the -- the names themselves, gentlemen, carry weight. Perhaps you take this down, gentlemen. The Battle of the Bulge carries weight with you and me. It moves us to action, because the name itself is a part of the event. An event has only happened after it has been called -- has received its name. The Battle of Waterloo was only the Battle of Waterloo after the English had decided to call it that way. Blücher tried to call it Belle Alliance, the good alliance, and it was -- didn't work. And there was another name proposed, you see. It didn't enter history. The French and the English have decided to call it the Battle of Waterloo. In German textbooks, you still fi- -- read the name "Belle Alliance." And for the -- for the Prussians who

didn't enter the spirit of the French Revolution at all, it made no -- not much difference; the downfall of Napoleon had no immediately political, you see, democratic repercussions.

The Battle of the Bulge, gentlemen, cost me some American friends. We were seated at -- at -- at New Year's party together while these news came -- -ing in, and this was the one time that the Americans really trembled. There was a shock. It was unexpected. It was a setback, after they already had felt that everything was -- was over. We all were of course terribly grieved. But my friends, who were dear friends for -- by that time 10 years, broke with me inside, because they said, "This is a German. Well, who knows? He's one of these wicked peoples." They ascribed to me, so to speak, the Battle of the Bulge. Anything could happen with me, because I came from this cursed country which offered a defeat to the victorious American armies. It was quite a shock to me, I can assure you. There we were, good friends, you see, in a close company, in a private home. And you just felt that they -- they had to take it out on somebody. So it was me.

That's what a Battle of the Bulge does. In -- in the world of eth- -- ethos, gentlemen, we are ruled by names. You know very well the difference between "Negro," "colored people," and "nigger." It's a difference. And it has different consequences -- which word you use. Very great dif- -- distinctions as a matter of fact. So it is with "WASP," and it is with "Christ-killer," and it -- with all these nice words which the American language harbors.

And it can't be helped, gentlemen, because we know each other by names. You give me the name "Professor." I give you the name "student," you see, and that gives us -- each other status. And we cannot be natural to -- with each other, you see. We have to be ethical. And it is Rousseau's and Thoreau's error that he thought men can be natural.

I tri- -- have tried to tell you that ethos is always older than nature.

Nature is the common impression of second thought, on all of us. But society is my role with regard to other people's roles. It's reciprocal. Nature is a second-rate experience. Nobody can experience the space except with others together. All nature, that is, all mere space outside, can only be observed if you are firmly grafted in the common sense, in the common life of a society. No individual, no baby can observe nature, because it is fearful until his mother has said, "You can look out of the window. I'm with you. I'm protecting you." Any physicist, you see, has a fire department, and has you and me, the taxpayer, supporting him before he can be delegated to the front of nature looking out for us into space.

If you can once see this, gentlemen, space we all have in common, but your lifetime you have for yourself. And therefore, your lifetime has to be reaffirmed by the name given you. The president of the United States is now president for four years. He is it only because we say so, you see. The man in -- in Haiti today, as you know, resigned as president of Haiti on December 6th, and now he -- he calls himself just nothing. Therefore there is -- the law has been broken. Have you seen it in the paper? A funny man. He -- he resigned as president because his term was up. He didn't allow a re-election -- a second election. He took command of the armed forces. And now he is a nameless somebody, and everybody has the right to declare that there is no law in Haiti. And he didn't know this, this idiot. He lives in a -- probably went to an American prep school, where nature and ethos are confused.

All of you, gentlemen, are sick because you don't know this distinction.

All of you think that life is experienced as -- in the same way in society and in nature. In society -- nature, you never experience life. You only experience death. You only experience things. What you call experience, gentlemen, is not what you think it is. In society, we experience how people call us. That's what you experience, you see, and how you -- they expect you to call them. That's a real experience in society.

For example, if you have the experience of your first love, you understand that your -- girl expects to be called by a name she has never heard before. If you can't invent a name for this girl, she'll never love you right. Any -- young love can demand that the persons involved are called with a name never used before on them. That's what makes a poet. That's why poetry is necessary in love, because you go to the poet and borrow some of his epithets so that your girl may give you a date. Better be poetical, you see. But this, gentlemen, is experience, is an experience which you cannot make in nature. You cannot make an experience in nature because you can -- of this kind, because you cannot speak to nature. Nature can operate on your five senses, but it doesn't make sense. But if your girl suddenly calls you "Johnny," and -- and is reconciled to your advances, you have made a tremendous -- have a tremendous experience. Somebody spoke to you who did not speak to you before. That's the difference. And that is experience.

All the words you use, "life," and "experience," you abuse, gentlemen, because you have lost the wall between nature and society. And that is the deepest reason, gentlemen, why Marx came into being against the liberals. In this country, as you know, liberals today are Communists. But gentlemen, there

is a wall between liberal thinking and Communist thinking. And what is the wall? The wall is that Marx said, "It's all society, it's how we call each other, how we speak to each other, how we treat each other, reciprocity." And all the liberals, every American philosopher, statesman, and thinker tries to deny that we are anything but natural beings. And there is no understanding, therefore, on the real Marxian issue today in this country, gentlemen. Marx has nothing to do with what the Russians do. That's politics. Marx was a very profound thinker who saw that Rousseau, and Thoreau, and Franklin had abolished the wall of the eternal dilemma, of the double household in which we live. You live in a family of human beings who call each other by names, by the right or the wrong names. And you live in a natural, you see, world outside, but only if you huddle together, if the auth- --olidarity -- solidarity. Society is ruled, gentlemen, by solidarity, despite every man's own time. Nature is ruled by distinction, despite the unity of space. Will you take this down? Society is ruled by solidarity, despite the distinction of -- every member's time, or lifetime, you can say, or time span or -- ja, time. And nature is ruled by the distinction of every thing, by the distinction of everything, despite the unity of space.

Well, Sir, I wish you would write this down, too. Why do you refute -- refuse? I shall treat you as a piece of nature from now on.

{{ }.)

Society lives by solidarity, despite the distinction of every man's own time. And space lives by the distinction of everything despite the unity of its space. If I speak to you, gentlemen, I have declared my solidarity. Can -- I can only speak to people whom I grant life, and who grant me life. Whenever you speak to a person, he is pardoned. There was a great law in the kingdom of Spain, when the king -- or the Roman Emperor, too -- when a man would -- with a judge, or the king, or the emperor, or the dictator speaks to a man who is condemned to die, the man is pardoned, because the sanctity of the society demands that when the living word reaches one of the members, you see, the -- the highest power, the supreme power, he thereby has received it.

In the old times, gentlemen, in any tribe, in any Indian tribe, when the father of the family receives the child and gave it his name, the child could no longer be exposed, and life -- his life couldn't be destroyed. By the acceptance of this per- -- of the personality of this child, by giving it his own -- its own name, the child only made the threshold between nature and society.

That is, the ancients, gentlemen, knew very well that it is only the word

spoken to somebody who takes him across from physis to ethos. We do this. Gentlemen, we no -- don't have to do it. Hitler snuffed out, as you know, all these -- 6 million Jews by giving him a -- them a number. And at the end, they had not even their own name. And at that very moment, he felt strong enough to -- to find -- helpers to -- to extinguish them. As long as they had had their name, I think many of his hangmen would have shuddered by his lawlessness, you see. But first, he flipped them outside society on the dungheap of nature. And once you deprive a person of his name, and you don't even know that he has a name, he's just a number, you can easily reconcile your conscience, you see, and say, "Oh, it's for the good of their -- of a," you see, "of the country, that these people are wiped out like lice." And that's what he actually did. He said in the beginning, "I shall weed them out like grass -- like weeds. And I shall teach people to look tha- -- in that," you see, "into them, the character of weeds." So gentlemen, ethics and physis are political problems. Philosophers are always in politics. Always in politics. At this moment, gentlemen, this country is without any thought, without any mind, I mean -- I -- I think the all-time low, Mr. Herbert Hoover, Jr., a man panic-stricken, with shit in his pants. And that's a -- representing us to the outside world. I mean, it's the all-time low in foreign politics -- has been reached in this country. Fortunately the man is dismissed. Even they find out in Washington.

And it's a great scandal, gentlemen. -- But foreign policy now, we -- we cater to Mr. Nehru's policy. Because policy has to be -- Mr. Nehru has now to tell the American public what's ethics and what's physis. If you read carefully how we cling to this Asian-African bloc -- why? Because everybody has now -- European thought? Can't be listened to. Europeans in America, like myself, can't be listened to. But we can listen to this idiot Mr. Nehru. If you read his Universal History, it's the stupidest book that has ever been written. But we -- it is. It is available in {Talplit's} for 80 cents. There has never been anything so miraculously stupid. But he's a "great, wise man." Because this country has no philosophy. It has declined to listen to philosopher, so it must listen to any witch -- sorcerer from the outside. Once it was the Chinese who was beloved. Now Mrs. -- Mrs. -- Mrs. -- what was her name? Mrs. Chiang Kai-Shek, yes. You have a hard -- hard time to remember that. But I can assure you, in my time, even my horse got her -- his name from her, because my -- a young friend of our house was such an enthusiast, you see. And her family gave Mrs. -- Mrs. Chiang Kai-Shek a million dollars. And so she got the right also to name my horse; now it has a Chinese name.

Only to show you that every 10 years, some other influence in this coun-

try, of some philosophical -- allegedly philosophical nature is at work. And I -- I just come from Boston, and I have a dear friend there. She was always progressive. She even voted for Wallace. And -- and now she's so progressive that Mr. Nehru is her idol. And I said to her, "Do you always have to have an idol?" She said, "Yes." She has to have an idol, because she has no philosophy. Mr. Nehru today in this country is such a joke, because there is nobody who hates America more than his delegate here, Mr. Mennon. He is a great -- yes, he is a great hater of this country. And he tries to de- -- degrade us. And we listen to his -- because we need something new, something, you see --. The only philosophy in this country is fashion, -- the latest mental fashion. Because you evade the issue, gentlemen, you have to have a philosophy, because if not, you have another man's philosophy. Because at any moment, you must know whether the trees in Oregon can be cut down or not. As you know, the people in Oregon, Idaho, and -- and -- and Washington have to have very appropriate ideas about Hell Canyon, and conservation. They are -- very much harder hit than we. They have a philosophy of government there. I have a friend there who worked in the -- in the Columbia River power development, and he is -- in politics, and I know how deeply the people there have for this limited area, at least, a definite philosophy. Very strongly developed, and that's how they defeated Mr. {McKay}, and Mr. {Welker}.

It's a partial philosophy, but it's something to know that people know the difference, gentlemen, between a forest that is alive and between a forest that is a thing. That's ethos, gentlemen. -- Take it now down. Ethos is the treatment of the universe as much as -- as much alive at least as myself or more. And physis is the treatment of the universe as less alive than myself, or dead.

You have a hell of a time to -- to appreciate *The Tempest* by Shakespeare, because the world there is eth- -- ethically treated by Ariel, and spirits, and Caliban, and the -- they -- they -- the whole -- Island, as you know, is alive. And that's for you is a joke, gentlemen. I doubt that it is a joke.

I have in my long life, coming from a big city with too much -- too much blacktop in the streets, I had to recover my senses. And I think I have. I now fully understand the necessity of speaking in gender, of the "la forêt," as the French do. It isn't a thing for a Frenchman to call it "la forêt," you see. It is alive. And the -- the sea, the same. Isn't the s- -- what is the sea in English? Which is "she" and which is "it"? Wie? How about the sea? Isn't there in English

a distinction? Wie? Which sea is feminine? No. S-e-a. Sea.

({ } the Atlantic Ocean is maybe compared to a "she," but "ocean" in general is "it.")

Ja. Because that's -- that's -- that's why I mentioned it to you, gentlemen.

Where there is a complete name, there is personality, you see. Atlantic Ocean, she, you see, can be she. And thereby -- it moves up to the grade, you see, of -- of life. It's -- it's your equal. The great -- that's the great story. The -- the abstract sea, you see, thing, neuter. It, you see. The -- the named thing alive.

St. Augustine's -- I told you about this incest { } and my famous example, gentlemen. In the old Roman law, and in -- and in St. Augustine, there is found the explanation why we can't marry our mother and our sister. You think that's something natural. Nothing in nature, gentlemen, that would forbid you to marry your --. The -- the animals -- do forget who's their mother and who's their sister. And they do mate. So it is per- -- perfectly natural. It has nothing to do with unnatural, incest, gentlemen. It has only to do with ethos. And St. Augustine has put it in a nutshell when he said, "I cannot make love to my mother and sister, because I already at first have received them by another name of love. And therefore I -- the new power of naming would be impoverished. I could never supplant"--you see, how do you say -- supplant? ja--"supplant, substitute, replace one name of love, the first name, mother, you see, by the new name of love, which would ring absolutely unheard-of," you see. The essence of love is the new name.

It's a very profound, and I think the only profound explanation of incest.

It doesn't belong to the biologist. It doesn't belong to the geneticist. It belongs to the ethicist. Ethos is hurt if what you have re- -- received in a tepid mood, or a lukewarm mood, or warm mood, mother or sister, you see, suddenly is obliterated by the explosive force, you see, of sweetheart and love. We must not -- you -- you -- evade all these serious issues by putting them, like genetics and eugenics, into the department of zoology. But gentlemen, you and I will never be a zoological being. It is hopeless for you and me, because we are shocked by wrong names. If somebody calls you a liar, you can say a thousand times it's just a word. It burns you up.

Yesterday, Mr. Booth read the -- Othello. Who -- who went there? Oh, you are not freshmen any longer, so you are through with Shakespeare. Well, there -- there Cassio, you see, is dismissed from his office by Othello, and he -- he runs around and says, "I have lost my reputation, reputation, reputation." It's

a very wonderful scene, because the -- the grasping Iago is already the naturalist and says, "Oh, the body. If you were wounded, I would pity you. But reputation? It's nothing. Reputation? Reputation? After all, everybody who landed in these -- on these shores usually had already lost his reputation in Europe. So what's the difference? Reputation, you see. It makes no difference." But it does, gentlemen. Unfortunately Mr. Cassio is moved through the whole play through his loss of reputation. And he -- and Desdemona perishes, because she tries to restore his reputation.

(Well, Sir. Iago equivocates though, because later on he says, "He who steals my purse steals trash.")

Pardon me?

(Well, later on, Iago says, "He who steals my -- my purse, steals trash, but he who fil- -- filches my good name is taking something.)

Well, Iago of course is the devil. The devil is the man who knows the importance of ethics, but refuses to believe it, you see? You see.

The -- the -- you see, the real problem of faith, which I have already tried to tell you I think in other classes, is that people who know something won't believe it. You always think that on the one side of the ledger is faith. And on the other is belief. And so you divide science and religion and you say, "Religion is -- belief that which cannot be known, or which is stupid, or which is the opposite of -- of science. And science is the facts." Gentlemen, that's not the story. The problem of knowing and believing is quite different. Iago says, "I know," you see, but he doesn't act on it. And therefore he doesn't believe in it. That's the devil. Believing -- it means action, to act on something.

I told you the story of Mr. -- of here, Mr. Steffansson, the Arctic explorer, who went to Washington in 1942 and said -- after Pearl Harbor, and said, "You know for 400 years that the earth is round, don't you?"

And they said, "Yes."

"But you have not believed in it. And you don't believe in it, and why don't you?"

They were very much surprised. You know the story? And what was his answer?

(I believe that he meant { } Iceland.)

In which { }.

(Pardon?)

Yes, in which context was this important for our war effort?

(Flying.)

In flying over the {Kuriles}, yes, and the Aleutians, instead of over -- via Hawaii. If -- you see, the -- the road on the Equator, obviously, you see, is twice as long as if you -- go take the shortcut, as the -- as the periphery of the -- of the ball, the globe. And they -- they had known, but they hadn't believed it. The same true is of Iago, gentle- -- Sir, you see. And the same is true of you, gentlemen. You know that men should have solidarity. But you don't act it out in Clinton, Tennessee.

So my -- this was my duty for your paper. First to state once more that logos, physis, and ethos, gentlemen, are realities, because the city of man speaks to us, but is small. The universe doesn't speak to us, but is big. You can also take down this as another sidelight: we always experience space as a whole, and then subdivide it into things, into smaller things. First, you wake up and there is this whole space, until you come to an hindrance. And then you can subdivide it into seats in this room, and places, inside. The experience of space is first, as one. And every division of Egypt, and Arab countries, and Africa, and Europe is belated, is second. Time is experienced the other way around. You experience first the o- -- one moment of your own life, and then perhaps the -- your own life. That all time is one -- has to be created. Has to be believed. It is not natural. It's nonsense to tell you that all time is one. Not an experience. It's a thought. It's just a -- a creation of the mind, an act of will. Most people never realize it. Most people live as though they -- they were the only people in the world, and their own time was the only time that existed.

Now most people don't know this. You always speak so glibly of space and time. Take it down, gentlemen: space and -- to put space and time together in this manner is a mere superstition. It doesn't exist, because all space is first experienced as singular, as one space; and all spaces are fragments and fractions of this one big space, the universe. But your lifetime, gentlemen, is first experienced as this time to yourself. You cannot share it with anybody. It's the existen-

tial problem. You only have your own time, you see. And you have nothing else, at first. Given: your own time; given: the universal space. They are the only -- they are two facts, you see.

If you can say, however, that your little home is not for sale, because it is yours in this universe, and if you can say that all men of all times, the ages, belong to you and you belong to the ages, then you have done something that is not natural. That's purely ethical. That's a creation of the logos.

The unity of time, gentlemen, and the division of space is the achievement of the logos, arbitrating between the space of physis and the time of society. The unity of time, gentlemen, and the divisions of space are the achievements of the logos, of the words spoken to these times, and to these -- this space. To space, we say, "Make room for a nation," for a little nation, too, you see. To time, we say, "Be one, from the beginning to the end," because it isn't by nature. We have no experience of any time before my -- your birth and before -- after your death. Can't be experienced. Purely fiction. But a fiction you can believe in. It's -- it's -- that's the dream castle which we build.

Let's have a break here.

[tape interruption]

...gives us a good Anglo-Saxon term for "society."

(It's not Anglo-Saxon. It's Assyrian. I looked it up, too. It comes from {kenon}.)

(I got mine from Webster's Unabridged.)

(I got mine from Webster's Academic. 18- -- 1850.)

Well, I -- I --

(But there is -- there is an Anglo-Saxon word however, which we thought of the other day, "burgh" -- b-u-r-g-h.)

Wie?

(And I'm fairly certain it's Germanic in origin, "burgh.")

Oh yes, it's burgh, there's Newburgh, and what you have -- what have you -- burger, the word "burger" you see comes from it. You see, the citizen. Of course, that's in German, too, I mean, the same, Bürger. And "bourgeois" is the same. La -- the French "bour," from which "bourgeois" comes. That's exactly the same word, "burg," "burger." It's Dutch, too.

And -- but that's not the story. The burgh is after all the fortified place.

But the minimum for a settlement in the old days, was a hedge. And -- in German, this -- this -- and this is pronounced like "town," so it could also be spelled this way. And in English "t" in German is always "z." You have English "two," and we have in German "zwei." You have English "ten," and you have German "zehn." And you have English "town," and you have German "Zaun." And the Zaun is today -- nothing but a fence.

Now the important thing is, gentlemen, that our anci- -- ancestors were good philosophers. You have lost their insight that men can only exist behind a fence. "The fence of the law," the Jews called it. The fence of the law. That is, human society is only able, by some distinction from nature, you see, to begin to exist, to live. And therefore the word "town" and the word "Zaun" in English -- in German, or the word "fence" today, the fence of the law, means that people among themselves accredit each other with life, and personality, and grant each other the right to live.

The Human Rights Day was yesterday, and you know, the president had to say that it was very poor at this moment, how it was handled. But what you call "human rights" is this living behind a fence where we cannot be treated like nature. You cannot treat a man inside your Zaun, inside your town, you see. Inside Our Town, we have to treat each other as -- as alive as we ourselves, or as I said to you in the definition, more alive. You look up to a judge, and a minister, or priest, or a good mother as more alive than yourself, I hope, or to the poet. And therefore receiving dignity, authority. What is authority? Dignity? Recognition that they have more life than we have. We grant them therefore recognition as a -- of a higher life.

It's all very simple, gentlemen. The whole gradation is constantly made by every one of us. I have seen young children snub an old man of 85, and I have seen them revere him. And that's then a decision they constantly make, you see. If they treat him as nature-boys, then they think because a man has no teeth and no hair left, he is just dead; and they treat him in nature as less alive than they are. If they live in a good society, with the fence of the law around

them, they'll get up when an old man enters the room, or an old lady, and will show their reverence. And that's the difference between the fence -- outside the fence, and inside the fence. And today the -- assumption of the young brat is that there is no such pale. "Outside the pale," no meaning for you. The juvenile delinquent has totally conquered society. The juvenile delinquent thinks that he is outside the fence, that everything is nature. He can shoot anybody in Central Park.

That's nature, you see. This -- this business of town, then, and township, is something rather -- very simple. -- Really, the recognition that the whole difference between ethos and -- and nature, and physis is in the fence. Everybody inside the fence has a right to live. Nothing outside the fence has this right, you see, can claim it, because it doesn't speak to us. We -- manipulate it, we treat it, we make war against it. We exploit it. We make it as a garden into the city, and plant the flowers there, and treat them, you see, as domesticated animals, or domesticated plants, then they come to life with us. Now let's turn to the -- this is the last day today on Plato. Will you kindly look up The Symposium? I said to you that the greatness of Plato is -- in The Republic is that he identifies the individual and the republic. That all the powers of the republic as a whole, the organization of mind, heart, and belly, is found as well as--in any city--as in the individual. That's, as I said, we should use the word "micro-" -- "micropolis" for man in Plato. Man in Plato is a little city. And the other is a macropolis. And you see, therefore, that's an ethical concept. Plato has for men and society nothing physical. But to him it's ethos. You speak of microcosmos, and macrocosmos, and think that's Greek philosophy. You are mistaken. In Plato and Aristotle, man is the city written small. This is very important, because I said to you, Plato and all philosophers ever since, gentlemen, are a community inside themselves. Any philosopher must be able to voice inside himself the voices of the whole community. He is not a philosopher who cannot speak the jargon of a king, of a mother, of a worker, of a slave, of a technician, of an inventor inside himself and make the -- all harmonize. The philosopher is a small city inside himself, gentlemen. That is since -- Plato, the solution, it may not be true that you and you are little cities. You may just be individuals. But a philosopher, you see, one man in the city must be like the city. A little ah-- -- acorn, so to speak, you see, the egg, the seed of the whole city. ({ } that Democritus, according to Aristotle { } said that a -- a man is a small world.)

Well, there you have a kind of derailment. I mean, he should have said he's a small city, I'm sure. That's -- is the break in the tradition. Today we all say "small world." That is microcosm. Micro- -cosm, small world.

Gentlemen, I warn you. I give you an example of how I experienced this very practically. It's -- 40 years ago I was a soldier in the war. And I was deeply moved, of course, by the conflict. And I tried to {fancy} -- at the front it was, in the second year of the war, possibility of unifying all the veterans of all the different countries, and make them turn around and face the home warriors, and these journalists, and these home patriots and fight them, instead. Because soldiers at the front are really of the same -- very much of the same breed as against the ladies at home. And -- well, I fumbled around with a project -- literary project. And I had the soldiers, and knights, and officers of all nations meet in my imagination. The manuscript is still there. And it's something -- it has still -- probably got to be done about it sometime. And the last speech I -- is a phil- -- is -- is -- has this as its content. I offer this to you to make you understand the practical importance of this definition of a philosopher as being a city in -- the nutshell.

They had met regularly and discussed -- I mean, the future of the human race. And on All Souls, at the end of the year of the Church, in November, you see, the ecclesiastical year goes to an end. Advent already belongs to the next year of the Church, you know. Decem- -- November 30 is the last day of the Church year. I had one man stand all alone. And he said, "All the others," there were 72, "have -- seems to have relinquished me, have deserted. I am here alone. What does this mean?"

And he said, "That's the real triumph, because in this year, we have been welded together to such an extent that everyone -- can now represent the 71 others, too. Everyone has taken over, so to speak, the other nation- -- nations' viewpoint, and the other nations' character -- so much that he is now empowered to speak for all. And so we have multiplied. Out of 72 individuals there have now -- have now come 72 people, you see, who can speak every one of them, for all 72."

Now that is, in a small way, Plato's experience in The Republic, you see. That at least he, Plato, must have filled himself with the positions, and the experiences of all men in a city, and in all potential cities, before he can, you see, propose the best state. Ja?

(Then you're telling us, Sir, we can't treat men in any way that's natural or objectively { } human behavior?)

Well, if you take a tree, Sir. Obviously, if you have an apple tree, the apple that is able to produce a new apple tree must have a certain wealth of poten- -- potentiality. If you begin to treat the human mind as a real thing, and not as a flimsy abstraction, you will understand that you can -- man can only bear fruit in political thinking if he has really become the apple of the whole tree.

That's all I want to say at this moment. I don't want to stress your question so much. If you could only see, I'm moving in a -- quite a different direction from your question. Can you see this? The important thing is that Plato is not thinking in the abstract, but he has filled himself with the life of his city. If you could see this, you see. And so he has become now an acorn or an apple. And the apple tree, Athens, can now wither on the stem and perish, because through Plato, the Greeks' free city is safe for generations, you see. From generation to generation, you can read Plato and inherit the -- the glory that was Greece. And also the limitations that were Greece. You can't find in Plato anything beyond the Greek city.

The important thing that I wanted to make -- is you nowhere find in the American tradition the distinction again between nature, by -- according to which the human being would have to be a microcosmos, a small nature, a small world -- and the micropolis, the -- ethical problem that a man has -- must have inherited all the good ways of life, of his city, the lawful order, his -- the quality of law-abidance, of virtue, you see, before he can speak about government. And you see there is a very vast discrepancy between being micropolis and being microcosmos.

Modern man seems--in this era of chemistry it is understandable--seems to boast that he is a microcosmos. But then he would have no direction, and he would have -- not know what is right and wrong. Because nature has no direction, and nature has no right and wrong. And nature is merciless, as I told you. In nature, everything is just itself, you see. Nature is based on selfhood, on impenetrability, on resistance, on gravity, on -- you see, on no escape. Society is based on interpenetration, on mutual understanding, on reciprocity, and on inheritance. And I can inherit acquired faculties. And the micropolis therefore is Plato. And please say to yourself, all Greek philosophers try to form this micropolis in various degrees. Some thought you could dissolve the polis into physis, as Epicurus, you see, and Lucretius. And they tried to be microcosms. There's no

doubt that Lucretius, and all the Epicureans, and Democritus tried to give the weight to physis and said the -- the city of man is a burden on us. Let's go out into nature. But that's only one {strand}. Then you get Heraclitus, and you get -- and you get Socrates, and you get Plato. And they struggle violently, you see, to restore the balance, and to say, "The philosopher must inherit the ways of life of a city. Before, he cannot lay out the next city. Before, he cannot philosophize." (Well, if the philosopher has all the parts of the city within him, what would be the objection to having the philosopher be king?)

Too muchness, too muchness. He would -- he would take away all the freedom from anyone. Nobody could be creative. Since he has -- knows it all, the others would become automat- -- automat- -- you see, automatons. Because he knows too much.

I mean, the -- the grain of seed must fall in the ground and die before it can bear fruit, you see. The philosopher is the grain of seed before it has died. You understand? If he rules himself. He can teach. And if then in 72 others his doctrine comes to life, they can found a city. You see, but it -- Alexander could conquer the world, you see, in the next generation. But Aristotle had no right to rule. That's the difference. The philosopher himself must not rule, because by his own self, he would extinguish the spontaneous life, the freedom of all the people he ruled. Can't you see this? Overweight.

That's the mystery between Church and state, gentlemen. The Church teaches, but it must not rule. As soon as a church rules, you see, it is horrid. It becomes a great inquisitor. Can you see this? It's the same problem, you see. The -- the wisdom of the Church has been that it -- that it is on a different planet. It does not rule itself. But it teaches. It instructs. It corrects. It criticizes. It prophesies. It leads, you see. It converts. But the people themselves must act in the state. And that's why the separation of state and Church is profoundly true. This Plato did not know. Plato is not a Christian, because he lives before this separation of the gods, you see, and the laws. That's why he's even called The Theologian, and he wanted to be king. And you can see that would be a pope who would be emperor, and an emperor would be pope.

It's all -- is -- if you don't understand -- that's why Plato at this moment is a great danger to be read. Lenin read him. And the Bolsheviks read him. And you read him. And you think it's harmless, gentlemen. If you unite Plato's -- Plato's claims in yourself, you become intolerable tyrants, because your insight is one thing, you see. You can use this for teaching. Or -- you see, your fumbling

in the political game, you see, like Mr. Nixon, who's just an opportunist, you see, that's -- more harmless, because he's just, you see, always out for one thing. He has not a straight thought in his mind. But he can't do much harm. He's not a tyrant. He's not like Lenin, or Marx, or Stalin. He has no philosophy, you see, except Nixon.

This is very strange. But you see, Nixon is only in Plato's thought one little side issue. Therefore it isn't -- he isn't so preponderant. Can you see this? He cannot be so destructive as -- as a man who says, "I know it all."

Gentlemen, Plato has in The Symposium in a certain manner outrun himself. His whole philosophy is between the single in- -- philosopher and the city. In The Symposium, however, there's a little more of unity between people because the truth comes out in such a way that every one has to contribute something. There is in this sense no philosopher in The Symposium who is alone. But there is an orchestra of philosophers, { } people. And that's why alt- -- it has always been felt that in The Symposium, Plato is greater than himself, that he transcends himself in { }, that his love for people, and his love of Athens, and his love of the arts, and his love of love make him, so to speak, explode his own system. And that's a very beautiful spectacle, gentlemen. A living soul must always be greater than his own mind. The love of -- you see, of reality must be greater than cleverness. You must be better than yourself; the Bible calls it, "Let us be more than conquerors." The living soul is always greater than he knew yesterday to be. I mean, you say, "I can't do this," and tomorrow you have done it, because we live. And life is -- the life of the next day must be more than my thoughts of yesterday.

And -- and Plato in a -- in a way I think has overdone -- outdone himself in The Symposium. And I cannot -- we cannot read it together, but let us look up just a few lines. It is the only place in The Republic -- in the -- Plato in which a woman can say something. And who is she? Diotima, yes. "Honored by Zeus" is her name. It has been the downfall of Greek philosophy that women were shoved aside, that the experience of married life, for example, was not ever utilized, you see, for explaining any comradeship, or community, and that Plato, even in the -- in the government -- in laws, and the city, treats marriage as a -- as though he was an owner of the stockyards of Chicago. It's butchery. It is -- it is a stud farm. And he even demands that in denial of intercourse -- a wise woman be present then to judge the eugenics of the case. He { } in this respect, because he tries to treat love as natural, and is unethical, anti-ethical.

This is not true of The Symposium. In The Symposium, the spirit gets hold

of a woman. And that's why I think The Symposium will always astonish within Greece. Of course, the Greeks had one very great poetess. Who was she? Sappho. But even this poor woman was condemned to lesbian love by the circumstances. Nevertheless, she was a very, very great woman. I can never read her poetry without being deeply moved. And she holds her own and -- with any great poet. Although we have so very little of her, every shred of paper we have of her, makes her into a first -- puts her into the first rank.

Will you kindly read 115? No, wait a minute; 114 -- I -- I'm mistaken. Can you? Who has a copy? 114 -- "Now with your leave."

("Now with your leave, we will take the battle --")

Alcibiades, the most beautiful, and the most successful statesman of Athens speaks of Socrates, and tries to say what Socrates meant for him. Ja?

("For it is fair to say { } and there was that --")

That's Socrates. Hi- -- "him" is Socrates.

("For there was that battle after which the generals actually gave me the prize of valor.")

So Alcibiades is talking. He was distinguished, got the -- by the order of merit. It's a little bit like the story now of the two swimmers. You have seen this, the story. One won in the heat, with 3 minutes 52, and the other won in the Olympics. Who was it? What?

(Jones.)

Jones was the other, was he? What's the name? Haven't you read the story?

(Green.)

No. No.

(Yeah.)

No.

(Yeah.)

The 400 meter? In swimming.

(The 800 meters. The 1500 meters.)

Well, didn't you see in Melbourne, he said, "I still consider the man who won the heat as the champion."

(That was the race. That was running.)

What was it? How do you spell it?

(Track. Track.)

Really? What's the name?

(Jones.)

Jones. I know this. And the other?

(Tom {Courtenay}.)

(No. Charlie Jenkins.)

Jenkins. That's it. Now we have it. All right. So -- so Jenkins, you see, gave me the prize of valor. This man. Please, go on. That's Socrates.

("I would not { } other person came to my rescue and saved my life. I was wounded, but he would not leave me. He saved my weapon, and me, too. Then I made { } myself, Socrates, to you the prize of valor.")

There you have the Jenkins-Jones situation. Ja?

("And here you will not find fault with me or say I am lying.

But the fact is, when the generals looked at my rank and wanted to give me the prize, you were more eager than the generals that I should get it and not -- that I should get it and not yourself. Again, gentlemen, it was worthwhile to see Socrates when the army was routed and retreating from Delios. I happened to be there on hos-

-- horseback and he on foot. This man and Laches were retreating together in the rout. I met them and told them to cheer up, and I said I would not desert them. There indeed, I had an even better view of Socrates than at Pot- -- Potidaea, for I had less to fear, being on horseback. First I had saw how he had kept his head much better than La- -- Laches. Then I really thought, Aristophanes, to quote your words, that he marched exactly as he does here, with swaggering gait and rolling eyes, quietly looking around his friends and enemies, and making it quite clear to everyone, given a long way off, that if anyone laid a finger on this man, he would defend himself stoutly.

"And therefore he came off safe, both this man and his companion. For in war, where -- where men are like that, people don't -- usually don't touch them with a finger, but pursue those who are running headlong. One could quote many other things in praise of Socrates, wonderful things.")

Would you kindly underline this, if you own the book, "wonderful things." We can -- have to -- to dwell on this word "wonder" right away. Ja? Go on.

("Of -- of his other habits, one -- one might perhaps say much the same about another man. And yet it is not his being like any other man in the world, ancient or modern, that is worthy of all wondering. When men like Achilles --")

"Men like Achilles might be found. One might take, for example, Brasidas and others. And again, men like Pericles, such as Nestor and Antenor. And there are more besides. And so we might go on with our comparisons. But as for this man, so awed, both the man and his talk, none could ever be found to come near him, neither modern nor ancient, unless he is to be compared to no man at all, but to the Silenuses, and satyrs, to which I have compared him, him and his talk. For indeed there is something which I left out when I began, that even his talk is very like the opening Silenuses."

That's the companion of Bacchus intoxicated with wine.

"When you agree to listen to the talk of Socrates, it might seem at first to be nothing but absurdity. Such words and phrases are wrapped outside it like the hide of a boisterous satyr. Pack-asses, and smiths, and shoemakers, and tanners are what he talks about. And he seems to be always saying the same things, in the same words, so that any ignorant and foolish man would laugh at them. But when they are opened out, and you get inside them, you will find his words first full of sense, as no others are. Next, most

divine and containing the finest images of virtue, and reaching farthest -- in fact, reaching to everything which it profits a man to study who is to become noble and good."

Now, will you take over? Go.

("This, gentlemen, is my laudation of Socrates. And I have mixed in as well some blame by telling you of the way he insulted me. I am not the only one he has treated so. He has done the same to Charmides, Glaucon's son; and Euthydemus, Diocles' son. And very many other whom he has tricked as a lover and made them treat him as the beloved instead.")

"And made them treat him as beloved instead."

("-- beloved instead. This is a warning to you, Agasthon, not to be deceived by this man. Try to learn from our experience; and take care not to be the fool in the proverb, who could only learn by his own. When Alcibiades --?")

Al-ki-bia-des. That's the Greek pronunciation. Let's stick to that. Al-ki-bi-a-des.

("-- Alcibiades had ended his speech, there was much laughter at his frankness, because he seems to be still in love with Socrates. But Socrates said, `You're sober, I think, Alcibiades, or you would never have wrapped all that smart mantle around you, or tried to hide why you've said all this, and put your point in a postscript at the end. For your real aim in all you said was to make me and Agasthon quarrel. You think I ought to be your lover and love no one else, and Agasthon should be --")

Ag-a-thon, I think we have to say. I think that's the tradition. Agathon.

You have a point. In Greek it would be A-GAH-thon. Who lear- -- who knows Greek? So. When the last syllable -- is long, then it -- the accent has to -- always in Greek has always to be on the second syllable. So it would be in Greek Agathon. "...should be your beloved and loved by no one else." Ja. Go on.

("But I see through you. Your satyric and Silenic drama has been shown up. Now, my dearest Agathon, don't let him get at anything by it. Only take care that no one shall make you and him quarrel.")

One moment. Gentlemen, Socrates here is shown as the miracle. He himself is the miracle, the wondrous person. And I have tried to show you that this is the problem -- in Greece that man, the philosopher, is the wonder. Be-

cause he contains the whole city, and therefore, the secret of life--he's the micropolis, you see--is -- appearing in him, and can bear fruit. And then you have the sense of wonder with regard to physis. But in -- in The Symposium, there is a third element which you don't have at any other of the dialogues: admiration. That's the sense -- third relation of miracu- -- the miraculous to humanity. "Admiration," of course, in your language, has very little to do with "miracle." But it is -- I'm afraid to say, you see, the same root, and it is the same feeling, that you are aroused to admiration, because something strikes you as miraculous, or somebody strikes you as miraculous. And so in The Symposium, gentlemen, it is the only place where Plato has given a picture of the Academy. Neither one philosopher, nor the whole -- the old city, the city of man going to war, and planting cabbage, and begetting children, but in the Academy, you have philosophers admiring each other, and loving each other, and living together in the realm of the spirit.

The ethos of Plato appears here, because here is Alcibiades, you see: great statesman. And here of course is Plato himself, and here is Agathon the tragedian. And here is Aristophanes, the com- -- the writer of poetry. All the people of the spirit and of the mind, connected with each other in a peace of love, in a banquet, you see, of a drinking bout and good talk. And that is more than the city, and more than the individual philosopher. And in this moment, the -- the Academy, which is the unity of spirit, you see, between good men, are united in a selfless company, in a higher service.

When Woodrow Wilson came to Dartmouth, gentlemen, unfortunately hi- -- this speech is forgotten. It's not even printed in his collected speeches. He made a very wonderful speech in 1909. Every one of you should look it up in the addresses of Dartmouth College. It was at the occasion of the inauguration of -- of President {Nichols}. And Woodrow Wilson gave a wonderful speech and said that a college must be a friendship of -- and an unselfish company. "An unselfish company." If it wasn't, it was no good. He also raised the question in this great address, when he said, "While I look around here in Dartmouth Hall"--it was -- ja, I think it was Dartmouth Hall, yes, Webster hadn't been built--"I came to think if it was possible that this group here could produce an Abraham Lincoln. And I had sadly to confess to myself that it couldn't." You have again the problem: philosophers, you see, you can produce in a college, but -- you understand, but not Abraham Lincoln so easily. At best, Nelson Rockefeller.

Where's the -- my crayon, my chalk? Here. So I think to end today's,

gentlemen, picture of Plato, I have tried to show you that Plato is the -- himself the micropolis. And perhaps I should write him with a capital M. { } a great thing. One man at least has achieved in antiquity that he is the whole city in his own { }. There is in him then the logos. That is, he can by his doctrine reconcile men's existence on this globe in a city and under the domination of the beautiful and the true on this globe. Then there is the city. Either Athens, that's the old city; and the future city, that's the republic. The best city. That's his republic. Now obviously, gentlemen, that's the -- ethos of Plato. And we haven't been able to deal much with the physis, but you can believe me that he also has a doctrine about physis.

Now in The Symposium, there is a subject, because the Academy, the -- the orchestra, the living-together of these philosophers is not of this world. It's Heaven. It's the -- the famous ivory tower of which you talk so much. But I would like you to understand that the ivory tower is not just negative. It's very easy to dismiss the ivory tower, you see. With The Symposium, if you read it, and I want -- want -- would like you -- like to think that some of you will take to it and read it themselves. In the -- there is mutual admiration. You call a mutual admiration society, gentlemen, but without admiration, they -- life is intolerable. We have to admire each other. That's not negative. We just have to in order to stand each other. If you don't admire each other, you will kill each other. And therefore, gentlemen, Plato, plus Plato, plus Plato--that is, a -- a multitude of Platos--is that heavenly society, which ever since has been called "the other world," the other world. This idea of another world, gentlemen, which you think is connected with Christianity, { } -- is not a Christian idea. It's a Greek idea. Plato takes refuge in this world of ideals, in this ideal world, that The Symposium describes how good people can rejoice in this so-called other world. Why is it "other"? They are not concerned with establishing the best city. They do not steep -- step down, so to speak, into reality, you see, but they are rede- -- released to their own best devices, their own cheerfulness, their own joy in each other. And this mutual love of The Symposium is what I call -- tried to tell you is the exuberance, the sufferance begotten by the philosophic- -- -izing spirit, where two, three people can meet in the mind, you see. That is neither logos, nor ethos, nor physis, you see. That's Heaven. There is peace. There is redemption. There is already at least mentally achieved the unity of this dilemma. In The Symposium, there is no conflict. Everything seems to go easy. It's the Beatitudes. It's the Island of the Blessed. What the French call "Les Champs Elysées." That means Elysian, what all -- ages have always tried to -- to construct, you see: a Heaven in which all these -- these -- not only dilemmas, but these paradoxes would be dissolved.

The Symposium is what the Seventh Letter of Plato says: "I have never written down what I really mean to be the kernel of my philosophy," he has said. I could answer, except in The Symposium, you see. The real kernel of his doctrine is that people can already in this world live as the wise can live together, you see, in harmony, despite their differences. There has no -- been no despotism of one ruling the city, so to speak.

And therefore -- always when you talk of Plato, put The Symposium on a -- quite a different plane from the dialogues, or from the -- from The Republic. The Republic has to deal with a physical city, and an ethical city to be brought down to earth. But -- The Symposium, you are living in Heaven. You are living in one good hour, you see, in a festive hour. It's the difference between work day and festive day in the philosopher's life. The -- the -- all the other works of Plato are hard work, and something to be learned from it. But The Symposium, gentlemen, is not the question of learning anything. Any fool who analyzes the doctrine of love in The Symposium deserves to be chased out of the town of the philosophers, you see. Because this is Heaven, and in Heaven, there is no argument. There is just enjoyment, and good talk, and in friendship, and in mutual love.

Now I find many pedants--you probably have found in your textbooks men like Will Durant or some such gentleman. He will, of course, put all these writings on the same plane, you see, and go to work and make mincemeat out of The Symposium. But The Symposium, gentlemen, is a work of art. And it is a unity between thought and scenery, so to speak. And woe to you if you ever come to deplore, to rape The Symposium, gentlemen. That's not a question of argument, but that's a question of joining in. If you can in your own friendship establish such an evening with your good friends, then you have made the right use of The Symposium.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(Number 21, 13 December 1956. Okay.)

...of all Greek or all philosophical thinking, at any time, gentlemen. This problem is called the problem of the universals. The universals. And as you see from its -- that it has only a Latin term, it was not discovered before the Middle Ages, under this term, "universals." That's a Latin word, and the {medievalist} philosophy was Latin, and not Greek, when it came into the -- into the Occident. However, it is a Greek problem. The Greeks had the problem, and it appears in the relation between the sophists, Plato, and Aristotle. And in other words, when I talk to -- now of this problem of the universals, I talk of the relation of Plato, Socrates, the sophists, and Aristotle. And I want to stress in this history of Greek philosophy, obviously, the unity between the various thinkers. I'm not interested so much in their separate systems. And the me- -- relation of Aristotle, Socrates, and Plato is a -- very mysterious. And before telling you the story of the universals, as they were called in the Middle Ages, and as we now rediscover them as the permanent question of all thinking -- it is perhaps worth your while that you first for a moment stand in some amazement before the three men, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, in their common achievement. The Greek mind is predicated on single names, on individual men. Everything we have said before pointed either to the single philosopher or to the founder of a school. And the tragedy of all dialectics, of -- of men, gentlemen, of all thinking, is that when you disagree with your master in antiquity, you had to de- -- secede from him and found a new school. Even Aristotle, although he always called Plato his friend, in his Nichomachean Aeth- -- Ethics, he especially says, "They are friends," he set up his own school, against the successors of Plato. The Peripatetic School against the Academy.

So the tragedy of antiquity is, gentlemen, that they had no universities.

They only had schools. A university is a place where different schools can exist -- coexist. And -- ancients had no universities. In many of the popular American books, gentlemen, on Greece, or on modern times, or on -- on t- -- education, you find this baloney that the -- first university was Plato's Academy. That's not true. That is not true. The condition of a university in the Occident in the Christian era is that opposite schools can teach in the same institution. And that a student is exposed to -- a Platonist as well as to Aristotelians, you see. That's the Christian spirit. In antiquity, that wasn't so. You had to break with one school if you wanted to go to another. There was -- no room for opposition. That's why

Plato's state and the Bolshevik state have so viel -- much in agreement -- in common. The Greeks did not know that the mind had to be left free. They wanted the truth, the whole truth; but they wanted then forced down everybody's throat who entered the sacred grove of -- of the school.

Yet, gentlemen, despite this pagan attitude -- we call "paganism" gentlemen, that -- the impenetrability, the relative impenetrability of -- of one man, one people, one nation, one city, one religion against the other. That's pagan. Paganism is a very definite thing, you see. Any divine force, you see, is impenetrable. Therefore there are many gods. If you see that the divine is one, you be -- know that there must be one god. Paganism is something you all have. You are pagans in many respects. All your department thinking, that something is a biological fact, and the other is a psychological fact, that's all paganism. All what you call -- your departmentalization. That's the modern form of polytheism. You all are polytheists. Something is true in medicine. Something else is true in religion. On Sundays you believe one thing. On Saturday another thing. In Smith, one thing. In Dartmouth, another. And on it goes. In your family, something else again.

Most of you are pagans. What is paganism, gentlemen? It's departmentalization. It is the splitting up of the universe, you see, according to -- to the accident of space or time, you see, in one thing, and then you move elsewhere -- another time it's different. Most men today are polytheists. There are very few people who believe in one god. It's so cheap today to say, you see, "believe in God." The deists, the -- these philosophers -- the philosophical believers, allegedly, on God. They don't believe in one god. They believe just in one world; but they don't believe in one god at all. You see, they have -- the double standard of truth, which you have abolished allegedly in sex, exists in every -- every other respect. One thing is right for Negroes, and one thing is right for white men, and one thing is right for Jews, and one right is -- thing is right for Christians, and on it goes.

To believe in one god, gentlemen, is an act which you have to daily perform. It doesn't help you to say, "I believe in one god." I want to see it. And the -- Greeks had -- they -- were pagans. And therefore they broke in parts. And every school had a different ideal, and a different wall around it. And you either had to be an Aristotelian, or a Platonist, later on. What I, however, want -- I'm driving at, is that for us, the unity of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle is the miraculous thing, not the diff- -- difference. There is a contrast in the teaching of Aristotle and Plato, to be sure. Plato believed in ideas, and Aristotle did not. Plato believed that before man is born, there is already the eternal good, beautiful,

and true somewhere, you see, in Heaven. And that we all are only the special editions, the particular editions of this universal idea of a man, a good man, or the idea of a lion. These are his eternal ideas. As we shall see, Aristotle rejected this. This is a very minor matter that he rejected it. Of course, two people will never agree on everything. Why should they? That's the question, you see.

The -- assumption of philosophy -- pure philosophy, misunderstood philosophy is that all people should agree on all things. And that is the besetting sin of the -- Plato's politics, that he thinks that in a city, all men should agree on everything, you see. But they couldn't live if this were so. It is part of our life, gentlemen, that we disagree. We cannot live by agreement. It's nonsense. We must live by contrast, you see. I mean, a marriage in which husband and wife always agree would go to pot after half a year. The whole interest in marriage is that the people disagree. You see. You come -- can come to an agreement, but there has to be a struggle. If you agree, just -- don't marry. That's homosexuality. You see.

Homoerotic is when equals love each other. But real love -- of course leaves -- loves a person of absolutely different mind. That's just the -- the incentive to { } her. It's the only way you can penetrate a girl is that you marry her although she is a sweet idiot. Or vice versa.

Now the philosophical idea was that you had to agree on everything.

That this was an ideal state. If we brush aside, gentlemen, this presumptuousness of philosophy that men should be like mathematicians, you see, be able to figure out the world as a -- in -- so that everybody had to agree with everybody else on everything, there is still this miracle of the sequence of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, as a meaningful sequence producing something in unity which not one of them represents by himself. You can see it in music, in our history of music between -- Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven. That obviously the three together are a greater achievement of the human spirit than any one of these three genius by themselves. You can't have the Ninth Symphony without the Jupiter Symphony of Mozart. And yet the -- Jupiter -- of Mozart had nothing to do in itself, it seems, with the Ninth Symphony.

This happens in great periods -- you have the same thing in Spenser, and -- and Shakespeare, and he is -- their contemporaries, Ben Jonson, that a number of people are needed and -- to constellate, you see. And the real miracle, obviously, is the constellation. And this is not in our books.

I read yesterday a book of Beeth- -- on Beethoven, a very good book, as a

matter of fact, a very famous book, by {Riezler}, and--it's a German book--and it's a fruit of 40 years of -- of work with Beethoven. There are two things which I do not approve of, which disappointed me. There is not this unity seen in the whole work of Beethoven. There is -- every work is analyzed, you see, and very well analyzed, and very wisely analyzed, but nowhere is it said that the great miracle of -- of -- of Beethoven, of course, is his life work of 133 oper- -- -us. And that that is the miracle, that you could write one quartet after another, and one symphony after another, and one sonata after another. What do I care for the individual sonata? There are too many to enjoy this in a book. What I would like to read in a book on Beethoven is the unity of this effort. That's much harder to express, gentlemen, because the title page says "Sonata, Number So" -- and you go on to another, and you say you can leave therefore -- you can leave one sonata out of your mind and go up over to the other. The same is true, of course, with Plato's dialogues. You can like one of the dialogues. I'm not interested here in this classroom with the individual dialogue. I'm interested in Plato. Therefore I have to try to show that all his work forms a miraculous unity.

Now we take one further step. In Beethoven, obviously, it is more interesting to figure how Mozart, Haydn -- or Haydn, Mozart perhaps is -- that's a better sequence, and Beethoven form one unique musical constellation. Like Child's Wain in the sky. And how the same way Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle are much more important because they are three in one. I mean -- could add some others, like Theophrastus, you see, or -- or Xenophon, or so, and even form a galaxy of such bright stars in the sky of Greek philosophy. But with Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, it seems to me, the unity is overwhelming for this reason, gentlemen: that although they live after each other, one after another in our understanding, they fill a space in three different places of this space, of this realm of thought, which is -- are eternal, which had to be occupied. It is as though one man who writes poetry pushes the other in another direction. You know -- remem- -- has anybody read the poem by Milton about Shakespeare? Who knows it? Can you tell me? What does Milton say?

{ }.)

What?

(About Shakespeare wrote his own mind { }.)

Does nobody know it by heart? Gentlemen, who goes into -- for writing?

Nobody here? Gentlemen, anybody who writes should learn this by heart,

because it's the comfort of the successor of the {epicoron}, of the later comer. It's

a deep sigh in which Milton complains that Shakespeare has taken away all place for him, all liberty. That's the real -- the real greatness of the poem, gentlemen. And it's already preoccupied. What do you do if you come after Raphael and Michelangelo, ja? You have to paint abstract. What do you do if you come after -- yes, of course. I pity these people.

Hindemith said to me -- the famous composer, here in this town, he said to me, very charmingly -- he's a very charming man. You have heard of Hindemith?

He has written nothing for the trumpet. He said to me, "I'm -- I'm fed up with Mozart. I can write any -- Mozart sonata myself. I have to write atonal just to -- not -- to keep awake. I go to sleep with Mozart. This is my -- this is too boring. After 150 years of Mozart, I can't hear it anymore. That's all given away." So these people are driven into a corner. Don't think that atonal music is arbitrary. On the other hand, don't think it's beautiful. It is just an act of despair. The same with abstract painting. The -- the -- the world has been given away. It has been done. You can't repeat it, the performance. Where -- who tells you that there is an infinity of possibilities? There is a finite -- sequence of possibilities. Once they are exhausted, they are exhausted.

This is very serious, gentlemen, very serious. You have to understand these artists. They want to be real artists; that is, they have to offer something new. But there are so many innovations that have been used up. Out they go. Harmony has been used up. You see it in Epicurus, and -- and Lucretius, I mean, and -- and the Stoa. Anything that -- that had to do with the concrete single city had been done by Aristotle. He wrote 100 -- 158 different cities. You don't find in Epicurus or in the Stoics any interest any longer in the individual city-state. It's over with, you see. That has been done. Can't repeat the performance. That's why the Stoics, as we said, were cosmopolitan, you see, and the Epicureans were private. That was the two ways out of the achievement that already was done. And there you see, gentlemen, you are -- you think, "History is bunk." But Greek philosophy can show you what it is. It is the taking possession of possible -- potential steps of the mind. Once this is done, it is done. The history of the Greek mentality is a complete story of the human mind. You cannot think one idea, and one thought, gentlemen, as a philosopher, and as a circumstance of generalization, and universal systematic thinking, which has not been thought in Greece. We cannot be original. We can only be original in patching together different thoughts. I think I am very original, gentlemen. I had many new ideas.

But -- that's why I do not -- don't stop to be a philosopher. I'm a sociologist now, because there is still a field where something new can be th- -- thought. But not in this physis business, you see, in this business of a general, you see, world of one space and one time as the Greeks' mind was fumbling with, or thinking for. Well, if you understand, gentlemen, that every thought the Greeks took is a finite conquest, final conquest of some possibility of the human mind, it is very important that we should ask ourselves what Socrates, what Plato and Aristotle together have conquered or occupied forever, why any one of us whose -- mentions philosophy has to know a little bit of Socrates, a little bit of Plato, and a little bit of Aristotle, because they come back in us, you see, when we think. And therefore, we don't have to repeat their effort, if we make them evident to us; it's simpler.

So I already put on the blackboard once before these figures. I -- only to remind you, Socrates dies in 399; Plato dies in 347; and -- if the same age had been reached by Aristotle, it would have been 304. That is not quite it. Socrates was 70. Plato was 80. And this man was 60 when he died. But in order to compare, it is quite wise to see that they cover -- the years of their deaths cover a whole century. Now this one century of Greek philosophy places Socrates at the point of questioning the questioner, the asker. I remember -- you remember I insisted that you should see that Socrates -- the Socratic system is not the schoolboy idea. In America, where all schoolboys think they are philosophers, and treat all philosophers as schoolboys, you always mistake the Socratic method with the schoolboy method. But Socrates doesn't ask children, and he is not a child that asks questions. But he asks the -- the sophists, he asks them to question everything. That is, a new system of questioning the questioner. That is, questioning the troublemaker, asking the man who disturbs the cult of the city, and the laws of the city, you see, the unity of the city. Ask the outsider. You can put it in the terms of Mr. Colin Wilson today, who wrote this book, *The Outsider*, this collection of fragments. You can take his expression and say, "Socrates is the outsider again -- for the outsiders." He asks the outsiders. All the men -- the heroes of his -- of his -- of his dialogues are philosophers, are mathematicians, are scientists, are lawless people, or whatever they are -- sophists; they are outsiders. They are people who have already asked themselves.

Now. So Socrates brings the individual anarchi- -- anarchist, gentlemen, back into the fold of a common tradition of thinking. Without Socrates, there would be not a history of Greek philosophy, sondern -- but scatterbrains; one in Syracuse, and one in Miletus, and one in -- in Crete, and one in Athens, and one in Sparta, you see, would have his own philosophy. As they had in the 5th

century. I haven't mentioned all of them, like Empedocles. You find them in Mrs. Freeman's book. The erratic people who starts something { }. Socrates is the first -- I couldn't say brain trust. That would be -- obviously wrong, because there's nothing of a trust in him, brain trust, has no recipes. But he is the brain for the brains. I don't know how to express this, you see. He invites all the people who have something to say, to say whether -- where do they lead? what does this lead to? is it good? is -- is -- are they -- are they responsible in their criticism, in their doubt, you see?

So doubting the doubt, gentlemen, it seems to me is perhaps at this moment a valuable interpretation of Socrates. You hear so much about doubt, and about intellectual curiosity, and -- it is all so flimsy, and so cheap, gentlemen. Intellectual curiosity is worth nothing. And doubt in itself is also worth nothing. We are forced to doubt. That's very painful, you see. And -- the place of doubt is the return into life. We have to doubt enough to regenerate -- to restore the goodness of our existence. Doubt is necessary. And a man who -- who cannot face doubt is a coward. But just to recommend doubt as a pleasure, that's wrong. It is not a pleasure to doubt. And -- in this country, everything is treated so -- all the parts of the mental life are treated as so arbitrary, they are recommended as "fun." Gentlemen, I can do nothing for fun.

Yesterday, a young lady said to me, she was so overwhelmed when she felt -- found that -- her parents, when she was already 70 still had fun with each other, because she found them handing each other's heads. I would have liked to slap this lady in the face, to call the sacred love between her parents "fun." That's not fun. That's a great story that after 18 years of marriage you feel really then is a great thing that you have this other person. Is that fun, gentlemen? It's a sacrament.

Don't reduce therefore all these things to nothingness by calling Socrates the eternal -- the eternal doubter. The -- he -- his discipline is that he makes the doubter aware what -- where he doubts, in what context he doubts, what it should lead to, to doubt. This is then much more positive, but much more difficult, you see. And that is the grandiose scheme under which he lived and died, that he should coerce the whole doubting community, you see, to see what they do when they doubt. Then they also teach us how to proceed in such doubt, once it is made fruitful.

But please take this from this course, gentlemen: don't mistake the schoolchild for a philosopher, and the common-sense man for a philosopher, and the philosopher for a schoolboy, and Socrates for the -- one of these quiz

kids, which is by and large the mental state of this country, that the higher -- quite a different level in the higher power is squared off with the childishness of a man who -- who -- like my 2-year-old grandson who all the time asks questions, because he is afraid to be left out in the cold otherwise, from the rest of the family.

The second -- gentlemen, that's an eternal necessity. Here you are. Your questions must be channelized. They must be made fruitful. They must be pressed into the service of the future. And that's Socrates' merit of the -- treatment of the question. The question which he only -- deigns, so to speak, to let pass, and which he purifies, and which he sets up is the question that if, unanswered, jeopardizes, endangers the future of the city, of mankind, you can say today. That's something glorious, gentlemen. That's a problem of purifying the question, and only letting those questions stand that are of superior -- the superior order of -- of--what do you say in English?--of life value? I mean value for -- for the regeneration of life, I mean, valuable, I mean, necessary. Not sales value, but the opposite, I mean. Value that -- without which -- "indispensable" perhaps is the best word, you see. They are indispensable.

So the indispensable doubt, that's Socrates. I think that's quite a good term to describe what he -- I have tried to tell you about it. It's not doubt in itself, but indispensable doubt.

This is not Plato's manner. I said to you, Pla- -- Socrates asks for the better. Plato asks for the best. His best city is the absolute, is an attempt to put men under the stars of eternity. It is not this doubt at this moment, in order to find the better. But it is absolute order. What is the order for which we are created in all, forever, always, without change?

Aristotle sees and overlooks the world in a different manner, gentlemen.

He does not -- he takes the Socratic doubt for investigation. He keeps it. He keeps also the idea of the best and then he compares what we have. That's why he's called a realist. When he writes these 158 constitutions, of which we only have one volume, on Athens, that has been found as a papyrus in 1892, and we are very lucky to have at least one of these books, he measures the -- in a concrete, particular, the specific, as against the -- the best thing, of which he gives a theory in his Politics, where he has this mixed-government idea, that you should have a government mixed out of, you see, democracy, aristocracy, and monarchy, as we have it in America, here Mr. Nixon is the crown prince, and is -- represents the monarchical element; the judiciary represents the aristocratic element; and the House of Representatives, the demagogical element.

Any citizen -- government, gentlemen, of the Christian era is a mixed government. It is not true that America is a -- simply a democracy. It's just the accent on democracy. But without the common law of England, and the -- without the judiciary and the -- without the -- the fight of -- of Marshall for the Supreme Court, and his right to test the constitutionality -- constitutionality of laws, we would have a mob rule, you see. Ja. You cannot deduce this judiciary from the democratic -- democratic principles. It's an aristocratic principle.

And the sooner you learn this, gentlemen, that the United States also have a mixed constitution, the -- the sooner you will understand your -- the slogans of this country as in great danger of dying -- killing us, you see. America can only win the -- the Cold War against Russia if it insists that it is not a democracy of the 19th century brand, which the Russians had every right to supersede, but that we have a mixed government and that therefore we can laugh about the -- the -- the -- the dictatorship of the proletariat, you see, because in wartime, we have also the necessary dictatorship of the -- our executive -- chief of -- executive. Dictatorship at times is inevitable, is indispensable. It's absolutely indispensable, you see. Out of the blue, Mr. Roosevelt, without any money, with -- anybody knowing it, spent \$2 billion on the atom, and half a billion dollar on Mr. Donovan's cloak-and-dagger organization. That has to be in wartime. I am very grateful that we did. But that's dictatorship. And fortunately you can't win a war without dictatorship. If you try to, you get the United Nations.

You have -- the sooner you see that's Aristotle, that's Plato's insight: mixed government is the best. And so he could write on 158 governments in the light of his best insight.

So we have, you see, if you have the -- the world as it is, the common-sense world of yours, Dartmouth College, et cetera, there are three philosophical attitudes: better, which means--how did I call it?--indispensable criticism, indispensable doubt; best, the creative power of our mind, or of our imagination--can also say of our hope, of our own; and then you can have in Aristotle, you see, the sound judgment about the existing order.

Now that's -- would be the critical attitude, gentlemen. That would be the idealistic attitude. And this would be the realistic attitude. Now in Socrates, and Plato, and Aristotle, they develop one after the other, and you can't have one without the other. Realism -- Plato -- Aristotle's realism is not your realism. What you consider a fact is a prejudiced fact. That's just common sense. That is -- as it is, cannot be judged, because you are inside of it, and you have no judgment.

You have neither gone through the doubt, critical doubt, nor through the wish to have the best; you have not desired, you have not hoped, and you have not looked back and say, "How does my hope -- my criticism compare to the reality?" And therefore you cannot judge the reality with regard to its abuses and its uses. What is good and what is bad in the reality you cannot know from the inside -- would be the -- Aristotle's claim.

(What is the relationship of the way you use the word "logos" to the meaning that Aristotle uses in his -- works? Same meaning?)

The word "logos" is untranslatable. And therefore I use it in order to shock you out of your idea that you understand it -- what I'm talking about. You must first notice that you don't understand it. We have killed this, you see, by the idea of thought. Where modern -- you think that you first think, then you speak, gentlemen. This is not true. We have taught you to -- speak, and most of the words you say are repetitions of things you have heard. You have -- can add -- you can re- -- refrain from saying some- -- passing something on that you have heard. You can mod- -- modify by thinking your speech. But you can -- thinking is not preceding speaking. You could not think if you hadn't learned to speak. Every thought is in words. Every wor- -- and if it isn't, it is hazy. And thinking is nothing but talking to oneself. It's a dialogue within oneself. It's a conversation you carry on inside of yourself. And as long as you believe that thinking is -- precedes speaking, it's look -- there's no understanding of the word "logos." Logos in -- in the Greek tragedy is conversation, is dialogue. And for Heraclitus, the same. A logos, in -- for Heraclitus, the word "logos," the logos which dominates the world, of the word logos in the gospel of St. John is the conversation which God carries in -- on with -- -ide Himself.

Richard Wagner has said of the Ninth Symphony, of the last -- of the last movement of the Nin- -- who has heard the Ninth Symphony? Good, then we can play with this. I just read in this book on Plato that Goethe expressed his admiration in these words: "When you hear the coming-up of the melody on joy, it is as though God-Father and God-Son had talked to each other before creation, still -- before human language was created, in the depths of their divinity, so primeval is the -- this melody."

Well, gentlemen, that's the logos. The logos is conversation, creative conversation. We -- and since you ask me the question, I have to make -- that's the, as you see, sidestepping my own question. But frankly perhaps you're entitled to an answer, and perhaps it helps you others, too. Logic is the attempt to

treat the logos as a part of physis. That is, what you call "logic," gentlemen, a syllogism, all the -- wonderful forms in -- who has taken a course in logic? Well, don't do it. And -- logic is the dead part of the logos. It is the repetitive part of the logos. All logical conclusions, you see, the logical things are the things that can be foretold, you see: Socra- -- all men are -- are mortals; Socrates is a man; therefore, Socrates must die. That's a typical, logical conclusion, you see. Not one of my -- lectures, gentlemen, is built this way, as you very well know. Yes, I -- but I represent the logos to you, and not the logic. And the logos is the power of the truth to reach you, gentlemen. And it is not the repetitive process by which you can prove that 2 and 2 is 4. That's logic.

Your over -- you ta- -- in this country people think that the whole mental process should be caught in the -- in the strait-jacket of logic. But logic is only the -- the di- -- dead part of the logos, that which has already been thought before and therefore now can be reproduced. Unfortunately, my logos is still alive. I am not dead, gentlemen. And you demand a dead mind. That is, in a dead mind, the logical processes can run off mechanically. You can repeat them ad infinitum. Mathematics -- lower -- arithmetic, at least, geometry are the lower parts of the logos, because they deal with dead things. Of you and to you, gentlemen, I cannot talk logically. I must take sen- -- talk sense. If I want to convince you to -- what profession to choose, gentlemen, I must not deduce anything logical, but must make -- it must make sense to you. In which way I achieve this is left to my creative effort, and your creative listening. Obviously it's -- quite obviously it doesn't make any more sense to you, you see, when I convince you by a- -- by arithmetic, or when I convince in some other way, by a simile, by an analogy, you see, by an example. There are a thousand ways in which a man can be convinced, you see.

If you read Aristotle's Rhetoric, you find a very good display of his insight into this higher logic of eloquence. Any good speaker knows that, you see, he gains his audience in -- not by logic, but by a- -- applying to the whole man, to every mental faculty in you, in all imagination, you see, in all the emotions, everything. No, the relation of logos and logic is such, gentlemen, that for the last hundred years in -- in the western world, logic has replaced logos. Logic has replaced logos. That's the story of the last 150 years. When you read Marx, or when you read Hegel, or when you read the -- the English logicians like -- like Bradley -- Brad- -- ja, Bradley, these poor people thought that the logos was restricted to logic. But logic is only the predictable part of the logos, that which already has oc- -- been used, has occurred, you see, that which therefore can simply be repeated. And that to me is very uninteresting.

Of course, I can prove to you that 2 and 2 is 4; but I won't waste my time on this. That's for children. Logic to me is child's play. The logic - what you call "logic," gentlemen, is that element of the logos which every child can immediately apply himself to. It can -- any child -- any man in high school, any boy in high school can use logical rules, how to prove a point, you see. But that's not the way -- how the existence of God is proved to you, my dear gentlemen -- people. You -- I have to prove to you that I believe in God. How I state this, you see, I may not have to say one word. You -- just realize that I do. And I hope that makes an impression. Otherwise, I am lost. By any argument, I cannot prove the existence of God. If I try, I am a fool. Because God we call that power which is always alive, always ahead of us, never -- never repeats Himself, and therefore if I would try to prove God's existence by argument, I would condemn Him to be dead. And to belong to the past and to be just a thing. And I could talk of God then as "it." Don't you see this?

So I only obey the orders of God if I treat Him as very much more alive than you and I are. If He is more alive than you and I, I cannot prove him by logical argument, because logical argument is known argument. But He is unknown, gentlemen. Or I -- or you don't believe in God, if you don't think that God is still unknown.

It's very serious, gentlemen. The same is true about the American -- United States. If you love this country, you cannot prove by argument that you must be a patriot. If you don't give the United States an unknown future, a grand future far beyond all reasoning, you cannot prove any love of country. It's -- cannot be proven. And yet, that doesn't mean that -- the less it can be proven, the more hope is there that it is alive. And that I can convey to you the beauty of this -- the potential of this country.

So -- make a distinction, and that's my answer to you, { }. First of all, logic is not logos. Logic is that part of the logos that already can be traced, retrieved, and traveled over again and again, because it is already dead. It is that part of the logos that has already been incarnate, embodied, and done with, you see. When God said, "Let there be light," gentlemen, the logos is in action. Something imaginative, a tremendous creation takes place. Today, the solar system is already on its way, getting cold -- and colder. And therefore you can now use physics for that which once came into being by the logos. Now it's there, it's embodied. Embodied things can be -- the deader they are, the more easily can they be proved, and examined by argument, and logic. In this sense, gentlemen, this famous sentence, "Socrates is a mortal,

therefore he must die," is only a half-truth, because we still speak of Socrates as very much alive in this very moment. Therefore logic says he's dead, you see. But the logos says he is not. Now what's true? Both are true, you see. As far as his physical existence goes, he had to die, you see. As far, however, as his -- as his immortal part goes, he -- has not died. Why should we talk about him -- every day, you see, all over America? That's a fact. How -- we don't deal with dead -- with dead donkeys in the same -- we don't mention a dead donkey who died 3,000 years ago. But we die -- do speak of Socrates. How did he do it? Because the syllogism of the logic, that all men are -- must die, and therefore Socrates is a man and therefore he must die, is only a half-truth. Because as carrier of our divinity, as carrier of the logos, you see, the syllogism doesn't -- isn't pertinent. It's just not true. You and I keep Socrates alive. And therefore, we deny that he's mortal.

(Sir, -- I've seen quite often that Aristotle is { } discovered the 13th country in Europe and { } with the organization of theology, that is, that his logic was found in { } was -- apply to { } best theological material that accumulated, and { } classified. Well, in -- in this sense, in the utilitarian sense, it is useful. Well, isn't that true? The theology was not dead material, really; { } but it -- it's reoriented the theological argument so that -- so that Aquinas could -- could { }.)

Oh, you -- you want to save the -- the -- the serviceability of -- of logic. Certainly, Sir, gentlemen. I think there -- as all -- everybody today praises logic, and says, "Be logical," and he wants you to say something very stupid, then -- so I have to talk against logic as something cheap. I don't say that it isn't necessary. I don't say that it isn't useful. But I say it is cheap. It has noth- -- very little to do with philosophy in the higher sense. That you must understand, you see, because it -- only deals with the dead u - -- part of the universe. And I have -- at this moment, a defense of logic is all right with me, but it wouldn't be however in place here in this context. Ri- -- I have nothing against using logic, ob- --. We -- we shall see immediately that part of Aristotelian logic is far superior to what is called "logic" today. And I think that was useful.

So we may use this. Gentlemen, the logos that is poured out in Socrates, in Plato, and Aristotle is the living logos. In making -- one asking the skeptical question, or what you call, "critical question," the other raising the standard of the ideal, and the third making the criti- -- the judgment -- apply the criticism and the ideals to reality, you see immediately that the logos is above the individual, that this one logos disperses, as a spectrum of colors disperses the light, in these three brains, in these three geniuses, in these three great men. I think

that is something to be admired. And philosophy is admiration, or it is nothing. It is astonishment. And I'm astonished that once, in the history of the human mind, in the last 10,000 years on this earth, in one century, the three possible steps of any mental process--doubt, you see; laying down the law of the highest standard; and then measuring all the facts in nature and politics by this standard--that this has once been united as one process.

To me, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle form one person. That's my trinity, my human trinity. And if you want to understand the divine Trinity, you better study this unity first in Socrates, in Plato, and Aristotle, to understand that the Trinity is not a superstition, gentlemen. It is the admirable experience of the universe, that we, poor mortals, cannot have in one -- in one moment the whole story. And -- you could think of a man, like Socrates, or Plato, or Aristotle, being all three during his lifetime. First, a critic -- you see, and then an idealist, and then a realist. But it is much more merciful, isn't it, for you and me that we have this great right now to rest on the three names. -- I think a -- a boon for us that these two -- three men were good enough to remain separate. You understand. If one man had run through the whole gamut, we wouldn't be able to recognize this.

I have a friend who is a biologist and who -- for 30 years has fought this thesis, gentlemen, that every phase of the life cycle, has to be in {the} { } by a story of the ki- -- species on this earth to be lived out by one person.

I had a discussion with one of you the other day -- who was it? -- on this topic. That anything that is in one -- in you as 5 percent or 1 percent, has to be lived out as a whole man in some form so that you can get hold and master your own 1 percent. That what is in Kierkegaard, gentlemen, for example, is in every one of us a little bit, you see. The poor man was nailed down on his cross of being just Søren Kierkegaard. That is, something that is a passing mood in any one of us became flesh in him as a whole person, in order that we can get hold of this 1 percent in us, you see, which otherwise would go unnoticed, you see, and just call a -- cause a ripple.

This is the great -- labyrinth, gentlemen, of -- the human solidarity. What we have as one-tenth of a pr- -- percent in our blood, you see, takes shape in one person. And the larger the -- the person lives, the greater his importance, like Van Gogh, or Gauguin, or whoever you take, anybody, Christ Himself, included, the more we can master our own destiny. You need these people around you, so that the criminal in you, and the genius in you, and the idiot in you, and the son in you, and the father in you, the brother in you, the lover in you, that they can

become aware of what is in y- -- -side of you. The rascal in you. Once you see this, gentlemen, you get -- gain a -- quite a different -- perspective in the human history. Human history is exactly a creation of species as biology, only it's service- -- made serviceable. The animals don't serve each other. We do. Every great man -- of whom -- whose name I have mentioned here, gentlemen, has something to tell you about some niche and nook in your undiscovered corner. -- You are much richer than you know. You are all sound asleep. You are -- perhaps you never wake up. Most Americans go to their grave after having traveled 70- -- and 100,000 miles, and after having eaten all the vitamins in the world, by the kilo, by the pound, and having never discovered themselves and all their own potentiality. -- But for you it's all external movement, Cadillac, or what-not. But real people, gentlemen, love these names, because these names, they are all you: Socrates, and Plato, and Aristotle are in you yourself.

And why -- why I say this is, gentlemen, that you must understand the economy of salvation, the economy of our human history is that if Socrates had al- -- also been Plato, and Plato had also been Aristotle, at one time in their life, they wouldn't affect you. There -- would be confusion. The very patience of our creator is that He creates elephants, and oxen, and lions, so that alternately you can be an oxen, a lion, and an elephant. But if one animal was all three, you see, the human species wouldn't benefit.

Let us have a break here.

[tape interruption]

...gentlemen, we now come to the logos in Aristotle, gentlemen. When you speak of a realist, you make the same error very easily as you do when you think that Socrates just asked silly question, "Is there a god?" like any school-child. Or "How are the children born?" or -- you -- you confuse question and Question. I tried to tell you that Socrates asks on a -- quite a higher plane: the meaning of any question, that's his question. Now the same is true about Aristotle's realism. And what I'm going to tell you now is the story of the so-called categories. You have heard the word "category," and you know that you -- if you put a man in a category, it's very dangerous. You categorize a man, and he is out forever, you see. He's just a controversial person. If you want to get rid here in this country of a man, you say, "He's controversial," which should be a great honor, you see, but it doesn't help him at all.

So gentlemen, what's a category? Aristotle is the father of the categorizing. He invented this term, "category," just as Plato invented the word "ideas." And perhaps you put this down: the Socratic question, the Platonic idea, and the Aristotelian category can remind you of the essential unity of this process by which there came to be first Socrates, then Plato, and then Aristotle. And that's the unity, as I told you, that I wanted to -- to make important for you. And therefore, we have still to pin down Aristotle on his return to reality. Plato and Socrates have taken man outside reality, outside the city of Athens, to be sure. Socrates dies for this, and Plato goes into the Academy, the grove -- beyond the walls, the precincts of Athens.

Aristotle now comes back to the city of man, to the cities of man, to the plants, to the animals, in a- -- in al- -- in ev- -- to the poems. And he says, "I shall now apply what I have learned from Socrates and Plato, by laying down the rule, how we have pincers to pick up reality." That's the category. The categories, gentlemen, are the ways of the mind to meet any reality. I've tried to categorize reality in my book, *The Multiformity of Man*. That's a categorial book. I have tried to discover that all men are either treated as duals, or as singulars, or as plurals, you see, or as infinite. -- Who has read the book, *The Multiformity*? Well, so I can't use it as an example for the -- most of you. But cate- -- to categorize, in Aristotle means something so simple that you may wonder what there is special.

If -- he says that if I want to deal with, let us say, a lion -- lion, I have to ask, you see, how many--singular or plural?--and thereby already predicate what I'm asking for. That's in the -- my -- I cannot invent this. -- It's either plural or singular. Perhaps dual. But you have to fall into one of the categories. You can't leave it indefinitely. You have to ask which lions? That is, where -- African lions, Asiatic lions. You have to ask "where"? You have to ask "when?" Lions in prehistory, lions in the Christian era, lions at this moment, lions in the future. So when-ness is a question, is a category. When-ness, you see. So the -- the quando, when, is an eternal category of the human mind. And if I want to fully understand anything, I must be able to give it its date. Without the date, the fact is not in. The where, the when, the how many, the what-action, what does it do?--and there has been a debate, and still is going on: how many of these final categories exist? Has anybody his book on Aristotle here, by any chance? There is in the preface -- in the preface a list of these categories. And you -- well, we better leave this. I think it's page 30- -- Roman xxxi, or xxvi, something -- like that. You can look in the index under "category."

No, that's the other introduction. { } are Mr. Wheelwright's { }. Do you have it? Ja, very good. Aristotle distinguishes 10 types. I -- and that has been debated. There have -- he -- later people have thrown out two of them. The first is its specific thing-ness, its essence. The third -- second thing is its quantity. The third, its quality: warm, or hot, cold, or green. Its relatedness. Where do you find it? In which connection? Lions probably in a jung- -- a jungle, or in a zoo. Its place, its time, its position of posture. That's -- has been debated, I mean. Vertical and horizontal, I mean. Such things. They may not be fundamental. What it possesses, that is, adjectives, gray line, great line, big line, you see, such things. And in what way is it active? That's the verb that goes with it: a lion roars, you see. As you know from the Midsummer Night Dream, you see. There is nothing but roaring, and it is the lion. And in what way it is being passively affected. These are the categories, the 10 ways in which anything can be said to be. Gentlemen, this is the most ingenious return to reality. The man who is immersed by common sense and reality is not aware that he always says, "the state," but in fact he always means the plural of states. The categories are very important, gentlemen, in -- in all political doctrine, for example. In Europe, any man -- boy who goes in Europe to school, is taught something about the state. But if you go to Holland, and in Belgium, it is very wise to teach the children that there are several states in relation to each other, and Holland is only there because there is Belgium, and Belgium is only there because there is Holland. That is, the categories can teach you that a -- alleged singular is really predicated on a plural, that it is only among many states, "civilized states" as we call them, or nations today, you see, the individual nation has any standing. Nationalism says, you see, has identified the singular of "nation" with existence. And nationalism is a lack of categorization. The world of states is one world of states, or the world of nations. And our United Nations, they are a desperate attempt to bring home to the French, and the English, and the Americans, and the Russians that they cannot judge the world from -- from their nation outward, that they have to see their nation as being inside a world of nations in the plural. This is an Aristotelian category, you see, because the word "nation" was invented as a plural. And the singular of "nation" is quite artificial. And anybody who says, you see, that he is only part of a nation, and denies that this nation is part of the society of nations, you see, or the unity of nations, or a world of nations, is fict- -- living under a fiction, because the United States, as you well know, came into being into a world of states by a decent respect for the opinion of mankind. Therefore, the United States added only one, you see, new nation to the existing nations. That's very -- difficult logic for you. You think that any man has the right to decide whether he should treat "nation" as a singu-

lar or as a plural. Today, the whole world is in flames, because this hasn't been decided. The category of "nation" has been naïvely, you see, sometimes been interpreted as "nations." The "Gentiles," as the Jews call it, you see, and your own nation as "Zion." And then you see what happens. Zion against the Gentiles, you see. Now every -- every church people sing about their own nation "Zion," you see. Jerusalem, the golden one, et cetera. That is, you see, we all treat our nation as the messianic kingdom. And the other nations as the Gentiles, as the { }. Very difficult practice -- dangerous practice. It has to do with the category of number -- of number 2, its quantity. If you know that the word "nation" should always be used in the plural, that's the way out, you see. Then you are safe. That's why the word "United Nations" is quite hopeful, if you learn what it means. But you have to study Aristotle in order to understand what it means.

It means that the plural, "nations," precedes logically any one-nation structure. That's why we can impose, and must impose on Libya, or on Saudi Arabia that it has a parliament, and has some human rights. Otherwise it isn't a nation. They can call themselves a nation, as long as they want, you see. But Mr. Mandaville, Saudi Arabia is not a nation to this day, and probably never will be. It will just be oil, you see, and Mr. Mandaville. But that's all. It is not a nation. And -- however, if you import into these poor people's heads the notion that they can be a nation -- a nation from the inside out, you see, without fulfilling their requirements that go with the nations of this world, you see, we get into deep -- very great trouble, as we do now with Russia, of course. Same thing. Ja? ({ } the case today, the nations or -- are actually countries, the people who live in a geographic area { } the Wahabi, the Wahabi sect of -- of Islam. Now { } most of them believe in Wahabism { } because they all have the same { }. { } Wahabi sect religion. Is that not enough to make it a nation?) No. I do think that it -- for a civilized nation, there must be a certain degree of religious liberty. That is, if you have a state cult, it's not a nation. That's an old pagan state, you see, where the gods -- if Athens has its own temples, and you can't be an Athenian if you do not worship the gods of the city, I think it couldn't be a nation. I mean, you must allow in any modern nation that a man cannot be forced to pray to gods that are not his own. I think there is a minimum. I resent very much that your oil company has a green flag over its camp there: "Allah is great, and Mohammed is his prophet." That's -- that's {bad dollarica}, you know. That can't be done. That's a sin, Sir. It's very serious, because you allow then as an American, who has founded the United Nations, you see, the fiction that Americans will for the dollar sell out their own

Christian faith, their freedom of religion in other words, because it makes -- it's better business. The English have not done this, Sir. But only the Americans. It is terrible. It's high treason.

(And {then you would say} that Russia really wasn't a nation.)

What?

(Then you'd say that Russia wasn't really a nation.)

Oh, they say it themselves. That's why they have given up the word "Russia" in the title of USSR. They are quite aware. They fight nationalism, don't they? They certainly are not a nation. They don't want to be. They are the Soviet Republic -- of Republic, the Soviet Union of -- of -- or the Union of Soviet Republics. That's very serious with them. It -- takes some courage to drop your own country's name. The name "Russia" is not in the title of the government which Mr. Khrushchev represents. Have you never thought about that? That's a tremendous thing.

Now, the categories, gentlemen, bring us now for -- to the uni- -- question of the universals. Sin -- since Aristotle is able to judge or -- the abuse of terms by his categories, for example, when must "nation" be used in the plural, and in the singular. I recommend this to you as one of the deepest insights today. It's much better than all semantics, Sir. Somebody talked to me about semantics--who was it?--in the intermission? Ja. You see, this -- no semanticist has even grasped, that Aristotle knew much more. The -- use the same term, but tell me whether you use it, you see, as fundamentally and existentially plural or singular. The same problem is true about man. You say "man" is unequivocal. It isn't, gentlemen. If m-e-n is older than m-a-n, you see, the result would be quite different, from your individualism, where you treat Robinson Crusoe as the normal human being, you see, as all physicists and all scientists, you see, seem to do. They start with one, you see. I start with all. I say "all" {when asked} -- have solidarity. I can under- -- only understand you because you are your mother's son, and I have to include in my humanity your mother. Just because I meet you. -- I see, you see, a qualification in the use of the word "man," which the -- the -- which the man only sees the visible, what's in front of him, doesn't see. The same is true of the nations. I see that the nation is a very painful process, gentlemen, under Christian- -- Christendom, in Christendom have sprung up one after the other, always talking to each other, always relating what they did to the competition of their neighbor. So I cannot explain in a Frenchman without knowing something about the British; I cannot explain the British without

knowing something about the German. Shakespeare is German, a German influence in England, because German drama, I mean, made it -- German Reformation did it. And on it goes. That is, the nations are fragments of a whole, of -- of mankind. And men, the same {way}, you see.

These are the serious problems. And the categories of Aristotle allow you to discover, gentlemen, how to take your pincers and when you pick out seemingly only one leaf of a tree, you already decide whether you know that it's a part of the tree, or not. You are -- your own prejudices come clearly out. You see, you find a green leaf. You can treat it as a thing by itself, you see. But if you use the right -- the categories of Aristotle, you will find out its belonging, that it is only -- has fallen down from a tree. You can't say anything correct about this leaf if you haven't seen the tree. If you do not presuppose that's part of the tree. That's the -- true of the nations. That's true of men. If you treat men as not a part of the tree, as not an acorn from the oak, you mistreat him. That's all. And so liberalism has mistreated men by treating him as somebody who's uprooted, who has no -- who has no -- is not sitting on a branch of the human tree. You all, gentlemen, come from a -- a century in which Aristotle has been despised. It's all a Platonic century. The natural sciences--perhaps you take this down, gentlemen--the natural sciences of the last centuries have neglected Aristotle, have despised him. In the 16th century, there was a great man, Pierre Ramus, who said that he would pay \$10,000--it wasn't dollars, it was ducats, gold -- I mean, gold sovereigns--to anybody who could prove that any sentence in Aristotle was true. So dis- -- they tried to make Aristotle despicable. But Aristotle is -- for politics, that was a time when science came to the fore, and things. And Plato's ideas seemed to be all right. But Aristotle warns us against our own naïve use of singular and plural, for example. And most political errors, like the treatment of nation, of state, of men, are predicated on these very slight tours -- legerdemain--how do you call them? somersaults of your mind--where you do not tell us whether you have first made acquaintance with the plural or with the singular, for example.

This is -- I -- I think Aristotle's lasting greatness: the warning from his pure philosophy, that when you steep -- step back into your own reality, your own city, your own garden, your own kitchen, you have acquired tools which allow you to treat your own backyard as though it was Madagascar. Montesquieu has said he wanted to treat France as though it was as far distant as Madagascar, in his -- "Spirit of the Laws." That to this day has remained the Aristotelian attitude, you see, that you can objectify the nearest of kin. You all try to do it in your -- and it's a great thing, but you have to learn how to do it,

gentlemen. The categories of Aristotle are a doctrine, or are an inventory of the mental means of getting hold of the -- your closest part of your self, your own prejudices, and hanging, you see -- you see, so to speak, putting them in front of you, holding them out of the window, and looking at them at a distance. (Isn't this objectifying even the things closest to you as dangerous as a Platonic idea?)

It is. It is, very much so. And that's why I'm also -- I think that -- I have always warned you against philosophy. But at this moment, I've just to tell you what philosophy is. I mean, that's what it is. It is not the whole story. I -- allow me at this moment now not to now criticize philosophy again, you see. It is certainly in one direction a tremendous achievement, you see. It isn't the whole story. It doesn't help you when you have to go to war, and -- for your country, you see, that you have objectified its prejudices.

Now gentlemen, we come to the universals. Aristotle said, "No ideas live somewhere in the sky." The sophists, which are the enemies of all three men--Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle--had said the mind can generalize at will. That is, if I have a donkey, and I have a lion, and I have a horse, I -- it is my mind that says "three animals." There are, in fact -- one is a donkey, one is a lion, and one is a--what did I say?--a horse. The word "animal" is a generalization of the human mind. That is the first universal. It says, first form of universalization, or generalization, the first ru- -- first form of universals, gentlemen, is a sophist's form. It says, "All things in reality are specific, particular. My mind generalizes," you see, "arbitrarily, at random. I can call these three animals `animals.' I can call them oddities. I can call them my property. I can call them my -- my whim, you see, or God's whim. But I cannot be forced to generalize. They have not in themselves the power to convince my mind that I must subsume them under one general- -- common denominator."

And this is the story of the common denominator again. We found that Thales of Miletus, when he said "water," was inventing the common denominator. Now we are with Aristotle, and the sophists, and Socrates, and Plato faced with the fact: What is a common denominator? When do I have to -- form a common denominator? And when I can leave it. The sophists say, "You can always leave it. It's perfectly arbitrary."

This first rule of universal is, gentlemen, that the universals come by the mind after the fact. The Latin word is "post rem." They come after the facts are in; then I do as I please. And after the facts. Latin, "post rem." That is the sophis-

try. That would show you, you see, that you can do as you please. You say, "Here is a -- hu- -- here are 65 men. That I call them human beings is just a kind compliment I pay you. I don't have to mean it. I can't prove it. You can't prove it. You can't demand that I call you humans, you see. You have no right -- no human rights, because you are just { }. And you are nothing else. You are just specific, you see." And therefore you have absolutely no claim to be treated as a part of a common denominator. The common denominator is the mind's arbitrary decision. And everybody ha- -- can make a different decision. I can call you, you see, "a New Yorker." Or I can call you "an American." I can call you "a Dartmouth student." And I can -- alternate at random, and you cannot derive any claim from my statement so that I should be, you see, bound by it. Because you say, "But you called me a Dartmouth student. Now I -- you have to treat me as a Dartmouth student."

"Oh," I said. "I'll just treat you, you see, as a New Yorker. And of course, as a New Yorker, you have no claim to any decent treatment."

Gentlemen, Plato said this, and said, "This is not true -- cannot be true. Sophistry is so terrible, so arbitrary, so unjust. The just man, after what Socrates has asked into us," so to speak, has -- "by his inquiries made certain, must be for the good of the city. The good of the city must be eternal, it must be lasting. Therefore, my statements about what is right and wrong, and how I should call you, if you are an Athenian citizen and a human being, must be predicated from time immemorial. The world has its eternal laws of order."

And therefore, the idea of Plato, gentlemen, the general, the universal, the common denominator, that man must be good in order to be a man, in the true sense of the word, you see, that means that the idea is earlier than the facts. First, we know what a man is. The common denominator, gentlemen, precedes the particular. Before a child is born, the parents already know that if a child is born, he has to be treated as a citizen of the divine kingdom. And therefore, the idealist says, gentlemen, that we already know before any particular happens, how the particular should be treated. It's the very opposite from the sophists. Now gentlemen, that's very tempting. All idealism, gentlemen, says that the facts do not alter the rules, that the common denominator is already known. Before any child is born, before any mountain is discovered, we already know what a mountain is. And therefore, the rule -- the second form is, of the universals, the Platonic form, put this down: sophistry, or skepticism, or nihilism. Sophistry: the universals are arbitrary performances of the human mind after the facts are in. Idealism: the universals are necessary before the facts are in. The

true, the good, and the beautiful, are always there. And that a man must be just, you see, we can tell him before he's even born. We can call him therefore, you see, "the just," so to speak. To encourage him, to fulfill his own idea of himself. All our name-giving is idealistic, you see. If you call yourself "Paul" and "Peter," we hope that the vestige of Paul and Peter will appear in your own -- in your own personality.

So we are all Platonists when it comes to the people we love. Because you give your sweetheart of course that name which you hope is truer than she now is. She must become "Honey" if she isn't yet honey.

So gentlemen, the -- the -- the great temptation to say that the second form of the universals is the Platonic form, which is stated in -- simply: the universal precedes the individual, the particular. It precedes it. It is eternally there. Man is man -- the type -- arche- -- Mr. Jung, Carl Jung -- you have probably heard of him -- more -- heard more of psychoanalysis than of anything else in your life, and it's the only field perhaps where you are -- have noticeable information. And so it may help you that Mr. Jung is -- is an -- Platonist -- because of his archetypes, he has the -- the idea that we all run through certain archetypes in our development. I think it's a gross exaggeration, but it is the Platonic idea, that the mold of youth, and childhood, and -- and adolescence, you see, that this is all there expecting us. And we simply, like liquid metal, run through these molds, and cannot help it. We -- if we don't, we are hurt.

Gentlemen, Aristotle gave the third form of the universal. He said that while I recognize the city of Athens as a city -- as a city, I make two experiences: one of a general, and one of a specific nature. I study inside my experience of the city of Athens something general, what a city is; and something specific, what this damn city is, which is dirty, and corrupt, et cetera. And he says, "The general and the specific are like a fork, or like a bifurcation of my experience of reality. I carry into my experience of the city of Athens these pliers, or these -- this fork, by which I mark off what strikes me there as the lasting and that what strikes me as the transient. Or the accidental and the necessary." Or however you call it.

And therefore, the third form, gentlemen, of the universals is: the universals are contemporary with the facts. Our mind applies in itself in order to live at all, to get going, in this twofold manner, that it gives some attention to the particular, and some attention to the general. That's called the universals "in re," in Latin. If you now see the -- the argument, there are three ways of dealing with an experience, gentlemen, of -- with -- with what you have to categorize in order

to know that you live in any real world. You can say that I have my universal ideas before the facts. That's "universalia ante rem," before the thing. Aristotle says you have the universals while you are observing -- in the thing, contemporaneous with the thing. And the sophist would say, or the skeptic, the modern thinker of the last 300 years has -- all been sophists, all the natural scientists, they say, "It's arbitrary. I call this a class. I call this a species. I call this a specimen. I call this a family."

And let me end with the great story which happened here in Dartmouth College some time ago. The sophists say, "Universalia post rem," which means that they come after the -- this world of individual things is around us, we go out and label as we please. It's just a label. I have heard people say, "This which I arbitrarily call God." This which I arbitrarily call -- call God. He even wrote it down, this man. He had unlearned to blush. And -- he should at least have used red ink for this sentence. And it's a great sentence written by a Dartmouth student. It really predicates the end of civilization. "Which I arbitrarily call God." That can be written down in this college, and nothing happens. Not -- the earth, however, gentlemen, shakes when such a thing is said. Because he treats even the es- -- "{essence} realissimum," the one great reality of all men and all times as something that he arbitrarily calls God -- that is sophistry. That is universalia post rem, you see. "It itches me, I call it arbitrarily God."

And mon- -- many Americans do not even know that they are counted out of the realm of living speech if they ever say such a thing in earnestness, because obviously, gentlemen, the name of God can only be used in dire necessity, if you have to. Otherwise it's blasphemy. That's what the Second Commandment says in the Bible, that you can abuse the name of God. Now if you say "arbitrarily God," you have -- not only said that you have abused the name, the serious name of God, but that the name of God, it's always an abuse to use it. "Which I arbitrarily call God" means, you see, that "God" is always an abuse of human language, the name of God. That's really the limit. I mean, the -- the author of the Ten Commandments didn't think that this could ever happen. Otherwise he would have probably said something to that { }. It is remarkable. This man is dead. He can no longer be helped. I would count out this man for any creative or any important purpose in life.

You see, an atheist is a great man. He fights God. He takes him seriously. But this man who says, "What I arbitrarily call God" cannot be him -- helped, because he hasn't learned English. He cannot speak anymore. He has curtailed his -- the dimension of his speech, by one whole third, by the whole third of the logos, because the logos is the power to say something unheard-of, gentlemen,

to say something new, with necessity, because it is true. And if I say that the power of the logos, God, you see, is arbitrarily introduced by me, I'm no longer bowing to the spirit that moves man to discover the truth.

So the -- I only mention this to show you it is a very practical question, gentlemen. In the year of the Lord 1956, Aristotle's problem of the universal is suddenly the foremost problem of all modern philosophy. After having been dismissed as -- as indifferent, as insoluble, as uninteresting for the last 200 years, 250 years, even, suddenly the problem of the universals has become the burning question of botany, of biology, of psychology, of -- as I told you, psychoanalysis, of Mr. Jung, you see: Is what we live, and what we think necessary? And are the terms which we use necessary? Or are they arbitrary? Do I have to call you a human being, gentlemen, or can I deny that you are a human being? That's by and large involved in this. Do I, by approaching you, have at the same time, in other words, gentlemen, to have religion? Can I deal with anything in the universe without obeying a higher authority which compels me to acknowledge where you belong?

If I only meet John Smith, and limit myself, in never saying what I mean by "John Smith," that I mean a member of the family of mankind, that is -- would be the modern, matter-of-fact way. John Smith? No commitment. You -- know very well that when I speak of "John Smith," I already say that he must be a -- has an Anglo-Saxon name. He probably belongs to the British commonwealth, or he is a citizen of the United States, because the name is given him within a linguistic area, in which, you see, there must be nations who -- who give the -- him citizenship. And of course it intimidates me, the -- the American consul may come down on me if I slap this man in the face. So John Smith acquires immediately with his name, status. He belongs to a common denominator either of Britain, or of America, or of white men, or of Western men, or something. Therefore, gentlemen, whenever I open my mouth and predicate an individual fact, whether it's an act or whether it's a fact, it's a thing or a process, it makes no difference, John Smith or the World War, the -- Aristotle says, "I have to apply myself," as the Bible calls it, "with my whole heart, my mind, and all my powers, to place this man in the realm of the divine order." That is, "I cannot speak of any little fragment in the universe without giving away my conviction of the appropriate order of the whole." To speak, you see, means therefore to re- -- make a confession of faith. It is always an act of faith that I say of anything in this world how I'll treat it. Because by naming it, I already treat it. You see, I give it already this place in the universe. I cannot help it.

The sophist says, "Oh no. I take this little thing, and I am -- I'm absolutely noncommittal about all the rest of my convictions. You can never know what I think about anything else." That's sophistry. That's what you would like to do. You hope to get away, gentlemen, by never saying anything about your religion. That's not true, gentlemen. You open your mouth, and that's your creed. Because you cannot speak of a man without already making him -- or me, the onlooker, feel what you think of mankind in general. Where they belong. Are they children of God? Children of the devil? Atoms of nature? You cannot help expressing this right away.

Therefore, the problem of the universals today, gentlemen, the Aristotelian problem, is the -- today the problem of the peace in -- in the world. If people must, when they speak, take down their visor and show their face, then we can speak to each other. If, however, they all live on Madison Avenue, and only think that the buyer must show his face, but the advertising man does not have to, then we live in a jungle and not in a civilized society.

And so the problem of universals is now returning. Aristotle gave it its -- its final twist. He showed the three possibilities. The sophist, the Platonic, or his own. And you can't get out of this. When you speak, gentlemen, you decide over all your common denominators. And your common denominators are your religion.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

I'd like to say something on these -- about these papers that has also some importance for you, because we will go on from this term paper to the finals. I shall demand from every one of you the acquaintance with one other school of thought different from the one you have treated. I mean, here -- someone said to me that he had dealt with Aristotle because he was interested in Thomas Aquinas. Of course, that is not a good learning of Greek philosophy if you just stay -- and cook further in your own stew of scholasticism. The whole problem of the history of Greek philosophy of course is that he should then deal with an opposite man. Who is the man who told me this? Pleading a very poor choice. You learn too much Thom- -- Aristotle already in your Thomism. So -- why don't you check on this? To understand what philosophy really is, you have to know about two different schools of thought.

I shall then require, gentlemen, from every one of you, and the whole examination will be based on this, that you now, for the last month, when I hope you have learned what to look for in these various systems, that you deal with one other system sufficiently so that you can write in the exam about it. Of course the exam's question will be specific. But I -- there will be one condition attached. You will not be allowed to draw on the term paper in the sense that you just deal with -- you deal -- have dealt with the Stoa -- the Stoics in this paper -- term paper, you cannot repeat the performance. It will have to be somebody else. And that's valid for Plato. It's valid for Aristotle. It's valid for all these gentlemen, that there will be some other knowledge necessary. Also, you will bring to your class Mrs. {Freeman's} book. And again, of course, the question will not be about a system of philosophy dealt with in this book. So you must take one of the later schools of thought, later philosophers, as the term paper is also aware -- and however, we'll -- will make use of this book in a -- in the examination question. I will only give one examination question, nothing to choose from. And you will bring this text to the exam, please, to the finals. You can also take your notes, but that's dangerous, because most of them are wrong. So please be it understood: somebody who has worked on Plato now better look up either Pythagoras, or Democritus, or Epicurus, or the Stoa, or Aristotle, and vice versa. I don't demand a full knowledge of all the philosophers of Greece for the exam, because I hope it's more solid if you understand two. But one is not enough.

May I then say something about the way you have handled this paper? I

think one-fifth has done well. And then -- really well -- very well. The other four-fifths I think are partly scandalous. Some of you think that for a student at Dartmouth College, the Encyclopaedia Britannica is a source of information. Gentlemen, the -- the encyclopedias are written so that on topics where we have no special information, we can get the sum. But it is never the source of information for a topic in which you are expected to do some work yourself. Never. It's all nonsense. It has reached this stage -- and why do you go to college? Buy the encyclopedia. There must be a difference between an educated man and a man who owns an Encyclopaedia Britannica. You aren't educated because you own the Encyclopaedia Britannica. The -- the editors of the Encyclopaedia Britannica may then be educated, but you are not. You're just plagiarizing. I mean, there have been -- are papers have -- handed in to me, just copying the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Never -- I mean, you -- this is too stupid for words. You can learn from any encyclopedia where to begin with your work. That's why I -- if you know nothing of -- about some topic, have never heard of it, you go { } Encyclopaedia Britannica, they give you the first idea, you see, but not the second, and not the third.

So I mean, it just shows the -- the -- the degradation into which all college education has fallen in this country, that you do this. This -- this idea of condensation -- condensations, and -- and finally one sentence is -- is left. That's not an education. When on -- to -- to -- to look up the Encyclopaedia Britannica on Plato or Aristotle is really the end of the world. The whole library is stacked full with books on them, from which the encyclopedia after all has just copied. Well, is there any doubt in any one's mind? I'm very glad to enlighten him about the place of the Encyclopaedia Britannica in educated man's mind. But -- or education. But is there any doubt? Do you think I have treated you unjustly? Then I will -- very glad to argue the point.

The -- in Plato's -- case of Plato, who has been treated most frequently, there is one interesting thing I think to remark. And it applies of course, to others -- philosophers as -- as well. But it didn't -- become so practical, because you just didn't the others in their original context. You just wrote -- read books about them. In the case of Plato, one of you has written a very long paper on Plato's Republic, going just from book to book. This is an anti-philosophical treatment, gentlemen, of any book. You cannot render a thought of -- the thought of a man, like Plato in his Republic by simply narrating, like an epical storyteller, the sequence of this boo- -- The Republic, which for artistic reasons and reasons of Greece -- the Greek environment, of course, had to meet a certain pattern of order, of dialogue, of dramatization, and of personification.

The first thing a man who reads a book must do, is that he begins with the last word of the book. Make this a rule, gentlemen. Each time a thing is intellectually treated, the order of things is reversed. If you make a book review -- write a book review, the first thing is -- you must have in mind is the end of the book. Otherwise you haven't read it. Now to plunge your reader, me, in the position that I have to wallow, like you yourself, once more through the sequence of these books of The Republic, is -- is the most unphilosophical thing you can do. It shows that you don't know what philosophy is. Philosophy is an attempt to see wholes, to see totalities. And you break it -- you destroy this power, this possibility. Is an absolutely worthless paper, and I'm sorry to say this, because the man was quite industrious who wrote this report. But it never dawned on him that he was showing that he had mistaken a movie and philosophy. In a movie, the things follow, and they end then with a surprise at the moment when you see the final kiss.

But gentlemen, any thought has to be conceived, comprehended. All these words mean that you have to take them together in your hand, and hold them up before you and go around them, and see them from many angles and from many sides. And with a book you can only do this if you look at it from the end and from the beginning. And even from the middle. And that's your digestion. And so this minimum wasn't done in this case, I'm sorry to say. And it is therefore -- he -- the man certainly didn't fulfill the requirement at all. If I ask in a course on philosophy the -- the statement of a philosophy, I must ask that much philosophical acumen on your part that you know what it means to think at all.

But this leads to a very central point. I -- I have just published this in a -- my Sociology: the place of philosophy in life, the seat in life, in Greek tradition. One of you has quoted Charmides -- who has Charmides? I had suspected him that he hadn't read it. But he quoted it. Come on. Who -- who quoted Charmides? Who quoted Charmides? C-h-a-r-m-i-d-e-s? Oh, don't -- don't -- I'll find you.

Now this is a very exciting dialogue, gentlemen, because it is the seat of -- in life, which philosophy there is given, the reason why there are philosophers in Greece. And I'm going now to speak a little more about this, after I have dealt with the papers. The seat of life of philosophy forces you to deal -- with any philosophical topic -- or with any philosopher in such a way that you do not simply follow the external line of his argument. But that you master the subject by looking around it, by seeing it from all sides, so to speak, stereometrically, you see, so that you can begin at the end as much as the beginning.

In modern times, gentlemen, the one man who may claim that he comes nearest to a Greek philosopher has been Schopenhauer, because he is the one and only philosopher in the 19th century who wrote decent -- a decent style, a very beautiful style, as good as Plato. And Schopenhauer said to his readers in the preface of his philosophy, that he had to ask them to read the book once, and then to read it again, after they had reached the -- the end, because otherwise he couldn't convey his thought. They first had to know the whole story, what he was driving at. And then they had, so to speak, critically read it again. And he said, "I was -- I am very sorry, I'm quite sure I cannot keep up with the -- with the cheap Will -- Will Durants, et cetera, and therefore -- of my" -- his time, "and therefore, nobody is going to read my book. But I must say that the simple condition of reading this book is to read it twice. Because you must have reached the end before you can understand the beginning." And if this sounds paradox, you -- then you -- just -- means that you don't know what to think means. And you don't know what to think me- -- what to think means, of course. And you -- they tempt you to buy a book, because they promise you, you can read it in nine minutes and 10 seconds.

Gentlemen, you are illiterates. You have unlearned to read a real book of any difficulty. And you even disclaim your duty to write -- read a book that is difficult. You say, "I don't write -- read books that are difficult." It's just a denunciation of your own stupidity, gentlemen. Only books that are difficult are worth reading, obviously. Why should you read a book that is light? I mean, then you can go to a burlesque show right away.

But you -- all your values in reading books are distorted. The whole problem of Heraclitus or of the gre- -- greatest minds of -- of Greece is that you have to think about one of these sentences 20 times before the -- understand how deep they are, and how -- how appl- -- wide their application is. And so I must say, I resent this -- this -- these Platos -- papers on Plato. They all show very clearly that not one of the -- you has taken the trouble of reading a dialogue of Plato twice. Perfectly meaningless. No book, gentlemen, of any value is a book that deserves to be read once. If you don't read Hamlet twice, or thrice -- 10 times in your life, you are unable to understand Shakespeare. Hamlet cannot be read once. It cannot. That's the first beginning, to get over the difficulties of who's the play -- what the action is, and who the players are. After you have gotten by this, then you begin to begin just to -- to understand what Plato -- what Hamlet is all about. I have read my -- the -- Homer's Iliad perhaps by now 25 times, and The Odyssey 26 or 27 times. And so on with everything. And I very

often do not understand -- even then. But you have no education, gentlemen, because you have not learned anything the second time.

There are three kinds of books, gentlemen. And this is important for Greek -- for philosophy in any case. There are the books that deserve to be read once, and never again; that are the books to be eliminated. A book that only deserves to be read once could just as well have not been read. It's not important. You can read it for a pastime, or you cannot read it. Then there are books that must be read -- read several times. These are the so-called classics, the good books. Dickens, or Macaulay, or Carlyle, or -- or Robert Frost. And then there are books -- very few -- that can -- must be read always. Like the Bible. And that's the difference of the Bible and the other books. Not that it is a sacred book.

There is nothing sacred. That's an -- just an empty word, gentlemen. But it has to be read always, because most of the time, we aren't up to the occasion. Most of the time, we do not understand the Bible, because we have -- we live in such sloth, and sinfulness, and stupidity that we don't understand it. You have to have a pure heart and a clear mind in order to understand the Bible. Most of you don't have that. You are sleepy. And you -- you -- wallow in so much -- sloth and -- and frivolity that of course you cannot understand serious things.

I had just lunch with one of -- a boy from another course. And he -- he admitted that he was 19 years old, but he had admitted that so far, nothing ever had appeared serious to him. A remarkable performance. Nothing. Nothing ever, he said.

These are the three types of books, gentlemen: read -- to be read once, to be read several times, to be read often. We read the books that we read once in order to find among them a book that deserves to be read again. It's a selective process, like a sieve. You have three -- you see, three establishments. And then there are, among the classics, a few that we give such a prominence, that we say, "always." And so that's why we give it, for example, our children as a birthday present, because we think that although it was of our time, we think still that Alice in Wonderland should be read today.

But you -- I mean, the thing you are fed of course, you are very much excused, the children's books that are printed on -- this commercial basis, in -- where people establish themselves as children's books' writers now every day in this country, not one of them deserves to be printed or read by any child. It makes these children only stupid. It's opium. It's a -- it's a drug. Because it is -- any difficulty is eliminated. The child can understand the whole book. A book which you can understand from the beginning, gentlemen, is not a good book.

It's an uninteresting book, because that's all -- means that you already are on this level, so it cannot do anything to you. And all these children's book which I happen to -- to see -- too many because I have to deal -- to do with little children quite a bit, I'm ashamed of the human race, that this is printed, and that gets the paper, and gets the money. And it's absolutely useless. If it wasn't there, it's just a pastime. I mean, it's like a babysitter. That's what these books are for, to keep people blinded from -- from experience, and from reality, and from anything.

So gentlemen, philosophy of course claims to have to be thought over several times. You can say obviously that that is not philosophy which can be understood in one sitting. It is impossible that this would be philosophy. Now if you would and could understand this, gentlemen, this would perhaps be the greatest gain of this course.

The history of Greek philosophy is the history of a process of thought that by every generation has to be repeated, you see. It is not over. All these thoughts -- anyone who has written one paper on any of these men must have at least realized that this is still today a valid thought. I was very angry with you. There -- a man writes on the atom theory of Democritus. And instead of sinking to the ground in reverence, that this man had an idea which today is still tormenting every physicist, of the char- -- character of the universe, he just reports this -- oh, this man, because he hadn't modern mathematics, so he was of course, poorer, a poor second with regard to the expression he could give to the atom theory, the writer of this glorious paper would then say. Gentlemen, he hasn't understood that they are eternal thoughts, but thought for the first time by the Greeks. The atom theory is not dated at all. It's with us today. At -- at times, we all, so to speak, go in this direction and -- and look for a way out of oursel- -- problems, you see, in this simple manner that all matter is of the same. At other times, we'll -- resent this very much, this eg- -- egalitarian scheme, because we feel that dead matter and living matter are not distinguished sufficiently. And there's no hierarchy of values. There is no order. If all atoms are just atoms, you see, then the sentence, "Let there be light," and -- is then as good as the light itself. I think it is better. The creative effort to create life, obviously, must tower over the factual existence of life. Anything that is new enters the world not because it is matter, but because it changes matter.

So the whole Greek story, gentlemen, is thought that must be repeated.

That's why these texts -- look at this book. We have these fragments, gentlemen. I have now written this paper -- I have now written a book on Heraclitus in Eng- -- in German, gentlemen, where I have gone into much greater detail with making these quotations alive again. Well, these -- these words, of course, have

reverberated in my inner man 50 -- 100 hundred times before they -- they have gotten their full glamor and their full glow again.

So I have not -- I -- I'm quite sure -- I have not given you in this course any thought that is only for once. It is -- essentially stays with us. Only we have this great privilege that we can watch in the Greek story the emergence of these thought patterns for the first time. And we therefore go back to this source material, not because it is superseded, but because it has eternity. Now gentlemen, you watch in Greek philosophy then a thing that is much debated today by the wrong people: the transmission of acquired faculties. The story of the human race, gentlemen, is the transmission of acquired faculties. But the -- acquired faculties are today given to the Mendelians, and the biologists, and the chemists, and such people. They know nothing about these things. We know -- should know something in the humanities. Our whole problem of hu- -- the hu- -- of a hu- -- human race is to transmit acquired faculties. That is, to transmit faculties that did not exist in the cave man, but in the process of the ages have c- -- entered the race, you see, the bloodstream, and now have to be kept in it, because they now are eternal.

Gentlemen, all the eternity which you and I know of -- in marriage, in justice, in -- equanimity, in humanity, in equality, they are all created qualities during -- in the process of history and then they are kept going. And that's the story of Greek philosophy. The human mind has, in the Greek -- period, reached its -- a maturity and a finality that you are very much privileged if you are allowed to -- to work into your mind the importance of these -- or the eternity, the perpetuity, the validity of these ways of thinking. We cannot get out of it. We can -- what I -- I have tried to do is show them in perspective, so that perhaps you may not simply remain one-sided, and -- the victim, so to speak, of the Greek division of thought, for example, in object and subject. Today we perish if we just remain Greeks. Since the birth of Christ, it is impossible just to have a Greek mind.

There was a man in this country and -- who at the philosophe- -- philosophers' slave market, it's always taking place between New Year and -- Christmas and New Year, you know, the slave markets of all the college professions, "slave market" it is called, because the -- the young instructors are sold there, across the counter, and -- for the various colleges, who go there to hire men. And always -- usually in Washington, or some other of these dreary places. And so there was a debate on philosophers.

And they said -- "I'm" -- one said, "I'm an Aristotelian," and the other said,

"I'm a Platonist."

And one man got up and said, "Well, there could only be three answers.

You could only be either a materialist, an idealist, or a realist."

And so the fourth man got up and said, "Why they had a conference of philosophers if this was all they knew, from time immemorial, that there only could be three schools of thought?"

It shows you the -- the reverence, or the dogma- -- dogmatism of the American human mind today. You all -- people are down on dogma, gentlemen. But when you use your brain, you're all dogmatic about either being a materialist, or an idealist, or a realist. Now I'm neither one of the three. It has taken me a whole lifetime to break out of this Greek thought pattern. But before, you haven't thought these Greek patterns, in their temp- -- temptation, so to speak, in their lucidity, you see, you will have a hard time of using your mind in -- as a free man should, so that you know what you're doing when you think. Most of you are just materialists, without knowing that you are. For example, or -- what you call "realism," equally stupid limitation.

Today, gentlemen, we have to make use of any one of these Greek thought patterns. For certain issues, you have to be a realist; for certain, you have to be a materialist; for certain you have to be an idealist. We must be free using any of these philosophies whenever they can serve.

But for this, the first step is that you have to understand that the human mind has its classical period of its birth into a constant {kush} -- a constant form, a constant mold in those -- Greek days.

These were the points I would like to -- to make with regard to the papers. And now let me turn to the seat of philosophy in life once more. Those of you who have taken my course in Philosophy 9--who has -- who has been in 9? -- only a few--know that before man thinks by himself, he plays with other people, and reflects in play on his life situation. When you play football, you play war. When you play chess, you play war. That is, whenever we play, we repeat mentally, you see, and ideally, a serious situation in life which we otherwise would have to experience itself. We can play war, we can play chase, we can play hunt. And we do. So the first philosophy of the human race has been our -- their -- the social games and plays. When we play -- when we go have sports, we imitate, and become aware then of the forms in which we really live. Children -- girls will play christening, and they'll play wedding, and they'll play

funeral, and thereby already practice the serious business, you see, of life without being serious.

Now gentlemen, the Greeks of course were great players. And Homer -- we started with Homer -- played on his lyre with the memories of the great unifying past of all the Greek cities. And I gave you also, I think, the date of the Olympic Games in 1776, when all Greeks from Asia, from the mainland of Greece, and Italy, and Sicily began to meet every four years to play together, as they do in Melbourne now, as modern Greeks.

So playing together has been antecedent, has been preceding Greek philosophy. And the Greek philosophers -- represent a strange second adventure of playing with ideas. But that's play, too. And in order to give you the way very precisely, how this came about, I -- like to spe- -- say now something about the dialogues of Plato in this respect.

Many of the dialogues of Plato are centering around the dressing room of the athletes in a -- in a -- in a gymnasium in Athens. There the young men sit down, and rest, and joke, and wa- -- wash up, and take a shower, and refresh themselves. And there's this old man Socrates, this critic. And he takes advantage of their leisure between the games to talk it all over with them. He is, so to speak, the -- the critic of these athletes, and takes them there to task. Now Charmides is a very good example of this kind of dialogue. But there are others, of course. The Ion is of -- a case, which is in your book. And The Euthyphron is one, and -- oh, there are at least five or six of the same type. And they also were imitated in some pseudo-Platonic dialogues -- have taken advantage of this very tempting situation. Here is a beautiful boy. All the old men are eager to meet him because they are in love with him. Going to make love in the pederastic, in the obscene sense of the Greek ho- -- homosexual passion. And Socrates surpasses them all, because he doesn't want anything from this boy except the beauty of his soul. He doesn't want to sleep with him. And therefore, Socrates is shown to surpass these other men, you see, who enter there, this gymnasium, because he wants only to have this man outgrow, so to speak, his physical beauty and go on to the beauty of wisdom, to the desire for wisdom.

And this is so simple that you may say the seat of philosophy in Greece is the intermission of an athletic contest. That's the seat in life, as it is called today with the expression. When you -- today the -- the Swedes introduced this idea, as the Swedish school in theology, who ask about any psalm in the Bible, "Which is its seat in life?" When was it sung, you see? Was it is sung in the -- at a festival, you see? Was it sung in mourning? Was it sung after a victory? It's

called the "seat in life" question for any biblical writing. Well, we may ask the same question about the philosophers. The seat in -- of -- in life for the Greek Platonic dialogue is in the intermission between the athletic contests. That is, so to speak, the point, the sociological situation out of which the whole effort of Greek -- of the Platonic, you see, system has -- seems to have grown. He may of course have -- have overdone it in his literary form. And -- I know very well that there have been other occasions, of course, in which people might talk and discuss things.

But the Greeks themselves seem to have felt that if you increase an order of things, you have already war, you have legislation. You have the jury. You have the life of the political, you see, marketplace. And you have games. Then where do you put, so to speak, where do you localize, where do you make room for thinking? Well, you go to the people who will be so tired of their physical exercises that they now like to play with their mind instead, you see. And so the lo- -- localization of this mental, communal effort to philosophize in Greece is the arena, or the -- the benches around the arena, where you sit down, and let all these things pass in review which you have seen, and draw your own conclusions about their meaning, and about their best performance.

I think it is quite important that we ask ourselves, "Where is room for philosophy?" If you go to Dartmouth, there is no room for philosophy. We tried to start a philosophical club here two years ago for the students who were majoring in philosophy. And we gave them a very nice room in the library. And I was asked to be -- assist the first meeting. And I said I won't -- we discussed it, and I said, "This -- a very interesting article here in a -- in an American paper. Let's discuss this as a good starting point." Well, we were, I think, 15 men. And I came, and I was the only person who had read the article. So I went home again. Because there is no room for philosophy on this campus. You will do requirements, gentlemen. You will do -- take finals. You will make -- do assignments. That's not philosophy, obviously, you see. The study of philosophy -- as what you think is -- is only imitating philosophy, I mean. If I make you work artificially by assigning you this reading, if you do not sit down and read yourself, that's not philosophy, yet. Philosophy must have some natural place in your own natural life. Before, it isn't. It hasn't taken hold of you. It hasn't, I'm afraid. The papers bear me out on this. You don't believe that ph- -- to philosophize is an activity just like breathing. It is, gentlemen. I assure you. It's like eating. Most of you, by the way, do a little bit of constant rationalization. You go across the campus, you do something wrong. Immediately your mind begins to work, and to justify yourself. Why you -- why didn't you talk to this guy? Or

why were you too nice to him? Or why were you not nice enough to him? I think you all philosophize in a small way all the time. And why didn't they ask you to en- -- to join the fraternity? I mean, every one of you has these problems. That is philosophy already, because it is afterthought. It is an attempt to justify the life that goes on in this campus, you see, in the mirror of your own mind, is it not? But you are not very well equipped to it, and you drop it again, and you say, "Let's forget it." That's the only philosophy you have today. -- That's really more than realism, and more than materialism, and more than idealism, I think; the Dartmouth philosophy is the philosophy of forgetfulness. You must find a good Greek term for it, and then we have a wonderful new theory, a new system of philosophy, the philosophy that tries to crush reflection. Wonderful idea. You can sell it. Ja?

(Philosophy is more than rationalization, though, isn't it?)

I hope it is more. That's the beginning, however. Usually something that is called a problem, something that is -- you know the Greek word "problem" means something that lies in front of your foot, and you stumble. It's a stumbling block. That's a problem. Now I think most reasons why we think are stumbling blocks in our behavior, in our own conduct. That is, we blush, we are embarrassed, we are self-conscious, don't you think? And then we build around it a whole theory, that we are wrong -- right, and the rest of the world is wrong. And that's called a philosophy usually, isn't it?

The seat in life, gentlemen, then, of communal philosophy in Greek is not your own self-consciousness. That's usually the starting point in modern man's philosophizing, you see. In his loneliness, he begins to rationalize his problem, his stumbling block, and get around it, and build some whole theory in -- because he doesn't want to face the fact that he is a failure. But in Greece, the problem is the intermission, the relaxation of the young man and the attempt of the old to make them serious. That's the whole Socratic method. And it is very -- I have tried to show -- tell you the story of Parmenides. That this was actually the way in which Parmenides tried to convince these boys that he could sell them permanent truth, whereas all the life that went on as they lived there, you see, playing, or -- in the army, was just appearance, phenomenon, you see -- that wasn't true. But what he said, that was the truth, you see.

So we have -- the seat in life, gentlemen, is in the playroom of the young, by the presence of the old. So there is a double situation: teacher and student, old and young, you see; and an attempt of the old to identify himself with beauty, and the attempt of the young to identify themselves with wisdom. And

that is why, in the Greek philosophy, this relation of beauty and wisdom is constantly stressed, is the constant thing. Now, the -- the young man, gentlemen, is always the physis representative in this situation. He represents the beauty of nature. And therefore we take now a step that leads us a little bit beyond the physis, ethos, and logos dis- -- you see, distinction which we've made so far. When we go -- come to the seat in life of Greek philosophy, and I think of modern teaching, too, here as we -- you see us together -- you can only study because you have some respect for what I know. And I can only teach you, gentlemen, because I take pity on the beauty of your form, and the shoddiness of your conduct. You are empty, and I am ugly. And that has to come together. I have shape, I have form, I have profile. And you are still shapeless. But you are much more in tune to -- with -- with nature's promise of the next spring. Spring is beautiful, gentlemen. Winter isn't.

Therefore, gentlemen, physis and ethos in Greek philosophy are represented by old and young, or "young and old" is proper. So that -- I have never mentioned this before. I wanted you to understand physis, ethos, and logos as inherent in any man's contemplation of reality outside of him. But the group that does philosophize is in a strange manner arranged. One group, the young, gentlemen, have an immediate access to the problem of beauty. Think of all the girls you love. And you have only a very delayed, and dilatory, and difficult approach to wisdom, because that takes many years of experience and criticism. And you haven't got th- -- gone through this, really, just because the time has been lacking. And you haven't been disappointed sufficiently enough. A man like myself who has been beaten down by 40 generations of students, gentlemen, has no illusions about the human race.

My problem, obviously, gentlemen, is to like you just the same. And your problem is the opposite, you see, not to fall in love with everybody, which is hard to contain oneself, the girls are so beautiful.

So old age, gentlemen, is skeptical, by nature, you see. Young people are -- I hope you are not skeptical. If you are, it would be artificial. You must be enthusiastic.

Therefore, the line--if I might -- may now show you--when we come to the seat in -- in life of logos, ethos, and physis, physis reaches into the reality of the human society in the form of youth. And logos reaches into the form of the physical realm in the form of old age. Now philosophy, to make bold--you see, to use the metaphor--is this realm in which the two shall meet. And overlap. The physical eros of youth, for beauty, and the experienced wisdom of the old have

this common ground where they can meet. Do I make myself understood? Therefore, physis and ethos are not just questions of objective contemplation outside of you and me--that I say, here are the ethics with my neighbors, you see; and here is physis in the botanic garden, in the arboretum, or in the Rocky Mountains--but in the fact that young and old speak to each other, and try to experience the same truth, there is already ethical and physical experience in the very fact of philosophizing, because the group that philosophizes, you see, represents to each other an element of perfect physis, and of perfect ethos. Can you follow the argument? On the part of the philosophers' group themselves, on the part of the subject, who tries to get a picture, a system, an order into the -- into the tempestuous three realities of -- of God, man, and universe, you see -- society and universe, there is already an experienced battleground, an area in which the -- the three things interpenetrate. Because the -- the young men who would throng around Socrates, do represent in his eyes, at least, you see, physical perfection which isn't good enough for him and he says, "Where is -- you are demented. Where is your mind? Where is -- are your ethics? You are just physically perfect. Yes, you are," you see. "But what of it?" And on the other hand, he can't do anything if he cannot implant his truth into these perfect bodies and make them carrier of this truth. He would then otherwise be -- his truth would remain sterile, would remain wor- -- weightless. He would take it into his grave.

The whole problem of the Greek immortality in The Phaedon is of course in this problem. Neither Socrates nor Plato see--sometimes they see it, and sometimes not--that what they call "immortality" is the power of the old to beget in the bodies of the young, you see, wisdom again. It is much more in this rekindling of the flame in another generation than in their own -- their own not-dying. They die very much, after all.

So the -- I would dismiss even this whole discussion of immortality in the Greek philosopher -- philosophical context as very fruitless. We all do die, gentlemen. And the whole -- I have never understood why people could doubt that we die. Christ had to die in order to rise again from the dead. His crucifixion would just be a joke, if He hadn't died, really. So we are not immortal. We have to die very real. Then we may come to life again, but that's a different story.

The Greeks deal -- dealt with the problem of immortality, because they had a deep yearning, gentlemen, for the eternity of the logos in young bodies. This unity of teacher and student, this unity of two generations in philosophy is,

so to speak, the dogma of Greek thought. Not one man thinks, but one man, you see, is -- yearns so much for beauty that what he thinks must enter this opposite number. And so all they think -- I think it's the simplest way of thinking of Greek philosophy as a -- as a sport replacing the physical sport. It is really the metaphysical sport. And it is really the play of a man's mind while the body is at rest.

This has a great consequence, gentlemen. Once you understand that the intermission of the athletic co- -- athletic contest is the seat for philosophy in Greece.

If you get a critic in a theater in the intermission, and you ask him what he thinks of the play, he can only at the first performance say, "I haven't seen the play, yet," you see. He has to suspend judgment, if he is a wise man. If -- if he is a very good critic, he will come for the second time, what I tried to tell you before. After he has seen the play once, you see, and he has seen it whole, he may then come and argue the individual roles and -- because only then does he know -- has the actress done justice to the role, after he knows what the whole role is about. Either he must have read the play, or -- in a Shakespeare performance, he has seen very, very many other performances. He knows already the outcome of the play. He knows what it's all about. You can only judge any artistic or mental performance, gentlemen--take this down--after you have been through the whole of it. I come back to my point, of course, made before, that the man who tried to give me the story of The Republic only point by point can't give me the story of The Republic, you see, because he doesn't know why this point appears at that one certain chapter.

And -- a good critic, gentlemen, then, has to face the whole of a thing. He has to be through with the whole thing. And therefore in an athletic contest, of course, the critic who sits there in intermission, takes advantage of the laziness and of these -- of this -- this sweating -- young men there, and discusses things with them, takes advantage of the fact that such a dra- -- contest has taken place before. They already know the outcome to a certain way. This contest may still, you see, hang fire, and not be finished. But how a football contest i- -- does end, everybody knows, you see.

And therefore, you see that the -- seat in life of a philosophical discussion is a classified one. It is not a unique situation. We philosophize, in Greece at least, in a stereotype situation. Although this special contest may not be over with, you see, we don't expect that this contest will deviate from all others. It is the weakness, gentlemen, of Greek thinking, of all Greek thought, of your

thought, of all secular thought, that it cannot deal with the unique things. It can only deal with repeti- -- repeated things. You will find that the whole problem of Aristotle and Plato are ideas or classifications. But never the -- unique thing. -- When Jesus came and wanted to avoid the pitfalls of Greek philosophy, He was not allowed to write a book. The greatest thing our Lord has done is that He didn't write. There would be no Christianity if He had written a book. Because all books are type-written, in the literal sense, that they deal with generalizations. That's why Thomas Aquinas is not a -- a religious founder, but just a theologian. And theology is much poorer than religion. It is just thinking about religion in general terms. All Greek thought, gentlemen, because it comes in the intermission of something that goes on all the time--athletic contests--is dealing with type. It's dealing with typical things. With things that are permanent, perpetual, so to speak, you see, but never with anything unique. The only unique thing in the Platonic dialogue is Plato and Socrates. He -- these are the only unique figures in the whole story.

So we learned -- if you really follow up restlessly, and tensionally, and -- and incisively such a seat in life, you -- you understand what philosophy can do and what it cannot do. Philosophy cannot deal with unique situations. Now, the -- further, gentlemen, because it is a play, or in a leisure time, it can never deal with the future. The whole Greek thought is unable to think of anything but cyclical repetition. If you think of what we read in The Republic about the abuse of the political forms, it is the cycle. It goes from tyranny, you see, to monarchy; from monarchy to aristocracy; from aristocracy to oligarchy; from oligarchy to democracy; from democracy to mobocracy; and from mobocracy to dictatorship. As we are at this moment in this country. And that's a cycle, gentlemen. Nothing new under the sun.

The strange unreality, gentlemen, of Greek philosophy, because it arises in a leisure moment, is in -- leisure is unable of creating something really new. You have a -- the leisure class, gentlemen, is always the decadent class in any society. And since you all want to join the leisure class, you become a heavy burden on America. Leisure is less real than serious life. And the philosophy, gentlemen, in Greece, a great -- very great historian has said, the -- the Greek philosophy has been unable to abolish any abuse in any city of Greece. It has reflected on them, it has criticized them, you see. But it did never have the power to conquer the citizens. I think I have told you that -- that the last Pla- -- Platonists had to leave Athens, because a man of the same name, Demetrius, a -- a sergeant of Macedonia, was made god in Athens in 304. Didn't I tell you the story? Wie?

(No. No.)

Well, did -- well, the -- the -- the third president of the Academy after Plato had the name Demetrius. Demetrius. And -- from Demeter, of course, the great goddess of -- and he was a very good man. But in the years of the Lord 304, that is only 43 years after the death of Plato, the -- the Athenians were so desperate, that they made a staff sergeant of the Macedonian army mayor of Athens. Erected a temple in his honor and worshiped at his statue, as though this staff sergeant was a god. That was done by the intelligent people of Athens in their despair. They thought that if they bought a Macedonian, they could keep their independence, at least with regard to the other Macedonian mercenaries, who ruled the rest of the world by that time, you see, the so-called -- the successors of Alexander the Great. Well, my -- my Platonist, Demetrius of Phalerum, took his manuscripts and fled to Alexandria in Egypt. And ever since, the great library in Alexandria contains the real philosophical writings, you see. They had left Athens. What is the story, ja?

(Well, wasn't Demeter one of the -- of the pagan gods? Is -- { } any historical connection?)

No. There is never a god Demetrius. That's just a human name. It means -- just as the adherent, the worship of Demeter. Demeter is the mother of Proseph- -- of Persephone, and is the god of the harvest in Greece, of fertility. Earth moth- -- it means "mother earth." "De" is earth; and "meter" is mother, and that's all there is to it. Demeter is the goddess of the earth. But Demetrius is simply a -- a man who is devoted to Demeter. That's a human name. It's a very familiar name in Poland and Russia to this day, Demetrius. Dimitri -- Dimitri von {Mohrenschild}. He has the name Demetrius, here, Mr. von {Mohrenschild}. Well, in following then through this business of the seat of life, gentlemen, we come to the advantages and the limitations of the Greek experience of their mind. The reality of the Greek mind is this crossbreeding of more than one generation. The Greek philosopher, gentlemen, is aware of the contradiction between the physical setup of the universe, in which the young seems to win, and the mental, the log- -- the logos problem in which the older is the better. Now you are torn, gentlemen. In your eyes, on the one-hand side, if a man is over a certain age, dismiss him, out he goes. Business, as you know, is tragic. A man after 65 is just fired. Same as they do in the colleges. Then you go to the Congress, and you have Mr. Theodore {Greene}, the chairman of the foreign policy committee, and you wonder. He's 89. Well, what's the story in this coun-

try? What is true? What do you believe? You don't know what you believe. You are absolutely torn, absolutely contradictory. The war was won by a secretary of war whose name was Stimson, and he was 78; and by a secretary of state, who was 82, Mr. Hull. Great people. And obviously very useful to a country that is so crazy, and so fashioned by crazes as the United States. The older the statesman, the better, because he has some wisdom left.

So you don't know what you th- -- to believe. On the -- in the lower brackets, you throw out all the teachers -- who may have -- possible wisdom. It's absolutely a waste. And the other hand in politics, you cater to these people, because you know you feel that otherwise you would be lost, will -- you will have no mores. And the contradictions of the American scene are never more vivid than when you ask yourself, "What do you do with the third generation?" You -- you are only in your mentality, you are -- only think of people from 1 to 30 from 30 through 60. And after 60, they go out of your philosophy. Men after -- over 60 have to go to Florida in your estimation, or to California, be forgotten, or Social Security or something. Out they go.

That isn't the true story, however, gentlemen. The country is only saved by these few people like Elihu Root, or -- or Sim- -- Stimson, or -- or {Greene}, or -- and many such people. And -- it's -- of course, you just see the Senate, I mean. It is appalling. I think we -- there it's overdone the other way. And the same with our just- -- with our judges. As you know, when the pack- -- court-packing plan developed of Mr. Roosevelt, the majority of the justices of the Supreme Court were much over 70. All of them. Now isn't that a strange contradiction? That you can't have a vice-president over 65 in a -- in a factory, but you can have a -- the Supreme, you see, Court just manned by people who -- who cannot move anymore. Mr. Justice Holmes was 90 when he retired. Now, I wouldn't, to tell you the truth, it goes too far. If I have a case pending in Washington, and I would think that the -- the presiding officer is 90, I would have the feeling that I can't get through to him. I can't convey my problem to him. Wouldn't you feel this, too? And I'm trembling over this {Greene} business, you know. That the -- the chairman of the foreign policy committee in this country is 89. But then I think that the greatest pope of the 19th century, Leo XIII, had his greatest time when he was over 90. And the commissioner to -- to -- to the -- Great Britain of Canada -- from Canada before the First World War, was Mr. Donald Smith. And he had his greatest time when he -- between 87 and 94 of age. He died when he was 94.

So you o- -- may only begin to see, gentlemen, that logos, ethos, and physis may even be transplanted into the ages of man. I would say that the first

age is the physical age of yours and mine, you see, in which we represent more or less a part of nature. From 30 to 60, we represent a part of the ethical society, you see, of the order. But from 60 to 90, if we are any good, we represent the logos, because that's the only contribution Mr. {Greene} can make. If you didn't have the feeling that he is beyond his own self-interest at that age, you see, he couldn't make his contribution. A man of 89 with two feet in the grave can have his mind on the interest of his country, you see. If -- if he's any good. And that much you -- you -- you -- there are such people, who have this wisdom then, you see, to forget themselves in the service of their country.

And therefore, what I want -- wanted to try to do is, gentlemen, to make you see that logos, ethos -- and physis are rooted somewhere in our own lifetime experience, preponderantly, you see. A man over 60 should not care. And you have had the great benefit of a president, gentlemen, who got into this age of 60 before time, through illness. Mr. Roosevelt became a great man through his polio. And it shows the depths of Republican depravity that they always spoke of him as a syphilitic. I've heard this myself, high judges of the Republican Party, Somerset Club {members}, just tried to get rid of -- of his greatness by dismissing him as a syphilitic.

Gentlemen, the polio of Mr. Roosevelt has saved this country, because from a mere playboy and a very cheap politician, through his illness, he outgrew his self-interest. A man who has had polio and is paralyzed, you see, has nothing anymore to ask for in this world. And that's the great blessing that this country has had from the sickness of this man. He was far beyond all his opponents, gentlemen, all these cheap opponents. Mr. Hoover had the depravity and the ignominy of inviting the governors of the various states before the election of '32 to Washington, and let them wait two hours standing, because he wanted that Mr. Roosevelt should falter and faint and so that he couldn't be a candidate for the presidency. Mr. Roosevelt survived even this ordeal.

But what I -- am trying to say is that through his polio, you see, a man who certainly was before physically interested very deeply, you see, in life, playboy -- and ethically, that is, politically interested in just cheap advantages of a politician--he was not a very serious man--through the polio was in early age advanced to the age of -- you see, over 60. It's not an accident, I think, he was finished at 63, you see, and died. Because he had lived, telescoped, into the last two decades of his life, into '28 to '45, you see, from his polio onward. I think he was stricken when? '27? It's very important, gentlemen. He -- he anticipated the third era, so to speak, the third part, the third third of this -- you see, of the man's lifespan. He had already compressed into the life of an active -- where

otherwise people are active and passages, and you see, and make money, and get rotund. He had already telescoped the -- into this the logos of wisdom, you see, and -- and indifference to self, this unselfish attitude.

So I hope I have made it plain to you, gentlemen, that we have in the Greek story a very wonderful attempt to cope with the supernatural division of God, man, and universe by natural means of mere growth. The Greeks are the people of nature, of -- of -- the philosophy, gentlemen, does ignore, so to speak, revelation. There is nothing of a higher order. And the Greek mind says, "Everybody can think this." But there is a condition attached. Everybody, if he is complete in his connection with the rest of the human age, and the human experience. The young, if they are in with their elders; the elders, if they are in with their young. And that makes -- remakes the whole story of Greek philosophy. It isn't the single individual, gentlemen, that can think. That's your heresy. You think that everybody can think. Everybody cannot think. You can only think if you are identified with two other situations: the young with the old and the elders; and the elders with the old and the young; and the old with the -- their elders and their youngsters. That's a very wonderful story, gentlemen.

We replace then, gentlemen, by natural means the supernatural. A priest is a man who tries to be three ages at one. And so he dra- -- he draws on the supernatural, today. He's a -- originally the word "priest" only means an elder, as you know. Nothing else, you see. But he has to be a normal man, and you have to -- if you -- he is a real priest -- formerly the Church was very ambitious in this sense, as you know. The -- you had first to marry. A bishop was a married man, and when he became a widower, they made him a bishop, because then he had experienced bachelor life, married life, and the third life of the logos, of mere wisdom, you see, where he is alone.

In the Greek church, that's still necessary. In order to become a bishop, you first must be married, you see. A bishop be one wife's man, the old text of the -- of the instruction of the Apostles says.

That's all lost on you, gentlemen, because you -- you live in a -- in a very strange -- estranged paradise. It is always the same problem, gentlemen: how much spirit has God immersed into human nature. And He has not given to any individual human nature much spirit, you see. But when the three natures of youth, and old age, and -- and elder-...

[tape interruption]

...and the oldest men own wisdom, of logos, from the decision between appetites, senses, and ambitions.

This is in a miraculous way the Greek situation, gentlemen, by which they are a nation taken out of the context. You have no other nation that was placed in the universe in this specific condition, that they were given all the data from other people's lives, and stood between them, and had, so to speak, to try to make a -- a system, or a poem, or an order out of this.

I think this country is at this moment very much provoked to recreate its col- -- its college from the sports. I mean, before the curriculum is not revamped in the same manner as Socrates tried to revamp it among the athletes of Athens, the -- all these humanity courses will -- don't -- won't do you any good, because you won't see their -- their seriousness, their importance. They just hang around you as heirlooms from the past. I think that if you only had the sports at this moment here in Dartmouth, we could reform the college very easily. Because I could make you to -- agree, that you must grow old. And if you once have the fear of the Lord in your bones that it is a terrible thing for an athlete to grow old, because he is so stupid, then we -- you would -- you would find out what you would have to know. What you must know, what you have to inquire into, and what the -- the -- all the plays you are -- intoxicated by, should lead you to. I mean, this -- this boy of 19 there, whom I tried to -- to fathom, there was just nothing to fathom. He was just his own clothes. And under this there was absolutely nothing to be found. And yet he had gone through all the -- I inquired what courses he had taken. Not one of these courses that of course ta- -- done him any good. I mean, if he had taken no courses, I could have reformed this gentleman, you see. But since he already had played with all these courses, he -- he hadn't developed the seriousness which -- I can develop in an athlete who is, you see, absolutely innocent of all intellectual endeavors so far. Let's have a break here. And then come back and distribute the papers.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...in -- in s- -- in as far as I have tried to make you see that the Greek philosopher himself represents the problem of physis, logos, and ethos, by his setup as a school of philosophy. It is quite important for you -- you learn the -- what a school is. You have no idea what a school is. You have wrong ideas. Everything here in this country is one step down. You call an academy something like Northfield, where they train people to be soldiers. Well, in Plato's time, the Academy was something for the people where you had to be 30 at least to enter. And you couldn't enter at 16.

Now most of the terms which you use, gentlemen, are anticipations of the real thing. A college, too, in the Middle Ages, was an institution in which people were, by and large, 25 years of age when they came there. So if you give the same thing to younger people, the thing of course is devalued. You -- the whole idea of education is always, "Give it a little earlier," and "Give it a little earlier." But the thing itself then is changed, obviously, you see, because you can't give to a 16-year-old boy the same food as you can give to a 30-year-old man. It's just impossible.

So it is not easy for you to see what a Greek school of philosophy was.

You s- -- talk so much about the Stoa, or the Stoics, or the Epicureans, or the Academy, or the -- or the Peripatetic school. You also talk very big about universities. And I think it's -- the -- the Greek history of philosophy should be used by you to sit in judgment over the things that carry the same name in our time, but aren't the same. And I want today to make the point, gentlemen, that a Greek school of philosophy had this vitality that it contained the three generations, as the logos, and the ethos, and the physis of man would represent. Youth being the physical aspect of man, logos being the wisdom aspect of man, and ethos being the aspect of the fighting generation -- but on the other hand, gentlemen, that the Greeks knew not of a university. And some of you have glibly stated that the Academy of Plato was the first university. And that's the American tradition. But that's als- -- as wrong as if you say that in America, every- -- -body is a philosopher. You can also read this in books that today everybody philosophizes. I see nothing of this. I see a total absence of philosophy even by the people who are professors of philosophy. Because to be a professor of philosophy doesn't make you into a philosopher. Don't think this. If you are teaching mathematics, you are not a mathematician.

I have a friend who is a mathematician here in this country. And he's --

he's one of the 150 mathematicians on whom it depends that mathematics is alive. And he says, "The terrible thing in America is there are 10,000 people who teach mathematics, and they all are held to be mathematicians. They are not the slightest thing of it. They teach my mathematics which I produce." Mathematics is only something real as long as it is constantly created. And there are -- perhaps 150 is a large number -- all over the world, including India and China, where people produce mathematics. You always take a professor of chemistry to be a chemist. Or a hist- -- a professor of history to be an historian. There's a great difference, gentlemen. A professor of history prevents new historians to teach the things that are needed. All the people who teach something are conservatives, because they have learned in their youth certain things, and they stick to them and think they are true. There is always a tremendous fight between the people who represent something -- as in the New Testament. The people who taught the law, face to face with the living law of the Lord -- of course were all against Him, were they not? Now, who was the law? He or the Pharisees? And that's the situation always, gentlemen. But you are totally blinded.

When I -- I have -- I think can say that in certain fields of human en- -- knowledge, I am at this moment the -- the -- in the -- in the ranks of those who create this field, who do it. It doesn't -- even this doesn't prevent me from doing it that I have to teach here at Dartmouth. That's bad enough. But obviously, gentlemen, if you are -- have the choice to learn something with me, or to -- learn -- learn some- -- some- -- by a professor in the graduate school, your assumption is always that the man in the graduate school who is appointed to teach it must be much more -- the better man than I, because I have no seal on this, under this, you see. I'm just teaching at Dartmouth. How could a man be good who teaches at Dartmouth? That's just impossible. You -- so you go on to the graduate school.

So here at this moment, some peo- -- boys here -- senior -- Senior Fellows who -- who concentrate on the field in which I am the one authority in Europe, now -- or rated as the authority. But they never think of taking a course with me, because they mistake the appointment in a school for being the man who produces the thing, you see. And since I'm not officially appointed in a graduate school for this field, it's never dawned on them that they might be quite well to come to me, because next year this man will go to Europe. Then he will be told, "Why didn't you go to this man? He knows better."

But in America, gentlemen, there is a constant confusion between school and produc- -- creation. And you think that -- what -- what's your purpose -- coming in or going out?

(Going out.)

What?

(Going out.)

I'm very glad. Now in -- the -- the word in Greece of "school" is a -- is a different word from what you today take it. A school is to you a thing in which that what happens is -- fore- -- can be foretold. You take an exam, and you have the -- the credentials from this school, and then you can become a barber. That's a -- the school. The school then for us, gentlemen, is something predictable, that creates a routine curriculum, and therefore, it is second-rate. Obviously, gentlemen, the -- in the times from 5- -- 600, from Thales' days, to the times of Marcus Aurelius, and even to -- down to the days of St. Augustine, who was -- went to school to the academics for a while as you know. He was very much tempted by the Manichaeans, and by the Pythagoreans, and by the Academicians, by the people in the Academy. This is not true. The word in Greece of "school"--and I would really miss my duty towards you, if I wouldn't stress this fact--the word in Greek for "school" is "leisure." If you entered the school -- skhole -- the word s-c-h has to be divided here, as we still -- pronounce "school." And "skhole" [scholay] is the Greek pronunciation -- not -- not the hard "k," but the soft. Skhole. It means leisure. It's -- comes as least nearest to this. A -- leisure, however, a skhole, given to meditation, and to the Muses, and to inspiration. So you joined the leisure class if you became a scholar.

And since this is totally lost today, and we think a scholar is a man who studies, in the sense that he has a special field, you see, in which he -- in which he is then finally appointed, it is well to see that the beginning of the word "skhole" means to risk one's free time at an adventure of ideas, and one didn't know where would one come out. It is the unlimited, the oceanic character of the enterprise which attracted the best minds in Greece for this activity.

So throw it all out, gentlemen. A school of philosophy in antiquity is not a school. And that's why the word "academy" to this day is a kind of glorification for a school. If you say, you see, "the academic mind," you want to say a little bit more than the "scholastic" or the "school" mind. It's not a school man then you say, you see, but it's aiming at Plato.

Now there is still this reminiscence that the school called the Academy of Plato, is an -- is a venture, is an enter- -- free enterprise. You may even say that

it is the freest enterprise of the ancient world. It's an attempt to gain influence, to make the philosophers king. Very -- and therefore, since there are no certified credentials in this business, after all, in every generation the great hope is that these boys, who have the guts to spend a few years with the master, you see, will then be -- do great deeds. But without any certainty, without any certificates. No creden- -- no examination. The idea of an examination is perfectly unknown in antiquity. There are no examinations, gentlemen. Examinations make people stupid. And this is the most stupid generation of students I -- that is possible, because you are examined every half year.

Gentlemen, I in my whole life have taken one exam, one oral exam, when I was -- for my doctorate. I -- that's why I still think I have my mind together. I never broke away from what I had learned, because there came finals, and I could forget about it. This whole thing went -- was all the time a going process. A real skhole, a real -- a leisure, you see. From my first day in grammar school to my last day in the university, I was on my own. I never -- I wasn't ever asked what I learned. I just learned. And so it was all inside of me, and I never made this clear break, "Now the course, History of Philosophy is over, so I can forget it." So I never heard it. After two years, you hardly know that you took the course. That's your case, because you take finals. Finals are the most stultifying process in American education. If you want to reform the college, the first thing is -- you should do, is abolish all examinations, and eliminate all the students who only are learning something because of the examinations. They don't deserve to go to college anyway. And it isn't worth learning anything for an examination. It's only worth learning something for your own sake, as a promise for your own future, isn't it? For whose sake should you take an exam?

Now the Greek situation then is a free situation. It's a freelance situation, it's a free enterprise situation. And therefore, the only certainty the school offers in Greece is that old people, grownups, and adolescents are together. It is not a child's play. But it is the play of grownups who make themselves like children. It's childlike-ness of old people. That's an academy. Grownup people sit there on the bank --. Gentlemen, when I was a young student your age, I had the privilege -- I -- I have always studied preferably with very old men, who were already emeriti. But in Europe, an emeritus is the most dignified teacher. An emeritus is not a man who doesn't -- isn't used more. This list of emeriti in Dartmouth, the directory of Dartmouth College, is one big insult to humanity. There are all the dignified teachers of this college listed as emeriti, and they have nothing to say anymore at this college. In Europe, the emeriti have no duties to perform, but they have the right to teach what they like. They don't examine anymore. They are not in any -- they have no duties, as I said, no obli-

gations. But they have a group of students. They have real pupils. They have real disciples.

And so I took preferably courses with people of -- from 70 -- between 70 and 80, because they of course are the mis- -- most brilliant and wisest men. And they had -- they had no standing anymore in the -- except for the -- what they were. They had no -- I didn't -- you didn't -- you didn't go to these men before, because they were appointed professors. They had outgrown their appointments. They were people like Robert Frost, where you go because this is -- it's just Robert Frost, you see. No title can ever, you see, do anything but belittle Robert Frost. He's always bigger than all the titles, and especially than all the degrees Dartmouth has given him. He is the man, of course. You look up to Robert Frost as bigger than any office he can hold.

Well, I wanted to say, the students with -- were seated with me on the benches of this seminar with these old men of 80 were themselves between 65 and 75 years of age. And that you should have seen, the ambition the still people had to outwit us young people, I mean, in reading the Greek texts and so. We read Hippocrates, for example, together. And that's what an academy is, where old people learn.

So you have to reverse your whole vision of the Greek world if you think that it is only a world in -- where the young are introduced. But it is a way in which -- where the young -- the old keep learning. And that of course is today -- has a -- a different -- a different name. It's called "research," gentlemen. But you must understand that research is the way of keeping old people young. Research has come into the world, and that again you do not know. It's today a kind of mystery word. Usually graduate students in various schools think research is wonderful because they get stipends, and fellowships, and money. It's today -- first milking cow. It is noth- -- nothing of the kind.

Research has been introduced in Europe as a way of keeping the teachers alive of -- at a time where the man already has to formulate answers to the young, you see, allows him to question. Research is the open attitude, you see, with your hands open to let the rain fall, so to speak, through -- from the sky. That's research. Teaching is being armed to the teeth, you see, and already imposing on you the truth, you see. And in order to be an academician, to be a man in -- in -- in -- in the real fullness of the mental ripeness, I at my age have to stay in research, you see. Therefore I am much younger than you, because you are satisfied with short-lived -- shortcut answers. You listen to the quiz kids, or something like that, \$64 dollar question. My questions are still very long-range. I

have still -- for a certain question I will have to answer 10 or 20 years ahead of me. And then I may know the answer. I can now -- I have now just published a book which I feel is the answer to things I wanted to know when I was your age. Now I know it. It has taken me 50 years to know it. And that's research. So gentlemen, the school in Greece is a situation in which grownup people are prevented from being just old, you see, by keeping also the opposite attitude of still learning. It is learning beyond age. It's the opposite from mis- -- from the child prodigy here, who wants to -- to go to the Horace Mann School and finish at 14 and enter Harvard at 15. That's a horror, in my estimation. It's destructive, and anybody who -- who's -- too young is in a terrible, terrible dan- -- terribly en- -- dangerous position. He's old too early, you see. But we should be kept young, of course, long enough. But you don't do -- keep young, gentlemen, by playing baseball too long. You keep young by doing research. Whether in your own profession or where not. Wherever a man at 50 can question his very existence, you see, he is still young. Not by playing around. It's a much more serious business.

So that's the Academy. Now the opposite -- at the opposite end, I want to stress the fact, gentlemen, that an academy, or a school of philosophy in antiquity is not a university. It's the opposite from a university, just as it is the opposite from a school. So you peek -- do me a great favor if you try for the time being to believe me -- that what in America what is called a "school," and what in Europe is called a "university" -- there are no universities in America--there're all tho- -- only namesakes of the -- that the -- the Academy or the Stoa are neither one. It -- I think it helps us to make this distinction. You grow into the real Greek situation out of which we have developed one way the university and the other way the school. The school is less than an academy, or a school of philosophy. The university is more. Our era wouldn't be a -- a -- a new era if it hadn't transcended the Ac- -- the antiquity in some respect. We have imitated antiquity by schools. We have overcome antiquity by universities. As soon as you understand this, you will begin to understand what Greek philosophy really is. It is something in between, something that does not exist today, in this -- as organized -- an organized effort. And that's not so easy to understand.

So I want to devote to this sociological aspect of -- of philosophy to -- this -- these meetings, because it is terribly important that you should -- should not believe that philosophy is the same 500 B.C. and the same today. And as long as you use all these words "school," "academy," "academic mind," and so on, "doctor degree," as though this was the thing, you see, that existed for 2,500 years unchanged, I don't see how you can understand the history of the human spirit.

Aren't you too hot? With gloves on?

(Okay.)

So we said, gentlemen, the school is today not an adventure. But it is safe. The one thing you can say of a school is that it gives -- is meant to give security, that it gives conformity in this country. That you -- you just are the -- all this -- conditions of going to -- successfully to school are known. You cannot surprise anybody with all the stupid assignments we get. You can't do more than the assignments. And the assignments are certainly limiting your own growth. I mean, obviously the -- modern stu- -- school is so stifling, most people who go to school learn too little. They learn much less than they could learn, like this mother in Illinois. {Feld}, you know -- have seen the story in the papers, have you? Who -- who was a teacher in Michigan, and then in Illinois she was sent to prison because she taught her own child, feeling that she could teach her child three times better than the schoolteachers. Didn't you see the story? No revolution in this country any more for this. I mean, in -- in -- 100 years ago, they would have tarred and feathered the judge who -- who sent her to prison. It is just incredible. But you don't even feel -- you don't even resent it. You think she was condemned righteously. She was -- that's an injustice, gentlemen, a grave injustice that was done her. She has the duty and the right to teach her child. The school is just a substitute. But you don't -- can't see it. You believe you are school militarists. This whole country is -- is run by -- by school barracks -- the school barracks system, just as Mr. Orozco has put it there on the -- on his fresco. It's one of his -- most important frescoes.

The simple idea that I have to give up my child's education, because a stupid schoolteacher who is 19, and hasn't yet found a husband, is allowed to -- to -- to -- to teach my -- my grandchild now comic strips, and to field all the wrong stuff. Pernicious. Chaff. Empty, so that they -- their whole taste is ruined for life. Nothing serious. Nothing that makes a real -- demands an effort. For -- they are just -- for the rest of their lives, they are worth nothing, these children. You haven't learned how to learn, so I can't teach you anything. That's the school today. And that is today the tyranny of this country. If you want to do better with your child, you aren't allowed to. This -- this woman had a certificate from the state, you see, of Michigan to teach. But the -- the state rights came in and the judge said, "In Illinois, we don't recognize the certificate of the state of Michigan. Go to prison."

So the school, gentlemen, is a limiting concept for growth. It's known

growth. That which can already be fore-ordained. And you must see this. Woodrow Wilson always used to say that nobody could come from an American liberal arts college who would be as good as Lincoln. That's quite an indictment if the -- one president of the United States says this, that Lincoln could not be produced in Dartmouth College. He said it here in 1909, officially, in a -- in a great speech he gave at the inauguration of President {Nichols}. If you want -- to read a serious indictment of college education, read the speech by Woodrow Wilson given 1909 at the inauguration of President {Nichols} of Dartmouth College. And he was himself president of Princeton, so he ought to know. It's very serious, gentlemen. A school today is the opposite from a Greek skhole, from a Greek school of philosophy. And as long as you do not make this radical break in your thinking, I think you -- everything you read about antiquity is misleading. The children didn't go to school then, you see. But the grown-ups did. And that makes a difference. By the way, perhaps you keep this in mind: that what -- in the days of scholasticism, gentlemen, in the days of Thomas Aquinas, the school men, as they were called, had students who were all over 30 years of age. The people who went to the University of Paris and studied with B- -- -omas Aquinas, with Bonaventura, with Abélard, they were all grownup people. And that made a difference. You can imagine that you can discuss with grownup people, you see, everything, only very differently from what I -- what you will put up with, before life. They all had lived. They all had sinned. They all had charges already of congregations, and churches, you see, or of courts, law courts, and so -- would -- any discussion in the Middle Ages between Thomas Aquinas and -- and his students was on a different level from what it is now in Manhattan College. I mean, I have heard these boys there talk about God and scholastic philosophy, just to vomit. Same as in Union Seminar. You can't discuss with -- God Almighty with a -- with a man who never had a congregation, never was in charge of souls. He doesn't know how s- -- desperate people are.

The university in the Middle Ages, gentlemen, and today is a conglomeration of various schools. Because in a university we have a -- one -- not one school, but a number of schools represented, fighting each other. In a university of the real, so to speak, type, as in Paris in the Middle Ages, for example, in the 13th century, as I said, it is -- doesn't exist in America. There is no university in America. The principle of a university is that a student is exposed to teachers who teach the opposite. Now that was not done in antiquity. In a Platonic school, you couldn't teach Aristotelianism. You had then to go to another school. You had to leave one and go to the other.

The limitations, gentlemen, of paganism is that the human mind remains impenetrable to each other, that one person does not -- is -- is not a brother with the man who has the opposite opinion. Opposition is not, you see, digested into a symphonic offer in -- in antiquity. It's the -- Christianity which says that the Holy Spirit can reconcile enemies. You have to love thine enemy before you can have a university. Because in a university today, you can have a pragmatist, and you can have a Platonist, and you can have an Aristotelian in the same faculty, you see. And you, as the -- as their student, are exposed in one week, you see, to the opposite teaching of Mr. Mandelbaum and myself. There's -- would be the beginning. It isn't quite the same, because you can here in this college evade it. In -- in a university you would be forced to confront, and to undergo the -- the influence of opposite schools.

(Well, isn't the Platonic dialogue just -- set up like -- for the purpose of a { } a university?)

You see that this isn't true from Aristotle. He had to leave. He had to set up his own school. Plato tried to squeeze the lemon, to exploit the previous schools. But the result was final. That is, the way the dialogues were set up meant that you couldn't go back to Pythagoras, you see, but he would profit from what was valid in Heraclitus or Pythagoras and then lay down the law that the Platonic school would be based on these and these conditions, like the ideals, you see.

(Wasn't the -- wasn't Socrates in the dialogues { } of { }?)

Well, { } winner. Socrates is defeating his -- his opponent. I told you that the only real dialogue in the modern sense is The Symposium, because the various contributions are left standing, you see. But they aren't left standing in the other dialogues. One is made a fool. And he's refuted.

Oh, no. No. That's very definite. You see then -- from the history of Greek philosophy, after the Academy, you see, existed, every one who -- who had a new principle broke away. They had to. The Stoa, as they -- Zeno was the most peaceful citizen you could have in Athens. He lived in Athens, you see, Aristotle. And you had three schools instead of one. If you -- a university had existed, obviously, you see, the three would -- would have remained or gone together as one. You were either one or the other.

That's why there is no progress in Greek -- in Greek science, you see.

Greek science stagnated and just ended in nothingness. The Greeks have had

every idea that a man can have in any field of human endeavor, in history, in language, in -- in -- in -- in -- in -- in sci- -- botany, in zoology, in genetics, even. You find--in atomic theory--you find in physics, chemistry, and so on not one great principle that the Greeks have not uttered. Eratosthenes said already, as you well know, that the earth was turning around the sun. That was well known in antiquity as a possibility. But it wasn't followed up. It wasn't fought out. That was an idea. And there was another idea. And what was thought -- taught in one school, and the other was taught in the other. And when the school folded up, it was forgotten.

By and large, the mental stage in America, where also you have the most wonderful fireworks in every generation. You have had here the Millerites, and the Social- -- Oneida Socialists, and the Put- -- Putney people, and if you follow the -- the -- through the list of social reformers in this country, it's a complete list. And nothing has come of it. Absolutely nothing. It's the greatest wasteland there is, is America, with regard to ideas. Because every year somebody else -- tries a very good idea. But then they say, "Oh, that was yesterday," and that's finished it, you see. Americans will only believe a thing of tomorrow. And if you say that the same was sai- -- told yesterday, although it is perfectly true, it's not good enough to be repeated. You are too impatient.

So in this country you have a little bit the Greek situation in the -- in the sense that not the -- the Greek science, gentlemen, has had all the problems, but it had not the perseverance. It did not carry the thing through. Eratosthenes' doctrine, that the earth towned a- -- turned around the sun, you see, the whole planetary system, wasn't followed up. If -- when Christ came, the whole Greek science was a quagmire of possibilities, of potential ideas, you see. And no system of carrying it through, of hashing it out, of perseverance. The indictment against Greek philosophy is not that it was wrong, gentlemen, but it had no virtue; it had no character; it had no means of sacrificing, you see, sufficiently in time and devotion, you see, to master the thing. You can say that the Greek mind worked to perfection, but it had no seat in reality. And that is the essence of the Greek school of philosophy, gentlemen. A university is anchored in the lifeblood of the people. It brings, for example, forth clergymen, judges. The Greek Academy didn't do that. It was not a preparation for professions, but it was a leisure class, who stood up outside the polis. And I've tried to show -- tell you time and again that the Greek mind is predicated on the fate of the Greek polis. That it went outside the polis, but it couldn't return {inward}.

So perhaps you take this sentence simply down: that a school and a university, whatever they are today, are part and parcel of the community. An

academy and a Greek school of philosophy remain outside the community. Therefore they neither undergo the degradation of a school, by which it is compulsory training of known content, nor do they have the greatness of a Christian adventure where enemies -- mental enemies, people who -- who simply would like to scratch their eyes mutually out of their head, you see, stick it out together in free debate, you see, in -- in -- in -- in enmity, in real enmity, mental enmity, you see. But stay together, because they know that the truth is not in one side only, but it must be in -- in the conflagration of both. The Greeks remain or step outside the city, and therefore they have the advantage of giving grownup people a real battleground for their minds. But they cannot find the way back into the city. They cannot force the mayor, and the selectmen of the town, and the ministers of the cabinet, and so on -- to have everybody who wants to become a mayor, or a priest, or a general in -- or a judge in the town to undergo this training, you see, as in a school. Can you see the -- the outsideness of the Greek school of philosophy?

That gives them, of course, the -- the freelance character, the freshness, the -- in a way, the -- the greatness, the character of a place for adults. Because as soon as you make it a requirement, you know what happens of course to such a thing. It is degraded into a mere school. Well, we help each other -- have had -- out so far in the West, in the western world as the heirs of the Greeks, that we have split the schools of philosophy, of antiquity into two things: schools for the young, you see, and universities for the real battle of minds.

But so far, gentlemen, in America, you are still finished when you are a controversial person. In Europe, that's a recommendation. You are courted every place because you are controversial, you see. But Mr. Oppenheimer hardly kept his job in Princeton, because he's controversial, you see. That's a recommendation in a university. In America, which is -- lives by the Stevensons, I mean the secretary of war from Yale, by the people who never have a -- you see, say anything. You know how Mr. Stevens became secretary of war. You have heard the story? Well, he said to himself that he had managed in Yale never to utter an opinion -- express an opinion during the four years he was in college, and that he therefore became -- a successful man. That's America.

I had lunch with a boy, gentlemen, a few days ago. And the boy said to me, "Professor, it's so nice"--he's a senior--"it's so nice to have lunch with you. It's the first time in four years in this college that I can speak my mind."

I was very much ashamed to hear that, I mean, for my -- the place in which I am condemned to -- to be. Such a nest of lies { }, if he could say this. If

even one man can say this, and if he could think that this was the behavior required from him in this place. I don't understand it. Can you understand it? Would anybody help me, how a man could say such a thing? How can he stand it? Why didn't he go away? Do you understand it? Can anybody explain this to me?

(Social pressure, I suppose. Don't you think?)

Ja, but what do -- would you kindly? -- I'm so stupid. I hear this word often. But what does it mean?

(Well, it means the pressure of having a so-called American respect for the { } parents, where the father expects his son to go through college. And if his son hates college -- whether he likes it or not, he still feels, because he's been brought up in a certain way, he feels obligated to go through with it, no matter whether he hates it or not. That's the way { }.)

So that he already comes here with a kind of aloofness and -- and says, "It is nothing in my life." Is that right? The -- you see, your explanation is probably valid. But I wouldn't call it "social pressure." It's a -- it's -- it's a little more complicated, isn't it -- don't you think? Ja?

(Sir, I think "obligation" may be the important word. The attitude generally seems to be one of obligation; that is, there are a set of regulations, there are exams, and meeting places, requirements, deadlines, and so forth. These -- these one does out of a sense of duty, responsibility, because it's imposed. But this destroys almost the real sense of love that one can have in -- in studying. And in -- { } more free contact with { }. So the approach is one of obligation, rather than love, and I think that's --.)

Well, I think your -- our examination system is at fault. You cannot -- get up love if it is constantly interrupted by these deadlines, what you call "deadline." As I said, I was very privileged in a -- in a university in Europe. You pass your final exam, your doctor's thesis, or what- -- or what is, you see, and that's only a very little of an exam. It's -- you -- it's nothing. You write a book. That's what I -- that is your own, after all, your own creation, your own --. So that's not an exam in your sense of the word, because you make your own contribution. And otherwise I haven't been examined. And I still alive. Ja?

(Where else -- where else can you go? In other words, what other alternatives are open for you? If you're going out to get an education, you want to go

to a place where -- that you will have, so to speak, best teachers available for you -- in the overall sense, where you can ask what questions you want to ask, where you can -- it's an idea of -- of having sacrificed something in order -- in order to further yourself in the best way that you see available. And that -- for instance, Dartmouth, or Princeton, or Yale, or any of these universities, while they do have their limitations, they do have certain aspects that are impractical as far as really furthering your learning ultimately. Still, you have to put up with these in order to -- go there and listen to these -- to the -- your teachers.)

Ja, but this boy said he had never said an honest word about his inner workings -- the inner workings of his mind. That has nothing to do with your mind. I side with you. That's probably the situation. And it's a good one. But for this boy, it had turned to poison, because he hadn't made use of this situation at all. Isn't that true? You see, I -- I'm driving further. I'm -- that's the starting point, your situation. But this boy says to me, as a senior after three and-a-half years in college, that he hadn't had a reason or an opportunity to speak his mind to anybody, and he was -- it was very refreshing to do so with me.

(But wouldn't that be saying, no ma- -- regardless of where he went to school? I don't think that -- I don't think that Dartmouth in itself { }.)

No, I'm speaking of all your schools. Of course. I have no axe to grind here. This col- -- this place isn't any worse than any other place.

(So what I'm saying -- I'm not -- I'm not defending -- I'm not defending the college. The college isn't the issue I'm raising here, just --)

No, but this boy's remark. Can you explain it to me? We are concentrating not on your remark, of which there is no doubt, you see. I have no -- no criticism of your stay- -- standpoint. But this boy had a different viewpoint, didn't he? Because how can you live through three and-a-half years? I mean, to speak your own mind is only part of life. -- If you want to receive opinions and convictions from somebody else, your contribution, of course, is that you open up yourself.

(But you -- you said -- you said you felt ashamed for the school, for the environment. And that -- I wouldn't -- it's not -- it's not that so much, as -- because I would think the boy, regardless of what environment he'd be in, would have this same problem.)

Well, but if even one man out of 3,000--and obviously he is not the only

one, but let's take one man--can get an impression that this is a place where you are not expected to speak your mind, there must be something very -- very wrong. Please.

(I think there's practically no place in the world where if you haven't got a little guts, it isn't hard to speak your mind. And so whether you're in Dartmouth College, or you're at Leipzig, doesn't really make much difference. So -- it's going to be hard. And this person's experience -- experiencing just as much trouble as he would anywhere else. { }.)

Ja?

(Professor Huessey, I think there are justifications in all this. First of all, I think the first big question might be { } himself, as you just stated. Second of all, I think the justification for the deadlines and the exams we take -- you yourself have said that a man must learn to follow before he can lead. I think you can apply that equally as well to learning. I don't think the average person that graduates from high school in the United States, being brought up under that philosophy is able to come to college and to study in a free system which you have described, at least not the first few years -- perhaps after that. And even at Dartmouth, they can if they want to, like getting into some of the seminar courses, and into their major work. I know I've come in contact with it. But I don't think I would have been able to handle it personally in my first year at the school and get the benefit out of it that I should have.)

Ja?

(Isn't that the -- the -- perhaps the problem of the -- of the -- of the speaker, that he must have a -- a listener for everything that he has to say? And most of the listeners in -- in Dartmouth -- Dartmouth College or any other college are somewhat -- represent the -- the -- a cult of mediocrity where -- where -- ?)

Ja, but this boy must have felt that he has to do with the informers. I mean, much worse. I mean, why -- if I don't say my -- my truth, it must be because I'm afraid that something happens to me. Please.

(Well, perhaps this fellow you talked to had heard of the senior at Princeton, who was one of the people responsible for getting Alger Hiss, a very controversial figure, to speak at Princeton last year, and because of what he did with this Alger Hiss business, he's now a -- on the American Legion Known Subversive List. And he's { } -- and he's a -- I believe this fellow is going to the

Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs and Politics. He's probably going to try and get a job in the state department. And this would be very tough, seeing this man is not a subversive.)

Mr. {White}, a moment. Here were some people who wanted to say something. Please, will you raise your hands again? I -- Mr. Mandaville, you had talked already once, so I wait. Ja?

(Perhaps this boy hasn't found any professors --)

What?

(Perhaps this boy hasn't found many professors who are interested in listening to what he has on his mind. I -- I know of many that I { } going home, not much else. Perhaps -- education is a two-way affair, not only on the part of students, but on the part of the professor, too. And { } professor { } interested in a class in going home.)

Oh, it is my great interest that you should go home. Yes, it is.

Now Mandaville.

(I was just wondering -- it might be that it's very basic -- comp- -- the idea of competition. You said that -- that the -- the school must -- must be in a -- in a sort of -- of a -- a leisure time. But the way people come to school in the United States { }, and probably in most of the European schools, too, they come to the school with the idea of competition. This is only enhanced by exams, and -- and competition to get into the school, and everything. And once you can't -- you can't study leisurely, because you're so busy competing with others that you're worried about competition more than studying leisurely and spending your time at your own pace and learning { } things.)

Ja, it comes down again to this question of ex- -- the exam as exhibit of -- of your studies. I still think the curse in this country is the exam system. I think it's an absolute mistake.

(Don't you have the exam system in Europe?)

Well, I told you. I haven't been -- I went from my fifth year to my seventh year to school -- high school, Gymnasium, then I went to the university. And in -- when -- then I took my doctor's degree, you see, the law. And that was the

first time that I had an oral exam.

(But today, if you go to the University of Paris, or to {Rome}, don't you { }.)

Same -- same. Oh no, oh no, oh no, Sir. Well, nobody goes to the classes anyway, there. No, they don't. I mean, out of 20,000 students of the law school in Paris -- a friend of mine who's just taught there. I have a friend who was called there to teach a year in Paris, in the Sorbonne. He thought it was great honor. He came back disgusted. Was an American. And he said, "Out of 20,000 enrolled students in the law school in Paris, 350 attend the lectures. And 4,000 come off and on into the school." They have such a small building, that if the 20,000 all came, they couldn't possibly. He said he would never teach at the Sorbonne again. It's an absolutely corrupt place. Yes, perhaps in Lausanne, it's different, yes.

What is it?

(No, { } even in Paris, if you want to enter the university, you have to take an exam.)

What?

(You have to take exams to enter the university.)

Well, that's like College Board, yes. Yes.

(Well, it's a little harder than that.)

Well. This I'm -- I'm not arguing the -- I'm -- argue the point of thinking that you can know a man through constant examining his mind and thereby stopping his growth, because any exam, you see, is after all, a little finite segment of knowledge. And it is not right. Knowledge is not a staircase. That's the idea -- the mechanical idea of learning. But it is falling in love with a subject and expanding from a first nucleus of knowledge which you know, by constantly assimilating related things, which come into your knowledge either through textbooks, or through life, or through -- newspaper articles. If I take the fields, gentlemen, of which I am keeping track -- there are quite a number of fields--like the classics, like history, like the law, like philosophy, and like theology--of which I am, in a certain way, to this day a specialist. And I have kept now for the last 50 years up with the development in these fields. Whether I

read a report in a -- in a newspaper, or in a magazine, or in a new book, or -- heard a lecture, I have my -- my files, and I will those sub- -- topics in which I am interested, will be in evidence there, you see, wherever my experience is, whether I travel in the West and make an experience there about water supply, or -- or moose, or something, it all is quite -- I'm quite indifferent to my source of information, you see. And I'm not drawing my information from the idea that I have to render the account by examination to somebody, who can only ask what is printed in a textbook. The terrible thing that happens to you through examinations is -- in my mind, that you really think that the textbook contains what you should know in this field. Obviously, that's just purely accidental, such a stupid textbook. What you should know in this field is what this field requires to be known, which is partly human experience. A sunset, or astronomical {factors}, you cannot learn from a textbook only. But you have to watch -- observe the stars yourself.

Now today, you all undergo this examination thing without ever having your classroom studies, and all the full range of your experiences in sport, in politics, in family affairs meet, because it isn't required. In an exam, the teacher has no right, you see, to draw on the wider range of -- of knowledge than the one compressed in this little textbook. Now that falsifies the whole matter. It seems to you that you only know the subject matter through the textbook. And therefore, the whole subject matter gets a stilted, you see, character, wouldn't you agree? If it -- you say you know only poetry from a textbook on poetics, you see, then obviously the paper you will write on -- on poetics will be very stilted and very stultifying, indeed. Where- -- whereas you should, of course, have 90 percent of your impressions by reading poetry, and then get a little help, 10 percent at best, from a textbook on poetry. See the difference?

It's the same with Shakespeare. What does it help me that you are made to read Hamlet in class, if you don't read voluntarily 35 of the 36 plays of Shakespeare yourself, or go to -- go to plays -- places -- theaters where they are played? The course on Hamlet is silly, because it is -- is -- is isolated. It's like the sulfuric element, the copper element in the sulfuric bath, without the sulfuric bath. You can't have electricity if you haven't the fluid, and the -- and the copper, you see, getting together and creating the current. The textbook is at best the copper element, in the whole electrifying process of the -- your own mind. And -- and all -- what I'm -- why I'm so dead against exams is that it -- they -- they breathe the illusion that what is required knowledge is the textbook knowledge. But the textbook knowledge is only 10 percent of the knowledge. In every field, by the way. In every field.

What does it help you that you take a course in history if you do not read up your -- voluntarily an autobiography, or the letters of John Quincy Adams, or the -- or -- or -- or documents all yourself, because you are interested in it? And then you go to a course that integrates the -- all this, and covers those things for which you had no occasion to study yourself, you see. That's how a decent person studies history. But you go to Mr. {Gisely} and think that's what history is all about. You are all wrong.

(I want to answer your question about --.)

And by the way, I was 15 when I did my studying in this manner in Europe, because you were left free. I have never thought that my history teacher could teach me history. That's impossible. I was very much, of course, ablaze with -- with historical interest. I would get anecdotes from older people. I would read letters, and biographies, collect works, read documents; and then the teacher could just give the skeleton. Of course, that's -- is a great help. And so in every -- I mean, I think any mech- -- man who works in gadgets -- is a gadgeteer does the same in physics. Who is a good physicist? Obviously the man who steps out and has his own laboratory -- lab a little bit. Isn't that true? And so he knows certain things, whether the textbook says it or not. He just knows how the radio works. And I -- the terrible thing is that you don't cope with the same manner with the humanities as you certainly do in chemistry and -- and physics. Americans are -- have the know-how there. You know how a motor runs. You haven't to wait for the professor of physics to tell you this. But why is that d- -- different from all other -- in all -- in -- in these examined courses, where you really think it's the textbook which tells you the whole story? It never does. Is -- is the textbook is only a -- a cramming device.

Ja, please. Anything?

(What -- what about the problem of the -- in America, which I don't think they have in Europe. In Europe, a very few -- percentage of people went to college. And among the people who went to college were the people who went to college were interested in learning for itself. What do you with -- in America, where you have this idea of mass education, and where a student who might not be gifted in understanding on his own, Shakespeare, who might not be able to just -- or would never be led by his American background to pick up Hamlet, and --)

Put them in the administration of the college. There they can't do any harm.

Ja?

(About what you said about the exam, the deadline period is true. But I was just wondering, is it necessarily the device of the exam that creates the trouble, or is it the attitude behind the course, and the way it's given. Couldn't -- wouldn't it be possible to have examinations in the course with the grade depending on them necessarily, and still, with the proper attitude, along with the teaching of the course, bolster a feeling in the person taking it, that he could continue on with his education in that course, regardless of the fact that his instruction has stopped?)

My dear man. I fully agree. I think that as -- as all these mechanics, they are below the belt, so to speak. -- One shouldn't much talk about them. An exam is something, which if it is handled rightly, that -- doesn't have to have problems. I think it has now reached proportions of importance, by which the teacher is just disenabled to get beyond it. You see, the -- I had -- the greatest defeat in Dartmouth College I ever have suffered is when I had a class like yours, in a different course it was; it was a smaller class. And we agreed that the fruits of this course would appear 10 years later. At best. Then they would know what they -- what it meant in their own lives. And they all wrote down their names, and they said, "In 10 years, we'll all meet." And not one of them has shown up. They took their exam, and they left. And therefore, I feel that -- that I'm right to complain that the exam, has not, you see, is not in the right salient -- in the right--how would you say it?--at the right height of your vision. You see, it isn't something you can keep under, here down below. But it is the highest aim. And then the story ends.

I don't know what to do about this. But I think the exam has -- is given mutually by all the people, you see, such a tremendous expression by the administration, such a tremendous importance. It is something -- that -- that has absolutely -- can be handled as an in- -- in an innocuous manner. That's why I'm going to repeat the question of my term paper in the final exam. And I'll let you know it ahead of time. You just have to know a little bit about another school of thought. And I -- and otherwise you'll bring the {Freeman} to class, and nothing more is asked, but that you have had some understanding during this course. So I -- I don't think examinations should be surprises, either. That's why everybody can use his notes, and -- in all my courses, as you may know. And because I feel I can perhaps diminish the damage done by exams, by making them less important -- less formal, you see, { } and less important.

Perhaps we -- we -- since we have been discussing -- perhaps you can stand my taking up the thread now without a break, is that right? Can you stand it?

Will you then kindly -- as a -- as the result of this -- of this di- -- discussion still note that the word "school" in antiquity is not a name for children, and it is not a name -- it is not yet the achievement which we have reached in modern times by following the Christian principle of making ene- -- inimical minds stand, so to speak, the strain, the stress of being put together for one progress of thought. The Greeks have not known progress--that's now my second point--because of their lack of a university. Plato's doctrine remains the same from 387 B.C. to 529. If you were a Platonist, you were a Platonist. You could leave the school and go to another school, you see. But gentlemen, you must understand that the mind of Greek philosophy is miraculous, because every philosopher came out of the head of Zeus like Athene, as a finished product. Paganism, gentlemen, does not know the interpenetration of human people. In our present day, gentlemen, we assume -- and you do it quite -- I think naïvely, or perhaps -- perhaps you don't, because we are on the way back to paganism at this moment really, a danger for it. But hundred years ago, Emerson, for example, knew that a woman contained in a -- herself also the understanding of a man. And a man underst- -- contained the understanding of a woman, that our soul was polymorph, was richer than our physical layout, and therefore, a university is a very modern and Christian idea, that we can harbor many other people's minds sympathetically within ourselves, you see, and argue with them; and let them stand, and know that the single mind is not wide enough for the wealth of creation, and the profundity of the divine wisdom.

This is the condition of what you call "progress." And since you naïvely believe in progress, you always look into history, progress. But gentlemen, Chris- -- progress has not existed before the Christian era. Progress in science is unknown in Greece. The Greeks made no progress in science, but they had any number of -- of--how do you call it?--sparks of genius, of Promethean discoveries, here brilliant pla- -- flash of insight. The -- the Greek civilization is flashy in a very positive sense, because as I said, all these flashes together are like a kaleidoscope of everything possible. But nothing was followed up. The Greeks believed not in progress, gentlemen, but they believed in cycles. They believed in the eternal return, eternal recurrence. You must know this, gentlemen, because you believe that there is no difference between paganism and Christianity. And I assure you there is. We have been able to give rebirth to the Greeks' mind. The Renaissance is a Christian idea, because there is no enemy, no cannibal who cannot come and get a revival for the best that is in him, in the Christian era.

You must always understand that the Renaissance of Greece and Rome is a Christian achievement, because they could not give rebirth to Persian, or to Babylonian, or to Jewish things, you see. Not even to their own. Homer was thrown out by Plato, as you have heard, you see.

We can give rebirth to anything pre-Christian. If you could understand the difference between the renascence -- the Renaissance -- what we call the Renaissance, and Plato himself, you would understand that the fact that we teach Plato in a Christian era, you see, in a liberal arts college, is a Christian feat. Because we take a pagan to heart and say, "He's still good enough for us," you see, "to look into everything that is valid -- valid in him. And we will omit slavery, we will omit homosexuality, we will omit, you see, women's -- women's degradation. We will omit all the stupidities and follies in Plato. We will still treasure him. He'll become a Christian saint. We will make him, you see, a member of our era."

Can you understand that this, no Greek could have done in his school? Because the -- Plato's school had to kept -- be kept even free from Aristotle. And people do not understand this. All the books -- textbooks on Greek philosophy which you read today in this country are of this bottomless naïveté that they think the Greeks would have had a renaissance of Greece, you see, the Greeks spirit. It couldn't. The Greeks cannot give free rebirth to something that is passé. We can. We can squeeze out even -- the juice out of Eskimos, and of -- and primitive people today. We have anthropology today, because we have a respect for these people. We want to find out what kept them going. And this is our era, gentlemen, this freedom of not repeating the performance.

You know there are the -- these -- these cyclical obsessions today with us. Mr. Spengler is such a Greek, who has written a book in modern times as though we were all Greeks again; and we had to go inevitably through the same cycles as the Greeks. He has a book, *The Decline of the West*. You have heard of it, haven't you? The same is true of Mr. Toynbee. Toynbee and Spengler, despite -- Mr. Toynbee's pious exhortations to the opposite, that he is some Christian, he has not an idea what Christianity is, not the slightest idea. The first thing about Christianity is that everything is free, available--if it has been any good--from former civilizations, and that we keep going by freely grafting upon our own tree of life anything we like from others. We have this free selective power. Mr. Toynbee is to me -- I mean, he's much more stupid than Spengler. Spengler was a genius, a pagan who wanted to be a pagan. He had the pride of his convictions. Mr. Toynbee always goes down on his knees and says, "I'm -- really, I pray on Sundays. Only on weekdays I -- am I a pagan."

I -- I hate this. This is imbecile, and it is a coward -- a coward's attitude. It's mental timidity. He doesn't -- he wants to have it both ways, you see: be a Christian on Sundays, and a -- and a pagan on weekdays, because his 23 civilizations are just completely chained, you see, to a cycle. Up and down, and up and down, and out it goes. Madness, even. But Mis- -- Spengler, it is great. He -- I talked to Mr. Spengler, and he -- he admitted. I said, "How can you know anything about the Greeks? According to your principles, we are all in our own cycle. The Greeks thought this way. We have the -- the -- our own humanities now, you see, so we are doomed to go through our cycle. That's what you say."

"Yes," he said. "That's what I say."

And I said, "Now then, how do you know that anything you write about the Greeks is true? You only sit in your own little ivory tower as of today"--1918 it was--"and therefore the Greeks are just a sealed book to you, are they not? You say that's a different civilization. How do we understand the Greeks?"

He said, "You got me there. That's a secret. It's a paradox. I don't understand it myself. But I am convinced that I understand the Greeks."

And I said, "I am, too." But that's why you misjudge your own time, because we are fortunate, you see, in understanding ourselves and another time. The Greeks didn't. And didn't have to. Didn't even try to.

(Sir, perhaps Mr. Spengler -- he -- he -- he doesn't think that the Greeks are in a different cycle from the cycle that we're in.)

Oh yes, totally different. Yes. Every thousand years. Oh, no, no, no, no.

Oh -- {Mr. Danby, Mr. Danby}, oh no, my dear man, oh no, no, no, no. You see, he has the {hellastocracy} -- you haven't read this book yet, have you? Oh, better do. Very good book.

No, the story's very simple. Roughly speaking, it's not quite { } 3,000 -- 300. That's our own time. That he calls this the occidental, the Occident -- occidental civilization. That's the oriental -- he calls it in order to -- he hates Christianity, so he calls it the "arrogant civilization." Nothing of Christianity, just "arrogant." That he calls the Greek. And then he calls the {salatocracies}. He means the -- the sea-faring people. He has this word from a phrase in the Egyp-

tian monuments, where the -- the sea peoples came and invaded Egypt, you see, the Phoenicians { }, covering the whole Mediterranean { } Etru- -- the Etruscans.

Well, I won't go into the detail. But the funny thing about the -- Spengler is that it is a total revival of the Greek Academ- -- spirit of the Greek Academy, of Plato. Strictly cyclical. Every thousand years, there is winter, spring, summer, and autumn, or fall. And then it ends. And then begins a new period elsewhere in a different, you see, what he calls the "maternal landscape." And so it hops from place to place. And its absolutely le- -- lawful order in these thousand years you cannot escape. And he said -- I just quoted it yesterday when I -- I said I -- I'm just in Mr. Spengler's position with saying farewell now through this whole year to Dartmouth. Yesterday I went for the last time to bring a final -- the papers for the final examination to Choate House, you know, where they print these deviltries, and -- and now today I go for the last time to -- to read -- proof on this. I'll never do it again. It's wonderful, you see.

And Mr. Spengler -- Mr. Spengler has this famous line -- has never forgotten it. I wrote his -- read his book in 1918 -- -19, and never again. But I still know this -- this sentence. Well, I wrote such a wonderful -- review about it then that I don't have to reread it, Sir. I know all -- everything that is in it.

And he said, "We shall die consciously. And we shall observe every step which leads to our death with deliberation," you see, "and consciousness." So that's what I undergo at this moment, gentlemen. I die consciously and -- to Dartmouth College. And -- and he was so sure that the only thing at the end of such an era we could do -- or he could do was to die consciously. And you know what killed him? It's a very interesting thing. He was a genius. And he had projected the end of our occidental cycle of western man by and large to the year 2200 and 2300. And then, all of a sudden--and I had, by the way, argued this point with him--he saw that the end which he had foreseen for 2300 wi- -- came with Hitler, for Europe. And he saw Hitler. And he saw, by the way, Mussolini. And he saw what quali- -- caliber of man Hitler was. He -- he asked Mr. Spengler to see him -- from vanity, probably. And then he talked two hours, and Spengler couldn't put in one word. And so he died broken-hearted, Spengler, feeling that the military dictatorship, of -- of these last Roman emperors, was upon us, this tyrant -- tyrann- -- this tyrants. And he saw in Hitler the year 2300 being present in 1934. And when he saw this, he saw that the end of his world had come. And it's a great lesson, gentlemen, in eschatology, in ends of the world. Spengler, as an honest man, saw that the -- he was the end of his own time, of his own world. And he died. And he died a very -- I think he was 50.

And I have always -- and a man who dies in his own time I -- commands my great respect. He is in harmony with his own mind. I mean, his mind is his life, his life is his mind. Something you can -- will never achieve, because you have no mind of your own. You have borrowed minds. Every day another.

And a -- a man who is so ingrown into the fate of his civilization that he -- he can even correct his projection, and because he had thought it a -- was still a little off, you see, suddenly seeing himself confronted with this monster from the abyss, he falls into the abyss himself and says, "It's all over. It's -- that's my -- the world I have, so to speak, identified myself with."

And -- so you may be perfectly safe. You are already in the third millennium. You are after Spengler. You see, the world in which we move today, or begin to move is a beginning, gentlemen. It's not an end. It could be for you if you wanted. I have always -- that was the whole point with my contemporaries, with the Thomas Manns, and all these -- Prousts, these philosophers of decadence. I was never interested. I -- I said, "You are right, so I must make a new beginning. I cannot be your contemporary. If you already foresee the end, I can anticipate the end. I can -- what's that to me? I simply assume that you are right. You see, that will run its course. It's over with." And that has saved me. I mean, Mr. Spengler and myself have -- we have very close contact. He's the last. I'm the first. And because I was taught by him. He had done something which had -- doesn't need to be repeated. If one man--the same is true of Proust--if one man jumps into the abyss, *A la recherche du temps perdu*, you see, I can perhaps be on the -- "*A la recherche de temps nouveau*." Why not?

So that the -- this is -- the Greek element, gentlemen, in our civilization has been revived from 1515--will you kindly mark down this year? I give you my reasons for this right away--to Mr. Spengler, to 1917, in an amazing manner, the tradition of Christianity is freedom and progress. The tradition of Greek is cycle. At the very mo- -- last moment of the renaissance of the Greek spirit, in Mr. Toynbee and Mr. Spengler, the -- truth has been reproclaimed of recurrence. Nietzsche has said "eternal recurrence"; Spengler has said "eternal recurrence"; Toynbee has said -- no, he hasn't the same expression, but it is -- "multiplication of the same." Now gentlemen, it is your choice: are you Greeks or are you not? Christianity today is threatened by an increase of Greek influence, because the primary problem of the Greek spirit has been its evasion of progress, its con- -- its -- its having to believe in cycle. It's very strange why these philosophers had to -- because they started with a question of space, with matter, with the cosmos, with the physis, you see, at the end. Physis is the same all the time. It's always -- you cannot explain--if you begin with physis--the creation of newness, you see.

You cannot. You must begin with God. Only God can create new things. If you do not begin with logos --. And Heraclitus was the last who began with logos, really, you see. All the others transformed logos into something physical. Even the ideas are just somewhere, you see, things in eternity.

So gentlemen, in 1550, Erasmus of Rotterdam--you have heard perhaps this man's name--is the greatest revival of Gre- -- reviver of Greek. He -- published the New Testament in the Greek language in Europe, and made it as -- the condition of the ministry to know Greek. That's the cradle of Chri- -- of Protestantism, the knowledge of Greek and Hebrew. This man, Erasmus of Rotterdam, made inaugural speech at the University of Basel, when he was made a professor there. And he said -- had an invocation. And you'll remember that I said to you, the invocation and the dedication are part of any man's philosophy just as much as the content of the book. You remember Lucretius? Now I come back to this. And I want to show you today why we no longer understand quite what a school and an academy, or a university is. Mr. Erasmus invoked there Socrates and called him "Sancta Socrates." Saint Socrates. He made Socrates into a Christian. And he said, "Socrates is as good a Christian as any Christian." Now the Greeks, including Socrates -- gentlemen, have not believed in progress. They have not believed--and they have not succeeded--that, for example, the death of Socrates is the fruit of a new life, resurrection. They have practiced it, but they had never this tenet. As you know, I told you that Socrates taught men how to die, you see, but Jesus taught mankind the meaning of death. That's something very different. The fruit of -- you see, the fruitfulness of dying.

And the Sancta Socrates, gentlemen, is the first word of the Greek renaissance. And with the word "Sancta," he gave the pre-Christian Greeks a status of sanctity in the heavens, so to speak, of Christianity, you see. Now all saints are progressive. Any saint has made a contribution which has renovated, regenerated, added to life. We know from every saint a way of life which had -- before hasn't existed. Otherwise he isn't a saint. Otherwise he's just an imitating, so to speak, of a saint. A saint is a man who discovers one more salubrious ways of life.

Now Mr. Erasmus has made you believe, through the Renaissance, that the Greeks can be adopted as children of our era. In the year 1917, gentlemen, when the World War led to the destruction of the whole old world, to the Balkanization of Europe, under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, when all the order of the old world was destroyed, and is -- out of kilter as it is to this day --

look at the Near East; well, what is the question? We destroyed the Ottoman Empire and we put nothing in its place. That's the Near East. What is there is nothing. You call them "states." But Mr. Mandaville will not make me believe that Saudi Arabia is a state or a nation. I told you -- we talked about this. Never shall I believe it, because it isn't. It is just a -- bankruptcy, a rec- -- a mass of countries in receivership. So when we destroyed this, gentlemen, we abolished the hope for progress. We abolished the hope for progress, because the only centers for progress are -- well, are places with universities. The Near East has no universities. Cairo is not a university, gentlemen. It is a s- -- world of superstition. Saudi Arabia has no university. If you want to have a nation, you see, you must have a center of self-criticism in it. You remember what we said about the Academy? That it was a center of self-criticism. Without such a center of self-criticism, you can't have progress.

Now you see perhaps the -- the sudden importance of the return of the academy into the city, into the polis, into the nation, into the state. Without this return of the critical -- the Greek spirit, you see, in to the political order, it has no effect. It is useless. And now -- we have now any number of barbarous countries like Indochina, and Malaya, and Egypt, and a -- Saudi Arabia, you see, where this doesn't exist. And we cannot treat these countries like normal countries of our description, you see, because their conditions of self-improvement are -- are lack- -- missing, you see. No separation of Church and state. No separation, you see, of higher criticism and political power.

So gentlemen, the mystery of the -- the reason why the -- the -- the -- this course in the history of Greek philosophy is -- is necessary is to warn you at this moment, that the reception, the renaissance of the Greek mind has run its course to such an extent that we now are endangered by its reception, because unnoticed, and uncriticized, there has slipped in -- into your mind the idea of cyclical thinking. You are poisoned by Mr. Toynbee, and by many others, by the business cycle men before, by all the -- cycle creatures, gentlemen, and all the prophets of doom, that--the Malthusians, by the way, too, and such people--that man is simply in a rut, that he is in a vicious circle, that everything returns. As soon as you believe in eternal recurrence, the renaissance of the Greek mind, the reception of the Greek mind, the re-adoption of the Greek mental figures of thought have reached a saturation point. And I feel I have to show you this, that we have, from 1550 to 1917 increasingly -- increasingly let our -- how do you call those -- let down your -- bar- -- barriers --?

(Guard.)

Well, let down our -- well, there's a techni- -- technical's term. Let down our -- our -- wie? our protection -- I mean, our protective palisades, or what- -- however you call it -- wie? down against the invasion of the pagan spirit of the pre-Christian era. The Christian era is the first era that has said, "Man does not have to return to his starting point. He can go forward." Every other era--take China's, or take Buddha--is -- are convinced that everything returns, you see. Buddha returns every 500 years, you see. The emperor of China was the same all the time for the -- 4,000 years. We don't believe this. We don't believe in the return of the native. And -- or do we?

This is -- that's why you are in such great danger, gentlemen. You fall for all these new things, like Spengler, not knowing that you therefore simply relapse into antiquity, into the Greek spirit, into the Greek Academy, which doesn't -- didn't love the -- their enemies. We know -- or you should know that America can only survive by loving Russia. That is, by learning from Russia, by accepting all the -- possibly, you see, incentives from -- from Russia. The -- world is too narrow to exclude anything from influencing us and from getting us -- awake. You cannot shut up, you see, and -- and say, "I'm not interested in what's going on there," because God has put the enemy, the devil, as our spur into our flanks. And we -- we don't deserve to exist if we flee our fellow man. He has something, you see, because he's part and parcel of the same family. We cannot get out of the human family. That's the condition of progress. It's very serious, gentlemen. Against everything we sin at this moment in this country.

And that's why the story of Greek philosophy at this moment is at a critical point. I want to sh- -- to announce--we'll study this further on in the next meeting--that the saturation point of your acceptance, of your renaissance of the Greek spirit has -- has come, because you now absorb Greek doctrines without recognizing them as Greek. I have to teach you Greek philosophy for the reason that you must know what is Greek and what is not Greek. If I left -- if you wouldn't listen to this course, you see, you would accept Mr. Spengler as a modern thinker, as a progressive thinker, as a last, you see, novelty, like Mr. Toynbee, or Nietzsche, or any- -- or Proust. And I tell you they are re- -- rejets, I think, Mr. {Baylor}, can one say in French, "rejeton"?

(Yes, that's right.)

Wie? How would you explain this?

{{ }.)

Well, perhaps you take down the word as a precious word. I don't think there is in biology or English this word, a reje-ton. You understand what it is? (Regeneration?)

Oh, the opposite.

(Why do you say { }.)

There is an English word. But I can't --

({ }. { }.)

No. You -- you -- you live in a -- you are a member of a family, it's an old family. And suddenly a boy is born, as you can find in old -- in old princely families, who looks like an ancestor of 1500. And that's a reje-ton. That is, is a throwback. Don't you say a --? -- no, not much of a reincarnation. It's a -- less than a reincarnation. It's a reje-ton, Sir. A backthrow. Can't you say "a back-throw"? A throwback?

(Throwback.)

That's what it is, a throwback. Watch out that you don't become throwbacks at this moment into the pagan era. It is perfect- -- as soon as you abdicate the conditions of progress, as soon as you play with the idea of mere cyclical return, in any field of -- whether it's in business, with the business cycle. America went pagan in 1929 in the Republican Party, and they had to do penance for 15 years, because -- they had to, because they were pagan -- they believed that the Depression was necessary. We no longer believe this, gentlemen. We say "to hell with the Depression," don't we? Now gentlemen, that's a conversion in the field of economics to Christianity, because as long as you believe in the business cycle, you believe that a part of human endeavor is under natural, you see, fate, that it is fate, that you can't do anything about it. It's fatalism. Don't you see this?

So the -- the problem of economics today is the problem of Christianity. If you think that you can -- eliminate the law of the cycle, or influence it, you act as a free man. If you say that you have to kowtow to this cycle, you see, you are Greek. But --

[tape interruption]

...of very practical importance, gentlemen, after all. The relig- -- the religion -- all the questions are religious questions, gentlemen. There are no other questions than religious questions. Don't believe in social questions and economic questions. All nonsense. The Rus- -- the Russians have also a religion. That's why they are very important. And that's why they are very dangerous. But the business cycle was the American businessman's arrest of paganism. And he had to shed it in the last 30 years. He has undergone a conversion. And that's why in the '20s, gentlemen, everybody believed in Spengler. Because everybody believed in some part of his anatomy in the cycle, in the business cycle. So it seemed quite possible that what a businessman believed about the Depression...

[tape interruption]

...and he would also be true, you see, with regard to the wider issues of human life. Today, Mr. Spengler has a poor press, because we no longer believe in this pagan element in our -- in our era. But the -- there -- that is the reason, gentlemen, why you must put the history of Greek philosophy as a part of modern history. The penetration of Greek thought, until it threatened to flood us, to overcome our resistance against its main tenet of cycles, you see, goes in the direction that a little comes in 1515 with the exhortation that Socrates might be called a saint, like a Christian saint, was unheard-of, was blasphemy at that time, can imagine. You no longer feel that's blasphemy. Why not, you say? Saints, you say, are cheap to you. So -- make Socrates a saint. And -- well, in 1957, the majority of your beliefs is already Greek, again. And that's time then to try to wake up. That's why I wrote this book- -- this pamphlet for you, "The { }." You understand?

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...but we see from -- say, from the first Greek Ionian philosophers to some indefinite progress, then ends abruptly, and then begins again with -- from -- with the glorious awakening of the spirit of antiquity, of science, and now has reached its apogee and climax in you. That is your naïve idea. Here you are, in 1957, and of course, you are so infinitely more clever than the people in 1515, that's progress. So you have two -- this is your picture. This is one cycle. Oh, no -- it's not a cycle, it's going straight this way. But here, this is a cycle. And damn it all--what happened in between?

Gentlemen, at this moment in -- in most rebarbarized countries like America and Germany, the era has disappeared, the Christian era, and people begin to talk first of all about cycles, and then they have abolished the counting from A. -- of A.D. and B.C. Most histories which I read try to erase this. Mr. Toynbee has erased the Christian era; Mr. Spengler, as I told you, has -- is -- nearly erased it; Mr. {Freyer} in Germany, to give another example; Mr. Hendrik van Loon, in his popular history, which is one of the most idiotic books that exists, but has sold over a million copies in this country. And so the mind is poisoned today. And if you look into your own selves, you are not quite sure in which era you live, gentlemen. It isn't so si- -- very simple now to admit that one does live in the Christian era. Very few people have reasons to say so. And the official teachers of philosophy--somebody like my co- -- my colleagues here in this department--would agree with the new slant that there is no reason in -- in important fields to count the years from zero, from the coming of our Lord to today, and say -- they say, "That's -- just superstition." You may of course go with the Jewish calendar, where it makes no difference, where no year changes. Everything is the same here, since the creation of the world. That's one other way of expressing disgust with the Christian calendar. But the Greek story of -- held by most humanists to this day is, that there was every reason to believe that the Periclean Age, and--down to Caesar and Cicero--was on the right track, then people lost sight of reason and fell into the abyss of religion, and so -- we all became superstitious again.

So you see the history of Greek philosophy is the cor- -- course in which this decision has to be made by anybody who -- doesn't want to take a course in college, but -- wants to understand his own time. The history of Greek philosophy must end in some connection with us. Why do we teach this course? This is very central. And most of you, I think, take the course for wrong reasons. And so I have to warn you, that the end of the course of Greek philosophy must lead

you to the awareness: why it ended in Christianity, and why the fathers of the Church could look to the history of philosophy as a great odyssey, a tremendous odyssey in which all the gems in -- pearls in the ocean were found, and fished up, yes; but it was an odyssey just the same. And it ended nowhere. It ended in mere repetition. There came the neo-Platonists; there came the neo-Pythagoreans; there came the neo- -- you see, neo- -- Stoa -- no -- new Stoa, and the new Epicureans, but the -- once the odyssey over the ocean of the mind -- human mind had been done, it was mere, fruitless repetition, and mankind couldn't live on it.

I began last time to reason with you already without saying so, why it had to come to an end. And I tried to tell you that the Greeks themselves believed that they were moving in a cycle. The circular character of Greek thought is that which I want to treat today. Because if I say myself that I move in a cycle, I cannot complain if the cycle is really experienced. And of course, mankind is, at any minute, gentlemen, in danger of moving in a circle, in a vicious circle. The -- progress, gentlemen, is a decision, of cutting the Gordian knot in -- by which we are entangled in a cycle. By nature, gentlemen, we are animals who remain in a cycle. But by our strange task, by the challenge that -- by our destiny, we are not allowed to stay in a cycle. Now your belief in automatic progress has taken it for granted that we shall not fall into a rut, as you call it, which means a cycle, you see. But by now it dawns, I think, on most people that whole nations, like Spain today--perhaps Hungary, now, or perhaps the United States--very well can move -- fall into a cycle.

If you look at a map of the -- Europe and of the earth, you find that more territories belong to areas where man has gone -- lived in a cycle -- in a vicious cycle and -- than the areas covered by -- lived in by groups -- inhabited by groups who have kept going. You look into the Near East, and any Israelite -- in Israeli will tell you that the Arabs are still moving in cycles, circles, and that's the real issue. -- They don't be- -- lead to the same age. All your attempts to be nice with Saudi Arabia--I've tried to tell this Mr. Mandaville--is he here? he is carefully absent--are idiotic. They live in the Stone Age, in -- in Moslem -- age. And Mohammed was a prophet who successfully sealed the tribes of a -- from Greek and Roman civilization. And he has kept his tribes in these -- in this strange circular movement for the last 1500 years. That's the essence of Mohammedism, of Moslem, you see. Great fellow who freed these ancient tribes from magic, from superstition, and the human sacrifice; but on the other hand, forbade them to enter the life of the city, or the life of urbanization, the life of literature, the life of science, and everything else you like, of art; forbid them the arts, as you know. And in every Arab country, and take to -- this Egypt -- this unfortunate

country of Egypt, the only people there who have ever filled any civil service, or any -- any office of medicine, or anything has been the Christian Copts, the 2 million Egypt- -- people in Egypt who did not go Moslem. They are the backbone of Egypt. They are treated as badly as the Jews in America, but they are necessary.

The -- all Moslem are incapable of entering history, because they don't want it. Mos- -- Mohammed has said, "I'm the only prophet. I'm the final revelation. Not one word -- can come after me that's of any importance." As you know, every Moslem has to know the Koran by heart. And that's very bad, gentlemen, to know anything by heart, you see, if you -- because it stymies you. We don't have to know the New Testament by heart. That's why every year the New Testament can happen.

The cycle, gentlemen. I have here a book which I recommend to you. It came out in Holland. It's written by a Mr. {van Groning}. And it's called In the Grip of the Past: Essay on an Aspect of Greek Thought. Essay on an aspect of Greek thought. Now it has so much to do with our problem here, that I thought I should mention this book to you, because it shows you you can, in -- for a very cheap price, and with a very few pages, get access to the thing that's unknown in this country: that the difference between the Christian era and Greece is our relation to the future. In this country, that's all wiped away. And people say, "Oh, you can be a Greek and you can be a Christian." You cannot. You have to take your choice. In February, there will be a -- the visit of a man who's now at Union, also a Dutchman, {Henry Cremer}. He'll teach here, or at least lecture here. I hope he'll -- I hope he'll stay at my house. An old friend of mine. He was a missionary in -- or not a missionary. He was a philologist, as you may say, in the -- in the Dutch East Indies. And he is -- was the man sent by the Dutch in 1945 to the Dutch East Indies, and came back with the report that they would be lost, and was no use fighting for them.

And so he is a very book -- man of the world. But he has written at this -- just this year a very beautiful book on Christianity against humanism, in which he chides these silly people, especially in this country, who think they can reconcile humanism and Christianity. They are irreconcilables, gentlemen, because of the relation of the humanist to the future. The humanist believes in automatic future. And he doesn't believe that the future can only be created by giving up the past. The doctrine of Christianity is that without death, there is no resurrection. And if you don't give up what you have, you cannot gain the future, access to the future. The humanist thinks you can have more and more, and the mind goes just on a promenade, and first looks at one tree, and then he

looks at the next tree. And finally he has all the trees in -- on his mind and in his mind. What he has is confusion, but no life. He has a museum.

If you go to New York, and go to the Metropolitan Museum, then you know--or the Metropolitan Opera, for that matter--then you know what the humanist can do. He can store. Or take the 120 impor- -- most important books, the last desperate effort of humanism in this country. Nobody wants anything -- have anything to do with these 120 -- Great Books anymore, because they have been made a humanist fashion. The Bible has to be read always, gentlemen. It's not a Great Book. It's something quite different. Humanists can only -- is a storehouse of knowledge. Why, gentlemen? And that brings up the rel- -- our relation to time. And of this, I want to say something.

When Aristotle speaks of Greek tragedy, he we- -- has a very strange word which explains to you the riddle of the humanist. You remember that we said there are three positions by which a man is spiritually alive. He has to weigh in these three elements. Now when Pla- -- when Aristotle in the Poetics, writes on tragedy--and it's very significant that one of you has -- has used this sentence in his treatment of Aristotle--he says, "Greek tragedy stopped when it had fulfilled its nature." It stopped. It's a very strange Greek sentence. I'm -- I've jotted it down for you. Who -- has anybody taken Greek? Not one of you. So this will remain Greek to you, too. I'll write it down, just the same. I'll put it in Latin, because it is -- should startle you out of your wits. I don't want to put it in English first. It must be a foreign thought. It is not a Christian, it is not an American thought at all.

Put it this way. "{Tragoedia finita est}"--that's my own translation from the Greek--"{quando { } ipsius naturam}." Are not -- these words are not superfluous. You see already the word "nature," "natura" must appear in its full glory. That's Greek physis, of course. It's a very strange sentence, and it comes from the greatest thinker, the -- the disciple of Plato and of Socrates, at the end of the great center period of Greek thinking. And he says simply, "The tragedy stopped when it had once attained its nature." Will you take this down, please? Poetics, fourth book, 15th paragraph, Page 1449 in the {Stephen Stephanos} edition. Aristotle Poetics, IV, 15.

Now it's a sentence which not, of course, anybody in America who treats the Poetics of Aristotle ever mentions. It's too important for that. Since the idea in this country is that the Greeks must be the same as we, the point where they are farrest away from us must not be mentioned. But this is the point where they are farrest away from us. He -- they say -- it says that tragedy, like anything else,

is a thing of nature, which -- when it comes to itself, it stops. That is, of course, for the -- the famous entelekheia of -- of Aristotle, the idea that we are on this earth to become what we are, to become what we are, you see. "Entelos" -- "ekhein" means -- "entelos" is the goal a man has, his destiny. And the entelechy of Aristotle says the highest man can do is to achieve what he is meant to achieve.

Gentlemen, when you think through these two ele- -- words, "entelechy," to become what I am meant to become, and "the tragedy stopped when it had once attained its nature," you see that the Greeks use the word "logos," use their power of the spirit to carry as many things from ethos into physis, and to look at your own tragedy, that is, the highest accomplishment of the city life, of the community, the Metropolitan Opera, or whatever you take, you see, something civic in any case, and say, "In the light of nature, what is its character?" And so physis in the Greek mind always wins over ethos and as you -- I tried to tell you that since the first days of the Ionian philosophers, the attempt is always to carry the -- experiences, the first impressions, the first experience of the child, you see, into the light of nature, to generalize it there, and to make it -- understandable in terms of physis, in terms of nature. It is this primacy, gentlemen, of physis over logos, or -- and over ethos which leads men to grow discouraged, because if all political action, if the aristocracy, gentlemen, if monarchy, if tragedy is a form of nature, then it must share the fate of all nature; then it has definable contours, you see. A wolf is a wolf, and it cannot become anything else. And a lion is a lion. And if you try to change an ass, you get at best a mule. But the mule cannot procreate, so even the mule is stopped, when you try to mate the -- the -- the donkey and the horse.

Nature is what it is. It is -- can be classified, gentlemen. And the Greek mind ends in classifications. Now, in -- no classification, gentlemen, has any hope for the future. If you can classify the Spanish -- the Hungarian revolution as a "revolution," it will go the way of all the -- flesh of all revolutions. You can't forecast it. Cla- -- things that are of a class, gentlemen, have a circular development. Will you take this down? The cycle is simply the -- the temporary aspect of anything you classify.

Now your whole mind is Greek. It's feverishly active to classify away all your experiences. "This girl? Oh, she's like all other girls. Or -- she's { } like all other girls, but like some other girls." Already that satisfies your imagination. And so I'm "one of the teachers." You have this infamy of telling your -- the best man you meet, "You are one of the most interesting people I have ever met."

Don't you -- know that this is an insult? You classify this man. Instead of admitting that you never have met such a man. That's the only response to a person that it deserves, you see, is -- his satisfaction. You have the af- -- infamy to tell a speaker, Mr. {Gateskill}, "You are one of the most interesting Englishmen I have ever met." It's of course a lie. You have never met an interesting Englishman before. But you say so, because you want to be a Greek. You want not to be found out by something admirable, by the famous { } of which Aristotle speaks when he says that in everything in reality is something to be so admired, so as to be so astounded by, you see, that you lose your speech. You don't want to be left speechless.

Gentlemen, the Greeks didn't want to be left speechless. Anybody who can classify a new event thereby denies that it is new. The whole attempt of the Greek mind was not to -- as yours -- not to be taken in. So you say to the greatest event in -- experience in your life, "It is one of the most interesting experience of my life." In this moment, it has ceased to be any experience, gentlemen. You don't know this. But you are sh- -- riddled with this. I haven't -- still to find a Dartmouth boy who has the courage to say, "I have never experienced this before." Before, you haven't experienced anything. Before, you -- can't -- haven't the courage to say this to yourself. You obliterate, you wipe away the whole {enamel} of the things that are -- you allow to experience, you rascals, by comparing, by always saying, "This -- he's a better lecturer," or "The other is a better lecturer," or "That's a better book than the other." Gentlemen, as long as you do not say that these -- book is unique, and the other book is unique, and that you decline to say which is better, you are a Greek. And you are very stupid. You me -- treat me as nature, and you treat my neighbor as nature, and you treat the girl as nature, and you treat your mother as nature. When Mr. {Bender} asked this incredible question in his questionnaire, "Whom do you love more, your mother or your father?" he's a Greek, you see. They -- they cease to be Mother and Father in this very moment. They are just father and mother in general. But they are no longer your father and your mother. Because about your father and your mother, you know absolutely no quantitative single thing. As soon as you try to know it, they cease to be your father and your mother. And they fall -- fall on the city dump of generalizations.

Now gentlemen, we come nearer to the important truth, gentlemen.

Anything that is my first experience, on -- which I let stand as unique, has value. Anything that can be classified is indifferent, is indifferent. The difference between the two -- realms of experience are of value, of validity, and the other of indifference. More or less indifference. And you are proud of be -- remaining indifferent. That's all you want. That's why you tell even the -- the -- an earth-

shaking experience still is one -- "The Gettysburg Address is just one of the finest or -- speeches ever made." As soon as you say this, gentlemen, you have lost all power to evaluate the -- the Gettysburg Address, you see. The only response to the Gettysburg Address is to burst into tears, which you cannot do, because you never cry with any great emotion. You think that's a -- that's a -- you even think it's a eulogy, it's a praise to call the Gettysburg Address "one of the greatest speeches." But don't you see that it has ceased to be a speech made for you? That as soon as you say, "One of the greatest speeches," it's in a museum, on a tin-can shelf of tomato juice, and orange juice, and other juices, instead of being a speech without which you would not be who you are. Which is the truth of you, gentlemen, that the only thing that is of perhaps some value in you at this moment is that you have heard the Gettysburg Address. The rest is shit, and urine, and dirt. But this -- Gettysburg Address, if it has ever taken habitation in your mind, ennobles you. You are a better man because you know it. So what's your business to -- to classify it outside in physics, in nature? It is a part of your ethos, is it not? It's a part of the first impression out of which your own character is -- is built up.

You see how important now it is to say, "Tragedy stopped when it had reached its nature." That was written in the year of the Lord 340. Alexander the Great was just entering Greece with his conquest of the world. And -- the life of Greece was over. And Greek tragedy no longer formed and produced Platos and Aristotles.

And as -- if you say that tragedy has reached its nature, you see, it is a second impression, because it stands on the tin-can shelf of your library, instead of forming you into a citizen of Athens, or of Greece, or of the world. Can you see the difference? Where this tragedy happens, one is in a second group of the library, or of the college education, you see; and the other is, as I hope you will see when you go to a play, now Romeo and Juliet next week is your own doing--or it's this week, isn't it?--I am looking forward to it. And -- because I'm still made over by Romeo and Juliet. And we made a special effort, my wife will see it in -- in -- in Boston on -- on Wednesday. And I go to Professor Booth's, who's reading, and then we'll see it together on Saturday. So that's the way one should celebrate the power, which I still -- I still have, to be impressed. I'm not a literary critic, fortunately. And I'm not an imitator of the literary critic, as you all are. I'm just a man who wants to be built up by Romeo and Juliet. It's first impression. And it's very difficult to produce in me and my age again this first impression. You have to see it three times in one week to expose myself to real pressure. That's what "impression" is, pressure. You want to

escape the pressure.

And we can say, gentlemen, the treating of anything as nature is an attempt to recede from its immediate pressure. Nature is a second space outside of my immediate necessities. You can see this from the laboratory today, gentlemen. What can you put in a laboratory? Only things which you do not immediately need for your own life. You cannot put the -- into the laboratory and experiment with it the piece of bread which you must eat. That is a first experience, that you must eat. If you have enough bread, you can take away some of this bread and use it in a second realm, you see, as a natural experiment. Therefore, anything you use as nature, gentlemen, is not immediately part of your own existence. You don't know this, gentlemen. You know nothing about nature. But nature is your temptation. It is the sorceress which has bewitched you, so that you think you live in nature, and not in the city of men. Nature is that which the community can afford to experiment with.

That's nature. Will you take down this definition? Nature is that with which the community can afford to experiment with. A physicist is the man -- a henchman, as you see, of the government who now experiments with atomic energy. We allow him this, because we have enough, you see, to live -- immediately. So we allow him to explode the earth. It's very dangerous and we feel a little -- a little hesitant now, because we entrust him so much, of this surplus of the universe that it may backfire into our own community. And one day, we may not have anything to eat then. You see? But first, we trusted him for centuries, because we thought we could afford it, you see. We had enough to eat, and in addition, we allowed the physicist to experiment with that part of the -- universe which we didn't -- to which we could remain indifferent. Would you see this? If I pray, "God give me my daily bread," gentlemen, then it's -- of an immediate importance. If I then say, "Let us have hybrid corn," like Mr. -- Mr. Wallace in -- in -- in Iowa, that's so much gravy, as we say. That's in addition. That's a natural scientific experiment, isn't it?

So if and when Aristotle tries to say that tragedy is -- stopped when it reached its zenith, its nature, he said something very profound. You can also turn around and say, "Because it reached its nature," you see, "it became natural. It couldn't affect man any more, you see. It ceased to be tragedy." Can you see? You can reverse the sentence. For the Greek, however, it is, as I -- it ended when, it's simply descriptive. But after Aristotle, I'm afraid, the Greeks ceased to come into existence, because this one element of the tragedy no longer held immediate sway over them. But it was already put in this second -- realm in which you treat literature, something to talk about.

Has anybody some memory of Mr. Spender's talk here when he came to this campus? The -- the English poet Spender? Did nobody attend, two years ago? You probably weren't here, yet. Well, he -- he -- he said exactly what I'm trying to say here about modern poetry. He said, "These English -- professors of English and their students murder me before I have -- I am a poet, but I -- after all, I can produce perhaps six good poems -- eight poems a year." And that's very much, gentlemen. A great poet writes perhaps 24 immortal poems during his whole life. You of course believe that he can produce whole volumes of poetry a year because professors of English can do that. And you can, too. But they are no poetry. They only look like that. They are tin cans. And you can write, of course, any number of essays in a college like ours, of course. There is complete contempt of writing, because you write all this stuff, it isn't worth being written. But by numbers, by quantity, it is sheer -- very impressive, and very suppressing. And so Mr. Spender said, "I only seem to write poetry to give nourishment to the silly college professors of English, and their students who -- who then try to learn be- -- to write better and quick. What I produce genuinely within one year is not enough to feed them for one week." It becomes nature. And it becomes trash.

And that's how the world today is -- is construed, gentlemen, the proportion of genuine and -- political, and religious life, and of natural life, is of course all in favor of the natural. Man has, so to speak, taken over the realm of nature. A zoologist has said, "Man is today like a cancerous growth on the surface of the earth with -- there where palm trees used to grow, and oaks, and -- and birds fly, and pigeons, and alligators, and crocodiles, and buffaloes, and moose, man is multiplying. But," he says, "he is just multiplying his nature. He's not multiplying in his creative power, in his religious power, as a -- liturgist, as a priest." The proportion on the earth of course is, gentlemen, that you and I, we must not become natural. But since it is your idea to become natural, the only thing is -- is now to produce 4 billion people on this globe, to wipe out all other organic life, and therefore, to destroy the equilibrium on this globe.

Man is absolutely lost if he is not satisfied to create communities. If you want just to be natural, know your calories, your vitamins, be an individual, then you become like one of these mushrooms, like these bacteria, one-cellular beings. Most Americans try to have this -- this hope that they will end up as an individual bacterium, absolutely unconscious, absolutely innocent, absolutely in- -- equal to everybody else. And all -- your dreams, gentlemen, are one of the second realm of reality of nature, where you become totally indifferent, and where you will -- might be wiped out by the bomb quite justifiably, because

there's absolutely no reason, gentlemen, for any man to live unless he's unique. If I can classify you, gentlemen, head off. You have to put a man in uniform to persuade his enemy that he can shoot at him, because when man is classified as a -- in a uniform, you see, as one form of others, will you bring any decent fellow to treat him as his enemy. The more a man is -- is unique, the more you will respect the man. The more you put him in a uniform, the easier you can persuade people to go to war. It's a condition of warfare that the enemy must wear a uniform. Otherwise you can't shoot at him.

So to make war, gentlemen, is the attitude of treating any part of reality as nature. Nature is at war, or at the stage of war we s- -- call our environment "nature." Because you will admit if you treat a -- a cow as nature, you can slaughter it. You can sell it, its meat. You can use its -- its milk and cheese. If you have your chickens in your chicken coop as your pets, you cannot treat them economically. You have to have 13,000 broilers, as my friend now has in Ver-shire. It's just horrid. And 13,000 animals, you see, they're classified. No feelings left -- left, you see. The -- the sooner the better.

Gentlemen, nature is on the way towards death. To say, "This is natural," means that I treat it as less and less important. It's a lessening of importance when I put anything -- on anything the label "nature." And this you have forgot-ten. Nature is unimportant. I used before the word "indifferent." The word "unimportant" is also right, because gentlemen, in nature there is no high and no low. There is no difference--indifferent we are, you see--because you have no right to say that anything in nature is more important than anything else. The judgment in -- of -- of anything that it is natural means that it is not important, because in nature nothing is more important than anything else. You have of course tried to treat society of human beings in the same way: "Nobody is more important than anybody else," gentlemen. I think we have reached the end of our rope, gentlemen. Every -- you have to tell everybody quite the contrary, as Mr. Saroyan tried to -- to write this -- you know, the Armenian poet in this country, Saroyan. He wanted to write, he said, so that everybody would feel terribly important and absolutely irreplaceable. But that is not natural, gentle-men. If each tragedy is unique -- if the new tra- -- writer of tragedy would feel that nobody had ever written tragedy, you see, Aristotle's sentence would not have come true, that tragedy ceased, you see, when it had reached its nature. Gentlemen, you and I must never try to reach our nature, because that reduces us to what we have been, what has already been lived before. So now let us -- I put this down in Latin, gentlemen, because I wanted to

draw your attention to the very different character of these two words of "nature" and of "creature." The sound in your English -- in your English ear, and your American ear, both ending in u-r-e, and you will not make much of them, as being differently formed. "Natura," however, and "creatura" have a very important difference. Neither Lucretius, nor Aristotle, nor Plato could make this distinction between "natura" and "creatura." And Greece came to an end because it couldn't make this distinction. "Natura," that which has to be born, or which is in process of being born, the end- -- the syllable of "urus" always means "in process of becoming." "Nature" in--and "physis," by the way, in Greek--are words of growth of known entities. That is, things have been born, therefore the child that is in the mother's womb will be born. And "natura" really means, as you know, birth. "Nasci," the word -- verb becomes -- renascence, you still have it there, rebirth. And in the present tense it has this "s" in it, which then is lost here -- it's originally "nas-tura," you see.

The -- "creature" is something very different, gentlemen. The word "creatura" which we need today to oppose to nature, which you hear so often now mentioned when we hear "creative writing," which is so -- or "creativity" which is the last refuge today of human beings who are killed by nature, by their own idol, by your belief in nature, in this cruel deity, of death, and of killing, and of warfare, and of the -- struggle for survival, and of all the qualifications which -- which go with nature: worthlessness, indifference. "Creatura" has this total accent in our not yet knowing what has happened.

We say that God created the universe, in retrospect, because we say that we are still in creation. You know, there is a famous hymn, which was, by the way, sung for some college students in Bowdoin College first, 1900 -- 1906 by DeWitt Hyde, "We" -- "Creation's Lord, we give Thee thanks that we are in the making still." Who knows this hymn? Who knows this hymn? "Creation's Lord." It's in every hymn book. Don't you think? Don't you know? Well, it's an important verse, gentlemen. Creation's Lord, we give Thee thanks that we are in the making still. The word "creation" is an attempt to say that we haven't yet heard what's going to happen.

In Rome, gentlemen, the word "creation" was used for creating consuls every year, to give a name to the -- to the present year. The name of the -- two consuls was, so to speak, the dating of Rome. And every year had a new date. And it wasn't 1957, you see, it was much more po- -- poetically: it was "Postubius" and "Jubius," you see, or "Caesar," or "Julius Caesar" and his colleague "Lepidus Amelius." And so to create a co- -- the consuls meant to name the new year with a unheard-of name. Creation is that which is not yet heard, which

nobody has the right to have named. That's a creature. A creature is the not-yet named.

And now we come to the important comparison with the Greek mind -- right -- back right away, gentlemen. Creation points to the fact that the past at one time was not yet created, you see. Was not yet created, and therefore looked to man as still being in the future. If you say, "God created Heaven and earth," it's an attempt to remind you that at one point, everything we know, you see, was still unknown. And therefore, we must judge the past from our own experience, how we behave towards the unknown. And since we behave very silly to the unknown, especially fear, you see, it is very easy to understand why the { } people -- made all stress on the right kind of fear, and said, "Fear nobody, except God." Because you fear all wrong things. You fear the authorities. You fear the Joneses. You fear public opinion. You fear the Committee Against Communism. You fear, you fear. But it never dawns on you that you will only live right, into the future, if you only fear God and not -- nobody else. You are the most afraid generation that -- that is -- has ever lived for the last 2,000 years, because for 2,000 years, all people have known that right through the past to this day the future is feared, is dreaded. The right future, God's future, created. You have been told it's all natural. So now you are all overcome with fear. You are all cowards, my dear gentlemen. I've never seen such a coward generation as the modern college: teachers, administration, and students. Despicable. If I tell you my experience with cowardice, you would be surprised. Because you don't know that you are cowards, that we are all by our nature cowards, because it is our nature to dread the future. { }.

A -- here was a boy, a student, killed by his col- -- fellow students, by the athletes in this college. He was hated, so they had a -- a drunken affair and went to his -- his room, and beat him up, and in the process he fell and died. It was hushed up. Instead of making this a great case, everybody feared the consequence. To this day, his parents have not forgiven Dartmouth College this cowardice. Nobody said a word in public, how bad this was. Nothing. It was all hushed up, gentlemen, because it was natural. After all, boys are boys. They got drunk. It was 1 o'clock at night. They intruded into his privacy, into his dormitory. So then he died. Well, who can help it? It's like a -- a fly that is crushed. It happens.

Gentlemen, if this boy -- this then -- you know what The Aegis is. That happened in spring. The Aegis came out in May, or in June. His name was not in it. His picture was not in it. He was a senior. He belonged there. But then you would have had to say something about his untimely death, wouldn't you?

They dreaded the consequences. Nothing was done. His own classmates dropped him and his picture from their yearbook. This book exists. I own it. It's a -- ever since, Dartmouth College in my eyes is contemptible. And you have never redeemed it. I don't know if it will ever be redeemed. You are all guilty of the same cowardice. It would -- you would do exactly the same if it happened in your ge- -- generation. It would be, after all, with the public, and Lebanon, and Hanover, and White River Junction, and somebody else -- they would be all upset if this would -- would be mentioned, would it not?

Another story. We had a team on which a colored boy was playing tennis, and -- five years ago it was, or seven years ago. We went down -- offered Mary and Williams a match. And they said they would gladly play us, but not with a colored boy on our team. So the -- the team obviously did the -- what they should do -- have done. They -- they didn't go. The Clairemont Eagle at that time was -- what now The Valley News is, the only paper here in the region that came out daily. They declined to report it. They declined to report this good deed, because it would arouse feelings. That's called "the press" today in this country, publicity. Omitting everything that's important.

You don't know anything about the -- what we have done in the last two months in the world, gentlemen. The papers don't tell you. It's all one pious lie. You are the mi- -- most miserable, evaluating people in the world, because you treat politics as -- as nature, as facts, as you call it. There are no facts without the fear of the Lord. Because they are all of the future, gentlemen. They are all coming. All these misdeeds of American politicians are -- have to -- come home to roost. And you or your children will have to pay the penalty. But you don't believe this. You don't believe in the visitation of our -- of our maker and creator. You don't call Him "creator." You call Him "nature." Well, in nature it's all fatal. And you can't do anything any- -- anyway. If you live in nature, gentlemen, why get excited, you see? The only way, gentlemen, of getting out of nature is to fear God.

Now, the Greeks wanted--as anybody who has read Lucretius knows this--they were angry with their fear of the gods. That's his great attack on religion, you see. Because if you have nature, instead of creatura, gentlemen, then you do not--will you kindly sum this all up in a formula?--when you treat everything as nature, you treat the present as an image of the past. When you, however, have fear -- the fear of the Lord in your bones, and call it -- that -- you say, "I'm a creature," then you treat the past as an image of the -- of your own present, and your own future. That is, if I read the Bible, gentlemen, I know that the authors of the Bible drew their conclusions from their own experience of life

towards the past. They said, "Since I am still in creation, obviously at one time, God must have created Heaven and earth. I am not yet. And I know what it is to be nothing, and nobody. Therefore I know that God created the earth out of nothing -- nothing." And if you ever have succeeded in becoming a new man, gentlemen, then you know that the creation of nothing is every good man's personal experience.

Yes, you can't, because you are all nature boys and nature girls, gentlemen. You cannot become anything surprising. You can only go on the scales every morning and weigh. That's of course very physical. That's physis. That's the only thing you think that can increase, your weight. But a man who gets married, or a woman who gets married, know very well that they are made over by this experience. They have never existed before. They were just in a dither; they were just shadows of themselves. Anybody who has put his foot down, and given up -- a declaration of his faith, he says, "Well I didn't know what life is -- was before I have said this." Now he is luminous. He's himself. He has been born by this one word of truth to his proper character.

Don't you think that Luther became a new man when he had said in Worms, "Here I stand. I cannot say anything else, God help me. Amen"? He who speaks, gentlemen, is reborn by his own words. That's the meaning of the Gospel of St. John. "In the beginning was the Word," and the Word creates. Jesus is only a different man from other people, because He said something different. That's the only quality you can give Him. Because what He said, He became. He threw Him -- His word, and He threw Himself after His word. And that's all creatura, gentlemen. That's creation.

So gentlemen, creation deduces the past from the present. Nature deduces the present from the past. Now you all deduce, at least allegedly, the -- the present from the past, and even the future. Therefore, the future is perfectly uninteresting, gentlemen, because everything that is natural is uninteresting. It's unimportant, it's indifferent, it's uniform, it's classifiable, it is predictable, and it is fearless. Anything that wants to -- to come to life dreads its coming into life. Life is dreadful, gentlemen, or it isn't life. Dead things are not dreadful. They are totally indifferent. Most of you are indifferent; if you only were dreadful. That's the first -- if a boy is dreadful -- I mean, out of a juvenile delinquent, something can become, because he's at least sensitized to the nonsense of his society. But if a boy sleeps through all these temptations, you see, and doesn't mind, he will remain indifferent even -- also to better appeals, of course. You can always say that a -- people who doesn't go insane in certain insane

conditions has no brain, no sanity to lose, you see.

Creation dates the path from the -- from the -- our experience with how we enter the future. And nature dates the present and the future from what has happened allegedly before.

Now we come to the Greeks, gentlemen. The Greeks come from a so-called mythical, religious scenery. They have a cult in the -- every one in his own city. They pray to the gods of the city. And they explain how this city was founded by the myth. So they have two tenses. The mythical time is the time in which all the guilds and crafts, families, cults, temples, walls of the city were created, the law. Every law in the city is ascribed to some creative founder, and he is rejected into a mythical time. Zeus, you see, did this; and Hephaestus and Prometheus gave them the fire. And the mythical time therefore is divided into gods and heroes. Heroes. And here are the modern men in Greece, you and me, the -- the students in Dartmouth College; and they look back and say, "In time before, this was the time of the founders," as we call it, with a little weaker expression, you see, "the founding fathers, then we wrote the Declaration of Independence; now we repeat it." Then they had the 4th of July, now we hold onto the Constitution. That is, in the la- -- mind of you boys, gentlemen, these times are the extraordinary times; you would call them "extraordinary"; the Greeks called them "mythical"; and then this is you. You live in ordinary times; you are "just a human being."

Now gentlemen, once you make this decision, which you all do in your -- that for some unbelievable reason there were, at some -- one time, the Apostles and Christ; and another time, there were George Washington and Jefferson; and now we have mediocrity and politicians. Once you make this division, your own time is incapable of ever producing anything new, because the new and the extraordinary go together, you see. Mythical times have produced fire, and architecture, and priesthood, and astronomy, and writing, and reading, you see. My own time is ordinary; is reasonable time. We are reasonable people. We are practical people. We ask, "What do we earn?" You see, how do we sell our cars? But Mr. Benz, and Mr. Merce- -- the man who invented Mercedes, and Zeppelin, and so, they invented the motor -- the { } without any money. They lost money on it. This -- you cannot be asked. That's unreasonable.

So your own time is ra- -- rational, reasonable, practical, economical--everybody pays his own way, and everybody does only things as you are recommended, which do not conflict with the presuppositions of the existing order. You won't -- won't be called a subversive, would you? Terrible,

you see! You will not hide behind the 5th Co- -- Amendment; therefore you will never do anything interesting or important. You will remain absolutely indifferent to all questions of politics. You will be as natural as can be. You will be an ordinary man. And all the things that you use are, strangely enough, come from a mythical time. That's by and large, your own { }, gentlemen, from a mythical time in which somebody like George Fox, the Quaker, had a hearing. Today, we would just arrest him and put him into a mental asylum in -- in New York. I mean, he's just a re- -- fanatic, I mean, mental, sick. We would analyze him, give him two concubines, and everything would go.

Well, that's by and large your view of the world, gentlemen. You all live like Greeks. You -- the past is the creative time when extraordinary things happened for the first time. But at -- now we are much cleverer. We have given over our life to Madison Avenue. They tell us beforehand how many things will sell. And we will only produce those things which will sell. And we won't do anything that we cannot be paid for immediately. That would be impractical. And we are reasonable people. And we know the laws of nature. And the first law of nature is that where nothing is, nothing comes. And therefore creation out of nothing is impossible, so we won't create anything, you see, because it can't be done. We can -- we can only follow, conclude, you see. If I have \$10,000, I can get 3 and-a-half percent interest. That's logical, isn't it?

So gentlemen, the Greek mind uses logos to increase the amount of physis around it. And that is the path from logos to logic. I tried to say -- tell you this before. Perhaps now you understand the implications. If you say that logos is nothing but logic--which my colleague, Mr. Mandelbaum would heartily agree with, that logos should be treated as nothing but the laws of the ordinary mind, you see, and not the inspiration of the extraordinary mind--if logos is only the bridge from the first impressions and the first experiences, to classificatory experiences and statements, then logo- -- logos is logi- -- logic is treated as a mere -- nothing but the structure of the ordinary, indifferent, natural universe. And the Greeks have turned logos into logic.

But you have done even better. Gentlemen, there -- one boy wrote a paper on the Stoics. And I think it's an historical, an epochal event. The Stoics came from Cyprus, as you know. Zeno, the first Stoic, was free of the Greek idolatry of logic. And therefore, he said, "By what means do we recognize what is the spirit with which we divide ethic, community, human life, future life, and natural life, and recurrent order?" And he said, "First the five senses. Then our generative power, our power to -- to -- to love." He knew that love makes us speak fanciful things. "The poet's eye in holy frenzy rolling," I mean, you have

to be in love to speak great truth. Then he said, "Language itself is a great inspirer of my mind. It fills me with all kind of powers, associations." And then he went on and said, "But the leading, the directing force in man's power of knowing, of recognizing, is the heart. And the whole logos comes from the heart."

Whereupon my Dartmouth student went and translated "heart" with "reason." And destroyed the whole idea of the Stoa. Who -- who is the gentleman, if he's good enough. I -- I -- you must have found it in your paper. Who is it? Will he not confess? It's a remarkable forgery, gentlemen. A remarkable forgery of a modern American mind, who cannot understand that this man Zeno already belonged to the 20th century. In Europe, people know this again. In this country, you still believe in reason. That is in something up here, and omit the directing power of the heart. The reason, gentlemen, of the brain, has no direction. It is merely pragmatic. You can never get from a -- the brain anything but reasons. But not direction. A reason is the opposite from a direction. You get reasons after you have decided where you want to go. You can adduce thousands of reasons why you want to go. That's called "rationalization." But to call the heart -- translate the heart with the English word "reason," that's high treason. And it was done in this paper without any rhyme or reason, because after all, in his -- in his sources, it was clearly stated that Zeno, the founder of the Stoa and all the other Stoics, knew that direction cannot come from the logic, you see. Logos is more than logic, because logos is the power that fills reason with the task to explain what is already present. A theologian, gentlemen, is a man who has experienced God and then tries to give his reasons why he might persuade others, too. But if he hasn't experienced God, please don't let him become a theologian. It's hopeless. I know now so many theologians who have no experience of God. And they think they can study God. You can't. By no logic will it ever become plausible to you that there is a God. I mean, I know many ministers who have the effrontery -- even Catholic priests, I know -- I met a boy from Manhattan College who gave all the reasons of St. Thomas for the existence of God. But of course, he himself was an atheist. I've never seen -- well, he had never any other connection with God except the reasons he could give for Him. And you just felt so frozen out by his approach. I was there together -- it was -- with this army camp in -- in upper -- in New York state, in the -- on the Bear Mountain Bridge -- Bear Mountain Bridge. They had a military camp after the war. And students could live there. And it was a quite an interesting group. And there was a boy there who wanted to

study for the priesthood Thomism. But gentlemen, Thomism is atheism, if it isn't coupled with the first experience of the human heart to his creator. No use using your brain, giving reasons why there is a God, if you feel that the boy never knew of God, anyway.

And that it should have happened in this class, in one of the papers, I thought is significance enough to -- to tremble, really. I fear for the future of this country, gentlemen, because with this sleight -- legerdemain, you are able in -- in such a term paper even to omit the kernel. And you think you have done a good job. I -- I'm afraid I have given this man C+. I shouldn't. It was E. He omitted -- you omitted the gist of the matter. An attempt on the -- in the Greek history to -- to face about, and to stop this constant intrusion of logic and of nature upon our experiences of being created, of being not yet anything known, of having still to say what we will do -- want to be.

A girl that says "yes" to the man who proposes to her is a different person. She's changed by the word -- one word she has spoken. She becomes this man's wife, does she not? She enters history only as his wife. Nothing before matters. She's forgotten. Because she married Abraham Lincoln, she now is known. That's all. And that's what she lived for, for -- to speak this one word. One word is enough to make over a man. A man who takes a bride, or a man who says "no" at this decisive moment is only the man who turn- -- turned down the bride or who took it. And he is nobody else.

But you all take the bride, because you say it's natural. And your only hope is that you won't be found out. But you can only live -- and t- -- you can only have the courage to turn down the bride if you -- have the fear of God in your -- in your -- in your system. If you are only afraid of being found out, then of course you can take the bride, because you only have to feel then, you see, that it isn't the perfect crime. And that's the whole attitude of most of you: "I'll do it, but I make sure that nobody will find out."

Which always amazes me among your -- in your interest in -- in crime, gentlemen. The only interest you have: is he stupid enough to be found out? My only interest is in the crime, that it must be punished. I have absolutely -- I cannot understand how people can read detective stories. It's a mystery to me. It's a total perversion in my mind. Because that is all within reason, you see. You understand -- why I mean. I'm interested in the man who doesn't commit the crime -- or who does commit the crime that his barrier of fear breaks down to God. But you only fear the -- the police. That's not a noble fear; it's not an interesting fear, even. It is a pure animal fear. Has nothing to do with humanity.

Nature and creation then, gentlemen, are divided in the Greek spirit in such a way that they are divided in a mythical time, and in natural time. The more nature permeates the mind of the philosopher in Greece, the more he says, "We people should live naturally." And the more the gulf is enlarged between the mythical time of creation, of which they cannot get rid, and their own time. And the more you -- enlarge this abyss between the mythical time and your own time, gentlemen, the more the present becomes the ordinary time; and the mythical time the extraordinary time; and the future is impossible -- it becomes impossible. It becomes absolutely impossible.

At that point, the Greek spirit broke down, gentlemen. What made Christianity win, is something very simple. The Christians insisted that the mythical time was just as much ahead as it was in the past. And it was just as much in the present as it was in the past. And therefore the Bible begins with the naked couple, Adam and Eve. Not with Prometheus, and not with Heracles, and not with anybody extraordinary, you see. But the Bible is an attempt to make the people of the past ordinary and the present-day people extraordinary, because it had to correct the Greek mind. The Greek mind says, "The people in the beginning were heroic. And we are ordinary. We are reasonable. We -- therefore we can understand rationally what we're doing," you see. "And we can report these miraculous beings at the beginning." You understand? But the Christian revelation says that because man tries to behave as an ordinary man, he misses out about the future. And if he is not an extraordinary man, he cannot create the future.

And therefore, the whole -- the whole distinction is between *creatura* {hominis} and *natura* {hominis}. The -- the Christian church goes so far that it even appeals to the wine that is blessed in the Church, and to the bread as *creatura*, because -- gentlemen, please mark this well, because otherwise you'll never understand Holy Communion and what-not in the Christian faith. You will think also that's a superstition, because you can only understand nature. You know very well that bread has to be taken from the spears of the -- from the field, from the grain, from the wheat, or the rye, and then it has to be milled -- put into the mill; and then it has to be ground into flour; and then it has to be mixed with water, and then you can have -- and the leaven, the yeast, and then you can have bread. And therefore you see that bread can only come off if, after nature has done its work, something social, something cultural, something historical, something technical is added. Bread is not what we find in the fields. But the process of creation goes on in your own treadmill, in -- on your own oven. And that is all against your belief. You say, "That's just a { } social

arrangement, that's such a second-rate thing, society." That's your { }. With the wine the same. There is no wine in the grapes. It has to be put in barrels. It has to be fer- -- has to ferment. It has to be bottled. It has to be then cooled or warmed. And then it is unbuttoned -- un- --how do you call it?--uncorked, and then it is ready for use after several years. The longer the time, the better. So the Church has expressed this -- this enmity against the Greek spirit very well in calling bread and wine "creatura." They are still to be created beyond their process outside human society, you see. And the -- so the two great blessings in the Church for bread and wine begin: O creatura vini -- O creatura panis. Which goes to show that the Church is very radical, anti-Greek in saying that these creatures still await their final consummation, you see. And the real wafer at the Holy Communion is not general -- bread or -- or -- or cranberry juice in general, as they now give in Methodist churches. But it is the wine that has been waiting for you and for whom -- which you have been waiting. It's your Communion wine. If you cannot realize this, you will always be superstitious with regard to Holy Communion. If you think that's wine in general, gentlemen, you cannot be redeemed. It isn't. And most people, of course, drink to their own perdition in the Holy Communion, because they don't understand. And they think they're just taking -- they have just bought something in the general store at Macy's.

The drink is just as unique as you are at that moment. It unites with you because at that moment only does this wine reach his destination. And you have therefore to call it with the personal pronoun, "she" and "he." It isn't "it." That's why the Church makes this great detour and this -- solemn formula, "O creatura panis, O creatura vini." And that's not said in vain, gentlemen. That's the salvation of the human race, that you and I can feel that not only we are only at this moment coming to pass. The whole creation moans and groans in order to come to pass tomorrow. It's perfectly natural for me to believe, gentlemen, that God created in the beginning Heaven and earth, because for Heaven's sake, I do still hope that there will be a d- -- day in which out of your dead clay, and your -- this dead material of your -- of your background, or however they call it, you might be created. You aren't yet created. Don't believe that for a minute. You are -- at this moment, you are nature, pure nature. And you wait for the word that will bring you into life. You haven't yet heard it, your word, which nobody else can say.

There will be an hour in your life, I'm -- it comes to every man and nation -- comes the hour to decide. Perhaps you have heard this hymn? Does anybody know it? Or again am I a single theologian? Yes? "Once to every man and nation

comes the hour to decide"--isn't that it?--which means that every one of you, gentlemen, will have his dark hour of temptation, or his great hour of illumination, or his wonderful hour of love. In which form it ever comes, it is unique. And it has come to nobody else before. And if you miss this hour, as most people do, from fear of human agencies upon your shoulders -- from your terrible anxieties of -- of being found out that you are something extraordinary, gentlemen, then you miss this hour; you cannot be created. Most of you remain nature. You remain dust. Most people are before their birth today. You are all present -- before your own nativity.

And this is so serious now in America, that you even yourself joke, and say you are "only 12 years old." What does it mean? You are before your own nativity. Because what is 12 years? It's the age before a man can say a word of his own discretion. When a word can be held against you because you have said it, then you are born. Not before -- as a man, as a person, you see. Anything you have said before is so general, you see, that people cannot hold it against you. You say, "Oh, I just said that. I didn't mean it. I spoke -- talked through my hat."

Now since you all say that Americans are 12 years old, you simply say that you are not yet created. And this whole, great country gentlemen, is this side of its own creation. This is not a joke, gentlemen. I mean every word of it. I mean that in 150 years since the days of Jefferson, you have been so proud of going the way of nature, the way of all flesh, that you have gone it. Most of you, as The {Chirotekes} shows, and as all Dartmouth College shows to me daily, are very proud that you will never be heard to say a word that can be held against you.

Gentlemen, as long as a man cannot say a word which can be held and must be held against him, he's a coward; he's a piece of dirt. He is not a man. And he certainly is not a human being in any sense of the word that entitles him to have a name, and to say something in reality. Numbers, cattle, which you try to be. And you are very proud of this. That's so funny. But full of fear. And you have a whole -- a whole stable full of Egyptian sorcerers who try to tranquilize your fear. They call it sleeping pills, tranquilizers, psychoanalysis, gentlemen. What else is it? They say, "Don't be afraid." Gentlemen, I tell you, "Be afraid!" It is only the question -- don't you think I'm afraid? But I'm less afraid of your disapproval, gentlemen, than of some other person's disapproval, who is a little higher up than you. That's why I do not care what you think of me, gentlemen, really not. As long as I have the fear of the Lord, how can I treat you lordlings as important? But you are only afraid: the teacher has to be pleasant.

Gentlemen, why should I be pleasant? It's not my business to please you at all. If then -- I cannot teach you if I want to please you. It's an unpleasant business to teach people who want to be asleep.

This has very much to do, gentlemen, with the cyclical vision of the Greeks. The -- the era -- you have to be a pessimist about the future if you are Greek. Because if you really know that you discriminate between a creative period of mankind, the founders, and the ord- -- ordi- -- and your attempt to make everything look ordinary, and everything look natural, then you say that you are constantly reducing the energies with which the future has to be created. It is a constant running-down of the clock. And the physicists, as you know, have even invented this psychodynamic law, this physiodynamic law, thermodynamic law that the world is losing energy all the time a little bit, and it is getting colder all the time on this earth, and so -- and so on.

Now every one of you knows that the salmons go upstream, gentlemen.

And every one of you knows that the penguins or -- who are these animals in the Pacific, who do not eat for three months when they mate? Who are they? The -- what? Ja, ja. And -- thank you. And therefore, it is simply not true, gentlemen, that we always consume energy. It is just as true that we wind up the clock as the fact that the clock runs down. All good clocks, gentlemen, are wound up by somebody -- in our household, at least they are, and they -- we have a clock that has to be wound up. And somebody does it. If I forget it, my wife does it and vice versa. And gentlemen, the whole problem of the Greek relation between community and nature is that they did not believe that anybody in their own lifetime could wind up the clock.

Now you see therefore that the problem of logic and log- -- logos is very -- very decisive in this fact. Logos is the power to explain how the clock runs down, and the power to wind it up again. For the Greeks, however, and for you, logos is only logic. And that only explains why the clock runs down, why it runs from ethos, from community, from sacrifice, from creation, from -- genius into ordinary imitation.

You can explain why one poet, Spender, can be imitated by 10,000 American college students. You cannot explain Mr. Spender. I'm only interested in Mr. Spender. I say, "The clock always will run down." That's natural, you see. But it takes a tremendous ethos, and a tremendous power of the logos to convince one man of you that he should become a poet, instead of selling short stories to the Saturday Evening Post, which is the opposite from poetry, which is infamy, which you shouldn't do. But you think that you can become a poet by writing

short stories for the Saturday Evening Post. Gentlemen, that's impossible. That means you want to have the name of the extraordinary, a writer, for something ordinary. And that is the forgery of modern man, that he wants to keep these mythical expressions "creative writing." And what does he do with the course in creative writing? He prostitutes it. He wants to please the editor of The Dartmouth -- of the Saturday Evening Post. This you cannot. That's not writing, gentlemen. That's imitation. You imitate writing.

And that you -- and that's why we -- colleges are today a stumbling block for progress. Because in these colleges, you imitate the creative life. You imitate mythical time. You talk big about the Gettysburg Address. But at the same time, you take courses which prove to you that you should never do s- -- anything unheard-of, that you should always comply with the orders, that you should never rebel, that you should not be subversive, that you should take an oath every month on the American Constitution, and so on and so forth.

Gentlemen, that's -- you are caught in a terrible lie, because you use these great words of poetry, of -- of freedom, of decision, and for what do you use it? To sell your wares. No.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

Gentlemen, the problem for the exit of Greek philosophy is -- in its own -- his -- time, or in its own cycle is to understand why it did not satisfy, why it didn't grip anymore. I tried to tell you that in 300 the Stoics already said something very un-Greek. They said that the directing force was the heart, and not reason. And I tried to show you that you misunderstood this, and that the man who wrote on the Stoics, in his flippant way, just assumed that a Greek had to say that reason was the directing force, and so forged the old issue. It was a very poor paper for this reason, because he couldn't even read the text. Now most of you assume that the Greeks were reasonable people, and that -- Greek philosophy means rationalism. But that's the pitfall of rationalism, and of your -- idea of Greek philosophy, and perhaps of the -- the Greeks' own idea of philosophy, that we -- that even the du- -- duchess of Windsor, who certainly is not a model lady, knows that the heart has its reasons.

Now it is terribly important for us today to get the chronology right, gentlemen. This is Zeno the Stoic, who introduces as a Cypriot, from Cyprus, as a man of the -- certainly is somehow in touch with the prophetic tradition of the people of the Semitic languages, and the Semitic tradition, knows that the heart has its reasons, and thereby breaks the identity of goodness and logic. Plato said that that what was true was good, and that what -- who -- who knew the truth had to be a good man. And that's your own faith in education.

I say the more a man is educated, the more imperiled is he for becoming a scoundrel. You say the more a man is educated, the better he must be. He's much more risky, gentlemen. You -- run a greater risk when you get educated. But the American dogma is the Greek dogma. From 1800 to 1950 in this country, we were all Greeks. Greek philosophy prevailed. Plato prevailed. Aristotle prevailed. The teaching of philosophy prevailed. And the -- the dogma of Greek philosophy in this sense -- in this limited sense, from 600 to 300 B.C. and from 1800 to 1950 in this country is that the good man is the true man, and the true man is a good man. That is, the true man in the sense: he who knows the truth.

The identity, gentlemen, of beauty, goodness, and truth is what makes the Platonists. And that, because we know we will act right, is the dogma of any philosophy that says it is enough for life to have philosophy. In 300 B.C., there was a knocking at the door of Greece. Alexander had gone to India, and had met there with the fakirs, and the yogis, for example, and the Buddhists. And he brought back the knowledge of the so-called gymnosophists. If you read any-

where in a Greek -- in a Greek text the word "gymnosophist," it means influence of Hinduism. It means asceticism. "Gymnos" means naked. And a gymnosophist is a man whom we would call an ascete. That is, a man who, in order to be wise, chastises his body. You see that there enters a -- something of which the Greeks were perfectly unaware, that to be immersed in physis, in one's own nature can prevent oneself from knowing the truth, and that you have first to get out of your own physis before you can see the rays of hope, you see, of the true sun. "Gymnosophist" is a -- a Greek -- the Greek expression which of course we have to approach in connection with sophism, sophists, and philosophers, the word "soph." In Greece, you see, the idea is to learn -- to love wisdom enables you to become wise. The love of wisdom is the positive step towards wisdom. It is this funny idea, you see: you are already somebody, and you add an inch to your stature by becoming wise. By love, you become more than you are. The gymnosophists, gentlemen, and any -- modern monk, and a ny modern puritan, if there are such, will tell you that in order to become better, you have to reduce something inside yourself. You have to s- -- cut out something. The -- I told -- always tell it in this way, that the good is the enemy of the better. I think we -- we talked about this here, ja? The good is the enemy of the better, you see. That is, you cannot become better because you are only 5 feet 8 inches tall. You cannot add to your stature one inch, neither morally, nor scie- -- nor in knowledge, nor in ethics, nor in anything. You can only, by omitting certain advantages given you, you see, you can grow. Because there is a certain sense of proportion in your being. And the idea that you evolve into more and more, and -- larger and larger bank account, so to speak, of virtue, is a mistake. You cannot have more virtues. You are who you are, you see. But you can shift the economy of your inner household. You can replace one item in this household, you see, by another item. And that's gymnosophistry. That's asceticism.

And therefore, with -- not only does -- Zeno, the Phoenician, enter the scene in 300, from Cyprus, that's one of the reasons why the Greeks have absolutely no claim to Cyprus. One of the idiocies of America is that we support the claims of the Greeks on -- for the island of Cyprus. They have absolutely no business to get it, more than the British. It's an error of judgment. Typical, I mean. You did everything. You -- you gave the Czechs the poor Slovaks and Magyars in Czechoslovakia and drove out the Germans -- from America, everybody who shouts loudest always gets the -- his -- his view in Ge- -- in Europe supported. Mr. Benes had no business to -- to get Czechoslovakia. Two-thirds of them who were not Czech- -- were not Czechs; and so the Greeks have no business to get Cyprus.

I offer you this in the history of philosophy as a good example, that the -- the greatest man from Cyprus was not a Greek; 300 B.C. And has -- Cyprus has always been peopled by non-Greeks, by Phoenicians, from the very first day. You fall for every craze here in this country, and all -- always wrong. Pseudo-nationalism this is. You -- this country cannot be nationalistic, but you wish the evil of nationalism on every spot in Europe. You support the Irish. You support the Albanese. The -- Albania, which is now a Soviet colony, as you well know, was created in Lynn, Massachusetts, by the immigrants from Albania, who of course got a hearing here, and all the Americans said, "These nice cobblers in Lynn, Massachusetts, must get their state at home in Albania." With the result that in Albania, the submarines of Russia prepare the Third World War. Just typical of Cyprus, by the way. And that's why I lay some stress on the fact that 300 B.C., Mr. Zeno came into Greece and introduced a foreign motive of philosophy. The moral motive, gentlemen, that the heart breaks the re- -- conclusions of the mind.

And the gymnosophists, the Hindu influence, comes into Greek, which we now have today still in our monasteries, in our Christian monasteries. That is already the form in which wisdom was allowed to enter the Christian Church, only as a blend between In- -- Hindu and Greek, craving for wisdom. The -- Hindu said, "If I want wisdom, I must pay a price." That's the price, asceticism, renunciation. And the Greeks said, "Craving, eros, love." So out of this plus and minus, gentlemen, our modern Benedictine monasteries, for example, exist. You read Mr. Thomas Merton--why is he a monk?--you see, because the wisdom which a -- monk in this world today represents is a combination of Hindu and Greek mentality. Very important to know.

Of course it is -- the Church has fructified and has profited from any of the previous streams of life. But the Greek way of philosophy has not been allowed to enter the Greek -- the Christian Church unchanged, unmixed, so to speak, you see. And the price which the Greeks did not want to pay, the gymnosophists, the naked sophists, so to speak, you see, paid. And the combination of Buddha asceticism, and Greek philosophy has -- this splendor ha- -- created of the medieval monks, who represented the wisdom of the Greek and Latin tradition, copying all their manuscripts, studying Aristotle, you see, Virgil, keeping the ancien- -- classics alive, under the condition that they led the ascetic life with the three vows of chastity, and obedience, and poverty, which no Greek philosopher in itself connected immediately with knowledge.

So the price of knowledge and goodness, gentlemen, entered the consciousness of the Greeks through Alexander the Great, through this combination of India and Greece. And I'm very sorry to say that all your textbooks on Greek philosophy therefore make no sense, because these 300 years, from 300 to 0, are not understood as an exchange of two streams of thinking. The stream that says, "Before a man can acquire knowledge, he must purify himself, he must leave nature," and the other stream that says, "He must crave wisdom," you see. And perhaps this sign helps you a little bit. The plus sign is Greece, the Greek mind, stretching out, longing for. Without yearning, gentlemen, without expectation, without hope, you cannot achieve anything. But without faith, with- -- that is asceticism, without forgoing immediate advantages, your -- your hope and your yearning is in vain. You are all full of hope. You are all Greeks. But you do not ask under what condition does your hope make sense. It can only make sense if you exp- -- pay the excise tax. If you ex- -- cut out that which stands in the way of your hopes -- ever be fulfilled, and there's very much in -- very many beams in your eye, whom you do not like to see. You only see, of course, the little -- what does the Bible s- -- call it? in your neighbor's eye?

(The mote.)

The mote.

So gentlemen, we have beginning in 300, the combination of the plus and minus of Greek and India. And we have in Zeno and the Jews of Alexandria the combination between Israel and the Greeks. That all begins in the same year and goes on till the coming of Christ, until--to Saint Paul -- because here we have the limitation, whereas for the Greeks, their mind covers the universe, gentlemen. For Israel, the human mind is just a speck of dust. That is, well what's the--how should I say it? The Greeks are pantheists, aren't they? And the Israelites are monotheists. Now what's the difference, gentlemen, between pantheism and monotheism on the surface of things? "Pan" means all. Everything is divine, you see. Therefore nothing is bad. Nothing has to be rejected. Nothing has to die. The Greek mind in a -- looking at the universe, cannot distinguish life and death. There's no criterion in all of Plato between life and death. The dead things are used as yardstick for explaining the -- the living things. The stars in Timaeus, are used, you see. The ideas: beautiful, good, and true -- all dead things, just dead ideas, you see, who do not speak, who do not breathe, who do not live. They are used to explain you and me, living beings. Incredible idea.

The Greek mind, gentle- -- explains life out of death, which all the modern

physicists do. Silly asses. Li- -- life explains death, gentlemen. But death can never explain life. Because I live, I must die, gentlemen. But not because I die I -- must I live, or because I'm dead. Dead things stay dead. And therefore most of you will remain dead, because you have -- don't know that you have to fight for your life in order to escape death. So you just remain unborn. You never even enter the danger zone of living.

Now, in your speech, you don't -- today again at lunch, somebody told me that -- that it was impossible to hear a word of truth said between students on this campus. I don't know if this is true, but he said it at least. And that shows that he feels that the life which only comes when people speak the truth to each other is held away -- off from you. You never know the good life, the full life. Full life is only be- -- when we speak to each other, gentlemen. Before, you do not know who you are, and you do not know what you think. Do you think you think? The best you can say is -- the best I can say that after I have spoken to you, I know what I think, because you do me the favor to listen to me. You love me enough to be patient with me, to believe in me; and so my truth comes to me. I told him at lunch, this boy, the story of the Arabian tribe. To this day, in -- in Arabia -- the proper peninsula of Arabia, you cannot eat meat, except as a fest- -- at a festive meal, because meat is too next to humanity, to you and me. A single individual is not entitled to eat meat. Only the group, the inspired group of people who have a good talk to each other, who -- against each other, mutually, who can mutually allow each other to share at a meal the best of food and drink, you see. They are allowed to eat meat.

So where you draw the line between vegetarian -- one group being vegetarian and the other group being meat-eaters, you see, the Arabian is much more sensitive and he says, "At times, I am allowed to eat meat, because I am inspired. I live the full life," you see, "of the waked mind of the group, of my community. And at times I'm -- I am limited to vegetarianism," you see, "to -- because I am not in the spirit." Can you see this? "I'm not inspired." That is real { }. If you would know this, you would be able to cure yourself, because I think a man who lives alone should live on -- or know that he is on a lower plane, so to speak, if he isn't creative. If he is creative, he speaks for the whole community. Then he is of course filled with the spirit of this very community for which he writes the next great drama or -- you see, or the Gettysburg Address. And then the -- can have all the camel meat he wants.

Did -- do you begin to see, gentlemen, that philosophy is a state of your own -- of your own nature, of your own life? And the Greeks have this strange

limitation, that they only see in the working of the mind its plus sign. They do not see the price they have to pay that before you can know the truth, you have to forgo certain things, like homosexuality, like any perversion of the -- your body. And the second thing is: the Greeks say, "All which the mi- -- eye sees, indifferently, since it is natural, is full of gods, is full of the div- -- logos, and is full of ethos. It's pantheistic." The Jews say that God is the Lord of life and death. And since He is the Lord of life and death, God -- the true God, gentlemen, is not like the Olympian god, ever to be represented in statues, in stone temples. You can't, you see. That's not the living God, because the living God proceeds all the time against that which must die into the living of the future. He declines to be captivated in dead matter.

And therefore the word "monotheism" for you should acquire a new quality, gentlemen, today. You should see that when we speak of monotheism, we do not mean one god against many gods. But the Jewish prayer and the Christian prayer is: "It is the god who can save us from our death. And can open our eyes to the fact that we are dead in our sins at this moment, that we are just animals by ourselves," you see, and that it takes a special act of grace meeting a brother, meeting a sister, meeting the Church, meeting a community, meeting an opportunity, you see, meeting a task to make us into the children of God, monotheism means that there is a universe that can be empty of God, that the world is not simply identified with -- by God, because part of the universe is less alive than it should be.

And you know who is less alive in the universe -- than he should be?

Man. Man. Man is that part of -- you cannot say of the sun that she -- he is less alive than it sh- -- he should be. We have no judgment in the matter, you see. It's just as hot as can be, it seems to us, you see. We can't argue the point that the sun should shine more. But we can argue with every one of us, you and me, with ourselves that we should be more alive, and less dead. And the whole problem, gentlemen, of Christianity, of the Resurrection, of the -- of the dying to our sins and rising with Christ, is a very simple thing. It's the verdict that the dead Christ is still 10,000 times more alive than you as you sit here at this moment. And that's simply true. We are dead. We just dream that we are alive. You don't know what it means to be alive.

If you can speak like Nathan Hale on the sh- -- scaffold, the words he said, "I wished I had more lives to give to my country," then you know that you are alive. What you say -- call "alive" is shitting, and urinating, and eating. That's not alive. That's just mechanical movement. You mistake your idea of life totally. You don't know what the good life is; have no idea. You think three meals a day,

that's living. Gentlemen, that's below, that's -- I call this anabio- -- anabiotic -- suspended animation. Suspended animation in this country stands for living. It's a mistake, gentlemen. It's good for the refrigerator business, but for nobody else. You live all refrigerator lives. And you want it this way. Your psychologists sell you suspended animation.

They prove to you -- now I come back to the last lecture. And it -- I -- it joins. You remember that I said that the ordinary time is always the time of logic. And the extraordinary time is this time of the myth, of the creative, founding moment, you see. Now the time of reason in your sense of the word, of using your brain, is the time of suspended animation. In your five senses, if you remain in your five senses, and don't let the heart speak, you can never propose to a girl, because it is always foolish to do so. Always, you see. Absolutely never any excuse for you to propose to a girl. It's foolish. It may lead, and usually does lead, to disaster. But anyone -- he wants to live, has to take the plunge. He has to. It is unreasonable, but very wise. Because the heart has its reasons. Yes, young lady -- it always is unwise for a young man to get going with a girl. Always. But it is very wise from a higher point, you see, if he wants to live better. He must live more. That's the only reason why he cannot stand this state of being a bachelor. Bachelors are clever. They're much more clever than husbands.

Gentlemen -- philosophy is always right if you de- -- reduce it to the state of today and omit it to the problem of fecundity, of bearing fruit. That's why the New Testament has conquered the whole realm of Greek philosophy with this one simple sentence, "By their fruits ye shall know you." "By your fruits" only, nothing else. It's the difference between Christianity or religion and fruitfulness and philosophy. All Greenwich Village is much cleverer, gentlemen, than the people in the other suburbs. But in the other suburbs, fortunately the children are born, and in Greenwich Village the cocktails are produced. That's fruitless, totally fruitless. In- -- the intellect is fruitless. The intelligentsia is a bastard of life. Philosophy is a bastard. If it doesn't know that it is, like Mr. Collins says -- like Mr. Wilson says, an -- an outsider, who wants to instigate life to become higher, you see, by its getting outside society and illuminating it -- about its future greater vitality.

The cultural critic, who abounds in this country, is a nuisance. Good for nothing. If you -- if you would close the Saturday Review of Literature and all the Mr. {Galletts}, et cetera, absolutely nothing would happen. No harm done. They don't produce anything. They are unproductive, because -- it has no consequence what they say, gentlemen, except perhaps negative.

Well, I want to say that the difference between pantheism and monotheism enters the Greek scene from -- to -- from 300 to the coming of Paul. And I would like your permission today to explain to you why, from Saint Paul to Saint Augustine -- that is, from the days of Seneca, the Stoic--that's the contemporary of Paul--to the days of the end of the Roman Empire, that's the 5th century--Saint Augustine died in 430 of our era--why the Greek philosophy is on the retreat. And why at this moment in 1950 again Greek philosophy has to undergo its limitations by monotheism against pantheism, that any philosophy that says that it can replace religion, it can replace faith, is already judged -- prejudged by an historical cycle in which the Greek philosophers had the run of the place. For 600 years they -- after all, they had it, you see. And broke down the first time in 300, by the con- -- checking -- being checked by the Hindus and the Jews. And then after the coming of Christ, they were themselves suddenly faced with their own limitation.

The way in which I think you should be equipped, and I feel very strongly on this point for many decades, is that you should read and bring to class for the next time, but we'll read it today right away--perhaps you'll read it at home then yourself--the famous attempt of Paul to compromise with philosophy. You know when he tried to compromise with philosophy? You ever heard of it? The story of this compromise is a very important one. You can today say to yourself and to -- any mod- -- you -- Greek, "The way I decide on the -- this speech of Paul, the way I stand in this whole question of the rank and role of philosophy in life." Therefore I think it's a -- it's a personal task on yours. It's not something you can learn from the book. Most books in the last decades have been written by the Greeks. The so-called theologians in this country were nothing but philosophers. They even called the Greek phil- -- Christianity a philosophy. They misunderstood the whole point. And therefore the last three -- three years -- three decades or four decades, as a matter of fact, this speech by Saint Paul has been praised as a tremendous academic oration, so to speak, as the ideal of a philosophical argument. Poor Paul himself has thought that it was a derailment, that it was a scandal in his life, that he failed to do his duty, and that when he went to make this speech, he was defeating his own ends, that he was deserting his Lord, and he promised that he would never do it again. He has never done it again, as far as we can tell.

So the thing is very dramatic, gentlemen, because half of the commentaries which you read are written by Greeks. And they want to show that after all, Paul could philosophize if he wanted to, and that he was a very nice man who m- -- under the circumstances one might even have granted the master's degree at Dartmouth College.

And he said, "If so, then I am faithless. I betray the Lord again," as Peter did in the night before the Crucifixion. "I shall try not to betray him again. It's bad enough that I once did."

Now I keep you perhaps in -- in expectation. But all the Christian martyrs and saints, as you know, have one hour of defeat. Jesus said on the Cross, "My Lord, why hast Thou forsaken me?" If He hadn't said that, He wouldn't have been a human being. He would just have been a -- a phenomenon, you see from the other world. Any human mortal, gentlemen, wavers. Jesus' temptation comes when it doesn't matter. He comes after the act, when we can be weak, you see. Any courageous man is frightened after the daring, after he has dared, you see. That's unknown. You -- you people think the difference between coward and -- and fortitude is that the -- one is -- never trembles, and the other does tremble. But the real difference between a coward and a -- a courageous man is that the coward is frightened in the moment of danger, and runs away. And the courageous man is frightened afterwards, when it doesn't matter any more. But if he isn't frightened, he's just a bull, not a human being. -- He's good for nothing. He's just a big noise, I mean. There is no human a -- -- humanity in himself.

Any man who does something daring, must tremble afterwards, then he is courageous; or he trembles in the danger, then he is a coward; or he trembles before, then he is timid. Timid people can be very courageous. That is, they mean not to be cowards. I think I am very timid. But I have learned by experience that it doesn't help me to be -- timid in the moment of danger. And then I am not. The -- the coward is -- is frightened by -- in the act, you see; the courageous, after the act; the timid before the act. Somehow you must be frightened. If you are not frightened, you are not human. The Lord wept when Lazarus was dead. And the Lord cried from the Cross, "Why hast Thou forsaken me?" But He couldn't get down from the Cross anymore. It was done. So why shouldn't He be frightened, you see? He did -- didn't interfere -- His weakness didn't interfere with His vision. With another man, however, it does interfere with his vision. He is so frightened that he, you see, avoids the process. He runs away from him in the last minute.

This is quite important for Paul, gentlemen. Every human being that is -- has a -- deserves the quality of "human" must undergo the emotions of the heart. And that is Mr. Zeno's and Mr. -- and Israel's contribution to the correction of Greek philosophy, gentlemen. A philosopher who always believes that he is right, you see, has no truth to sell, because we demand in the Christian era from

the man who holds the truth, that at one time he must doubt his own truth. Otherwise we call him a fanatic, don't we? A man who never doubts his truth is not a human being. A man who always doubts his truth is a coward. Can you see the connection? Most of this -- people in this country now, in -- from the anxiety of being fanatics, are cowards. They never hold any truth. That's nothing, gentlemen. You must fight for your truth, but after you have fought, you one times -- wonder, you see, why you did. But it doesn't matter.

I always tell the story of a friend of mine who was a professor of philosophy at Duke, and wrote a very wonderful book on Nietzsche. Took him -- cost him 10 years of his life. And when the war broke out -- the Second World War, he volunteered, and entered as a private, although he was 40 years of age, and he could have secured a colonelcy, like so many of my colleagues in this nice college have done. And he didn't. He thought that was -- would be a coward's action. And he didn't become a co- -- colonel, but a private. And he served up, and became a captain at the end, which was quite a career for a private. But he came home after six years. In the process he lost his family. Got a divorce. Everything was destroyed. He gave up his pro- -- professorship. He's now in Tokyo with our embassy. And -- everything changed; everything was sacrificed. And he came to me in '45 and said, "I'm" -- oh no, '46, or '47 even -- many years had already been invested in this venture, gentle- -- of serving up from the ranks. And he said, "I'm disgusted with myself. I've made a fool of myself, and a mess of things. If I had gotten a colonelcy in 1941, which I could, then I would have been a brigadier. And in the administration of the foreign countries, I would have played a -- outstanding role. And with my knowledge of French, and German, and of the country, and the {mind} of the people, I could have prevented many stupidities and follies of the -- of the occupation. This reeducation to democracy, and all the nonsense that has been done, and estranged Europe from America so totally, and why didn't I do this?"

And we had an argument. And man- -- many things devi- -- developed from this argument. I wrote a whole book on this stor- -- on this problem. And the gist is this, gentlemen: that he -- he cultivated at that moment, in '47, as we all do, the -- "Oh God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" philosophy. I call this the "philosophy of the ashcan." When the fire is burned out, it is obvious that we all -- disgusted with the whole process, you see. We have the -- the hangover of the next morning. Fireplace is burned out. All the drinks are over, you see. It has cost a lot of rum and whisky, and very expensive party. And you hardly understand, with a headache on the next morning, why you ever did it. But that is no -- absolutely not of any more authority, your judgment the next morning, than

the mo- -- judgment in the evening. You are not the wiser man, or the more -- more entitled to judge, because the next morning you feel empty, and take an aspirin.

The philosophy of the aspirin -- of the ashcan has absolutely no more authority. Quite the contrary, gentlemen. If you consider that my friend entered the army as a private, and enthused thousands of college -- boys to do the same, I can say that we won the war by the -- Mr. -- who made the right decision at that moment, the decision of not asking for self-aggrandizement but humbling himself to becoming a private. And if I think of his judgment in 1947, I say it doesn't matter. It's his private opinion. It absolutely -- absolutely of no -- no interest to me, because it doesn't -- isn't infectious. It's just private reasoning. And so, he's very important with his decision in '41; he's utterly unimportant with his opinion in '47.

You -- of course, are so clever, and so rationalistic, and so intellectual, and -- you are the cream of the nation, and therefore you think that while you're sitting here on your fannies, and sitting in judgment over events and actions, that you are the people to make the right decision, and to judge -- critically, wisely, because you are out of luck. You are not swimming in the -- in the stream of events, and that when you volunteer for a noble deed, that you are fools.

It's the other way around, gentlemen. Fools we are in this classroom. We all are, because we are less alive to our responsibilities at this moment. We have nothing to decide of importance at this moment. We just -- if you don't use this time rightly and see yourself in proportion, as we are here, that we are far away from responsibility, we cannot really think right. We -- you must be aware that at this moment, we play. We play with ideas. That's very irresponsible. And I can only, by reminding you that we are in danger of being irresponsible, harness your energies of thinking at this moment, to the great moments in which my friend had to enter the army, that -- moment for which we are -- here are preparing each other to think right. Can you -- see this?

And so forth. If thought is not in the less vital moments of your mental life harnessed to the great moments, where you are more alive, it must go wrong. And then logos must become mere logic. I've tried to tell you this through the whole course, gentlemen, that the logistic, the syllogistic problem is the problem of subduing, of making subservient the working of mere logic, and mere mentality, and mere reason, to the great moments where you are fully alive, where body and soul are required to stand up and to fight. If you do not at

this moment resolve to resist a bribe, which you are offered as a judge, you see, you -- and you just say, as you will hear in Romeo and Juliet, you see, the nurse propose to Juliet that she should marry the Count Paris, because after all, it's a very practical idea, you see: "Just be practical, Julia -- Romeo is dead," the -- nurse says, and, "So please, Juliet, let's go on with the next match." I don't know if they have cut out -- who saw it yesterday? Is it played?

(Yes.)

Well, there comes this tremendous line in Juliet, gentlemen -- by Juliet, this 14-year-old woman. But she's a real woman, great person. She says, you see, she's resolved at that moment that there shall be a wall between her and the nurse; they will be twain, cut in twain. Not a word of confidence anymore will be exchanged between her and the nurse. That's the most -- the greatest line in the whole play. Because here rises this young woman, you see, to the -- her full solitude of her thinking. She knows that her thinking no longer is now promiscuous, you see. But she, with her -- with her great privilege of loving Romeo, must put the mind, you see, no longer on the level of this -- of this {plebeian} boy, but has to think in terms of service to her love. And there the mind is -- exactly that happens to Romeo, that she -- to Juliet, that she suddenly sees that all her reason, all her rational powers have to be kept ready for the great moment which then comes where she is willing to -- to drink the vial, and to go to her, you see, potential -- to her death, as -- as it really turns out, to go to her death.

And that's the -- I think the -- the wisdom of -- Shakespeare of course is always just -- make you feel very low yourself, that he could put in this one line, this use of reason by a noble soul, that we think in our -- in our abstract moments, in our classroom moments, in our mod- -- moments as students in preparation for the real life.

Never think that here we live really, gentlemen. We prepare to live, or we postpare. I report to you what life has thrown on the beach of life -- you see, as -- as its jewels, and you collect these jewels so that you are not naked when the great moment arrives. But the terrible thing of yours is that you -- the critic today in this country is that he thinks he is more alive than the poet, the creator. And -- and the -- the nurse thinks she's more alive than Juliet, who's aglow, who's in love. And this dead, damnable creature, this nurse, is nothing. Dirt. But she has more of a mind, of course. She talks 20 lines when Juliet speaks one-half. One of the mysteries of the -- Romeo and Juliet is that -- that Shakespeare didn't care to make Juliet loquacious, you see. One line of hers, and 20 lines of the

nurse. And one line of hers is 20 times as good as 20 lines of the nurse. If you can't hear this in the play, you can't read Shakespeare. It's all -- everywhere the same, gentlemen. And of course, Shakespeare had this great advantage over the Greek world that the women could speak in -- in mod- -- in Christ- -- in the Christian era, that Juliet can rep- -- come forward, instead of Zeno from Cyprus. The heart speaks, and the heart has its reasons. And it has much better reasons than all the philosophers of the world.

So the philosophy of the ashcan, gentlemen, is the -- the philosophy in which philosophy is not ex- -- as they call it today, existential. That is, in which the state of aggregate, during which we philosophize, is not seen to be less vital, less filled with zest, you see, of living, than the life of love, the life of politics, the life of warfare, the life of heroism, the life of sacrifice, the life of asceticism, you see, the life of passion.

Jes- -- Mr. -- the Apostle Saint Paul preferred, as you know, to be -- remain incognito all his life. Nobody knew in his days that there existed such a man in the educated classes of the Roman world. He was just negligible. Seneca was a great man, you see. Every -- he was prime minister. And always, ever since Seneca and Paul, people have been intrigued by the relation of Paul and Seneca. And they even forged a whole correspondence between the two in antiquity, because they couldn't imagine that two people could be contemporaries, you see, and not be in the same -- society, so to speak, move in the same limelight. And, as I said, we have now the letter -- the speech of Paul in Athens, before the philosophers of Athens, in which he tries to accommodate, and to -- to compromise. And it is the structure of this speech, gentlemen, which was his downfall in Athens. The structure is academic. In -- you know where this speech is to be found? Wie?

(Acts 18.)

What did you say?

(Acts 18.)

Wonderful, yes, Sir. Quite. Ja. Right you are. It's the 17th chapter. And, as I said, if you -- are not careful, and read one of these Greek commentators, to these philosophizing commentators to -- they will say it's the high point in -- in -- in Paul's career. To him, it was the -- the degradation, the -- the -- the desertion. Because what happens is this:

"When Paul expected his comrades to come to Athens, he was -- incited by the spirit in this -- inside himself -- because he saw that the whole city was given over to idolatry. And so he first -- dis- -- disputed with the Jews and their adherents in the market place, day after day, to anybody who was willing to hear it. But there were also Epicureans, and Stoics, philosophers, who discussed -- debated with him. And some of them said, 'What is this {semini verbius},' this thrower-out of germinal thought, 'saying?'"

When a man here s- -- in this country doesn't want to have to do with any new thought, he calls me, for example, a "germinal thinker." That is, "It is before it is successful, so I don't have to care for it." I have seen this ver- -- in a very funny manner with some of my -- the people here, and so forth. They call me "a germinal thinker," they think they honor me. And that's then a good reason to say, "Well, it's too early," you see. "Fifty years later, we'll quote him." It's a very strange word, gentlemen. It's a -- as important as "gymnosophist," and a -- perhaps I may even give you the word, because it is the New Testament. It's a good word, and I assure you that at this moment, where the philosopher- -- -pher's isolation and paganism is again to be brought back to the fold of our Christian era, where this is a very important moment, gentlemen, in the history of the human spirit. The cycle of the Renaissance has run its course, and we have now to encompass, and comprehend, and bring home Greek philosophy as only an element of reality, but no longer being sovereign, no being -- longer being able to tell you and me that you can live by philosophy alone, ever. Since this is 1957, a great year, gentlemen, in which Bolshevism and pragmatism both have to be conquered, unless there -- must be a Third World War, and both are philosophies, gentlemen; pragmatism is a philosophy, and -- and Communism is a philosophy. And both are unable to rule the life of nations. You cannot run America as a prag- -- pragma- -- by pragmatism. And the Near East crisis shows it. It is a scandal that we now -- in all practice we will join the Baghdad Pact, but by our vanity, we are obliged to say, "No, not the Baghdad Pact, but something -- the Eisenhower Doctrine," you see. That is, the other good nations in these -- Near East have done their duty two years ago. We had an election coming; therefore, we couldn't act. So now we have to boast that we invent a new policy. Because we simply say after two years, "You have been right." The Baghdad Pact, which says exactly what the Eisenhower Doctrine says { }, that is, the Russians try to go into the Near East, it will be a { } war. But { } the Baghdad Pact. But of course, we are so vain that we cannot say, "Now finally we will subscribe to the Baghdad Pact." We have to humiliate the

English. We have to humiliate everybody else, and we have to say, "Now we invent a new doctrine." Two years too late. After all the mischief has been done. Because we want to live by pragmatism. Solve things as they come along. The elections come first. Everything else comes later. That's pragmatic. This country has a philosophy, gentlemen. It's a purely secular country. It goes from one sensation to the next. It's sensationalism, you can call, or sensualism. That's pragmatism. It's just another expression. It's a satisfaction that what the eye sees is good enough for the mind to make -- to feed it.

Now -- pardon me, what was I going to say? I wanted to give -- tell you this strange word with which Paul is charged. From the point of view of a Greek philosopher, gentlemen, all Christian mission, all Christian apol- -- literature, the New Testament, Saint Augustine, they are {spermo logoi}. It means sowers, just as the parable in the New Testament calls it, you see, "sowers." And the sower is told -- "We don't believe you. We haven't seen the -- the seed go up," you see. If you throw -- the sower cannot demand faith by the unbeliever, you see; he will wait to the harvest. You understand. If I call a man "a sower," from the outside, a "spermo logos," that is, "spermo" is -- you know, sperm, and "logos" is -- is a speaker of sperm, or thrower of -- sower of sp- -- sperm. The sower of which the New Testament is full, which you expect today in a -- not today, which you accept in a pious mood on Sundays as a very nice parable, gentlemen, is a very serious explanation of the cultural lack of this country. You see, if you be- -- only believe in logic, you will always come too late for all events. The whole problem of the secular mind is that it is always too late. Bill Mitchell came in time. The country came 10 years later, at -- after Pearl Harbor, you see. Because no sacrifice for the secular mind. No risk. You have to stick your neck out, and you have to be persecuted if you want to be in time. I may mention this, perhaps it's a small matter compared to the sacrifice of Bill Mitchell -- but I received a letter today, and -- from Germany. And there had been a conference. And there was -- the speaker -- the main speaker was a man who has always called me a "spermo logos," a sower, and said "impractical, absolutely impractical, this man," me. And he's a man -- a very famous high- -- up in the -- political science. And -- the adviser to the Bonn government. And for seven years, I have beleaguered this man's mind. That is, he has been fee- -- felt very restive. Has ves- -- visited me here and so on. And has never said anything but, "Not for me, what this man thinks. Impossible." And seven years it has had this incubation. He is secular, and he thinks rationally, and logically. And you

would all got along with him wonderfully, you see. He never says anything important. And -- and he's always on top of the world, because this kind of diluted rationalism is of course always acceptable. He's -- never ahead of anybody, you see, so everybody can agree with him. And this conference had made him the -- the central speaker.

And in the discussion, a man got up. By the way, an ex-Nazi, not my friend at all. I just got the report today in the mail. And said, "What you said was said in this place in 1950 by Mr. Rosenstock-Huessy."

Well, he was put on the spot. And he said, "Yes," he said. "It has taken seven years before I have understood it. He was right," because I had accused then the Germans, that they were lagging in understanding of the events of the last 30 years, because they used their mind as an American will use his mind to think about things that had already happened. And always come too late, of course. And -- I had advised -- a kind of scheme by which perhaps the next generation might be spared this cultural lag, by which of course it would take a conversion of the intellectuals, if they would not conclude logically from what the eyes see, from the facts.

Zeno the Stoic, and Jesus, and Paul, and the prophets have always known that to judge by the facts leads nowhere because that's all past, you see. You cannot judge reality from the past only. You must know your destiny, your destination, the goal to which -- toward which you live to know what you have to cut away -- out of a present condition, you see. Half of the past is rotten. How can you know if the past is master, if you only think because you know the past? Now the interesting thing is, my correspondent who writes me the letter says, "Why must it take seven years before he will admit that you are right? In '50, he condemned you; in '52 he condemned you, in '56 even, you see, when I met him last summer, he wouldn't accept a word. He would never quote you in public. Now suddenly, in January '57, he has broken through the shell, and he is willing to give you the honor of having had the right -- this right insight, you see, and recommended a new method -- method in political science."

Well, I thought I might tell you this to explain the fate of {spermo logoi}.

The sower usually is condemned never to hear who heeds his word, you see. There is no physical connection, usually, between the sowing and the -- and the reaping. And therefore, of course, much sowing isn't done, because most people say, "Why should I go to this effort? I don't see any results." No results. Mostly no results. I mean, I would still at this moment think that -- I have taught for 20

years in this college absolutely nonsensically, uselessly, no fruit. You forget it all. At this moment, you may be interested, gentlemen. Tomorrow you hear something else, and you forget it. And that's of course the worst that can happen. I sow on blacktop. You are all blacktop in your minds. No -- no soil. No topsoil. You have no topsoil left, because you hear too many things, you see too many things, and one follows the other, and you have no time for me, gentlemen. It's not your fault, perhaps. I don't say it's anybody's fault. But as the construction of your mental life is today, you cannot bear fruit. You all want to be clever, gentlemen. You won't be astounded.

Gentlemen, if a man is astonished, he sinks into amazement, and -- we talked about this. Philosophy means to have time to be astonished. You have no time to be astonished, gentlemen. You say, "So what?" On to the next. Gentlemen, if you cannot be astonished over one little question, one single question, so long that you stand like Socrates, after the Symposium, for 12 hours on your feet, you see, without tiring, in the throughfare of Athens, and then find out that the comedian should be the tragedian, and the tragedian should be the comedian, the same person -- if you can't do this, gentlemen, you can't philosophize. And you can't live.

You are lived. You are lived from one stimulus to the next. And you even say that you want to be stimulated, gentlemen. If you only would pray every even- -- "Dear God, don't stimulate me," that's the reasonable prayer of any human being of your age, gentlemen: "Don't stimulate me," don't you think? Because you have too much to -- to digest the stimuli- -- -li which you already have. You want to be stimulated, gentlemen, so how can you bear fruit? Do you think that a woman receives more children if she sleeps with 10 men in one night? Well, that's what you think. Your mind is, after all, a womb of -- of chastity and fruitfulness, or it is nothing.

Paul, of course, knew all this. And he was a sower. And he was ap- -- approached by the Epicureans, and the Stoics in the 17th chapter of Acts -- as a sower. They tried to -- not to dishonor him by calling him a philosopher. The word "philosophy" occurs in the 18th verse. You see, some Epicureans, and -- some Stoics, both philosophers, debated with him. And some said, "What is this sower of words here intending to perform or to achieve?" And others, however, said, "He seems to be the announcer of a new kind of polytheism, because he speaks of Jesus and of His resurrection." So they approached him and led him to the {Areopag}, and said, "Are we allowed to know what are these new -- what is this new doctrine which is spoken by thee? You bring -- seem to bring something new to our ears. And we want to know whatever it could be, because all

Athenians are hospitable for -- against -- towards any stranger. And they always seem to be ready to give up every other occupation, if there was something new, either to say or to hear." I need not tell you where this happens, too.

And so, Paul was standing in the center of the {Areopag}. That is, the -- the -- you would say--how's the place in front of the -- of the Supreme Court in -- in Washington?--where is this -- something, I mean, is the geography so to speak, of -- of Athens. And the {Areopag} was the Supreme Court of Athens.

And he said,

"You have more religion, O men of Athens in every respect than anybody I know, because when I went by, and I looked over your various stiles, your various pillars for worship, I found an altar -- altar in which there was written, 'To the unknown god.' Now that which you, without knowing it, already cultivate, I now am going to announce to thee -- to you. God, who created the world and everything that is in the world, since He is the Lord of Heaven and earth, does not live in manmade temples, cannot be cultivated by human hands, because He Himself is the one -- the giver of life to all, and of our inspiration. He made--ex uno--out of one act of creation the whole humankind, and gave them to inhabit the whole globe. And He defined the -- the eras, the -- the lapses of time," you may say, "the -- the prescribed periods, the length of time, and the boundaries of habitation for every part of our race, and in -- charged them to seek God, if they might attract Him, or might find Him, as indeed He is not very far from every one of us in our heart. Because we live in Him; we are moved inside of Him; we exist within Him. And this already has known by some of your poets, we are God's kind" -- {genus} -- how would you say? "kind" is right?

(Breed.)

"Breed." Ja.

"We are God's breed. Since we are God's breed, we must not show our esteem with gold, or silver, or stone, or the art of sculpture" -- no, pardon me. I -- I'm wrong. "Since we are His breed, we must not compare the divine as being similar to gold, silver, stone, sculpture, or even any human thought. And since God looked down on the times during which this ignorance prevailed, and we did compare -- the divine to gold, silver, and human thought, He now proclaims to all men that we all should do peniten- -- penance, and has stated the day in which He is going to judge the earth in equity. In a man in Him he has laid

down the power to give faith to all of us, since He suscitated him from the dead."

That's the speech. The logic of the speech is academic, gentlemen. It's un-Christian. It begins with the known, and goes to the unknown. It begins with the unarguable, and then deduces, you see, the arguable. It tries to avoid the scandal of the Cross. As you know, Christianity is foolishness to the Greeks, and scandal to the Jews. The Jews say it's a scandal to say that a man could become -- God could become man. And the Greeks say it is foolish, you see, to say that God could -- no, pardon me. The Jews say it's a scandal that a man can say a man can become God, and the Greeks say that it's -- it is foolish to say that God could become man. The incarnation is a scandal to both. I mean, when Jesus said, "I am the Messiah," the high priest rent His garment and said, you see, "That's blasphemy. He has to die," because he said, you see, "He, the ma- -- mortal man, was God Almighty." And on the other hand, for a Greek, that is no blasphemy at all. All God -- men can claim like Caesar that they should be deified. They were, you see. But that the immortal gods who live on -- the Olympus, that they could take -- become incarnate and be satisfied to go to the Cross in their loneliness, and could be deprived of their eternity and could die voluntarily, that's impossible for a Greek to understand.

So the criss-cross between Judaism and Greek, of course, is a secret of the Christian message. And the problem of the speech of Saint Paul, gentlemen, on the {Areopag} in Athens is that he tried to avoid rid- -- the ridicule. He tried to be not ridiculous. He tried to sell his wares as a good professor of philosophy, and be respected in the process.

Now gentlemen, I called him a {spermo logos}, and the Greeks called him a {spermo logos}. The sower cannot be known for his seed at the moment of the sowing. He has to wait for the harvest. Paul didn't have time at that moment. He hoped against hope that he could sell his truth in the hearts of men, you see, before it had taken root in the hearts of men, before they were willing to step down and live the life of the -- suffering, and ignor- -- you see, and incognito, themselves. They wanted to know the things of life, the facts of life as you call it so nicely. And that's always of yesterday. The facts of life are always life, minus my own willingness to be eclipsed, to give up something, to be not recognized at this moment for what I think I already have the right to demand. You have always to add this voluntary minus to your position if you want to increase the future, because you must be extraordinary at this moment, gentlemen. And the mind can only see the ordinary.

You remember that we had this -- this strange situation, gentlemen. We have the mythical time, the -- God, theo- -- as an example, I give you Zeus and Heracles. And you have our time, human time, which is normal, reasonable, you see, and ordinary. This is all extraordinary. Now, the Christian, gentlemen, problem of Saint Paul was to say that the future cannot be reached by people who want to live the ordinary life, because they omit that their own ways of life have been created in extraordinary time. And since as much has been created today as was created yesterday, since creation, as I tried to tell you, is a process in which you believe as still going on, as opposite to nature, you see, since, to be a creatura means to be that we are unfinished at this moment, and we still, you see, have to expect the outcome of our own creation, tomorrow. We need those extraordinary elements of the mythical time, because everything we know: fire, railroads, and radio have been created by extraordinary people, like Mr. Pasteur, or whomever we take. Or Descartes. And they have not been created by an alumnus of Dartmouth College. Therefore -- except Mr. { }, who seems to have been a decent guy, and { }.

Well, don't you see this point of Christianity is to say that Adam and Eve were ordinary people. That is, in the days of Zeus and Heracles, there was no Zeus and Heracles. They were just common folks. But in our days, they are extraordinary people like Heracles and Zeus.

It has been said by a little Quaker woman some years ago that a Christian is not a person who does anything extraordinary, but who does ordinary things in an extraordinary manner. That's a very good definition of the problem of creating the future, gentlemen. If you cannot do your paper to me in an extraordinary manner, although it is an ordinary paper, you see, you cannot do your share to the restoration of life on this earth. In every moment, you have to do the ordinary things of life in an extraordinary way. As though nobody had ever done them, you have to do -- do them with the emphasis as though they had to be done now for the first time as a precedent, you see. If you cannot do the ordinary things in this extraordinary manner, the energy with which they are done will, you see, lose -- may be lost, the energy. Must be lost. It's a -- the famous thermodynamic law of humanity: by mere repetition and routine, the vitality is lost. You have to do everything as though it has never been done before. That's why most marriages end in divorce, because they do not celebrate the day as their wedding day. They celebrate the wedding day 25 years behind. Dead. Out goes the marriage. No one is interested in what happened 25 years ago.

So gentlemen, this is the con- -- collision between Christianity, and Paul,

and Seneca, the -- the attempt to make the future the seat of the highest vitality, instead of the past. It's that this burning up of energy, which creates the solar systems, or which creates the republic of the United States of America, which creates anything, you see, is waiting to come. It wasn't, yesterday. Anything we know of the past is lacking in grace. That's why I do not see how any one of you can pass by -- over the old doctrine of original sin. It is obvious that you are all guilty of it, every one of us. Original sin means the loss of energy by inheriting something.

Now, all America is just crowded with these softies who have inherited too much, and get an education for nothing, beca- -- and have less energy than their fathers, who got no education. And that's original sin, gentlemen. You can call it in -- terms of physics the loss of energy. Now you know very well that in every process of -- where energy is spent, there is this loss in volume, you see. And why don't you -- why do you laugh off -- your head off when you hear the word "original sin"? I think it is always the -- the -- the end of this country. When I hear this, I feel cut up, because I feel that you have become bastards of your own nation, of your own tradition. A man who laughs at original sin doesn't know that pioneers have founded this country, and had always faced -- to face the question of the second generation, where people would not, you see, have the same energy as their forefathers. That's original sin. That is, by your having inherited something, that's original, you see. By your having -- finding something already, you see, you -- you are no longer under the full pressure of having to do it yourself for the first time.

So gentlemen, Paul tries to reconcile these Greek philosophers, and tries not to be a {spermologist} -- a sower, but a teacher of philosophy, a systematizer. So he says, "Well, everybody in Greece said it just -- already. It's a well-known truth." Well, if it is a well-known truth, you see, then why -- he is of course superfluous. He first, of course, already sterilizes himself. He says, "You know it all. I only repeat the performance. Now, I told you that's anti-Christian, because the coming of Christ is something unheard-of. He comes into the world, because He never came before. If you can't make feel this -- make people feel this, that this has never happened before, it will not happen now, you see. It will not happen with the same -- with the same impact, with the same originality, with the same martyr, readiness to -- to die for it. It has never happened before. You must -- that's the first thing a Christian must say. Then of course, as soon as he says this, the Jews are scandalized. They say, "We have the revelation." And the Greeks laugh and say, "Prove it." Now, of course, if you prove the n- -- new thing, you see, by the old, it is no longer the new thing. It's deducted from the past.

So you cannot reconcile the Greeks and the Jews, gentlemen, when you want to live. You cannot. The scandal is inevitable. Bill Mitchell had just to be court-martialed. There is absolutely no other way of convincing Mr. MacArthur. You know, MacArthur was a -- one of his judges. He has to do it. And you'll see the problem of Paul--compared to Plato, and Aristotle, and Socrates--is a very simple one. That he has before him all the time this great sentence, which no other philosopher has, and Paul is as much a professor of philosophy if you like as -- as any -- as any Greek one. Much learned. Modern Greek theologians have always said he wasn't. But I mean, you just read one sentence; he's more learned than -- than all the Greek philosophers of his -- of -- who were his contemporaries. And he says this--will you kindly take down this sentence? The decisive distinction, gentlemen, between Christianity and Greek philosophy is in these three words: which you will read in the liturgy of the service of Saint Paul on June 29 in the prayer book. It's of course in the -- one of the letters of Saint Paul. I've forgotten at -- at this moment in which. And there he does repentance for his superciliousness and sophistry in this speech on the {Areopag}. He says, "The Greeks have not known it. But I -- {scio cui crediti} -- I know in whom I have believed."

The basis, gentlemen, of a Christian is that he has forbears. He has an author. He has authority. The basis of Plato is that he has ideals. Ideals, I told you, are waxen no- -- have waxen noses. That is true what you think is true. That is beautiful that you think is beautiful. And that is good that you think is good, you see. Ideals don't talk, you see. But the Lord talks, speaks very energetically to you. And if you look at Him, gentlemen, under His searching eye from the Cross, nobody is justified, as yet. He still has to do one better, because -- the problem of Christ is, as you know, that He opened our eyes to our own death, which is un- -- still in front of you and me. We have not seen it, yet. In Him, it is -- becomes known to us what it means to die. And -- since we are all cowards by nature, we don't want to figure our life in the direction of our death. We think we can find ways and means by saving accounts or something else, of escaping death.

I can't go into this. The -- the three words, however, mean, gentlemen, that for the Christian, the only mil- -- endowment towards the future is the vitality of the founder, that we have to be as vital as he, with complete freedom what to do. We have no system; we have no code; we have no ethics; we have no physics; and we haven't even logic. We have only the logos. That is, we have the power in us, which He had, you see, to remain faithful to His cause, regardless

of the consequences.

Can you see the difference between having the problem of vitality between -- before you all the time, you see, or the problem of some code of ethics, or some system of philosophy? The replacement of a -- by an -- of an ideal by a forbear, and of a code by a sacrifice by a victim, is tremendous. Because, with the victim before our eyes, we concentrate on our power of freedom, to be totally free. Self-interest, or illusion, or what-not, you see. And if we however have as our forbear a book, a text, a rule of -- set of rules, you see, we try spasmodically to compare what happens today with what happened yesterday, which is useless, you see. Nothing that happens tomorrow is of -- in any way the same as what happened yesterday.

That's why Christianity has -- always boasts that it is the doctrine of total freedom, of complete freedom. You can't understand this, why the spirit of Christianity is so much freer than the spirit of Gre- -- of the Greeks. But it is, because the Greeks at best could sell you a system. The -- the -- Christianity gives us the power of the creator of a system, so that you can create your own system at this moment. The power of creating a system stands higher than the system. Most people can never -- a whole life understand this. They think that a system is higher than the power to create a system.

I give you this example, gentlemen. If Freud and Marx in our days had their way, then nobody after Freud and Marx could be a genius, and could preach a new doctrine, because Freud says that all doctrine comes from obsessions. You -- all -- ideas, therefore, it isn't worth to believe them. Saint Augustine has a mother complex. And Moses had a persecution mania, you see. Or the Israelites -- has the persecution mania. They killed Moses. That's the origin of Israel.

And so, gentlemen, if you believe Freud, the one consequence is that no Freud cannot be born, or can at least preach. Because you can't believe any man anymore. They all have ulterior motives. Mr. Freud, too. And the second thing is, with Marx, the same. Marx was a man who lost -- left his class and went over to the proletariat. If anybody was not a proletarian, it was he. He was a prophetic Jew of a wealthy family, and he married the daughter of a nobleman, of a count. And these two men set out -- two people set out and said, "We give up nobility, we be -- give up religion, we give up philosophy, we give up bourgeoisie, we give up al- -- our country, we give up our native language, and we become the workers' champion." If Communism is right, that's impossible. The Russians killed all people of the upper class, because they were impossible. They

couldn't be converted.

And therefore, gentlemen, I fight for Freud and Marx against the Freudians and the Marxians, because I say it is more important that people like Freud and Marx can be born in every generation than any beautiful system Mr. Freud and Marx can erect. Can't you see this? I'm interested in Karl Marx; I'm not interested in Marxism. I'm interested in Freud. I hate him, but I'm interested in him. He's important. Such people must be born. In their system, they can't be born. They can't be produced. Therefore, down with the system; up with Freud. If you cannot understand this, you do not know the case of Christianity.

That's the whole case of Christianity. Christianity came into the world for no other purpose but to say that it is more important that people like Jesus are born than that the whole system of the law is preserved. And therefore Christianity is a sequence of Jesuses. It's a sequence of saints. It's a galaxy of stars. It's a sequence of martyrs, confessors, missionaries, and nothing else -- of geniuses. It has been said of -- of Christianity that -- compared to the Greek philosophy, gentlemen, in Greek philosophy, the genius was the free enterprise, private enterprise. And in the Church, gentlemen, of our era, genius is incorporated. That is, all the geniuses know of each other, and can support each other. I told you that in antiquity there was no university, because every school -- head of a school had to keep alive by, you see, in separation from the opposite school life. The first thing the Christian era had to perform is to create this consolidation of all the geniuses. What we today believe of a human mind is that he works in collaboration with all other spirits, you see. That's the problem of our era, you see. That's what is called a university. In every generation it is again back -- relapses into paganism, sloughed off. Marxism is such a temptation. Freudianism is such a temptation, to -- to bury the unity of the human spirit by claims of one little gang, you see, to know it all by themselves. So we are at this moment at a very low point, gentlemen. The era -- the year zero, in which Christ came into the world and said, "Let the spirit free everybody, so that we don't have to have the -- the war of all the systems against each other, but the fertility that all these systems may correct each other, you see, because I give you the spirit that shall make you free." This moment, gentlemen, is -- amongst us. It is not yet decided whether the United States shall not go the way of Spain, because in your great fear at this moment, and your great cowardice, and your timidity, you may end in utter -- either confusion or indifference, like the Greeks. The Roman Empire died from the indifference of its citizens. The only survivors were the Christians. The rest, just -- I mean, indif-

ference, you see. Retreat? "Oh, I'm just a human being." You can't do anything. Everybody has a little private cult: Lions, or Rotarians, or what-not. And -- and that was all. Gentlemen, the agony of the Greek philosophy, from zero to Saint Augustine, from Paul to Saint Augustine, is something I recommend to your great attention. You are on the best way of entering this path.

The abyss between the people who believe, and the people who don't believe, the people who are up to date, and the people who are lagging culturally, is as deep today as it is always, of course. But we can say today that if you believe that it is enough to have a philosophy for life, you are at this moment embarking on the venture of Mr. Hitler, Nero--that's exactly the same period, you see, in -- in significance. And because you say the individual has not -- bring the time up to date.

The lag of the mind, gentlemen, that is the problem of our day. And that means the limitation of the operations of the mind. Sum of it all: philosophy comes too late, by its -- left to its -- own devices. Philosophy as a system of its own, always comes too late. And that is the crushing conflict between Christianity and philosophy, you see. Philosophy is not wrong. But it comes too late. Because it says, "Everything -- all the facts are equally good," it remains indifferent to the disgust with half of the facts, with the power to say, "Half of the facts have to go out of existence, because they're dead." The decision between life and death, gentlemen, is not made by philosophy.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

...unable to make -- into -- their disciples into extraordinary people. The problem of philosophy is its relation to time; that the further back you go in time, the more creative is the moment. Aristotle will say that there is a first mover, but everything else is second-rate. Now how can we stand to hear from any period in -- in the origin of the world which is greater than our own time? What's this?

You all believe that the founding fathers were founding fathers, and that you are just brats, and kids, and boys. Well, gentlemen, as long as you say that they are founding fathers, and you are all boys, and the ladies of 70 are dressed as girls, you cannot wonder that this time is decadent, because you are just girls and boys. But you accept this with great glee and say, "It's wonderful."

You live all in a mythical time, just as the ancient Greeks, because -- mythical is if you say that there was a time when things happened for the first time, but today everything happens by deduction, by logic, by reason, for causes, by motivation, for ulterior motives, and so on. Well, gentlemen, if you are all caused, you have nothing to do with the first cause. But I assure you, gentlemen, that I am free, like a first cause. I am not caused.

In what I am caused, I am mortal, and I'm very indifferent. I wouldn't stand here and speak to you. But for what I say, I'm not caused, gentlemen, but I'm cause. I am a first cause. I hope you are, too, when you do right. Anybody who does right, or who proposes love, or who does an act of charity is a first cause. Has never happened before, I hope, or you can't live. You all s- -- consume life, gentlemen. Certainly in your minds. And you are very costly addition -- you are the mildew on this civilization, all the educated people in this country, because they all live by derivation. And you are even proud of this logic. You call this "logic."

So, last time I tried to show you that there was a group of men at the end of antiquity who protested, who said that the problem was to look at the past as an ordinary time, and to look at -- themselves as extraordinary people. To reverse this process is mythical process, on which you all -- you all live in a myth, of this founding-father business of the prime mover, of the origin of species, and whatever you call this nonsense, because everything has happened before, and you are just derivations. Dregs, you are. Dregs, not derivations. You are dross, { } relics.

When Paul had this clash with the Epicureans and the Stoics in Athens,

and -- for 300 years, there was this wrestling match between the Christian spirit and this philosophical logic. And I think my -- your papers bear me out -- that it is nearly impossible for me to break into your vicious circle of thinking, gentlemen. I had a talk for an hour with one of you. I couldn't get even near his mind, when I tried to show him that Plato was not simply using the ideas of Socrates, but he was existentially moved by the life and death of Socrates, and that the ideas of Plato are the fruit of the death of Socrates. He could only write and say to me that the -- the ideas of Socrates produced other ideas. That's this mechanism -- mechanism which you have in your brain, that one thought begets another thought, gentlemen. My life begets my thoughts, and I hope my thoughts beget your life. Why should I teach you otherwise, you see? But you can't see this. This interchange between -- between thought and life -- you really think that everybody's ideas come from somebody else.

The climax was reached in a paper I had to -- to criticize today, to read today, in which the gentleman said that logos, physis, and ethos are ideas. I asked you to subsume the ideas of the Greek philosophers under these three realities, these three experiences which we all have when we write, when we speak. They are not ideas, gentlemen. As soon as you make logos, physis, and ethos into ideas, we are just Platonists. Because the word "idea" is an invention of Mr. Plato. There was no idea before. And -- if you are outside Plato, there are no ideas. But you think you can dodge the whole issue by hiding behind one of these philosophers, Plato, who is the most, of course, fashionable in your time, and say that my reminder that you live, gentlemen, under God, with people, and above nature, above things, that you eat and shit, that you love and hate, and that you believe, and obey, and command, all these three things which you do daily, that these three experiences disrupt the continuity of your thinking, gentlemen. God, men, and world, or the commands which you give as an ensign to the platoon, or whatever you do, or the orders of your doctor, which you follow, because you believe in science, or medicine, or whatever you believe in, the acts of friendship which you show to your classmate, the -- or your roommate, or even your teacher, and -- to the treatment of the things which you cut down, like a tree, which you use for firewood, they are acts which point in three -- you see, absolutely disconnected directions. One, where you are overlorded; one, where you are a lord, and one, where you are a brother.

These are experiences. They have nothing to do with ideas. As long as you call them "ideas," you haven't understood the whole course. And I would venture to say that three-quarters of you, according to your papers, have not understood that logos, physis, and ethos are not concepts, are not ideas, but are a stammering attempt to draw your attention to the fact that you talk to people,

and listen to people, that you obey greater powers than yourself, and that you have the power to use animals, plants, and minerals, and the topsoil of this earth for your own sustenance. Don't you, any moment? What do you do when you breathe in this air here in this room? You dominate nature. You take it upon yourself to declare that your life is more important than the incumbered existence of this oxygen. You don't give a thought to the fate of the -- air in this room that it will be used up. You say, "I come first."

That's the experience of everybody. But in other respects, gentlemen, you don't say, "I come first." You say, "I come last." When you help a child, or when you -- or when you -- please your mother, you say, "I come second," don't you? And if you -- rejoice in a -- in a good party, or propose to a girl, or go down to Smith, you say, "None comes first, and none comes last. We are together." This is physis, ethos, and logos as directions of our experience. In German terms, of course, or English -- I found my -- German's my mother tongue, so it always comes back to me, of course. In plain English then, gentlemen, logos is the lord over me. You of course are polytheists, so I must say "the lords," "the gods" which you have. I believe in one God. Yes, most of you are polytheistic, because you don't -- anybody who doesn't believe in God believes in many gods. It's very simple, because everybody has to obey orders.

Ethos, that's man. Men. Humanity, whatever you take. Your nation. Your family, et cetera. And nature, gentlemen, that's the realm of things. The -- Anglo-Saxon word for "nature" is "world." For -- in Greek it is, as you know, the "pan." So don't repeat in your finals all your own thinking, this nonsense which has made -- sterilized most of your papers on these philosophical schools, that you think that these people use -- logos, physis, and ethos. I tried to make you realize that you, while writing this paper, are forced in your own thoughts to act, distributing part of these men to their divine inspiration, and call them "gods," or "divine," or "true," which is the same, you see. When you {count} a man "true," we say that God is in him.

And that's why he's -- a philosopher, for example, is only interesting -- with regard to what is true in him. Only one-tenth of the people who have written papers in this course have even dared to mention the question of truth. You cannot deal with a philosopher without asking whether he is true. You don't. You describe in terms from a sc- -- textbook what somebody else has reported that he has said. But I have never been able to find out, gentlemen, where you are in this whole business. And that's the only thing that would have interested me.

This is, of course, perhaps a little difficult, gentlemen. But we come to this. This is an important question. How far is this, which this man dealt with, for you real? And how far is it just a picture on the wall where you read that somebody said something about something? It's very difficult for -- for any one of you, this seems to me, to break into this reality, where you say, "I -- if I had lived in the days of Pythagoras, would also have tried to solve the dilemma between logos and physis, by saying it's all number. Because numbers can come from the -- my -- the workings of my spirit right into the things, you see. They seem to connect them." And he -- Pythagoras therefore did not ask the very simple question, "What cannot be numbered?" He only saw that something could be numbered, you see. In as far as you and I can be numbered, we become things, however, you see. So it's pretty dangerous to use mathematics.

One of you -- who is the -- the future scientist who wrote on Pythagoras?

Mr. {Porter}? Ja. Did you? You had this problem. It is a real problem. I wanted you to ask yourself, you see: how far do we get with numbers? It is a very -- awe-inspiring thing, of the Pythagoreans. Don't misunderstand me. There is something which we cannot give up, you see, that part of your and my being is explicable by numbers. It's really awe-inspiring that anybody should ever have conceived of this great harmony in numbers. But obviously something is lost. If I call Mr. {Porter}, you see, Number 365, you see, you have a right to protest, you see. Your name is lost in the -- you see. The thing that cannot be numbered, you see, is lost. What that is, is the mystery of logos, again. I mean, logos is richer than numbers. That would be the outcome of my treatment of Pythagoras, you see. Or it should have been yours, you see. Pythagoras himself cannot be reduced to a number. Otherwise there would be no Pythagoreanism, you see, no authority.

Today I want to introduce you to the -- to this last chapter of -- in Greek philosophy in which people try to cure the constant loss of power from generation to generation, because the logos was made a part of nature. The operations of lo- -- of the logos were, so to speak, considered a province, a territory of nature. Some of you have described this very clearly. -- One of you writes, for example, that with the Stoics, nature contains all the divine order of the universe, too. Now, if nature contains the gods, then part of logos, you see, obviously has been reduced to nature. And -- because the gods are the powers whom we obey. Once you look at them from the outside, as -- as nature, you see, they can be treated indifferently. Nature is that towards which we are allowed to remain indifferent. Perhaps you take this down, gentlemen: logos is that for which we have to have awe. The more you treat things as natural, the more you can

remain indifferent, the more you treat them as logos, the more we have to be moved. If you then say that the divinities--as the Stoics did, by the way, partly at least--is that the gods are real, but parts of nature, the more you allow man, as Lucretius, for example, wanted us very much to do, to dismiss the gods, you see, as indifferent, neutral.

The whole world -- way, gentlemen, from Heraclitus, in his dispute with Parmenides, is that Heraclitus wanted to keep the paradox of the logos, that I'm overawed by it, that as a moment I say something, I still feel the force by which I'm allowed to say something is above me, is something that will speak tomorrow again, differently. I have to wait--what he calls the way back--but I have said something, gentlemen, to you. I have to wait until I find myself justified, and verified, or refuted by the facts. I can treat you -- teach you something. And it will only be tomorrow that I know, "Did I?" you see. I have to wait. It isn't enough that I think right.

Sometimes, as in this country, I -- sometimes think you have to teach nonsense in order to bear fruit in truth, because the good words, the true words have all been so abused, that as long as I speak of the good, and the true, and the beautiful, there is just sterility, and non-understanding, no reaction whatsoever. We go to sleep. Now it is sometimes better to wake people up with wrong truths, gentlemen, than to put them to sleep with right truths. I don't know.

In Heraclitus, gen- -- gentlemen, the relation is still very clear that the logos is above physis. And it is very clear that Heraclitus, because he has this relation of -- logos above physis, that he is rough, that his ethics are -- serious, are severe. The result, wherever logos is above physis, gentlemen, is severity. Severity of the teacher to the student, of the -- of the prince to the subject, of the judge to the culprit, you see, because the man who has logos above nature cannot treat himself as nature, when he speaks or when he uses logos, he knows that he is himself above the things of this world. And so he has the power to subsist in a middle ground.

Today, as you know, where everything is natural, no judge has authority. The president goes in shirtsleeves and is called "Ike," and on it goes. That's a very great symptom, gentlemen, of our desire to be natural, gentlemen. Because he's natural, he doesn't want to make decisions. All the disagreeable decisions are made by Mr. Sherman Adams or some other unknown quantity, and he plays golf, because that you can understand. He's natural. That's the state of affairs of this country, gentlemen, that you elect a president who says, "I don't want to make decisions. I hate the presidency for this reason. I want to play

golf." Everybody is delighted, because you are just the same. And so you have what you want, gentlemen. You have nature. You have absolute nature, and no logos whatsoever. Pious phrases, insincerity, hypocrisy. It's the most insincere country I know of, is this country in political affairs. Not one word spoken in Congress is true. Not one word. Everything -- you see, we say -- we say that we are starved with oil, you see, and -- and now we won't sell oil to the English and French to punish them. The oil -- all the oil companies, in fact, for six months are itching to sell their oil to England and France, and with great glee have -- have come this -- see -- see this happen that the Suez Canal is blocked. Nothing better could have happened to the American oil interests. Texas is just jubilant. But no, they talk about the drought.

Nothing is true that you hear officially, gentlemen. Always the opposite is true. Don't believe one word that is said here in foreign policy. We always do the very opposite from what we say we say -- do. But to you, these pious phrases, they all take you in, gentlemen, because it's part of -- the mind to you is just a natural entity. It follows the smallest pressures, the electorate, the stupidity of the -- of the -- and the folly of the day. That's what you think is -- is -- is the mind for. The mind is a machinery. You -- and you will -- you will of course put the -- the -- the International Business -- what's the -- these -- these are these bastards doing? Wie?

(IBM.)

Yes. They will run the country very soon.

Now, I'm very serious, gentlemen. You must, if you -- as long as you do not distinguish between logos and physis, you will never distinguish between natural pressures, gentlemen, and the truth. You have no criterion of the -- that's called "pragmatism" in this country.

Pragmatism -- when Chesterton came to this country, he said, "They tell me that you can make anybody buy anything by psychology." He said, "That's -- that's new." Chesterton -- you know, the English humorist. "That's really new to me. We never would have dared to say officially that we are free to cheat everybody," because saying in psychology that I can make everybody buy everything, even if he doesn't want it, you see, that in -- in Engli- -- plain English is called cheating, you see. You call the psych- -- customers "psychology," don't you? So you see, as soon as psychology becomes a means to an end, all science

in this country is prostituted. You have to pay \$22,000 to -- in Boston to the head psychoanalyst, if you want to -- to settle for psychoanalytical practice. So you can see how many people have to be fleeced before one case can be healed. And I have a friend, who's young -- a poor teacher. She had \$8,000 of savings. The psychoanalyst found out about it, and he exactly treated her as long as there was one cent of these \$8,000 coming, forthcoming. And then {she} suddenly was cured. That's all going on in this country with great glee. You call it "science." The science of psychoanalysis, you see. I call it "the robbery." But as soon as you have no distinction between physis and logos, gentlemen, how -- what's the difference, you see? What's the difference between nature and truth? You have -- can make no -- no -- no distinction. To you, all the utterances of human beings are nothing but instinctive results of pressures on this {people}. The person says what it is clever to say. And what is lucrative to say. And you assume that's so. If you want to be elected, you have to say these things. If you want to sell something, you have to say these things. And if you want to be liked and be taken into a fraternity, you have to say nothing, and on it goes. And you believe this. That's so funny. You believe that physis has swallowed up logos.

Now gentlemen, once physis swallows up logos, the result is--as with the Stoa, as with the Epicureans--logic. That is, logos can be pre-calculated, gentlemen. The Greeks had this word "logic," and they had also the word "logistics," by the way, in many forms. And in Plato already, you find the degradation of logos to logistics. That is -- what is logos, gentlemen? Pre-calculable truth. That is, you are not saying something because you have to say it now, you see, and then verify it by your own act. You don't take an oath and say, "I'm going to be faithful to this woman," and then try to be faithful, you see. But you precalculate, as a lawyer would in a contract, you see. And all logic, gentlemen, is repeatable truth, and computable truth. it is know- -- truth already known, and now reformulated.

The result, as you know, in the Stoa was that the logic produced tremendous rhetorics. Rhetorics is also saying something, you see, for the second time. Not saying -- not speaking under compulsion for the first time, as an original mind, you see, but thinking it over, and now putting it in to such a form, you see, that it will sell.

As soon, gentlemen, as this -- as this Niagara, from logos to logic, was set in motion by Parmenides, here, when he tried to make master -- man master of

anything in the outer world, in his mind, and not allowed himself to s- -- admit that he was inspired, time and again, and to say what was necessary in this moment, but he looked at all the world as just a -- in shambles, so to speak, you get the necessity, gentlemen, of finding some way of rebuilding logos. And so you get at the end of the -- in the Paulinian appearance in Athens, you get the clash between logos and pneum- -- pneuma -- pneuma. We -- you have heard of the Holy Spirit.

Now gentlemen, as long as the Greeks believed in logos, there was no need for the special word "pneuma." Pneuma and logos -- are historical ideas. You use spirit, the word "spirit." You have heard of the Holy Spirit. Why did the Christians--when they went into the pagan world, to the Gentiles, to the Greeks especially, and the Romans--why did they have to -- burden us with the Trinity? That is the problem of the Greek mind, gentlemen. In the meantime, the logos of antiquity, the power to speak, had been used by the philosophers, and the philosophical schools as an apparatus, as a mechanism, as something that was like nature, you see. It could be particularized, and it could be itemized, and -- any of you who has written a paper on any of these philosophers must simply know that the logos was treated by them as a thing, as an entity like any other. This is what the Greeks did to logos. They depersonified it, and they detemporalized it. And they said, "The logos is a machine, is a mechanism."

To give you the -- an example of what happens in -- in America at this moment. We have here a group of people here who try to keep the inspiration of President Tucker alive. And one of the men -- took -- in this group to speak on -- on President Tucker. And he got up and he began, "The mechanism of a college..."

And I interrupted and said, "The spirit of a college."

And there was great laughter, because he wanted to speak about the spirit, but the natural word for him was "the mechanism of the college," you see. Because it's much now -- natural for you to speak of the mechanism of the college, you see, than of the spirit of the college. You -- we know more about the mechanism, the filing cabinets, et cetera, and the alumni fund, you see. So it is -- the draw is always -- the drawback is always to speak about the mechanism, you see, and not of the spirit. Or -- except when you sing "Dyin- -- Dartmouth Undying," you see, because it is so definitely dead.

This is very serious, gentlemen. You have -- we are -- anybody in any family, in any fa- -- nation is faced with this contradiction, you see, that the

spirit which we invoke usually is -- already has been used for ulterior motives, has it not? We say it's a pep talk. And once you say it's a pep talk, the logos is already dead.

Now the Christians' attempt to go out into the world from -- from Judaism--Israel being the only group in the ancient world which had shunned philosophy, and had not gone this way of logic, and natural science--this way into the Greek world was beset with this decadence of logic. If log- -- logos is a part of the natural realm, you see, then it can be looked at objectively, and it is something that I can use, as I can use anything. And the Greeks did, by the time of the Roman Empire, use their mind.

So we can say, perhaps in so many words, gentlemen, when logos becomes physis, then it becomes mind. Mind is logos in the state of nature, as a part of a man's equipment, as a man's mechanical equipment. Logos in the force of our -- and your original experience as a child, for example, is overwhelming, an act of obedience. I mean, when you take a child for the first time to church, there are no questions asked. But it tries to open its lips for the "Our Father" with the feeling that there is a Father in Heaven. As soon as you -- in this country, you can no longer rely on this. You are all so sophisticated.

It happened to me in the last class, in the last course, last year. I've never for- -- I shall never forget it. I shall take this to my -- to, so to speak, as an earthquake -- to my grave, as a real, shattering experience, that a boy in the same class in the beginning of the course seriously -- in the beginning of the class, said to me, in front of the class, publicly, that Jesus committed suicide. And by the end of the class, he had gone one better and he said, "After all, Hitler sacrificed himself for his nation." Now I don't think you can speak to this man any more about any religious truth directly, you see. He is absolutely ruined. Everything has gone.

The -- the greatest act of logos, of obedience to our Father in Heaven, has become suicide, the going to the Cross, the Crucifixion. And on the other hand, the most arbitrary bastard, the devil himself, the great liar, really an ana- -- the -- a beast from the abyss, has "sacrificed himself for his nation." This is -- can be performed in New Jersey and adjacent territories. This boy of course, came from New Jersey, from one of these Nazi communities there. Well, that's -- Wisconsin and New Jersey, gentlemen, they have more Hitlerites than all Germany today. (To give this fellow his due, he might have been able to say that quite logically, looking at it from Hitler's point of view, Hitler believed -- I imagine

Hitler believe he was sacrificing himself for his people, don't you think?)
Not in his last speech. He said, "You deserve now to perish." He didn't
say that he -- he said, "I go out, because you haven't sacrificed yourself for me."
That was his last speech.

(Well, I mean, before that. A person who's crazy can say all sorts of
things.)

But my dear Mandaville, if you do not shudder over the human frailty,
I'm very sorry you don't know how serious the destruction of all values at this
moment in this country is, if you can sell this -- and this boy was convinced that
this was clever, you see, was very smart, and if you even are convinced that it
can be held, we have no means any longer of understanding each other, because
the logos can only be understood in terms of sacrifice, you see, in terms of
obedience, in terms of authority, in terms of majesty, in terms of awe, in terms of
submission. Because the logos says to you, you see, "Now you have to go and
die on the battlefield."

Now if Hitler, you see, sacrificed himself for his nation, the whole resist-
ance against Hitler all over Europe was criminal. Understand? All the people on
whose memory our -- your, my future rely, much more than you know, because
these good people have said, so to speak, like the Hungarians now, you see. It's
very similar -- the consequence is, you see, that we have no good men in our
{ }, because they all -- the goo- -- best ones have all resisted this scoundrel. So
you get into terrible consequences, you see. The blind admiration of Nero, of
power for its own sake.

Oh no. You don't see what the logos does. Every word you speak, my
dear man, and every name you invoke organizes the whole universe, you see. It
is -- you can never isolate Jesus and -- and Hitler, you see. They infect all your
judgments in ethos and physis. Because after all, you despise then a man like
Jesus who had not -- not even -- not even a veterans' home, not even a Levitt
House to put His head down. And Hitler, who conquered the whole world, and
you still say he sacrificed himself for the --. That's the consequence, then. Where
is then -- why not take the Suez Canal? Why not march into Hungary? Why not,
my dear man? Why not? It's the only reasonable thing to do: conquer the world.
That's the consequence when you use this word "sacrifice," my dear man, in the
opposite sense in which it was meant.

You cannot isolate Mr. Hitler as a nice, interesting fact, you see. He's just

the world war, world conquest. That's what -- and he said so. "I want to be this," you see.

Oh no, oh no. The -- that's why -- everybody in Europe feels that the United States are just a shipwreck, because they have no mind left, gentlemen, or if you say -- no logos left. There is no logos here. Anybody can sell anything and s- -- called -- be called "smart." This is very smart what this boy said, you see. Also -- you also think it's smart. Smart is logic, gentlemen, without the spirit. If he makes you buy something, it's very smart. But that he may create an inflation, and a spiral in wages, and so on, by -- by overdoing his -- his automobile stunt, his prosperity in automobiles, so to speak, that is, you see, not logic. That's logos. That takes a spirit to know.

I gave an example, gentlemen. There is a paper -- who was in Philosophy 9? I think you will -- remember, I gave you this example of Mr. David Lawrence, this arch-rascal who publishes this capitalistic paper on -- on -- United States News Reports, where he said that inflation was in- -- in- -- inevitable, because debtors like inflation, and there are more debtors in this country than creditors; therefore we must have inflation.

What's wrong about this? Very smart. He was very clever. And many people, of course, subscribe to this paper, because he is so smart, gentlemen. The scoun- -- what is -- can you reach the point where you find what -- what makes him into a scoundrel, just by this one paragraph? You see, the logic is impeccable, you see. But of course, always, as with the spirit, it is that the spirit knows that there are not just debtors and creditors, you see. There is still right and wrong. There are still widows who have a right to -- to live an income, but on their pension, you see. And there are still endowed institutions who have a right to live on their endowment. And there is -- there are -- any number of things that cannot be dragged down by the greed of -- of enter- -- of workers and manufacturers. Inflation is the way in which the -- the working class and the industrial class live together on my and your back. Fleece us, that is, the people who at this moment are not wage earners or, you see, or money makers. You live in some form on a -- on a settled income, on -- on the tuition or whatever it is, who -- somebody pays. If this has to be increased, you are in danger. That's inflation. Inflation is just un- -- -not right. The smart man does not know what right or wrong is, gentlemen, because right or wrong -- you should know this from your study of Plato -- is something that is not natural. It isn't even mathematical, Mr. {Porter}, you see. That's the Pythagorean problem, you see. Plato said, "The good is also the mathematically true," you see. "Mathematics and the Good," Mr. Whitehead called his last lecture. But the good is not the mathemati-

cally correct at all. It's different.

Ethos and physis cannot be identified; that's the power of the logos to say. As soon as you make logos into logic, you will not give in before you have explained the whole ethical realm of politics by natural commotions. And that's what's going on in this country. That's what Mr. David Lawrence does in these news reports. He says that inflation is inevitable because there are more creditors -- more debtors than -- than creditors. And debtors love inflation. Can you see what happens when you treat -- treat all social relations by numbers, by quantity? That's physis. And that's -- and that's -- you see, that's acclaimed in this country.

So the word "pneuma," then gentlemen, is an attempt to get out of the constant loss of energy of the logos by tre- -- being treated by mere logic. So I have invoked the necessity, gentlemen, of creating pneumatics. That would be a reminder that logic is always wrong. Because logic treats the logos as nature. But gentlemen, that I can say "no" is never nature. That's always supernature. That is always something quite different. That's a power that is of -- primeval. Just as God created the earth, I can create injustice by calling a thing unjust. Somebody has to call a spade a "spade" before it is a spade. You don't believe this. You think the spade is a spade before I have called it a spade. But this is not so in society, gentlemen. Before I have called Hitler, you see, a "scoundrel," he is not a scoundrel, because in the ethical world, you see, anybody who can speak is on the side of the angels before he has been found out and declared to be on the side of the devil. The strange thing about humanity is, gentlemen, that you assume that before the man has been declared to be worth killing, and worth executing, he has a right to live.

Let me now put this whole problem, gentlemen, of -- so -- may I sum this up? The -- doctrine of the Holy Spirit is an attempt to link up the Greek odyssey, the Greek migration, the Greek ex- -- exodo- -- exodus from normal humanity into philosophy. This attempt to look at the mind as a mechanism, and to treat it as something that is under law, and whose results can be pre-calculated. That is the essence of logic, you see, pre-calculating of -- the results of the spiritual life of mankind. The pneuma is an attempt to restore the balance, and to say, "Just as much as I can repeat old ways, I can also start a new way." And since I can start a new way, the power with which I decide whether I repeat at this moment, or whether I st- -- start something different, you see, this decision is not logic. And that is -- comes from the spirit, or as the Greeks called it, from the pneuma.

Never forget, gentlemen, that the word "pneuma" and the word "spirit" is nothing but the word "breath" in -- in Anglo-Saxon. It's nothing so very highfalutin. It is simply the breath of life. I have published a book in German under this title, *The Breath of the Spirit*, to draw attention to the fact that something absolutely physical is meant, that I can take a deep breath and start all over again. So the -- the whole road of -- of the ancient world, from Paul to St. Augustine, is an attempt to bring the mind of the Greek philosophers back under the domination of the spirit. Or, as I tried to tell you, to balance the overwhelming weight of past routines, of known and computable ways of the mind, by unknown, unheard-of future ways of inspiration. The Holy Spirit is an attempt to tell you that the past is not better than the future; the future is not better than the past. Both -- has to be holy. That is, both -- has to be de- -- delve into this {c- -- total} freedom, as in -- the New Testament expresses it, that a good -- that a wise man brings out of his treasures something old and something new. You become, gentlemen, a Christian as long as the old is not better than the new in you -- in your judgment, and the new is not better than the old, by itself. As long as you think new is better, you are apes. And as long as you think that old is better than new, you are monkeys. So take your choice.

The problem of the spirit is that old and new are no categories for truth, or for goodness, or for value, or for importance. If you are recommended television because it is new, it's a very poor recommendation, you see. That's not a good recommendation. But you believe that you cannot resist the new. This country, as you know, is just -- if you say, "This is new," you think you have to have it, you see. And if you say, "It is old," you think you can -- you can -- pass it over.

We had a young woman who married -- went to -- to marry in -- in Oregon. And she came back after 20 years. This was in '35, that she had gone out and gotten married. And she came back in '55 and entered our church and said, "This is impossible."

And we said, "What's impossible?"

"This church," she said.

And we said, "Why?"

"It's the same rug. It's the same rug." There was the same rug, you see, lying in the aisle -- aisle, which had -- been there when she got out to Oregon,

you see. In a decent church in Oregon, you see they change the rug every three years. Of course, no -- no spirit. But rugs.

To show you what happens when logos becomes, gentlemen, the -- something physical, a mechanism, a logic, a rhetorics, all the things of public speaking, all the things you study. I got here a book yesterday -- from the university in which I have to teach next spring. So they wanted to prepare me for the worst, I suppose. And -- it's called a -- a ring lecture. That is, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 people have followed each other very -- like the Great Issue course. But with some more connection I suppose this is, because they -- it's called "From the -- from the unvivified--how do you?--unliving to the living." It is a way, so to speak, of life -- from -- from death to life.

That is the way, gentlemen, of the Greek mind. This is a typical Greek book. It begins with the deadest, the external, the air, the fire, the elements, the heavens, as it is still in Plato's Timaeus, you see, the universe, which is dead, as far as we know. It may be heated; it may be moving. But it is dead. It has no life. And all Greek mind, and your mind, too, thinks it can explain me and you by knowing what Mars and Jupiter are like, and what the galaxy is, and what the cell is, and what the waves is, and what -- all physicists do this, you see. You see, the -- the tendency is to go to physis to explain life. To begin from scratch. -- People think that's very logical. Because if you -- if you use your logic to explain the living from that which does not live, you see, the reasonable people say that this man is logical. You give me physics. What's the next science on top of physics, what would follow, Mr. { }?

(The logos.)

Oh no, no. I mean, in natural -- in the field of natural science. If you first have explained everything you can do in the realm of physics, which would be the next science -- which is already a little more complicated?

(Chemistry.)

Chemistry. {Mixturing}, you see. Then would come the cell physiology, you see, biology; and then would come plant life, you see; and then would come animal life; and then would finally come?

(Spiritual life.)

Well -- they don't believe in the spirit, but at least human life. Social life.

All right. If you think already { }.

Finally, you would then explain God from waves, and that's what they all try to do. We -- this book is very typical for what the Greek mind has tried to do since the days of -- of the Ionian philosophers, to explain the higher out of the lower, gentlemen. To explain the higher out of the lower. And the spirit with which I try to explain the lower then is itself explained as the result of the lower, you see. I use my mind to say that waves constitute the universe. But I say this. And this in -- in your mind is perfectly logical. One day it will be explained by Mr. Einstein's theory of relativity, because what I say is the result of waves. If it is the result of waves, it is not { } you, in any respect. It cannot be true, gentlemen. Because in order to be truth, it must have a source which is not waves. Waves don't bind me, you see. I can -- you can laugh at this. Anything that is just waves, gentlemen, has absolutely no compulsion. If you look through any truth, gentlemen, as being purely psychological, purely chemical, purely physical, it loses all interest, because why should you believe in such nonsense, you see? Something that is just produced, like an -- like an -- egg soufflé, like an -- how do you call it? -- these French soufflés, you see, out of a few eggs, you make a tremendously pompous { }. How do you call it?

(Fondue?)

Wie?

(Fondue?)

Fondue is quite solid, you know, compared to a soufflé. Wie?

(Would meringue?)

Yes, a meringue is good example. Soufflé, they call it. Don't you say soufflé, too?

(Yeah.)

All right.

(It's an omelette. Scrambled eggs.)

It always seems to me that -- it is -- it is just startling how you people all go around, waiting for the next physicist to explain your own highest prayer, or

thought, or -- and then think that you will accept his explanation. If all explanations are nothing but vapors of the brain, gentlemen, of the brain cells, then I'm not interested. Then he has just to say what his machinery forces him to say. And he certainly cannot tell the truth, because he will only follow his self-interest; he will follow the line of least resistance. All natural explanations explain everything by the -- line of least resistance, by gravity, you see, by selfishness. The -- way -- the response, the protest against the Greek mind was Christianity, which said that the road travels from life to death -- to dead things. That I first say "no," that by -- when I speak to you, gentlemen, I am alive. I am certainly more alive than this piece of wood. And that's why I'm entitled to stand here, and to hammer this table. It has to take it, because it serves a higher life. And -- now comes the whole problem, gentlemen, which the Christians had to face--the Jews, too--and which you and I have to face when we see the place -- try to -- allot the place to philosophy.

This book is written from the dead to the living, and it always assu- --

[tape interruption]

...this book are as alive as anybody can be -- while they wrote the book, and you are at most alive when you read it. That is, the assumption is, gentlemen, that when you write a prose book, or a book in prose, or when you read it, that this is the highest moment of vitality, so to speak. The highest phase of vitality.

Now, I'm going to go to Münster, gentlemen, and to teach there. And I shall begin with this book, and I shall say, "I have to reverse the process." I have to teach a -- a cl- -- a course in which I try to pursue the road from life to death, how even the best life dies in the ears of students. Because you take examinations, which is a specific form of Hell and death. Anything that is asked in an examination is no more alive than a dead dodo. It's killed, obviously. That's why all the great truth is constantly killed in our colleges. You cannot be asked a question in an exam under duress, and still appreciate its poetical, or its scientific value. You just have to know it by rote, and you have to -- try to get by. And you swindle, and you copy, and you cheat, and what-not. So all truth in any school of -- of the world, gentlemen, dies. The dead -- the death, the un- -- very in- -- undignified death of imitation and -- and fear.

But there is another, much more difficult thing. Anybody who speaks, gives a course from the logos down to physis--as I intend to do, instead of from

the physis up to logos--must admit that in the moment while he's speaking in the classroom--I'm speaking here to you, gentlemen--we are less alive than we might be. In other words, the whole problem of Heraclitus, and Parmenides, and the Stoics, and Plato, and Aristotle is the incongruity of the comparison. If you try to explain the mind as a mechanism, gentlemen, the mechanism of -- even of a college, the mechanism of logic, you have, through these various phases--from physics, to chemistry, to biology, to psychology--you have the right to assume that you are on top of this ladder. This book is written by people who think they are on top of the world. They are the finest flowers of this -- of this world of Mr. Einstein in which you deduce the higher from the lower.

If I say, gentlemen, "All lower things must be explained by the higher, the world is only because man is, man is only because God is, and I cannot possibly explain the slightest star in the universe -- use the slightest star in the universe to explain me, but I must use me to explain the star," I am in this very great handicap, gentlemen. I cannot reverse the process and say, "I look down now on the feces of my body and say, that is what I've left behind, although it is literally true." I must look up, as well as down. That is, any human being who is not crazy knows that when he opens his mouth and passes judgment on things, on lower -- on things of the natural world, gentlemen, is standing halfway between a greater life and the lower life. And therefore, there is no reciprocity, gentlemen, between the logician and the pneum- -- pneumatist, you may call him this way, the pneumatics, the spirit, the man who believes in inspiration and in his obedience to the spirit, because I have to admit that I am not the lord of the spirit. I am under the spirit. Whereas this other, this logician can say that he is on top of his world. He is the finest flower of the dead universe which he has construed.

Can you see the difference, that this ladder leads to the point that these 12 gentlemen are sitting there on top of their own death chamber, which they have construed, and say, "We are the finest flower of the dead universe, which finally has produced life," which is a joke to me. Death doesn't produce life so easily.

You know there have been very wise men who have said that all the oxygen in the ar- -- atmosphere come from our -- from life, from corpses that have given off the air, that even the oxygen that you find around us are the result of life. You see, not the other way around. The oxygen is not the -- the -- the reason for our existence. But the -- we are the reason for the existence of oxygen in the universe. A very great Frenchman, Felix Ravaisson, has always taught this. And I think he'll come into his own. It's a very profound remark,

that that little life, that has -- exists in the universe, you see, has come down into this universe which is totally dead, and has not produced us. If God hadn't created us as living, and created an environment in -- we would be -- these -- these dead things wouldn't be. I don't think that any one of you believes that cemeteries are the place in which the children are born. They are born in a cradle from the love of their parents. And love is nothing which you find in -- in dead matter.

However, there is a real problem, that the man who looks down, gentlemen, has very modestly put himself between the logos above him, and the physis below him. And he knows that with all his fellow men, he is in a community of mankind in which he is not alone in handling and manipulating the logos, but he is only a member of the group which is inspired. That's Heraclitus' doctrine, that while I say something, somebody else has to say the opposite. And that is the life of the logos.

So this is my problem in Münster, and it should be my problem with you, gentlemen, to make you understand the tem- -- the eternal -- temptation of the philosopher. The tem- -- temptation of the philosopher is the reduction of a three-dimensional existence into a two-dimensional existence. That is, he wants to have a polarity: "I'm the subject. You are the objects." That's all you know, too. I don't live this way, gentlemen. I know that I am entitled to call certain things objects. But I am in a certain -- to -- in all important questions, I'm subjected to some power that is not my object at all.

I -- you can hear today even ministers say in church that God is the object of our worship. If the -- object of our worship, He would be an idol, and He couldn't be worshiped. He is not the object of your worship, you see. Can you see this, that this is impossible? But that's the result of such a book, gentlemen. If you only have this ladder, from the unliving to the living, you see, up -- up -- up in one direction, you see, man is the only subject, and all other things are objects, including God.

And then you have this tragedy, gentlemen, that among the things which this -- this human mind here, these 12 wise men, here--they are very funny, really--which they finally dabble with, is the objectivity of the divine. That is, they must transform the persons into neuters, into things. Always think of the way of the Greek tragedy that -- which it is, the Greek philosophy, the word from "he" to "it," the world -- the road from -- "we" -- "he" to "it." Out of Zeus, there comes the divine, or the universe. The real change, gentlemen, is not a new name, but a new gender. "That"-ness, instead of "he"-ness, you see. That's

why you cannot understand the Trinity. The Trinity is a very simple attempt of the times from Paul to St. Augustine to combat this constant loss of personality, of your authority, of he who says something to you, by saying that if I am already allowed to think of myself as a person--which is very bold assumption, because in fact I am after all a bundle of nerves, and of -- you see, and a coward, and what-not--so if I call myself, as you are -- think you are allowed to call yourself, a "person," or even a "personality," then obviously, God must be more than one personality. He must be at least myself and two generations, and their unity. I'm only young or old. You are only now young, and one day you will be old. So God must be at least the Father and the Son. That's the minimum, in order to understand the authority which He has over me.

The Trinity is a very chaste attempt, gentlemen, to place you in the middle of the pro- -- process between logos, and physis, and ethos. It has nothing to do with denomination. It has nothing to do with the pope in Rome. It has something to do with the truth, gentlemen, the Trinity. Don't believe that because you are a Christian, you must believe in the Trinity. No. Because you have to believe in the Trinity, you must be a Christian. It -- it is simply so that your own spiritual experience must prove to you that it is utterly ridiculous to deduce your power to declare love, or to declare war, or to make friends, that this should depend on the working of your cells. That is not -- not -- begging the question. That is valid that you want to make peace. And you have to stand by it, whether your cells function one way or the other. Or the next scientific fashion tells you that your cells move in a different direction. What difference does it make to the -- your truth? What difference does it make to your freedom? What difference does it make to your willingness to pay the penalty of your decision, or to stand by your word?

As soon as you have realized this, gentlemen, you understand that the Trinity is the philosophical answer to Greek philosophy. That's what it is. It is nothing of a luxury. It isn't the heart of the matter. Jesus didn't have to preach the Trinity for reasonable people who hadn't gotten lost in philosophy. But anybody who has studied philosophy, even by indirection, in a -- in an American grammar school, must believe in the Trinity in order to get out of his mental cave of philosopher -- being a philosopher. A philosopher is a man who has only the one-way street that he is on top of life. And everything is less alive than he. He is perfectly willing to admit that he can be deduced from the less life. That's his -- so to speak, his admission in the logical process. But otherwise, he is quite sure that he represents the highest life at this moment.

Anybody who knows a little bit of himself, knows that this is nonsense,

that most moments we are less alive than great powers like genius, and saints, and martyrs, who have done much better, really -- as we -- than we. Any one of you knows at this moment, that when your mother gave birth to you, she did a bigger job than you have ever done in your life so far. And -- you know very well that a veteran who -- a soldier who has died in Korea has stood his ground better than we. We mostly fail. Anybody who has died for us, anybody who has sacrificed for us ranks higher in vitality than you and me. And any- -- no -- nobody can be talked to, who doesn't admit this from the very beginning, that there can be higher life than his own. That's the condition, gentlemen, under which we only can transact business when we deal with the truth. You cannot be the yardstick of the truth yourself. It is impossible. Can you see this?

The philosopher doesn't see this. And that's why Greek philosophy -- had to -- be brought down. And that's why I'm interested, gentlemen, in this course to say to you, very frankly, gentlemen, that the Trinity, which these ministers themselves do no longer understand, because they have not -- neither studied Greek, nor Latin, nor Hebrew, nor philosophy. They don't understand anything. They are the slaves of the fashionable philosophy of our day today, these poor, so-called ministers of the word. But you and I, gentlemen, as laymen, as secular minds, you must know the remedy against your own mind's haughtiness and arrogance. And that is only when you see yourself standing here. We are all within the realm of the experience of neighbors. One saying one thing, and another saying something else. Now we all know that this is held together by some higher authority. You have listen to me, you see, as your teacher. But I have to have teachers, myself.

In this constant exchange of authority, gentlemen, I am only on the rung of the ladder which is in the middle; and therefore there is a higher authority than myself. Anybody who has died for me, has more claim to your respect than your -- than I have, myself. He has {brought into the life}, and I have not. And I pray that I may be spared, that I don't have to die in resistance against Hitler, or some such --.

Some of -- my best students, gentlemen, who have taken every word, which I have taught them in Germany, and believed it, have acted upon it and have died from the hands of Hitler. Well, they are now higher in authority than I am. I am their teacher, all right. But they have done what I have taught them to do. And therefore they have outgrown me, and I have to admit that they are above me. And they do. By the way, this is a very practical business for me, because these people have now to be put into the right authority in Europe if -- if Germany is going to have any life again. And we are battling -- I -- I just --

large exchange of printed matter on this business. I had to write some open letters on this be- -- in this -- on this point to the people who -- who, like Mr. Mandaville, think that -- that Hitler was after all not so bad.

(I didn't say that!)

Well, at least he believed that he sacrificed himself for his nation. You said.

(I said he believed -- I said that he believed he was sacrificing himself.

Well, what crime would that be, Sir?)

Ja, that's all enough. That would be enough to absolve him. Anybody can't do more than -- than have a good opinion of himself.

(I wouldn't say it otherwise, { }.)

Well, gentlemen, let's come back to the main issue. The main issue today is that the dogma of the Christian Church has ceased to be a dogma of the Church. It's a problem of the philosophers today. The Trinity today is the last chapter in the history of the Greek mind. It is an attempt to get out of the vicious circle, and that's why they were all great Greeks who -- who had this -- who proclaimed this dogma, you see. That is, an attempt of the Greeks to find access into the Church and to Christianity.

The Jews laugh at this dogma to this day and said, "Why bother? We have never believed that man's mind was such a great thing, or that the world was -- could -- the idols of the world, the sun was a god, or the stars were gods. We never believed this nonsense in the first place. We were no astrologers, we were no chemists, we were no psychoanalysts. And therefore, we don't have to be converted." And so the -- any Jew will -- a real Jew, I mean, an orthodox Jew--not Mr. Freud or so--but they will poke fun at -- at the Trinity, and say it's not necessary. And you have learned this, and you all poke fun at the Trinity and say that Paul spoiled Christianity, because he had to say to the Greeks that they had to be -- come under authority again. Nothing else the Trinity says.

The Trinity places man in the middle. Here is nature. These are the things for which I can make up my mind. I must study them. I can -- you see, anything that is indifferent, gentlemen, is physis. Indifferent in the sense that I can use it, because I undoubtedly have the right to use all lower life. We talked about this, about meat, didn't we? With the camels and the vegetarian? Did we speak here

about this? That was the other class. Well, I mean, the -- you don't doubt the fact that you can eat hamburgers, you see. A vegetarian doubt -- begins to doubt it, you see. He places himself elsewhere and he says, "I can't take life."

Now there is this whole decision to be made that there is higher life and lower life. And just as much as you have every right to kill a flea, so you have a right to eat hamburgers. It's a national passion in this country to eat hamburgers.

Which is a grave decision, gentlemen. Why should we eat meat, you see?

If you are only apes and monkeys, a Darwinian cannot eat meat, because a man is just an animal -- other animal. If you -- if you group men on the level of animals, you see, then we better not eat meat. But man is not an animal. He's animated. He's a little better than an animal, because he can condemn himself. He can condemn part of his life as lower life, and other parts of himself as higher life. And he can draw this wedge in between himself, between his transient, and temporal, and -- and physical existence, and his representation of the power that decides where the -- the road shall go, what the journey is.

So gentlemen, the acknowledgement of the higher life above me places me in the position to know what is physis, what is ethos, and what is logos. Before, I try to mix all these spheres. I try to treat logos as a machine. I mean as -- read all these logical positivists, or semanticists. They all try to say the -- the mind is just a machine. And if you treat the machinery right, then it has infallible, but indifferent, results. There is no truth which the pure logician can bring out, that is of any importance. They are all valid, in the sense that they are -- cannot be refuted. But if you will read -- read the famous syllogisms, and the famous logical feats of Mr. Zeno, the logician in antiquity, or today, of these modern things, -- they are not interesting. They are just as good as the \$64,000 question. The answer -- I have not -- yet to find the answer to any of the \$64,000 question which are -- is of any relevance. They are all indifferent, you see. That's very typical of our civilization, that nothing important is ever asked. The stupidity is asked, and stupidity is answered. And for this you are paid.

We -- it's really very interesting, gentlemen, you see. It's a -- it's the same as with your mechanical examination questions. There can -- no important question can be asked -- which is tested by a machine, you see. They are not important. It's a lottery. -- Your life doesn't depend on the "yes" or "no" of this answer, isn't that true? Now, of course, I -- unfortunately you do not know that while writing the papers for me, your own future mental life and its health depends on the answer you give. But it does. It isn't important, gentlemen, what

mark you get in this course. And it isn't important what you tell me and what I think of it. But it is terribly important that at one point, you should break through your own mind's crust, and know that you are under logos and above physis, and in an ethical relation to me. Which is very difficult for a student to grasp, it seems. But this is the whole problem of this course, gentlemen, that logos, ethos, and -- and physis, gentlemen, can be simply called "God," "man," and "world." The -- I use the Greek words to -- to shout you into the -- into the awareness, gentlemen, that there is within the -- your educated sphere, where you all use these highfalutin terms like "psychoanalysis," and "psychology," and -- and "advertising," and -- and what all the terms are which you use, I mean, this -- this -- this goulash of -- of English, which you call "scientific language," that -- I can enter this realm of nonsense, too, and sell you there logos, ethos, and physis, as highfalutin terms. Human beings who don't go to college say -- speak just of God, man, and world with honesty, because they still bow their head to God. You don't. So I have to call it "logos." And physis to you is -- is -- seem -- seemed to me better in your technological age than if I say "world," because you think the world has no -- is not -- not entrusted to you. You don't believe that the creatures are moaning, and groaning, and waiting for their redemption by you. You do- -- think you can cut the redwood, or cut the violet -- tread down the violet, or extirpate the -- the moose, or the elk, and as long as you treat the world as -- in this sense, I'd better say "physis," to make it possible for you to -- to find this term within your own jargon, within your own lingo. So I have only spoken Greek to you, gentlemen, all this time, because I felt that by -- inviting you to the -- this -- the -- to this jargon of the Greek philosophers, I might do two things: show you the temptation, which anybody who does something in this world has, to be -- become master of his destiny. The Greek philosophy is an attempt to become master of our destiny, gentlemen. Christianity has tried to set the scales in order again, and to tell us that we are not masters of our destiny, and never shall be. This is your own decision, gentlemen. When you are in your office, in your business, you think you are the masters. To a certain extent, you are, you see. Where you repeat the performance, where you invest -- compute -- we are to a certain extent the masters of -- not of our destiny, but of our purposes, you see. Destiny has nothing to do with purpose.

And the -- important thing that happened, gentlemen, in the reconquest of the pneuma -- through the Trinity is, this distinction between purpose and destiny. The Greek mind cannot distinguish between goal and aim, between destiny and purpose. The -- when your mind is God, and God is the mind in this sense, you see, in -- in philosophy, in your own business, you always say -- think

that your purpose is your destiny, and your destiny is your purpose. Obviously, gentlemen, the destiny is only always evident after your purpose has failed, you see.

When Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt had polio, his destiny became very clear, because his purpose was destroyed. That's why many great men have been created by suffering, you see. It takes suffering to d- -- learn the distinction between purpose and destiny. Can you see this? Not? No? That's difficult. So on this we have to -- speak next time. You cannot see the distinction between purpose and destiny?

(No.)

I'm glad you say it, because that's just the -- of course, the same thing as you can't see the difference between logic and logos. Right, you are.

Who, by the way -- would you all be honest, and tell me? Who can see the distinct -- difference between purpose and destiny? Who can see it? I think that's good. This is only a minority. But that's the same issue, gentlemen. The problem of philosophy has been that knowledge is virtue. And virtue is knowledge. Now virtue is power. A man who would have power would be the master of his destiny. Man has no power. And -- the more he tries to have power, gentlemen, the more powerless he becomes. God is only strong in the weak.

That's all paradox at this moment. But I think we have the topic for the last lecture, gentlemen. The end of Greek philosophy is always -- each time this recognition that purpose is not destiny and destiny is not purpose. Today, I was satisfied to introduce you to the fact that the pneuma, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, is not a religious doctrine, and a religious experience, but the necessity of expressing the Greek experience in terms that were no longer Greek, but that -- led the Greeks back into the general experience of the whole human race, that the loss of spirit, the loss of logos, by mere logical, you see, instrumentalism, mechanism, cleverness, had to be rebuilt, or replaced, had to be remedied by making man again able to be inspired by a power higher than he himself.

Thank you.

{ } = word or expression can't be understood

{word} = hard to understand, might be this

(This is side 2.)

My friends, this is the last meeting. And I have to offer you a suggestion: what good your participation in any study of Greek philosophy might have for the future of our society. If it had not some meaning, if it was just a private interest in a -- such a serious time as we live in, it should not be sustained. You think that you are here for your pleasure, or to have a good time, or to get something out of your studies. For a teacher, that's an untenable position. I'm not here to give you a good time. I'm not here to interest you in anything. I'm not here to -- I'm here to try to mobilize you for that which is necessary. That's the only reason why you have the right to be in a college.

And most of you don't accept this challenge and you think you can do as you please. I don't talk to those.

But it is a serious question, gentlemen, why Greek philosophy and philosophy are still needed and -- in the -- predictable future will be needed as an instrument for our own salvation, for keeping society going.

This chapter of the criticism of Greek philosophy, which was started by -- the Apostle Paul, when he spoke in Athens, and which ended in St. Augustine, is the chapter which has now to be written in occidental thinking, in worldwide thinking, you may say. Philosophy itself, now, has suddenly to speak of the spirit. The reason for this is if you -- remi- -- remember what we said in the last meetings is -- I -- you remember, we started last time with this strange book, *From the Dead to the Living*, or from dead things to those who are alive -- which are alive, this lecture of 12 men in -- given in Münster in Germany, where I am going to teach this next summer. And I'm going to contradict the sequence, the hierarchy, the order of this book by giving a -- a course from life to death, and not from -- death to life, because I do not believe that the dead things produce the living. But I do believe that all life is finite and leads to death, and can only become life everlasting if one pays the -- the penalty, and knows where -- what has to die -- in order to keep the -- the rest alive.

It's a very serious business, gentlemen, that today the mind has become so natural, so just a part of nature, so logical, so reasonable, so rational, so semantic -- or whatever you call it, that philosophers themselves have now to invoke the fact that the mind is not the story of the logos, of the reason that the

word represents, or demands, or requires. And I said to you that the man who -- begins with physics, and then goes on to chemistry, and goes on to psychology, and ends up in poli- -- then goes on to politics, and finally ends up in theology, perhaps, that this man, who builds allegedly out of atoms his universe, can, when he stands and -- or when he writes his book, as- -- presume that he is alive, on top of this pyramid.

And so these 12 gentlemen of course all pose as though they are on one end of the ladder. They are supposedly alive, and--although they are teachers, which is a killing job--and that the things on which they look down, so to speak, have lifted them up out of the morass. They have pulled themselves up by their own bootstraps, you see, and now they look down on their bootstraps.

That is the funny picture which all these modern naturalists propound.

First, they say that everything came out of dead matter. And then they assume that you and I take them for living, you see, without further proof. And I told you that I am in a very much more absurd situation. I know that when I stand before you, that's not my highest life. I have better moments. Grave decisions had to be made. I think I was more myself in such moments. Nobody who can go into any curriculum, into any scheduled activity--no doctor, no lawyer--can say that while he's doing this, he is at the top of his world, of his li- -- vitality.

These moments of greatest inspiration come and go; as you know, the spirit listeth where it -- blows where it listeth, or what's the saying? And we cannot -- never know ahead of time whether we are at our best.

And therefore, a man who's -- looks down to the danger of dying, and is grateful for the little life he has, has at the same time to look up to moments in time where there is more inspiration, where there is greater life. And he has to admit not that he is on one side, as dealing with his objects, as the ruling ob- -- subject like these gentlemen, who come from Mr. -- physics and chemistry--but I come from the living word which has inspired me one time, so that I chose to be a teacher--but now condemns me to carry on the routine job of -- of teaching you for 30 or 40 years. Every day I'm half asleep, when I stand here. And I have to wake myself up against all the odds of your resistance.

And so I have to stand, gentlemen, very modestly and say that part of my mind represents more life than I -- to have at this moment. And partly it's part -- now has become part of my nature that is dying, and mortal, and is full of gravity, and laziness, and sloth, and all the encumbrances of dead weight as you call -- we call it rightly, you see. What we say, "dead weight" -- any college carries a lot of dead weight, doesn't it?

That's very serious, gentlemen. The line which I was -- the problem which I am going to talk to you about today is then the final problem of philosophy which is now before -- on the agenda of anybody who is serious in the western world about thinking -- is that the line between that -- which is below me and Him who is above me, runs right through my mind. Part of my -- mind is natural, and part of my mind is divine. And the mind itself is neither natural nor divine, but is in this transitional stage from life to death, and from death to life, and we know at no one moment whether we are stupid or wise, whether we are inspired or dull, whether we repeat or create. And we are at this moment here in this class also in great danger that I succumb to the temptation of siding with your sleepiness, and your silliness, and your laziness, and only sell you repeatable truths, in which I would commit a crime against the spirit, but would satisfy very much you, because everything I would then say would be of immediate use to -- for your ex- -- final examination. And you would praise me highly, and say, "What a good teacher! Finally, we have got it all in black and white." You see? But the letter killeth, and the spirit vivifies. And I can kill you with my letter when I satisfy your mind. The satisfaction of your mind is the crime, because your -- mind is a natural being, just a part of your nature, which goes by the line of least resistance, which goes by -- always downhill, which follows pressure, and dangers, and ease, and what-not.

So gentlemen, I offer you as the problem of philosophy, and as the reason why Greek philosophy will then form an inherent introductory chapter to our own endeavor: the fact that the logos proposition today appears in this form. You remember we had this division of logos, ethos, and physis. And we said, "Ethos -- are the rules of the game within the group. Physis is that at which all of the members of the group look indifferently." You see. With indifference, because it's outside the life of the group. The ethical behavior, you see, is the condition -- the city, for our having any nature to look at, to contemplate. And therefore, we -- we recognize that the ethical principles of fellowship, of sacrifice, of integrity, of membership come first. The second -- what you call "physical science," is only possible if all members of this group can look at the outside world with indifference, together. And Mr. -- all these physicists in -- in these various places where they now make these interesting attempts to -- to bomb us, are our servants. A physicist is my country's delegate -- delegation, the society's delegate. He's my domestic servant. Don't respect them so highly, gentlemen. They are our -- technicians. They look at the world of indifference after we have granted them their existence.

Now the logos. This was for the Greeks something that inspired the city, and inspired all the various individuals in their relation. Or it was the p- -- the -- the laws of the universe, the natural law. You see, they had either laws of nature, and -- or they had laws of man, laws of the city, of cities. That's how we started out.

Now, to you and me, gentlemen, and to philosophers of the future, the problem appears again as it appeared to St. Paul. The logos is the law of my own spiritual life. Something third. Of my own spiritual life. I must learn to discern the spirits of sloth and of creativity within myself. I must make this distinction, as I told you, between logic and pneuma, inspiration. If you want to have a Greek word, we -- we -- we shall call it "pneuma." { }, so we need a pneumatology to balance the logic. What is pneumatology, gentlemen? Pneumatology is the doctrine of how creative thought enters the community, and enters you. When are you creative? Not after you have drowned yourself in -- in all kind of dissipation, for example. A certain amount of discipline is necessary for the man to meet his God, to be creative.

But there are many other problems, gentlemen. Fear isn't -- usually not inducive to creativity, if it isn't the fear of the Lord.

So gentlemen, for the first time in the history of the modern mind, the theology of the philosopher suddenly is paramount. And lo and behold! The best book written on Greek philosophy in the last five years is written by a gentleman in Harvard, who's very famous, Mr. Werner Jaeger, on the theology of the Greek philosophers. The reason is -- should be -- to you now be apparent. The only interest we now have in the Greek philosophers is their own enthusiasm. But what is enthusiasm? The inhabitation of the philosopher by God. That's enthusiasm. "Enthusiasm" means "God inside." So the problem today is not the laws of the city, which came before there was philosophy, gentlemen. And it isn't the laws of nature which came after philosophy enabled men to look with -- in spectacular success to compare notes about water, and fire, and earth, and all these things, in common to all citizens, you see, of all cities in the world. Today -- there is a third problem today, gentlemen: the ethos of the thinker. The ethos of the thinker, because the ethos of the thinker is penetrated by a sharp sword -- as the Gospel rightly says, that he is half-dead, and half-alive. Partly as far as he is dead, he belongs to physis. And the mechanism of his ph- -- psychology, you see, is simply that he goes by the line of least resistance, that he will judge by prejudice, that he will be inhibited. And in Yale University -- Yale Law School, they had a course on the prejudices of judges. They studied the

stomach ulcers and the hemorrhoids of the -- judges of the Supreme Court. And then they predicted how you should plead in front of these judges to win your case. That is, that's actually true. It was a -- an all-time low. You know, you don't know this, gentlemen, but America is just at this moment coming out of a deep moral depression of 25 years, in which the scoundrels held sway in all our colleges. And they partly still hold sway in our institutions of higher learning, in which you could get away with Proust and Freud as the standards of life. And you still believe that's true. Now you have Sartre.

Well, that's very simple, gentlemen. You believe -- actually were told that the judges of the Supreme Court could all be bribed if you played on their ulcers, or on their nerves, or on their prejudices, or -- if you only knew the -- the -- the keyboard, you see. Justice? That was -- had gone long out of the window. This whole group, gentlemen, exists. They are professors of law, they call themselves, you see. They are -- of course, they are professors of injustice. We live in the time of the sophists, again. But the difference is, gentlemen: the sophists mocked the laws of the city. The -- the modern man mocks the laws of his conscience. That is, the laws of the person, the conditions under which a man is a person is, however--and you know it, that this is true, from your own experience, gentlemen--that the line between death and life runs right through the middle of your own intellectual life. In as far as you just have a mind, you are a drilled and trained animal. You jump at conclusions. If I hold the meat, the sausage before you, you see, then you draw the conclusion. You just have to say, "The man is a Democrat," and the other fellow reacts accordingly. All these things, "Jew," "Pole," "Democrat," "Bolshevik," I mean, they are -- can be used for treating man as a circus -- a member of a good circus in which he jumps to conclusions just as the animal runs through the ring. And it is a spectacle, of course, in which our adverti- -- Madison Avenue -- leads. They tell you that everybody can be made to jump. And they play on the mind, gentlemen, as a part of the natural law -- order.

You can see, however, the man who says that everybody can be jumped upon by prejudice and can be -- be dragged to conclusions mechanically, thinks that this sentence is true, this one sentence. And with all this one statement, he is already in the realm of freedom. Because anybody who knows that this is so and can state this, you see, thinks that you should accept the statement not as a consequence of his ulcers or his glands, but as true, you see. If this one sentence is true, then there is truth. If there is truth, then there is something superior to your death. Because the truth must prevail, whether you have to die in the process or not.

What is truth, gentlemen? That which is valid whether I like it or not. Whether I benefit by it or not. Whether I profit or whether I am going to hang. The criterion, the ultimate criterion of truth is that a man represents this truth willy-nilly, even if he has to go to the cross. That's the only verification of a great truth, gentlemen, that a man is not fazed by his danger of death, as you all are. A man who is not willing to verify what he says by his death doesn't know what truth is. He may say, "I'd better not fight. I -- I'm not a truth-sayer. I'm not for this martyrdom." But then he should go out of the way and admit that there is truth. But he is only unable to represent it; he's impotent. Most people today are impotent to testify to the truth. That's true. But that has nothing to do with the fact that all the -- even they still think that there should be mercy for them, and that the truth contains the sentence in which is said, "The untruthful may be tolerated until they become too dangerous."

We all live, gentlemen, by the truth, and not by self-interest, because not one of you has his life in his own hands. We are all tolerated, gentlemen. The dividing line, gentlemen, in -- goes through you and me. And I -- today I offer you a very practical criterion of how to draw this line. It is of course not my own invention. But it has nearly been forgotten, especially in the last 200 years. It is today forgotten with one very cunning vocabulary, the identification of "mind" and "soul." Whenever today people use the two terms, "mind" and "soul," interchangeably, gentlemen, they deny that the mind is half-alive and half-dead. They think it is only a mechanism. And the -- most of you use "mind" and "soul" indiscriminately. Most of you would, of course, say that if you have to choose, you'd better use the word "mind." "Soul" may -- cannot be found. And on the other hand, you may use then the word "soul" sometimes as though it didn't matter much whether you said "mind" or "soul."

It is very important that this battle was fought already 2,000 years ago. S-- Paul was very much aware that the academic tradition insists of making the mind a part of nature. And then the soul disappears. Everything becomes mind. The soul is then nothing but muscles, or physiology, or reactions of nerves, or what-not. And the lack of distinction between psyche, gentlemen--the Greek word of "soul"--"mind," that's the Greek {nus}, and spirit is the quandary of the Greek -- of Greek philosophy. As far as logos was degraded to logic, the distinction between mind and soul was lost, and the spirit was extrapolated as something has to do with the city, before the individual came about, or with the gods which were just superti- -- -stitutions, and became evil spirits or what-not.

In the Letter to the Corinthians, which I recommend to you as a part of philosophical reading, because Paul was versed in all the -- in all the disputations and arguments of the Greeks. And he has very scathing terms in various letters for the emptiness of their psychology. The -- it's a -- they are philosophical letters, gentlemen. Just as much as what you like to forget, I mean, of course, and what you think, they have to be religious, which puts you to sleep.

The -- he says literally in the 15th chapter that--of the Letters to the Corinthians--oh, the first chapter, pardon me--that the -- the bastards, the secular mind, are {psychekoi}, are psychologists. They believe that there is nothing but the psyche with its mind, and that follows certain mechanic laws, certain predictable reactions--all the things you have to -- are made to believe, too--and that the pneuma, the spirit, you see, is denied by them. And so he makes the distinction--I think the two words are worth your new knowledge--between the {psychekoi}, he has not -- no necessity of speaking of psychologists, the word "logos" is quite unnecessary. He makes it direct. The {psychesi}, in Latin you would -- or in -- in English, you would call it the "{psychesi}," the psychics, and the other he calls the "pneumatics." So he says, you have to take your choice, whether you believe that everything is under the understanding of a mechanism of my mind, or whether I am a pneumatic speaker. The psychic speaks according to his own interest. And the pneumatic speaks without any regard to his self-interest.

Obviously, gentlemen, when you go to a doctor and ask for his help, you always believe that he is acting pneumatically, and not psychically, himself; but he is in the service of divinity of his medicine, and that he is dealing the truth out to you, regardless of whether you -- he is making money on you or not. It is no consideration for a doctor to ask himself how long he should prolong your agony, you see, because he wants to keep you as a customer. A good doctor must send you away after the first meeting and say, "I have no need anymore -- you have no need anymore for my cure," you see. And a doctor who would keep you for 20 meetings, you see, would be a scoundrel, would he not? And a good doctor won't do this.

Now what's the difference then between a good doctor, gentlemen, and a scoundrel? That he is pneumatic. One of the seven spirits of the Holy Spirit, the spirit of healing, has taken possession of him, and he is willing to forget his self-interest. And you all believe this. The same is with any professional man to whom you go. You assume that the spirit of his profession keeps his mind so alert that he forgets the carnality of his flesh, and the interest of his self. And

you couldn't live for one day if the {people} were not -- around you were not much better than you yourself, according to your own materialistic philosophy. But I find today Americans of course are prone to condemn themselves to the bottomless pit of what they call "materialism," but this -- all assume all the people around them are wonderful guys, and -- and obviously in the -- in the service of the -- of the spirit of God. Very strange. It is a complete reversal of the times, I think, of the past. Today the individual American is quite abject in admitting his own materialism- -- -ness. He says, "I'm not an idealist. Oh no, I can't. It's -- would be stupid," you see. "I -- I'm selfish," and he's quite relieved if he admits it to himself, and feels he's a great man. But then he always relies on the community that some people in the community are not this way. He can turn to them for help, for example, and he feels that they won't cheat him. He goes, for example, to psychoanalyst, and he thinks the psychoanalyst will love him, help him, cure him, and send him home, you see, after he has no more money.

So gentlemen, the original new situation of today is that the line between physis and logos does not run through the city, the community, but runs through you. A philosopher is a -- a -- a city in the nutshell. We are all today so highly individualized that you can say of all of us that we are Greeks in the sense that we are, every one of us, a philosopher. And since we are, we must now, you see, distinguish in ourselves the part which is original and alive, and the part in us which is purely mental mechanism. The line of division between logos and physis, in other words, today runs inside the biography of the individual. And for your own salvation, gentlemen, you must inquire when you are inspired, and when you are expiring. I would call all the expirational processes of humanity, the mechanic processes, the "mental processes." They are necessary. Anything we repeat. Anything we learn by rote. Anything we just follow by convention. That's not bad. As much as I have to ex- -- inhale, I have to exhale. As much I have to eat, I have to shit.

So gentlemen, don't mistake me. The mental processes do not stand condemned. A part of our life is death. They are intertwined. The real problem is only to see the inherent necessity, gentlemen, that as much as we can logically conclude from precedent and cause, you see, as much we also must set new -- be ourselves a first course.

So in a very logical, I think, and very -- a very simple manner, once you admit that the line between logos and physis is not now inside the community--the United States, which has a territory, which is physical, rivers,

mountains, you see, climate, resources, geographical situation, economic situation, and then the education of the people, you see, and schools, and philosophers, and churches the other way--but if you see that inside you, part of your mind is deadening, is routine, is inherited, is nothing but result, and that for this very reason, it will poison the community, unless you also are the sower of new truth, and the beginner of a new chain, you see, that you can misjudge your own situation within the community. If -- and since we have vulgarized philosophy to such an extent that you, and I, and we all can claim to have a little bit of the habit of a philosopher, forming our own judgments, then it is terribly important, gentlemen, to discover the difference between Plato and the Platonists, between Aristotle and the Aristotelians, between Parmenides and the Eleatic School, between Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans, between the men who thought something for the first time, and the people who repeat what has -- they have thought for the first time for years to come, that gentlemen, the cleavage in the future is today -- will be the cleavage between the men, the group of men, the kind of man who is a genius -- are geniuses, and those who follow geniuses. Now every one of us is in the same boat, gentlemen. At -- in a certain field of your own endeavor, gentlemen, where you are in love, where you are courageous, where you are inspired, you -- you begin something. And in other ways of life, you learn, and you repeat. And every one of us, gentlemen, is half genius, half inspired, and half routine. Twenty-three hours a day, I would say, we live by conventions, you see, and one hour--it's of course an arbitrary figure--you can see this, you see--you are setting precedent for others. Not more. I mean, that's already quite a big order. Twenty-four -- one-twenty-fourth of your time would be spent in the leading { }, you see, where you have no precedent, where you first climb the mountain. But in some little way, every one of us has to know that he has to strive for this balance between inspiration and expiration, between mind and spirit, between psyche and pneuma.

And that is what St. Paul invoked constantly in his letters. He has a very typical way of putting it. And I like to dictate to you this sentence, because I have never found it commented on.

He writes in the -- perhaps you take this down. First Letter to the Corinthians, 15th chapter, 45th verse. Now that's straight philosophy. "The first man"--will you take it down?--"The first man, Adam, became a living soul. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit." This is expressed historically. If you -- we now in philosophy, gentlemen, after 2,000 years are allowed to use these same terms systematically. The first man in you and me, the man of the city, the child of man, the child man -- son of the -- man of the world is a living soul -- living

soul. But the man who wants to render to his community, to his life on earth, to his historical -- in his historical place what he has gotten, who wants to give back what he has received, must become a life-giving spirit. All the terms are here of which I am talking. It's a wonderful verse, because it's just one verse, two half-sentences. And you have the fact that man is two things. As a member of his community, he is a living soul, just psychic. Can be treated psychologically. He's alive, yes. But soul and life in the New Testament, by the way, "psyche" and -- and "{se}" are interchangeable. Some people translate the word "psyche" from the Greek into the word "life" in English, and others translate it into the word "soul." It is perhaps better to just translate it as "life." It's vitality. That's what it is, psyche.

So man was made into a living being within his community. When he wakes up, gentlemen, and turns around, and becomes the acorn that falls down from the oak tree, and must found the next community, his family, his profession, the next -- city, he becomes the nex- -- first president of Czechoslovakia, or whatever he does; that is, after all, sets out to start a new avalanche of fac- -- acts rolling. He must be a life-giving spirit.

That is, gentlemen, beyond life there is the power that gives life, as we all know physically. And if you go -- the -- the -- the laws of procreation are more important than the laws of -- of living. Procreation comes first. That's as you know why the -- why the great animals forgo food when they court. For three months, these sea lions don't have to eat. And they go up into the island on the Pacific. You have seen these movies, probably. You remember? What was it? "Sea Lions"? Or what was it?

A great story, you see, that they do not have to -- they forgo self-interest, because the survival of the species is much more important than their own life. So perhaps I have made this -- my point clear, gentlemen, that you and I are two people. In as far as we inherit an order of our city, we are living souls. And our mind then is working in a mechanical way, because it has been impregnated by an order for which we have not received ourselves the first impetus. We were not responsible for our behavior. We sit down at table. In -- in Turkey, they kne- -- they sit on their fannies, and not on chairs. You will admit, as we all know, that's convention. And although a child may think it is a great crime to eat in -- by -- you see -- kne- -- to sit down, not to sit down, but to kneel when eating, you would laugh the -- with -- and feel that you are superior to this child, because you know it doesn't matter. But of course in innumerable ways, you and I are western people, and of course we have, as everybody

knows, our mechanism -- mechanism, and our defense mechanism, and our hatreds, and our animosities, and our prejudices. A -- a man like myself was brought up--to give you a rather innocent prejudice--with such a prejudice against the Jesuits, that it has taken me all my life to -- and friendship with real, specific Jesuits before I could drive out this terror, which I was -- had received into my -- into my blood that Jesuits were just all very wicked people. And so the mechanism of our psyche, gentlemen, is a reality. It is also a reality, gentlemen, that for the love of the future, we are able to divest ourselves of this mechanism. That's the right word, I think, "divest." D-i-v-e-s-t. And this power of divestiture, you might call it, of divesting yourself, of yourself and of your impregnation of your mold, that is the condition for doing our part of the gener- -- regenerative processes of the human race. Just like -- as these penguins or sea lions are not allowed to eat for three months--that is, give up their daily habit, you see, for this greater purpose--so all of you, gentlemen, when you make a real decision--for example, for whom to vote in the next election, you cannot vote by self-interest. That's not a good reason. Or you are not citizens. As -- if -- if a country, gentlemen, has all the voters only voting for self-interest, it must go bankrupt. It must go bankrupt. The importance in any country is that little group that swings the balance which is not swayed by self-interest. The others -- I mean, don't count these votes of 45 millions, and so on. I'm not impressed. The margin, the people who can be swayed by deeper considerations, they are the ones for whom the whole system of democracy alone is, you see, feasible and through which it is upheld.

That you do not see, gentlemen. You think democracy works by majority vote. I assure you it only works by the people who are not -- you see, cannot be foreseen, so to speak. This country has been saved in wartime as you know by a man like -- Secretary of State Simpson or Stimson, or Hull who were Republicans who served the Democratic administration. And America has always been saved by such people. We have an honorary doctor of this college, Grenville Clark, who has saved the country twice. Nobody knows of it -- much. He lives here in New Hampshire, so we gave him an honorary degree. He deserves more than an honorary degree of Dartmouth. I don't think that's such a great honor for the man. But -- because we are honored that he accepted it, he created the Reserve Officer Training in Plattsburgh ahead of time, so that the United States were ready in 1917 to enter the war with a -- at least a certain group of trained officers. We did this with General Leonard Wood. And he has created the draft board system, which has certainly de- -- debureaucratized the -- the draft, to a certain extent. And he has many other merits, but these are his two outstanding ones. That is, a -- a voluntary action of total self-forgetfulness, as it comes out in

the fact that he -- his name isn't even known for these great acts -- actions. -- You -- the -- you read a history of the First World War, and Mr. Leo- -- Grenville Clark isn't even mentioned. But only on his existence does the democracy of the United States, gentlemen, rely. As long as you can find this unknown group of patriots, the democracy system can function. The pre- -- -supposition, gentlemen, of everything that's in the Constitution is, that there are people who are not influenced by self interest. As long as you don't have this third group, the whole mechanism must break down. You must have civil war between all the {struggle -- } interests. You always assume there's an arbitrator. If your mind is a mechanism, how can you, if your mind is a mechanism, assume that there is any disinterested person? Impossible.

Now there is no disinterested person, gentlemen. But there are people who are more interested in the survival of the race than in their own survival. Take it very massi- -- massively. Jesus was very much interested--He wasn't unselfish and Paul wasn't--in the sense that He didn't want a certain future to come about. But He want -- was ready to pay the price of His own existence for this future, which any man in love has to do, like the sea lions. They perish in the process, like the drones in the beehive.

This is the mental proposition today of the philosopher, gentlemen. And the strange re-arrangement of forces in the future of -- in the next hundred years in which philosophy will have to be taught, and Greek philosophy will have to be taught, is this: Will you please carefully assay -- assay this great transformation? Fifty years ago, the philosophers stood for the indifferent things, for nature. They -- all philosophers were philosophers of nature, and the theologians tried to defend inspiration. Today the process is totally reversed. The theologians are so well versed in biblical criticism, that to them the whole Bible has become natural. And they are the pagans today. If you want to hear a real pagan, then go to a theologian. They don't even know what it means to -- to believe in God. They only know of God. They discuss Him. They argue. Just as the Stoics and Epicureans discussed the gods in -- in the Areopagus. The philosopher today, however--take Nietzsche, even take Sartre with his existentialism, who speaks that man is thrown into the future--have more faith than any of these ministers.

I -- receive a -- a magazine, Christian Economics. Such a lack of faith I've never seen.

The terms, gentlemen, in which we are going to speak rationally about

inspiration, or have a pneumatology, of course, will look different from the ancients. To give you an example which may clarify the way in which this -- eternal problem between the life-giving spirit, and the life-consuming spirit, between expiration and inspiration, between mechanism, you see, and -- what's the opposite to mechanism?

(Vitalism.)

No. That would be still psychism, you see. But it's very interesting.

Perhaps it's shouldn't be -- you -- you find the word, you see. I -- going to say it later.

This -- dualism inside the life of the philosopher I may perhaps explain by a remark of Aristotle. Aristotle was asked what hope was. What hope was. Now the word "hope," as you know, is the American ground word. If nothing is to be hoped for, there is still hope. Hoping against hope, that's a very famous term in this country. And one of my best American friends said me when I came -- told me when I came to this country, he said, "There's no faith in America. But there is much hope." That's very true, gentlemen. And we need -- if you want to understand, gentlemen, the difference between inspiration and expiration, between psychology and sociology, on the one-hand side, and the doctrine of the pneuma, pneumatology on the other, I would say that all what you receive as -- today as the science of the mind is based on hope. One day we will know. One day everything can be explained, you see. It's all wishful thinking. It's all very hopeful. And one day we'll know everything. And so I then say, "So what?" I mean, if we know everything, we will have no reason to live anymore. I don't want to know everything, because I don't -- I want to live. The idea that by knowing everything, you could still have life on this -- earth is of course nonsense. Once you know everything, life is extinguished, because then everything has become mech- -- a mechanism, predictable. If you would know everything, you see, then God would have become a thing, and life would be neutralized. I -- we talked about this "who" and -- and "what" business, didn't we. I can also say, "Where I am inspired, I am listening to some one." "Inspirer" -- "inspiring" always means to believe in who's who. That is, in persons. And to expire, to function mechanically believes in so-whats, in whats, in things, you see. Down below, for the natural man, there are only the world of things; and above, for a living child, for a creative mind, for a poet, even the flowers and the stones are personalities, you see, are she and he, because everything is alive. Can you see this?

So the -- you can also distinguish the inspiring faith which goes through your mind, where you have the power to personify, and this other, this sterilizing power of neutralization. Where you neutralize. As soon as you say, you see, "God gave this to me," you are inspired. As soon you say, "Somehow it was given to me," you are a coward, you are expiring, you don't want to commit yourself. You see, the unbelievers call God "somehow." Whenever a man says "somehow," you know that he suppresses a religious phrase. You don't know this individually, you see. But it is just the way in which you still leave open the fact that there is an inexplicable, you see, thing. But you can't anymore make up your mind to call it "God," so you say "somehow" or "anyway," you see. "I did it anyway," usually by an inspiration of the devil. So "anyway" is just as "somehow," very significant for the modern man's philosophical mind who only wants to look down to some mechanical thing. And since he doesn't know the cause, he puts in "somehow" and "anyway," so that he can say, "I didn't say that was a devil, or a god, or an angel, you see. I neutralized it. Of course, I have no idea what did it, you see. But it was certainly a what, not a who." I mean, when a married man says so, you see, you always know that his wife asked him to do it.

Now. We today would then have to say, gentlemen: The mind, who has these endless chains of causation, of logic, of deduction, for example sees how long the road would be to progress. But he says, "Somehow, anyway, one day we shall arrive there." That's hope, is it not? Hopeful thinking. You all live by these hopes. You even think that's good.

Well, Aristotle was asked, "What is hope?" And he answered a very important thing, I think. He said, "It's a dream by day." It's a dream by day. And I thought about this, and I said, "Couldn't I find a definition of faith which could correspond to Aristotle's say?" And I think faith to you can become valid if I say, "It's intelligence by night," in sleep. Aristotle said, by the way -- the fa- -- the correct definition is, "A waking man's -- a waking man's dream." That's hope: a waking man's dream. And I would say that faith is a sleeping man's wisdom.

You see, a -- a general who has laid all his plans, like Eisenhower for the invasion of Europe, and he cannot go to bed and sleep, is not a general. That he has the faith to sleep, to for- -- go to bed, you see, that's his -- the wisdom that must take him -- through the night. He's more intelligence by going to sleep than by going on thinking.

This is, I think a very useful help to show you the hinges in which our

real personal life hinges, hangs, is suspended. You have to sleep and you have to be awake. Hope is the waking man's dream. And a little bit of dreaming probably in daytime is in order. Without these daydreams, you see, without hope, the har- -- they would be too hard.

Modern psychologists are too much interested in night dreams. I think they should be more interested in the hopes that men nourish at day, where they cannot quite wake up to -- to reality. So I think Aristotle's definition is very useful and very important.

Now the creative mind, gentlemen, is the one who can sleep so deeply that his faith can produce. And when he wakes up, the solution is there. As you know, all the best things come while you are asleep. We grow in our sleep. All inspiration takes place in the early morning hours, when you wake up and it has come to you, like the egg of Columbus.

So I think faith and hope are very much related, like day and night. Now all mental philosophies, gentlemen, of the Greeks have tried to frown on sleep, to praise light, to praise enlightenment, to praise clarity, clarification, and so on. Gentlemen, obviously the balance between night and day, the balance between darkness and consciousness, between extinguishing and -- and enlight- -- illumination is the real problem of your and my life, and of the life of all of mankind. There must be as much darkness as there is light. And the idea that there can always be more light leads to the extinction of the stars in your consciousness. And I think if I had to say something, we would have less night illumination than we have in this country, in favor of the Edison Power Company. It's very serious, gentlemen, that you live in a fools' paradise, because you think you can abolish darkness. And you do not ask yourself why there shouldn't be darkness as much as light, so that light can impress yourself as light. Unless there is darkness, light loses its meaning.

This goes, of course, very far. A -- a zoologist has now come out with the declamation -- and very eloquent declamation that we ourselves, gentlemen, have so abolished the -- the contradictions, the paradoxes as between darkness and light -- death and life, and -- that the -- the human population now increases by leaps and bounds and uproots all lower life. And they say -- he says, "If you would ask the moose, or you ask the nightingale what they think of population increases in -- in mankind, they would say, 'That's a cancerous growth.' It's a cancerous growth that these -- these men-bacteria represent, you see, because as in -- with cancerous growth, you see, it -- it strips -- outstrips all leaps and bounds. The proportion is changed. And since man has lost all sense of propor-

tion in his mental thinking, since he has said that mechan- -- mechanization, clarification, statistics, knowing more and more by system, you see, is im- -- is the only solution of everything, it's no wonder that he himself lives in this cancerous way on the surface of the globe, and ruins the soil by chemicals, and water pollution, and what-not, and so undermines the balance between the less-vital and his own vitality.

It's very serious, gentlemen. Wherever you look, you will scent -- feel that the true wisdom today is to acknowledge that before -- unless you have darkness there must -- can be no light. That's why I think this -- we'll take -- say farewell to the child prodigy, where light came too early without any darkness, you see. It's terrible to be a child prodigy, because too early, you see, everything is clarified. The child has not been allowed to sleep, and to daydream, and to slumber, and -- and therefore down with the child prodigy, I would say, because it means that philosophy has lost any sense that before there can be expiration, mechanization, organization, clarification, enlightenment, there has to be inspiration, you see, and creation, and originality, and spontaneity.

So you see perhaps -- at this moment that my line to draw the difference between mech- -- mechanism and creativity within the human -- the human character of the philosopher, of the thinker himself, within human -- thought processes is really today critically needed. We can no longer today ask so outwardly what is mechanical in a community, you see, and what is political there. That will depend on your and my awareness of how much dead wood you represent, and how much life you represent. How far are you a life-giving spirit? How far are you just a living soul that is lived by mechanisms, by psychic, you see, formations?

My answer then is, gentlemen, that our solutions probably will all have to do with time concepts, like night and day, waking and sleeping. That's a rhythm in which things follow each other, you see. And instead of saying, "mechanic," I will say "day thought," you see. And instead of saying, "incarnation," I will say, "night thought," "growing thought," you see, "sown thought." You remember the sower. And that -- of course, where you -- want to sow a seed in a -- in a student, gentlemen -- think of my situation. When I came to this country, there was still a great respect for vacations. We are now nibbling off this very wonderful gift to the -- your mind, in which your mind is allowed to lay fallow for four months. These four months in summer were the heart of the -- matter. You have such a mech- -- mechanized mind, that you do not understand that the four months in summer are much more important than anything that happens in winter. Because it -- your mind lies fallow, it's a night of your

consciousness. And therefore, when you return to college, you can have grown. You might have grown. Some of you do, as you must -- all have experienced. But nobody has respect for these vacations. The people think you have a rest, or that's laziness, or that's for making money, or going out West, or having a -- taking a trip to Europe. Who is interested in this damned trip to Europe, you see? What we are -- need is incubation. For incubation, there has to be a quiet time. Now what you do in summer is absolutely indifferent to me. But it's terribly important that you do not learn actively in these four months. Can you see this? So that the action of your mind, which is always mechanic, can be balanced by a creative respiration of your mi- -- you see, of your -- of your inner man, in which certain things can protrude, and grow up without your knowing it, without your doing anything about it, just showing their head, and coming to the fore as important as having a --.

You see, today, the women in this country, the men, the students, they are all unimpressionable. I can't make an impression on you, because you are impressed 365 days a year, day and night. And -- you are overimpressed. Too much stimulated, because we have denied any difference between the active, mechanic mind -- mechanically working mind of the psychologist, you see, and the creative mind of the future citizen. And so teaching has become a very sterile business, and the expression are these mechanical examinations with "yes" and "no." They are all for the active mind.

Gentlemen, this whole course, as you -- can see, what do I care that you know anything about the fact that I can ask an examination? As long as a man makes such nons- -- writes such nonsense that logos, physis, and -- and ethos are ideas, and are not his own experience, and his own immersion into reality, I haven't made an impression. And to make an impression on you is much more important than, gentlemen, than to make you so- -- make you know something which I can inquire for in an exam. Can't you see this? Where in your anatomy the thought, "What is Greek philosophy?" is harbored, is my problem. Can I put it into your liver? Can I put it into your spleen? Can I put it into -- only in your brain? If I have only unloaded my whole course into your brain, if it doesn't preoccupy you during the summer, and if you forget it after the finals, I have not work- -- operated right. Is -- I -- is not clear? Here, it goes in, here it goes out. It evaporates. That's the right word, gentlemen, evaporates. And that's why you think of the mind as something vaporous, as something airy. You say, "Ideas are airy. They are not solid."

Gentlemen, when a thing of the mind gets hold of you, it begins to be

embodied by you. And this is called "incarnation," or "embodiment." And that is the problem of philosophy, gentlemen. The problem of philosophy is the question: Can spirit be embodied on this earth?

Now you see perhaps why Plato and Aristotle are more important than the Platonists and the Aristotelians, you see. If you say, "I'm an Aristotelian," I'm not interested, because that part in your anatomy which is Aristotelian is just here, a little thing, placed up here, you see. For the rest, I look at you, and I say that you ma- -- would make a good football player. But you are not Aristotle. But Aristotle is not a good football player. He's Aristotle, right through. He embodies Aristotelianism. That's your question today, gentlemen. That's why I tried to tell you that the line today has to be drawn between the man who thinks something for the first time, and something -- body who repeats it. That's the problem today of problems. Plato against the Platonists; Aristotle against the Aristotelians; Paul against the Paulinians, and so on. Christ against the Church. Everywhere the problem today is: We all are on both sides. We are all 23 hours repetitive. And we are one hour original. Put it in a -- as I said, a perfectly arbitrary proportion. But we have to say both sides in our thinking. You cannot think because you are 23 hours mechanic, that you all can be ch- -- that you can be cheated, and that you must always take the line of least resistance, you see. And you cannot, because you write a creative poem, or you create a new profession, or you start a new -- a new firm, or -- or what-not, or marry a Chinese girl, for this reason, you cannot say that you are always creative.

The whole problem is in the in-between, the decision that you have to answer for both orders of the world, the world of the law, and the world of freedom; the world of the spirit, and the world of the mind, in other words. It runs right through you, this whole problem, which -- every generation of philosophers. But the new form is that you and I, treated as philosophers, are all at the same time Plato, a founder, founding spirit, and a Platonist, a mere college boy who learns who -- what Plato thought.

As far as you think something for the first time, gentlemen, it must be thought by you with your whole heart, and your whole mind, and all your understanding, and all your powers. In as far as you learn something by rote, you see, it can be lodged up here. The place of thought in your existence then becomes the vital distinction for the -- for the reality of what you think. Where is it lodged in your anatomy?

You know, Romeo asks this wonderful question, "In which part of my anatomy is my name lodged?" You have heard it? Who? It's wonderful. The

poets, of course, know -- has this wisdom long before the prosers have it. He knew it 400 years ago, that for Romeo and Aristotle, you see, their name was lodged in their whole being. They were the embodiment of this. For you it's a passing -- it's a passing flirtation, what Romeo went through. And what Aristotle went through in 63 years for you is one course here in this -- in this classroom, and then you dismiss it.

Now gentlemen, you must learn that Aristotle and you are not akin, even though you think he's true. The mere fact that you say with the mind that "probably Aristotle is right," does not allow you to tap Aristotle on the shoulder and say, "We are comrades in arms." Can you see this? There is a field of endeavor, I'm sure, in your own life, where you are the equal of Aristotle, but not in philosophy. And this is the damned curse which hangs over in this country, that you will not make this distinction, gentlemen, between the first and the repeater, the customer. The customer here of any -- of any motor car ranks, so to speak, with the man who construed the motor car.

To give you -- another example, gentlemen, of this great commiseration today is the story of Descartes. Descartes is, as you know, the modern, great leading spirit in philosophy. And by my saying "leading spirit," I already put him on the side of creativity, you see. And we have to say "leading spirit" if we want to do him justice. But he was -- the theory of his philosophy was that the mind was all that existed. Descartes has no room for the spirit. And he's a very useful example, because Descartes was a genius who deprecated the existence of genius, who said "There's just reason." "Everybody can think as I, Descartes, can think." And nobody asked him the silly question, the simple question, "But why didn't anybody ever think before you came?" I have today to defend the genius of Descartes against the system of Descartes. The same with Plato, you see. I have to say, "It is terribly important that people like Plato should be born," you see, "but they must have the right to write their own ticket. And therefore, they cannot be Platonists. It is more important that people like Plato are born, and Aristotle, and Descartes, you see. So I must defend genius, you see, against the consequences of genius."

This is what I mean when I say that any philosopher today, who does not make room for the miracle of the philosopher, for this freedom of the philosopher to say something new, is a poor philosopher, because he does not learn from Christendom in its victory over Greek philosophy, what had Paul taught the heathens -- the heathens, you see. That he had to bring to the heathens first the doctrine of the Lord, of the genius, you see, of the free man, before he could make any dent. As long as he wanted to -- draw the conclusions, from their

param- -- premises, you see, without preaching the crucified Lord, you see, he left out the miracle, which we represent in this universe of natural law. The miracle is that you and I, in the -- at the high points in our life, make a break, are the first cause. That's our divinity. If Aristotle says, "God is a first cause," what of it? Every one of you, in a certain way--if he helps an Hungarian orphan to come to this country, or what he -- -ever he does--he sets a new beginning. And so, that's our divinity, gentlemen, that we s- -- are a first cause in a small way, somewhere. And nobody, gentlemen, who has experienced that he is a first cause, knows who God is. Isn't that obvious? Before he just talks like a blind -- of the colors.

Most of you do this. But you are much better in your own life I think than you think you are. You are without rancor. You forgive a -- forgive a -- somebody has sinned against you. Anybody who can excuse another man, gentlemen, who can forgive him, is a first cause.

What is excuse, gentlemen? Can you interpret this word? What does it mean to excuse somebody? What is it? It's "causa," Latin, causation. To "excuse" means to do away with the cause which would lead to certain logical, mental, mechanical consequences, you see. If you excuse somebody, or excuse yourself, you say that this cause shall have no effect. Now every one of you, gentlemen, knows that this is possible. You make constantly excuses. And you always ask to be excused. And you always assume that I may excuse you. But I will be a damned fool if I ever let you know beforehand whether, in this case, I will -- am going to excuse you or not. I'm not going to do this, because I must keep my freedom too, you see. I cannot be a mechanism. You cannot say in advance, "He always excuses me." That's why a Christian is not the man who always turns the other cheek. But sometimes. But nobody can know in advance whether a Christian will turn the other cheek. If he would become a mechanism who always turns the other cheek, gentlemen, you see, you can buy him for a dime from Wurlitzer.

We are no mechanisms. You must never know, you see. Man is incalculable. And this is the problem then of your own mind, gentlemen. Your own mind must be able to follow precedent, and must be able to -- not to follow precedent. The same mind in a certain number of cases will say, "Yes, I'll just acquiesce. It has been done this way always; I'll do it again," you see. But not always. Sometimes. And nobody must ever know -- yourself must never know. So when the president in the United States said, "We will never use viol- -- force in the Middle East," I shuddered. How can a president say this? It's impossible. He has no right to say this. It's a free country. -- He's not a free man anymore if he says

in advance what he's ever going to do. He ca- -- he cannot know. He cannot know.

When -- when Wilson said he -- "I -- I kept the country out of war," he was at war four weeks later. That's the law of -- of the real -- of real life, gentlemen.

As soon as you try to -- to turn life into psychology and mechanisms, gentlemen, you will be overwhelmed by surprises, because everybody will begin to act the other way. The self-assertion, gentlemen, of the new beginning of -- of the miracle of freedom, you see, is -- just as with the Hungarian revolt. You see, if you had predicted this, everybody would have logically proven to you that it couldn't be done, that no Molotov tank, you see -- Molotov cocktail could blow up a Russian tank.

So the whole program, gentlemen, of modern philosophy is to take over the role of the fathers of the Church. The -- if you want to have universal truth, you cannot rely today on denominations, and you cannot rely on these petty frogs of the -- theological schools, who -- who are riveted, I mean, in their cleavages. It has to be the free, universal truth by which this great truth has today to be defended, or rediscovered, or stated, that in all of us, there is this combination of freedom and routine. And that our mind is the battlefield of the spirit and the mind.

And therefore, gentlemen, today we do not care for the Greek systems of philosophy, but we care terribly much for the philosophers. The Greek philosophers are the great argument in our fight for the truth of our own freedom, and our own faith, and our own creativity. Every one of these men broke away from one system, which he inherited, you see, and began his own. And in as far as genius today has to be, so to speak, placed, recognized, saved, spared, in an order of Communism, and of pragmatism, which abolishes all genius, which aboli- -- denies all freedom, which precalculates crises, et cetera, in such a predictable universe, we need every free spirit today to defend the incalculable in humanity. And it is today the -- not the system of the Greek philosopher, gentlemen, but his own existence, you see, by which we know that the spirit can be incarnated.

And therefore, the word against mechanism, gentlemen, is a little bit complicated. It is embodiment. If you call the mind "mech-" -- a "mechanism," it is his repetitive part, his expirational part, his dead-end street. But if you call -- the same man "an embodiment of the spirit," you see, then you see all the short-

comings of the mortal who speaks to you or who -- to who- -- whom you read, or from whom you learn. But you know that what I say may be much truer than the man who speaks here, that through me, the spirit has found a place of efficiency of -- in this material world.

So the end of the story, gentlemen, is quite an overwhelming one in this sense. All the tenets of Greek philosophers, the division of -- into idealism and materialism, I think can be -- have been blown into smithereens. Don't use these terms any more after this course, gentlemen. They say nothing to you and me, in truth. Nobody can be an idealist. Nobody can be a materialist. I certainly don't see how anybody can.

But there is a third party in the history of Greek philosophy. That's the Greek philosopher who created these schools, who said, "You have to be a materialist," you see, and "You have to be an idealist. Follow me." Well, at one time, he didn't follow, you see. He created. He heard something which he had to pass on. And this is today the -- the eminence of the Greek tradition, gentlemen. Can you still bear with me for 10 minutes? Because in order to -- can you? I'm sorry. It is the last time. It's my only opportunity. I will -- now -- because I want to cement a little bit this historical, tremendous transformation of the importance of Greek philosophy for you and me. I told you already that Mr. Jaeger wrote this book, *The Theology of the Greek Philosophers*. There is one deep reason, gentlemen--the deepest reason, I think--why at -- this moment is so important that you see the genius in the Greek philosopher and save, therefore, your own faith in inspiration, in pneuma, in spirit, in life-giving spirit, as the Bible calls it so very poignantly, you see, which is undermined in your environment. The reason for this secret is this, gentlemen: From the times of Thales to the times of the Stoics, and from the times of -- of Thomas Aquinas and Descartes to our own days, to the world wars, the abject mechanization of the mind by philosophy was always balanced by poetic faculties, by Dante, by the Greek tragedy, by poetry of all arts, and by the arts. And we all, even the worst rationalist, said that philosophy, if it -- he put it on the side of the -- of the mechanism, could be balanced by inspired poetry.

We no longer can rely on this balance, gentlemen. After the experience of the last 50 years, poetry has given up the spirit and has become itself anti-poetic, you may say, rational, logical, analytical. And therefore, because poetry is no longer checking philosophy, and science, you see, we have to become poetical. That is, we have to defend the powers represented by poetry. You have now to think not of what Mr. Sartre writes about putrefaction of the human mind, but

who he is. Who is Mr. Sartre that he can say a new word? You see, give us a frisson nouveau. Who is Proust? I do not care for his book. But I do very much care that such men like Proust still exist who say something different. That is, philosophers, gentlemen, at this moment must defend poetry, because poetry today has become philosophical. That is, it is so rationalized, it only sees the -- the mechanism of life. As long as you have such poetry, and in as far as poetry has given up its spirit and has become, so to speak, preaching the gospel of mechanization, and of nature, of physis, you see, obviously philosophy now has to pr- -- preach the gospel of pneuma. Because the poets are the pneumatics, are they not? They are the inspired people. And therefore it is now up to the philosophers to defend poetry, because it has now become the strange role of the poets to defend the cloaca maxima of indigestion, or whatever they deal with, the -- the itching of -- of your {vargus}, and sympaticus, and -- and your glands, and so on.

They are no longer poets. Never be betrayed by names, gentlemen. The functions of the human spirit constantly are transformed. If the poets cease to be poets, then the philosophers have to be -- cease to be rationalists, or logicians. And therefore we need a metalogic--as it has been called--"metalogic" or "pneumatology" which balances the mechanics and the embodiment processes of -- which permeates your and my strange being, gentlemen.

Partly, gentlemen, your mind is the product of your environment. And partly you embody the spirit. That is, a creative thought which has to come through you into this world. The history of Greek philosophy has at all times served as the great admonitor, that without genius, life comes to a standstill. The question is not between one law and the other law, between system and another system, gentlemen. This -- the problem is always that between unforeseen and foreseen, between laity and professional, for example, you see, you -- there can be no people of God on this earth, gentlemen, and no real people if everybody is an expert. This country is going to hell because there are no people left. There are only now people who have a job, jobholders, you see. The women. They were formerly the people, you see. Now we have class distinctions; the president can have a Cadillac. And I don't know what the vice-president can have, you see. And the worker can have a Ford. In this country there are suddenly divisions. In the last 20 years they had never existed, when we came. Very strange. In this very moment, gentlemen, where everything becomes mechanized, you see, the freedom of the laity, of the people, you see, in any one moment to break in with a surprise, with something that is not predictable has to be de-

fended by thought.

And therefore, I think that with this course, I should have -- liked to introduce -- to initiate you into the great secret that at this moment, there starts all over the world among serious people a new chapter in the history of the renaissance of the Greek spirit.

Thank you.